

SBVC Program Review

9/1/17
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
B 118

MINUTES

Members:	Laura Cross	A	Kenny Melancon	X	X = Present A = Absent
	Rochelle Fender	X	Debbie Orozco	A	
	Paula Ferri-Milligan	X	Stacy Meyer	X	
	Christie Gabriel	X	Sandra Moore	X	
	Todd Heibel	X	David Smith	X	
	Timothy Hosford	X	Nori Sogomonian	X	
	Robert Jenkins	X	Shalita Tillman	A	
	Carol Jones	X	Anna Tolstova	X	
	Judith Joshua	X	Abena Wahab	X	
	Joel Lamore	X	Kathryn Weiss	X	
	Leonard Lopez	A			
	Michael Mayne	X			

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	FURTHER ACTION
Approval of Minutes-- August 18, 2017	Motion to approve August 18, 2017, minutes made by A. Tolstova. Seconded by D. Smith. Minutes approved unanimously.	
Review of Needs Assessment Forms	<p>The committee reviewed last year's needs assessment process and forms and discussed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic initiatives are separated from the Educational Master Plan document and posted on the Program Review website. This will be the link on the forms. • Line spacing on Technology request form needs to be adjusted so that it is easier to read and it is limited to one page. • The committee discussed whether other forms, besides Technology and Facilities, need to have signatures that writers met with a Program Review Committee member or attended a workshop. Instead, the committee decided that the instruction sheet state: The Program Review Committee strongly recommends that you either attend a needs assessment workshop or meet with a committee member to review your documents. • The instruction sheet should have Technology and Facility separated so that the requirement that writers must meet with R. Hrdlicka or R. Jenkins be easily seen. 	<p>P. Ferri-Milligan will revise the forms and send them to the committee for a final review.</p> <p>C. Gabriel will revise the EMP form so that the Strategic Initiatives link to those on the Program Review website.</p>
Discussion of Needs Assessment Process	K. Weiss asked whether needs requests should be limited because of monies that can be used narrowly. No motion was made, so the needs	

	<p>requests will not be limited.</p> <p>The committee discussed the rubric/priorities for evaluating needs assessment requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Safety 2. Mandates (regulations, licensing) 3. Impact on core of a program 4. Need based on EMP data (higher enrollment and productivity) <p>Other discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about qualitative data? EMP narrative--look closely at the way departments are evaluating • Link to efficacy reports--richer data • Committee--look back at the most recent efficacy report • Committee members--information source--not an advocate for their own areas. 	
Addition to Needs Assessment Process	<p>The committee discussed the extension of the needs assessment process to accommodate requests outside of the needs assessment phase. Monies become available through various funding sources and plans are made to acquire them. For example, although the SSSP & Equity plans were vetted on the campus, the needs were never reflected in the needs assessment process. In addition, grant applications often have a short turnaround--the needs are not identified through the needs assessment process before the grant is submitted. The suggestion was made to form a subcommittee to vet out the process. The subcommittee should keep in mind that the process should encompass time sensitive requests versus emergency requests. The subcommittee will produce guidelines for the process and bring back to the full committee. Volunteers for the subcommittee: J. Lamore, K. Weiss, N. Sogomonian, D. Smith, P. Ferri-Milligan</p>	P. Ferri-Milligan will call a meeting of the subcommittee.
Next Meeting	Friday, September 15, 2017, 9-11 a.m. in B-118	
Adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.	