

<b>SBVC Program Review</b>		8/28/2020 9:00-11:00 AM Zoom Meeting			<b>Minutes</b>	
Members:	Daniel Algattas	x	Jessie Lemieux	x	X = Present	A = Absent
	Yon Che	x	Kenny Melancon	x		
	Laura Estrada	x	Stacy Meyer	x	Guests: Bethany Tasaka	
	Tim Hosford	x	Joanna Oxendine, co-chair	x		
	Dina Humble		Girija Raghavan	x		
	Celia Huston, co-chair	x	Bethany Tasaka	x		
	Magdalena Jacobo	x	Shalita Tilman			
	Bob Jenkins		Anna Tolstova	x		
	Melissa King	x	Abena Wahab	x		
	Kenneth Lawler	x	Kay Dee Yarbrough	x		
	Robert Jenkins	x				
<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>				<b>FURTHER ACTION</b>	
Welcome and Introductions	Celia welcomed everyone to the meeting. She has chaired the committee previously and is looking forward to working with all the members of the committee. Introductions were done. The agenda and an overview of survey results were reviewed.					
Committee Charge and Membership	The committee works under the authority of the Academic Senate and reports to them. There is a 4-year cycle. The charge of the committee was read out. The membership is 10% faculty, 3 classified and 3 managers.					
Academic Senate	Anti-racism on the agenda of all consultative committees who are going to support and work towards equity and inclusivity. The					

Resolution SU20.21	resolution was read out. Celia pointed out that the resolution should be kept in mind as we go through the meeting and that it will be read out again at the end. It was pointed out that some committees like the honors committee has no funding. Tumaini and Puente which have large numbers of African American and Hispanic students are also lacking funding. Tim Hosford pointed out that they report separately. Celia is going to look into ways to provide funding. Kenneth Lawler asked if huddle reports to program review.	
Program Review and Accreditation	Standard 1B addresses program efficacy. SBVC's program efficacy is tied to the mission of the college. We look at all the steps needed for program efficacy and provide feedback to the departments.	
Overview of Campus Program Review Processes	Kenny pointed out that reviewing SLOs was the new requirement. No one was able to complete this well as this was too broad a requirement. Departments need more direction on completing this part. Joanna pointed out that she tried to narrow the focus with some depts to make it more concise. Analyzing selected data took almost 8 hours. Kenny pointed out that data organization and doing SLOs for each class is very time consuming. He suggested taking the total for each class rather than report on each section. EMP sheets will be emailed out on September 10 <sup>th</sup> . Needs Assessment will be done in the Fall and program efficacy in the Spring. The prioritized list will be sent to College Council. Most department do the spring program efficacy once every 4 years, except for CTE department which are on a 2-year cycle. Evaluation of the program review process needs to be done for accreditation. Currently we have not template for adding new programs.	
Quality Focus Essay	The Quality Focus Essay was read out by Celia. Kenny mentioned that he was trying to start a new class which is a program. Celia mentioned that she will send out the full Quality Focus Essay. Tim Hosford pointed out that there is no established process to add new programs to program review. Needs to establish a process for this.	

<p>Program Review Survey Results</p>	<p>Joanna will work to build out an executive summary of survey results. She will have documentation as to how the different pieces in the survey fit together. She will have a detailed look at the results connected with needs assessment before next week. Most people who answered the survey said that they were aware of the program review efficacy submission. Also, most people replied that aspects of the process were helpful. It was pointed out that rather than being a box-ticking exercise, the program efficacy process is about continuous improvement. Discussions need to take place which involve the whole department. An overall ranking for submitting needs assessment was required in the survey. The top ranked was job market/industry demands. Current efficacy status was ranked last for moving forward with needs assessment by several of the respondents. Promotion of equity/access was ranked higher by some and lower by some respondents. The survey was completely anonymous. Future surveys may include questions on work area. Majority opinion was that needs assessment was ineffective and in need of change. Unclear prioritization and who has the ultimate decision to fund was not clearly communicated. Some respondents feel that they do not know enough about the needs assessment process. Most found the EMP sheets useful. Some respondents mentioned that they are not involved in the process and that the deans took care of it. Needs assessment replies mentioned funding availability, non-equitable prioritization, vague criteria, subjective voting. It was also mentioned that needs overwhelms the process and that there is no rationale for non-funding. Data is not available in a timely manner. Forms were regarded as lengthy and cumbersome. Half of the respondents said that the process helps in continuous improvement. There are no consequences or actions if they do not participate. Forms do not fit some areas. It was also mentioned that the process is not valued outside the committee or accreditation. Kenny mentioned that people wait till the last minute</p>	
--------------------------------------	---	--

	<p>and cut and paste from previous years information. Celia stated that we probably need one-on-one conversations with departmental chairs. Kenny noted that many departments do not attend the workshops that are offered. Joanna said that people would like to see examples of good reports so that they can have guidance ahead of time. Forms need to be streamlined and people are not finding the forms useful for continuous improvement. The college needs to conduct an in-depth review of the program review process and the culture around the process needs to change. Joanna will get more info on the needs assessment section of the survey. EMP sheets will be sent out on September 10<sup>th</sup>. Laura mentioned that some management positions do not have the same voice as others. Kenny said that he has been trying to get funding back for a department that lost funding and that there is no process to do this. There seems to be no rationale for the removal of funding.</p>	
Needs Assessment 2020	<p>Celia mentioned that we can suspend the needs assessment process for the fall. After review and changes having been incorporated, we can do the actual needs assessment in the spring. Feedback can also be obtained from Academic Senate. Kenny mentioned that it might be too late to put down needs if the process is suspended. A motion was put forward to suspend the program efficacy process for the spring. It was mentioned that programs that are on probation will be able to re-submit and come off probation if the efficacy process is suspended in the spring. Kay Dee Yarborough seconded the motion to suspend program efficacy for spring 2021. Voting was as follows: 12 yes, and 4 abstained. Joanna said that a deep dive into the survey results for needs assessment will be sent out prior to the next meeting on September 4<sup>th</sup>.</p>	<p>Motion “To suspend program efficacy reports in Spring 21 in order to fully evaluate the program efficacy process and revise the program efficacy forms.”</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> Kay Dee Yarborough</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> Melissa King</p> <p>Motion Passed</p>
Academic Senate Resolution	<p>The Academic Senate Resolution was read out again</p>	

SU20.21 Revisited		
Academic Senate Bylaws	Bye law changes were that the chair can only serve two terms.	
Adjournment	The meeting adjourned at 10:59 am.	

NEXT Friday, September 4, 2020  
MEETING:  
9:00 - 11:00 AM  
via Zoom