

SBVC

Program Review

4/21/17
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
B 118

MINUTES

Members:	Kathy Adams	A	Kenny Melancon	X	X = Present A = Absent
	Aaron Beavor	A	Debbie Orozco	A	
	Laura Cross	X	Stacy Meyer	A	
	Diane Dusick	X	Sandra Moore	X	
	Rochelle Fender	X	David Smith	X	
	Paula Ferri-Milligan	X	Nori Sogomonian	X	
	Christie Gabriel	X	Shalita Tillman	A	
	Todd Heibel	X	Anna Tolstova	X	
	Timothy Hosford	X	Abena Wahab	A	
	Robert Jenkins	A	Kathryn Weiss	X	
	Joel Lamore	X	Jessica Roledo, ASG Rep.	A	
	Leonard Lopez	X			
	Michael Mayne	X			

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	FURTHER ACTION
Miscellaneous	<p>Would the Committee like to formulate a standard statement for late submissions? For reports that are late and receive conditional, if follow-up report not on time, then automatic probation.</p> <p>Teams to submit revised write-ups that include deficits and recommendations by next Thursday, 4/27.</p> <p>P. Ferri-Milligan addressed putting all of the needs assessment applications on the website. The question is whether this is an Accreditation issue.</p> <p>Last year, accepted conditional reports in fall. Is that adequate time, or move to spring? Only move Programs on probation; Conditional Programs may still apply for needs.</p> <p>CTE reports due April 24. Send Paula email if no revision.</p>	<p>P. Ferri-Milligan and K. Weiss will work with Celia Huston to address needs assessment form storage.</p>
Efficacy Team Reports/Committee Ratings	<p>HUMAN SERVICES – Team/Fender, Dusick, Lamore Areas of “DOES NOT MEET”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strategic Initiative – No discussion of demographics and no data for Pattern of Service. 2. Data/Analysis 3. SLOs –no reflection, details, analysis. Concerns, but not addressed. (Error on form – “SAOs” instead of SLOs.) <p>Team Recommendation – CONTINUATION. Committee voted unanimously to approve CONTINUATION.</p> <p>INSPECTION TECHNOLOGY – Team/Gabriel, Tolstova, Ferri-Milligan, Orozco Areas of ‘DOES NOT MEET”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demographics – Difference of opinion within Sub-Committee as to Meets/Does Not Meet. Lacking females (safety concerns and outreach) and racial diversity. Does not match data of school or nation. Need to address declining enrollment. Recommendation chosen by committee MEETS 9 does not meet 6 	

2. Student Success in the area of SLOs.
3. Mission – Productivity. Enrollment dropped.
4. Relevance/Currency/Articulation.
5. Technology/Partnerships/Campus Climate

Did not address previous does not meet.

Team Recommendation – CONDITIONAL. Committee voted unanimously to approve CONDITIONAL.

LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY – Team/Heibel, Tolstova, Lamore and Robledo

A few areas of weakness.

1. Currency with LIB 110
2. Technology/Partnerships/Campus Climate

Did a good job of addressing DOES NOT MEETS from previous document. Highly aware of issues.

Team Recommendation/continuation. Committee voted unanimously to approve CONTINUATION.

PSYCH TECH – Team/Moore, Dusick, Lopez

Demographics could have been clearer and does not have plans to address.

Areas of “DOES NOT MEET”:

1. Student Success – Committee voted 10-2 to change Team recommendation from Meets to Does not Meet.

Team Recommendation/continuation. Committee voted unanimously to approve CONTINUATION.

PSYCHOLOGY – Team/Smith, Sogomonian, Meyers

Overall nice job. SLOs evaluation – 87% taught by adjuncts, and low participation in SLOs from adjuncts.

Areas of “DOES NOT MEET”: None

Team Recommendation/continuation. Committee voted unanimously to approve CONTINUATION.

PUENTE – Team/Tolstova, Hosford, Fender

First submission. Recommend in future to specifically address SBVC College campus rather than global.

Areas of “DOES NOT MEET”:

1. Demographics – no analysis
2. SLOs – provided no data
3. Trends – Not clear

Team Recommendation/continuation. Committee voted 13-1 to approve CONDITIONAL.

RTVF – Team/Moore, Adams, Mayne

Well-written document. Institutional Effectiveness – Productivity could have repeated documentation.

Areas of “DOES NOT MEET”: None, and no previous areas of does not meet. Committee recommends better organization of productivity.

Team Recommendation/continuation. Committee voted unanimously to approve CONTINUATION.

REAL ESTATE – Team/Jenkins, Meyer, Heibel

Document submitted very late. Serious structural deficiencies in document.

Areas of “DOES NOT MEET”:

1. Access/Demographics/Pattern of Service
2. Student Success – SLOs. No course map. Brief with no analysis.

	<p>3. Institutional Effectiveness: Productivity and Content Review; several courses out-of-date. Team Recommendation/conditional. Committee voted with one opposed to approve CONDITIONAL.</p> <p>STAR – Team/Melancon, Mayne, Fender Document submitted late. Areas of “DOES NOT MEET”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access: Meets with a comment. Numbers do not match report; report came from two different people. 2nd chart needs to be changed. Replace? Analysis reflects data of 2nd report. Page 5: Committee troubled that program seems unconcerned with demographic problems as well program’s suggestion that questioning those numbers is somehow discriminatory. Further, discrepancy in % of white students in program; data was clearly inaccurate, but no response from department to Research Department. 2. Institutional Effectiveness 3. Planning: Accomplishments & Challenges. Change word “compare” to “describe.” Lacks specifics. <p>Team Recommendation/conditional. Committee voted with one opposed to approve CONDITIONAL.</p> <p>TUMAINI – Team/Adams, Wahab, Lopez Document submitted late. Lack of data and analysis. Areas of “DOES NOT MEET”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student Success – SLOs. Percentages are well below expectations. (Committee vote on response: MEETS:6 DOES NOT MEETS:7 ABSTAIN: 0) 2. Institutional Effectiveness – Productivity <p>Team Recommendation/conditional. Committee voted unanimously to approve CONDITIONAL.</p>	
<p>Periodic Review of Established Programs</p>	<p>Committee reviewed Title 5 and ACCJC requirements versus what we do in Program Review. Specific to CTE, programs are reviewed by regional team. Is there enough job market out there to support training program that we offer? CTE 2-year program...mini-review – is there still demand for program? New programs coming in should not duplicate what we do. Are classes duplicated in content? Based on this language, do we have argument/documentation to support that we are doing all these things if audited? Committee agreed that we meet their requirements with the exception of labor market.</p>	
<p>Next Meeting</p>	<p>April 28, 2017</p>	
<p>Adjournment</p>	<p>Meeting adjourned at 10:58 a.m.</p>	