|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SBVC Program Review** | | |  | 9/17/2021 10:00-11:30 AM Zoom Meeting |  | **Minutes** |
| Members: | Daniel Algattas | | x | Jessie Lemieux | x | X = Present A = Absent |
| Yon Che  Edward Jones  Armando Garcia | | X | Kenny Melancon | X |
| Michael Mayne | | X | Stacy Meyer | x |  |
| Tim Hosford | | X | Joanna Oxendine, co-chair | X |  |
| Maria Lopez | | A | Girija Raghavan | x | Guest: Dina Humble |
| Celia Huston, co-chair | | X | Bethany Tasaka | A |  |
| Magdalena Jacob | | A | Victoria Anemelu | x |  |
|  | |  | Anna Tolstova | x |  |
| Melissa King | | x | Shalita Tillman | A |  |
| Kenneth Lawler | | x | Kay Dee Yarbrough | X |  |
| David Smith | | X | Todd Heibel | X |  |
| **AGENDA ITEM** | | **DISCUSSION** | | | | **FURTHER ACTION** |
| Call to Order | | The meeting was called to order at 10:02 am | | | |  |
| Approval of the minutes | | The minutes were approved unanimously. | | | |  |
| CSUSB Program Review Model | | Joanna did an overview of the CSUSB Program Review Model. At CSUSB, only instructional programs go through program review. This is guided by the faculty. Every seven years, the program goes through a self-study whose purpose is to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the program and to identify areas of improvement. The whole Division works on the process and there is involvement from all faculty members within the program. There are specific guided questions which need to be answered and there is a timeline within which the process must be completed. The programs can identify an external reviewer to the program. The next level of review is the University Academic Program Review. This committee is made up of tenured faculty. Faculty from the program that is being reviewed are not allowed to be on this committee. Programs are allowed to request funding at other times, though all big requests come through program review. Joanna shared several documents that were used in the program review process. None of the reviews are graded, there is no probation or anything for a program. The process is a feedback loop so that programs can improve. The Associate Provost collects all the data and consolidates it into a Program Review Action Plan. Resources needed to improve programs are identified and made available through collaboration with the Deans and the VP of Finance.  Direct Requests are also made for non-instructional areas or for instructional areas in the off-cycle years. This is also a collaborative process with the Deans and VPs. Process C is the University Budget Advisory Committee and this is a funds surplus process. This process is used to distribute any surplus that has been identified. Department submit proposals and all proposals are considered and prioritized. | | | |  |
| Dates for Needs Assessment | | It was decided that sending the documents out in October and setting the submission deadline in November would give departments a month to work on them seemed like a reasonable timeline. A tentative due date of November 10th was agreed upon. | | | |  |
| Laney College and CurricuNet | | Kay Dee Yarborough had communicated with Laney College about Meta which is being used to build curriculum. She wanted to know what information from curricula should be in a program review module. Celia wanted to know if the system can get student success data that the committee can then look at. The system would take the existing forms and populate with student data from other modules. The committee could then work in the system, making notes and even voting within it. Todd requested another presentation from Meta about the capabilities of the system at SBVC. Celia mentioned that the accreditation committee had mentioned that they would be adopting the Meta system for SLO assessment. | | | |  |
| Supporting Chancellor’s Goals | | Celia suggested that the committee work together on an assignment detailing how Program Review supports the Chancellor’s goals. | | | |  |
|  | |  | | | |  |
| Adjourn | | The meeting was adjourned at 11:03 a.m. | | | |  |
|  | |  | | | |  |
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