

SBVC Program Review Minutes – December 3, 2021

Members:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Celia Huston-Chair** | X | Michael Mayne | A | Girija Raghavan | X | Bethany Tasaka | x |
| **Joanna Oxendine- Co-Chair** | X | Tim Hosford | x | Kenneth Lawler | x | Victoria Anemelu | x |
| Jessy Lemieux | x | Maria Lopez | x | David Smith | x | Anna Tolstova | x |
| Daniel Algattas | x | Eric Morden | x | Kenny Melancon | A | Shalita Tillman | x |
| Yon Che | x | Melissa King | x | Stacy Meyer | x | Kay Dee Yarborough | A |
| Todd Heibel | x | Edward Jones | x | Armando Garcia | x | Dina Humble | x |

* **Review Minutes:** The review of the minutes was postponed to the first meeting in the New Year.
* Joanna said that she was still in the process of finding out which of the Needs Assessment Requests for the previous year had been funded. She wanted to go through all the faculty positions that had been hired and see which were growth positions and which were replacement positions.
* Celia noted that the 10am meeting time did not seem to be working out for everybody. It was decided to go back to the previous meeting time of 9 am to 10:30 a.m.
* Rania Hamdy-Professional Development Coordinator-has given Program Review a time slot on commencement week to give out information on SLOs, Needs Assessment and Program Efficacy. Celia noted that she would like to use the time to find out what would make Program Review relevant for departments. We need to find out how Program Review can contribute to continuous quality improvement rather than be a check sheet. We could present the old efficacy report and then have breakout rooms to collect feedback.
* Joanna wondered how Program Review would be presented in Meta. Celia replied that it is custom-built for the college and that we could build the efficacy document using the questions we would like to ask. Dina observed that it is built using our process but that there were opportunities to explore other options as well.
* Jesse suggested that we look at an example of an efficacy report and try to find out which parts should be shorter and which parts need to be longer in order to get a clear picture of the program.
* Joanna observed that we need to find out which questions would serve to contribute to continuous improvement of programs.
* Shalita pointed out that the demographic question which asked to compare the demography of the campus with the demography of the particular program did not apply to her area as there were multiple reasons why a person may not qualify for the program.
* Joanna observed that we do not have to have a one size fits all document. We can have different documents for the instructional area, the student services area and the administrative area.
* Eric Morden pointed out that it is also about how the document is reviewed and judged. He noted that the process needs to be more constructive and not be seen to be punitive.
* Joanna said that the committee does not need to judge the programs but can contribute to supporting the departments by providing them with a continuous improvement model that can help them to take their areas forward.
* Celia noted that we probably should go more towards a SWOT model to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.
* Bethany shared the college’s new institutional learning outcomes with the committee. She invited feedback from the committee on the ILOs.
* Celia asked for volunteers for the role of facilitators of the breakout rooms during the presentation on Opening week. Jesse, Joanna and Shalita volunteered.
* It was decided that the first meeting of the new year would be on February 4th instead of on January 21st since that would fall on the first week of classes.
* The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.