

SBVC Program Review Minutes –February 4, 2022

Members:

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

**Call to Order**: The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m.

**Approval of the minutes**: The meeting minutes for November 19th, 2021, was approved unanimously.

Needs Assessment Request has been received from 5 departments. Celia said that she had been to an ACCJC training and that their view was that the institution decides whether they have done an adequate analysis and that they are not to impose their definitions when they go out to evaluate a campus. Jesse pointed out that perhaps many needs assessment requests may focus on mission and not on vision and values and that the committee needs to be careful that they do not penalize any department for this. The EMP for a department that did not turn in a needs assessment request was used as an example to illustrate how to evaluate the data on the form.

Shalita asked how Kenny could have got a defective piece of equipment replaced without going through the whole needs assessment process because it was urgently needed. Celia pointed out that there was an urgent and emerging needs process through College Council that he had used. Dina said that she is encouraging the departments to build into their budget development any repair and maintenance needs.

Celia pulled up an EMP from one of the departments as an example and showed how to use the EMP information to evaluate the needs request.

Joanna briefed the committee on reviewing mission, vision and values which is a big part of our campus master plan update. Input from all areas of the campus community will be incorporated. Joanna requested the committee members to participate in this process as much as possible.

Celia reviewed the committee charge. She also reviewed the legal and accreditation requirements. She pointed out that the program efficacy and needs process is very much driven by a committee decision and that we can choose to change any part of the process to a different format. She suggested that it would be a good exercise to look at our current program efficacy documents and see if the questions that are asked fall within a legal or accreditation requirement. We can choose to ask any type of question as long as the legal and accreditation requirements are met.

Celia reviewed the efficacy document questions starting with the demographic data requirements. Joanna pointed out that we don’t need to keep the exact question as asked but that the concept should be represented within the document. She said that we could end up with separate efficacy documents for each area of the campus so that everyone could be answering to documents that are more representative of their work. Shalita pointed out that the demographic data from her area was very different from the campus demographics due to various factors beyond her control and that this has led to her document being judged poorly.

Erik Morden suggested that we should have a component in the document that addresses how the department is being equitable and that data can either support this or not but that the department would not be penalized.

The committee also reviewed the patterns of service questions within the efficacy document. Questions on campus culture, communications and climate were also reviewed.

Celia sent out the efficacy document to the committee so that they could look over the questions, evaluate whether they are a legal or accreditation requirement, and decide whether to keep the questions as they are or to rework them.

Joanna went over the review of the mission, values and vision of the College. We are at Step 1 of the process of review of the educational master plan which is inviting feedback from across campus. This will be incorporated into the document and sent out to a wider campus audience. Joanna invited the committee to give feedback on reviewing the mission of the college. Dina noted that the mission did not reflect the college’s commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion and anti-racism efforts. Shalita felt that the mission should be re-written. Kenny pointed out that the mission statement was written for that time and that it perhaps is not reflective of what we are focused on right now. David Smith suggested that we could incorporate diversity within the mission statement. Joanna invited the committee to email any ideas to her to improve the mission, vision and values statements.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:17 am.