SBVC
Program Review

9/16/16
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
B 118

MINUTES

Members:					
Laura Cross	X	Kenny Melancon	X	X = Present	
Diane Dusick	X	Stacy Meyer	X	A = Absent	
Rochelle Fender	A	Sandra Moore	X		
Paula Ferri-Milligan	X	Steve Sarres	X		
Christie Gabriel	X	David Smith	X		
Todd Heibel	X	Nori Sogomonian	X		
Robert Jenkins	X	Shalita Tillman	X		
Joel Lamore	X	Anna Tolstova	X		
Leonard Lopez	A	Abena Wahab	X		
Michael Mayne	A	Kathryn Weiss	X		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	FURTHER ACTION
Approval of Minutes	Motion to approve minutes of September 2, 2016, made by T. Heibel; seconded by S. Sarres. Passes unanimously.	

College Council Report—EMP/FMP	P. Milligan reported that the FMP is further along than the EMP. Focus of College Council was on the EMP, which is heavily loaded with Basic Skills and CTE. Transfer was not mentioned. What does the committee want brought back to the consultants? We need to weave CTE and Transfer together. We are a comprehensive community college and that needs to be reflected in the documents. The charts on the EMP are of concern since they have unexplained highlighted items. The committee would like clarification on those items. Honors is not mentioned. Concern over too much classroom space. State formula 8:00 a.m.-10:00 p.m. M-F, and we have some dead periods for which we will take a hit. Also, some classes are in rooms that are not appropriate; small classes are in large classrooms. Our student population may not be available to take classes during those dead times. Future funding/matching funds needs to show, through this process, that we need more classrooms. We need more computer labs. Ratio is class cap to room square footage. We would like disclaimer that includes our student population. Comparing us to the state is useful but not necessarily what's happening at Valley—for example, saying we have too many computer labs. Many depts. are not scheduling at these times because students do not take the classes at those times. Are clubs or special event use included in classroom usage statistics? Does supplemental instruction room use get factored in? Academic student support? Tied to both EMP and FMP is discussion of growth and new program. Strong Work Force has large influx of money coming in. Need process to vet new growth, programs, activities, and Program Review is a good place to do that. Not efficacy, but we may need embedded in our system a new program viable in our community. Would labor market show that? If we have a process for CTE only, what if a dept. decided we need Ethnic Studies? Our resources remain the same, and some programs may get allocations when not properly vetted. Need reasonable process vetting for cross-discipline/cross-program on campus. K. Weiss requested input from Committee. Suggestion: Have everything go through consortium before bringing to campus. We would have same data to decide if it seems like it would be a viable program. Would not work for non-CTE programs. Need one process for that. Send them out at the same time? Some new programs will be included in department documents. Some will be new departments, and their resources would need vetting. We are logical committee to look at this. Process needs to show need. Could be done alongside needs assessment. What if they want new program in January? Better for our workload to deal with them as they come up. If established, would go into normal efficacy cycle. We would just recommend or not recommend programs to President in our capacity as an advisory committee. Do we want a role in evaluating new programs? Consultants wanted someone to identify 10 most-likely-to-grow programs. With EMP, we will include process, but there's no way to provide that information within the next week. There are already four programs in this category. We need expansion and contraction category. After those 10 are identified…what happens? What happens in EMP will drive College. We don't have enough time to dialog this out in our committee for substantial contribution. There are no cross-dialogs coming together. CHC chose programs with highest WCSH. There are many transfer programs that help CTE with pre-reqs. These are inter-twined. What is the rush on the deadline? Any other concerns to bring to College Council? The EMP and FMP documents are ours now. Tech Building is next concern. Focus on dialogs rather than deadlines. Take two months to review document, and then bring to Board. Consultant forums are next Friday, 9/23, at 1:00 and 5:00 p.m.; K. Weiss encouraged Committee Members to attend and contribute.	K. Weiss & P. Milligan will bring the concerns and corrections to the consultants at the College Council meeting. Kay & Paula will look at ways to evaluate viability of new programs.

Norming Session	P. Milligan supplied the committee with three needs assessment documents from previous semesters in order to engage in norming discussions. The committee discussed what should be considered as we move forward in the current needs assessment process. The following considerations were addressed as important:
	  o Savings
	  o Foundational Material
	  o Stops Program
	  o Urgency
	  o Document completeness/explanation.
	  o Solid justification.
	  o Tied to the rest of the plan.
	
	Program Review Committee members need to make sure it's clarification rather than advocacy when addressing documents.
	
	How do we relate division document to ranking? It gives us context. Need Framework. In rankings, sometimes our committee disagrees with division ranking, and then their subsequent ranked items get overlooked due to first ranking blocking consideration of others. We will leave consideration of rankings the way they are for now. There are certain requests that grant funding will not cover, and those factors should be represented in dept. document.
	
	Small dept. can never grow if no full-timer to advocate. Suggestion that each department has at least one full-time faculty member.
	
	Committee gained basis of assessment.	

Misc.	Financial Aid had conditional rating and FA Manager said not able to meet October deadline for re-written document and no additional information to provide anyway. Do we extend deadline for document? No. Dean Marco Cota will be requested to submit document. Three Programs on probation from last year: Water Supply Technoloby Marketing/PR Food & Nutrition	
Adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 10:52 a.m.	
Next Meeting	October 7, 2016	