



San Bernardino
Valley College

Institutional Program Review
Annual Report
2025-26



San Bernardino Valley College
701 S. Mt. Vernon Avenue
San Bernardino, CA 92410
(909) 384-4400

Institutional Program Review Committee Members 2025-2026

Committee Co-Chairs

Dr. Danielle Graham (Faculty)
Bethany Tasaka (Faculty)
Gabriel Martinez Larzo (Administrator)

Administrative Assistant

Shyla Cobbett

Classified Members

Isaac Hayden (Fall 2025)
Sarah Yearyearn (Spring 2026)
Timothy Hosford
Nathan Yearyearn

Faculty Members

Victoria Anemelu
Anthony Blacksher
Jaime Garcia
Jessica Gordon
Leslie Gregory
Abeir Israeil
Dominique Johnson
Kimberly Johnson
Yvette Lee
Brandy Major
Stacy Meyer
Fili Michele
Doris Ontiveros
Miguel Ortiz
Ebony Perez
Natalie Peterkin
Melissa Romero
Christina Torres
Angie Vogel

Management Members

Joanne Hinojosa
Erik Morden
Vanessa Thomas

Student Representative

Vacant

Table of Contents

Institutional Program Review Committee Members 2025-2026	2
Committee Co-Chairs	2
Administrative Assistant.....	2
Classified Members.....	2
Faculty Members.....	2
Management Members.....	2
Student Representative	2
Introduction.....	5
Program Review Committee Charge	5
Adopted Charge and Purpose.....	5
Membership	5
Participatory Governance Restructuring.....	6
Key Changes	6
Recommendations for the Restructured Committee	6
ASPIRE Year 3: Demand & Currency	7
Context	7
ASPIRE Year 3 Timeline.....	8
ASPIRE Submission Overview	9
2025-26 ASPIRE Themes.....	9
Claims Without Sufficient Data	9
Goals and Planning Disconnected from SWOT	10
Variation in Data Use and Evidence Quality.....	10
Individual Program Needs vs. Campus-Wide Needs.....	11
Opportunities for Cross-Campus Collaboration	11
Use of AI and Buzzwords	12
Kudos: Exemplary ASPIRE Work.....	12
2025-26 ASPIRE Process Feedback & Recommendations.....	12
2025-26 Resource Requests	13
Resource Request Process	13
Technology Committee Non-Ranking: A Note for the Record	13

2025–26 Resource Request Rankings	15
Budget	15
Equipment	16
Classified Professionals.....	17
Faculty.....	18
Facilities	20
Technology	20
Looking Ahead: 2026–27.....	22
Unresolved Questions: Program Review’s Role in the New Resource Request Structure	22

Introduction

The Program Review process has been in existence at San Bernardino Valley College (SBVC) since 1992. Program Review is a college-wide, collaborative effort to rigorously evaluate each program so that resources can be allocated where growth and need are indicated and reallocated where there is no longer a clear programmatic need for fiscal support. The resulting document is used for short- and long-range planning and is advisory to the President, the Budget Committee, College Council, and the Academic Senate.

The 2025–26 academic year marked the third year of the All Services and Programs Institutional Resources & Engagement (ASPIRE) process, with the annual lens focused on Demand & Currency. It also marked a year of meaningful transition for the committee itself, as Program Review began the process of formal restructuring under the new Participatory Governance framework approved by College Council. Prior to commencing with regular committee meetings, the committee took part in an orientation on August 21, 2025.

Program Review Committee Charge

At the opening meeting of the 2025–26 academic year on September 5, 2025, the Program Review Committee formally adopted a revised Charge and Purpose, reflecting a modernized description of the committee’s role and a streamlined statement of purpose. The revision had been under consideration for multiple years; with newly elected faculty co-chairs in place, the committee was able to finalize and adopt the language with broad support. The Charge and Purpose were approved by the Academic Senate on October 1, 2025, and by the College Council on October 29, 2025.

Adopted Charge and Purpose

The Program Review Committee guides and serves as a resource for the process of self-evaluation of all instructional and service areas for regular assessment of San Bernardino Valley College programs. Program Review is conducted by authorization of the SBVC Academic Senate.

The purpose of Program Review is to:

- Guide the college through an ongoing self-examination of how effectively programs and services are aligned with its mission, vision, and values through a structured process.
- Foster a culture of continuous improvement.
- Contribute information and recommendations, including needs assessment and resource requests, to other college processes and committees.

Membership

The 2025–26 year saw the continuation of two faculty co-chairs, Dr. Danielle Graham and Bethany Tasaka, and the appointment of Gabriel Martinez Larzo as Administrative Co-Chair.

Membership comprises faculty representatives by division, classified professionals, management representatives, and a student representative. The student representative position remained vacant throughout the year. A total of 19 faculty members, three classified professionals, and three management representatives were assigned to the committee. Isaac Hayden served as a classified professional representative during Fall 2025 and was replaced by Sarah Yearyear for Spring 2026.

The committee continued to experience challenges related to attendance and quorum. Across the academic year, several meetings did not achieve quorum, which at times slowed the pace of substantive work. Contributing factors included competing meetings and obligations, non-service days for non-instructional faculty, and some uncertainty related to anticipated changes in committee structure under the Participatory Governance Taskforce (PGTF) process. While these challenges did not prevent the committee from accomplishing its core work, they reinforce the ongoing need to revisit the structure, size, and composition of the committee as part of the governance restructuring process underway. The committee's experience mirrors challenges documented in prior years' annual reports and provides additional evidence for the importance of establishing clearer expectations and accountability for committee participation.

Participatory Governance Restructuring

A significant development in 2025–26 was the active engagement with the Participatory Governance Taskforce (PGTF) and the subsequent College Council approval of a new committee structure for the institution. This restructuring has direct implications for Program Review and its role within the governance ecosystem at SBVC.

Key Changes

- **Academic Senate Committee:** Program Review is expected to transition from a campus-wide committee to a committee formally housed under the Academic Senate. This shift aligns Program Review more explicitly with faculty governance and academic inquiry.
- **New Companion Committees:** The restructuring established two new committees with which Program Review will interface: the Planning, Resource, and Allocation Committee (PRAC) and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC). Resource request recommendations and data-informed institutional findings from Program Review are expected to flow to these bodies, which in turn report to College Council.
- **Service and Non-Academic Areas:** Discussion is ongoing regarding how service and non-academic areas will be reviewed and how their resource requests will be channeled. The committee anticipates that a separate or parallel review pathway may be developed for these areas, with outputs flowing through the new committee structure.

Recommendations for the Restructured Committee

The Program Review Committee offers the following recommendations as the restructuring process continues, based on the committee's experience this year and the

discussions that took place throughout the 2025–26 academic year:

- **Reduce and clarify voting membership.** The committee discussed the challenges of maintaining quorum with a large and diverse membership. While maintaining a broader voting body, reducing quorum requirements within each representative group, would improve reliability and accountability. Non-voting resource representatives (e.g., from RPIE, PRAC, Facilities, Technology, and IE) could attend as needed to provide expertise without burdening quorum.
- **Formalize reading group capacity.** ASPIRE report reading is labor-intensive. Any membership model should explicitly account for this workload and ensure that the number of reports assigned per member is manageable. This year’s model of 5 reading groups with approximately 8 reports per group provided a workable structure.
- **Clarify Program Review’s scope within the new structure.** The committee recommends that the charge language be narrowed to focus on academic programs and student-serving academic support areas, while recognizing that some functions may shift to PRAC or IEC under the new structure. This will reduce confusion about what goes to Program Review versus other institutional processes.
- **Continue Friday morning meetings.** In-person Friday morning meetings were generally supported by committee members as the preferred format on a committee poll and during in-person discussions.
- **Establish Fall 2026 as a formal recalibration period.** As ASPIRE Year 4 does not begin until Spring 2027 (with reports due at the end of Spring 2027), Fall 2026 provides a natural window to review the process, align timelines with budget and planning cycles, onboard new committee members, and implement the restructured committee model.

ASPIRE Year 3: Demand & Currency

The 2025–26 ASPIRE process represented the third year of the six-year ASPIRE cycle. This year’s lens, Demand & Currency, directed programs to focus their SWOT analysis on the current and anticipated demand for their programs and services, as well as the degree to which their curriculum, practices, and offerings remain current and relevant to students, industry, and the broader educational landscape.

Context

Year 3 reports were generally stronger and more comprehensive than Year 2, which the committee attributes in part to the greater clarity of the Demand & Currency lens, as compared to the more politically complex DEIA lens that defined Year 2. The committee also benefited from a full year of elected faculty leadership, which brought stability and focus to the process. That said, variation in report quality remained, with some programs providing robust, data-driven analyses and others relying on more qualitative or narrative descriptions that would benefit from quantitative evidence.

An important structural change this year was the decision to combine “Demand” and “Currency/Relevance” into a single unified lens rather than treating them as separate foci. This was approved by the committee at the September 5, 2025, meeting and reflected in the Year 3 Meta form, allowing for a more holistic analysis of how programs remain in-demand and contemporary.

Due to ongoing issues with the CurriQunet Meta system and lack of responsiveness to flexibly meet the committee’s needs, committee members were directed to submit their feedback through a Microsoft Form rather than directly in Meta, which served as a practical workaround for a portion of the year.

ASPIRE Year 3 Timeline

Date	Support/Activity	Location/Format
October 3, 2025	Workshop 0 – ASPIRE Year 3 Launch & Process Overview	Campus – In Person
September–November 2025	Scheduled Division Visits by Co-Chairs	By Division
December 5, 2025	Workshop 2 – Goals, Plans, Resource Requests, Meta Submission	Hybrid
December 17, 2025	Open Office Hours	Hybrid: Zoom & B-119
December 19, 2025	Early ASPIRE Submission Deadline	CurriQunet Meta
January 16, 2026	Stragglers’ Day – Final Submission Deadline	CurriQunet Meta
February–March 2026	Reading Groups – Committee Review of ASPIRE Reports	Independent / Committee
February 20, 2026	Resource Request Process & Reading Group Assignments Discussed	In Person
March 13, 2026	Theme Discussion – Patterns Across Reports	In Person
April 3–17, 2026	Division Rankings Finalized; Theme & Feedback	In Person

Date	Support/Activity	Location/Format
	Discussion Continued	
April 2026	Resource Requests Forwarded to College Council (April 29, 2026)	College Council

ASPIRE Submission Overview

Approximately 40 ASPIRE reports were submitted for the 2025–26 cycle. The committee organized these into five reading groups of approximately eight reports each. Reading groups were intentionally structured to balance divisional representation, mix experienced and newer committee members, and avoid members reviewing their own departments when possible. Each member provided written feedback through the committee’s capture form, and themes emerging across reports were discussed at the committee’s March and April meetings.

As in prior years, the committee’s approach to reading was feedback-focused rather than rubric-based. Members were guided to offer constructive observations on alignment between SWOT analyses and goals, the presence and quality of supporting evidence and data, the clarity of planning goals, and the degree to which reports reflected the Demand & Currency lens.

2025–26 ASPIRE Themes

The following themes were identified through the committee’s review of ASPIRE Year 3 reports and the collective discussion of patterns emerging across divisions and program types. These themes are intended to inform campus planning, support institutional effectiveness conversations, and guide future ASPIRE process improvements.

Claims Without Sufficient Data

One of the most consistent observations across reports was that programs made strong claims, particularly regarding demand, full classes, and the need for additional full-time faculty, without providing the quantitative evidence necessary to fully substantiate those claims. The committee frequently noted statements about high enrollment, waitlists, and capacity concerns that were not accompanied by enrollment figures, fill rates, efficiency data, or historical trend information.

- Programs that did provide hard data (enrollment trends, fill rates, FTES, success rates, and labor market alignment) produced noticeably stronger and more compelling reports.
- Many programs referenced the need for more full-time faculty as their primary response to high demand, but did not connect that claim to data about student outcomes, course cancellations, or adjunct-to-faculty ratios.

- The committee recommends that the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (RPIE) provide more proactive outreach and support to help programs access and interpret data from the SBVC Data Dashboards and other institutional sources prior to the ASPIRE submission window.
- Specifically, the committee recommends offering one-on-one dashboard training appointments for department chairs and a structured orientation meeting at the start of each fall semester between RPIE and department leadership to clarify what data can be requested and how to incorporate it into SWOT analyses.

Goals and Planning Disconnected from SWOT

A recurring concern was the disconnect between the SWOT analysis and the Goals and Planning sections of reports. Programs sometimes identified meaningful weaknesses, opportunities, or threats in their SWOT but then failed to address those same issues in their goals, or vice versa. In several cases, goals were carried over unchanged from prior years with no indication of whether they had been reviewed, evaluated, or updated.

- Goals should be written in a way that is concrete and measurable, with clear end-states and timelines rather than open-ended maintenance language (e.g., “will continue to” or “will remain”).
- Planning should describe the “how” of achieving stated goals, not simply restate the goals or offer general rationale.
- Programs should be encouraged to explicitly note when goals from prior years have been achieved, revised, or are no longer relevant, rather than simply carrying them forward.
- The committee will consider revisions to the Meta form prompts or accompanying guidance documents to better scaffold the connection between SWOT and Goals and Planning.

Variation in Data Use and Evidence Quality

The committee observed a clear divide between programs that approached their ASPIRE submissions with robust quantitative and qualitative evidence and those that relied primarily on narrative description. This variation was observed both across and within divisions.

- Programs that excel tend to use enrollment data, course fill rates, success rates, labor market information, and student attestations to support their analysis. The committee identified several “model” reports (noted in the appendix) that demonstrate exemplary integration of data and narrative.
- Programs that struggle often acknowledge the existence of relevant data (e.g., “our enrollment has grown significantly”) without providing the actual figures, limiting the committee’s and administration’s ability to act on those claims.

- Student Learning Outcome (SLO) data and disaggregated data (by race/ethnicity, Pell status, and other equity indicators) remains underutilized across reports, even as the college has designated BSI and HSI status and Vision 2030 equity goals are in place.

Individual Program Needs vs. Campus-Wide Needs

Many resource requests, particularly in the areas of technology and facilities, reflected concerns that extend beyond any single program. Outdated technology infrastructure, inadequate lab space, and limited support staffing emerged as recurring concerns across multiple programs in different divisions. The committee discussed the challenge of channeling these campus-wide concerns through a program-specific resource request process.

- Technology requests and Facilities requests tended to reflect systemic infrastructure needs (e.g., outdated computers, aging software systems) that may not be best addressed through the ASPIRE Resource Request process.
- The committee recommends developing clearer guidance—and potentially a separate campus-level process—for distinguishing between individual program resource needs and institutional infrastructure needs that should be addressed through IT, Facilities, or other college-level planning processes.
- Space and time constraints emerged as a near-universal theme, with programs across divisions noting that physical space limitations and competing scheduling demands are significant barriers to growth and quality.

Opportunities for Cross-Campus Collaboration

Multiple programs identified opportunities for cross-campus partnerships and collaboration that were not yet fully realized. The committee observed that programs often operate in relative isolation from one another, even when their goals and student populations overlap significantly.

- The Library, STEM-MESA Center, Academic Success Center, and Counseling Services were each identified by multiple other programs as potential partners, suggesting opportunities for more intentional coordination among these areas.
- The committee recommends that the ASPIRE process more explicitly prompt programs to identify collaboration opportunities and to document any cross-departmental partnerships in their TOASTS and Goals and Planning sections.
- A future committee or institutional structure, possibly through the IEC or PRAC, could take responsibility for identifying and nurturing these cross-campus connections as they emerge from program review data.

Use of AI and Buzzwords

The committee noted a pattern of programs referencing state legislative changes (AB 705, AB 928, AB 1111, CalGETC, etc.) and emerging topics such as artificial intelligence without substantive analysis of how these factors specifically affect the program's demand, curriculum, or practice.

- References to AI appeared in two distinct ways across reports: as a tool to support or streamline work, and as a concern or threat related to academic integrity and student preparation. The committee recommends that future ASPIRE guidance encourage programs to be specific about how AI is affecting or could affect their work, rather than treating it as a general buzzword.
- Similarly, legislative references should be accompanied by analysis of their specific implications for enrollment, curriculum, workforce alignment, or student success within the program.

Kudos: Exemplary ASPIRE Work

The committee recognized two programs for particularly strong Year 3 submissions that represented model approaches to the ASPIRE process:

- **Culinary Arts:** The Culinary Arts program demonstrated strong commitment to doing all the things required in its ASPIRE submission. Despite operating with significant space and resource constraints, the program produced a detailed and candid account of its challenges and continued dedication to student and program success.
- **Film, Television & Media (FTVM):** The FTVM program produced a comprehensive, well-organized submission with strong evidence of demand through enrollment growth, industry alignment, and workforce relevance. The program's forward-looking planning, including new certificates and expanded programming, was clearly supported by the SWOT analysis.

The committee extends thanks to all programs that participated in the ASPIRE Year 3 process. The work of reflection, analysis, and planning that goes into these submissions is consequential and deeply valued.

2025–26 ASPIRE Process Feedback & Recommendations

Based on the committee's experience this year, the following process improvements are recommended for future ASPIRE cycles:

- **Data support prior to submission.** RPIE should provide proactive data support to programs before the ASPIRE submission window opens. One-on-one appointments for department chairs, a structured fall orientation between RPIE and program leadership, and development of data coaching are strongly recommended.

- **Read reports during committee time.** Beginning with next year’s cycle, the committee discussed shifting some report reading to designated committee meeting time, which may improve consistency of engagement and allow for more immediate discussion of emerging themes.
- **Strengthen the Meta prompts.** Revisions to the CurriQunet Meta form should be considered to better scaffold the connection between SWOT analysis and Goals and Planning, and to encourage the use of specific data rather than qualitative claims alone.
- **Clarify ASPIRE’s scope relative to new governance structures.** As PRAC and IEC are established, the committee recommends a deliberate conversation about which elements of the ASPIRE process and resource request review belong within Program Review versus those new bodies.
- **Develop meta-feedback for programs.** Programs would benefit from receiving a summary of committee themes and observations as part of the ASPIRE feedback cycle, rather than only individual report feedback. This annual report can serve as one mechanism for that, and should be widely shared with campus constituents.

2025–26 Resource Requests

The Program Review Committee conducted its annual campus-wide Resource Request process in connection with ASPIRE Year 3. Resource requests in the categories of budget, equipment, facilities, technology, classified professionals, and faculty were submitted by programs as part of the ASPIRE process and subsequently ranked at the division level before being brought to the committee for final review.

Resource Request Process

This year, division rankings were used as the basis for the committee’s final recommendations, consistent with the approach established in 2024–25. The committee’s role was to review divisional submissions for completeness, identify any concerns, and forward the compiled ranked list to College Council for consideration at the April 29, 2026, meeting.

Eligible Request Categories: Budget augmentation, equipment, facilities, technology, classified professionals, and faculty (growth positions only). The committee reiterates the guidance from prior years that replacement positions, salary-related budget increases, and subscription renewals for existing software should not be submitted through the ASPIRE resource request process.

Technology Committee Non-Ranking: A Note for the Record

The committee wishes to document a significant process challenge that arose in the Technology request category this year. The Technology Committee, which is responsible for ranking technology-related requests forwarded by Program Review, declined to

provide rankings for the 2025–26 Technology Requests.

A series of substantive concerns about the quality and completeness of the technology requests submitted was raised by a Tech Support Specialist II with Campus Technology Services who sits on both Program Review and the Technology Committee. His concerns, which were shared with and supported by the Technology Committee Faculty Chair and many members of the committee, included:

- Multiple requests that were categorized as technology but were more appropriately classified as furniture (Library lab hide-away desks) or department-level software renewals (Automotive subscriptions, Welding software licenses) that fall outside the scope of ASPIRE funding.
- Requests where it was unclear whether the item was new or a renewal of existing software, making it impossible to properly evaluate the request.
- Requests where the quoted costs were based on internet searches rather than formal quotes from the Director of Campus Technology Services, resulting in significant discrepancies between requested amounts and actual anticipated costs (e.g., Biology iPad request underestimated by approximately \$3,165; Chemistry laptop request underestimated by approximately \$14,210).
- Insufficient information in several requests to allow for meaningful evaluation or ranking.

Due to these concerns, this member formally abstained from ranking the requests and asked that his concerns be forwarded to the Program Review Committee. The Technology Committee, in turn, did not return a ranked list of technology requests to Program Review.

The committee acknowledges that this outcome reflects a systemic gap in the current process: programs are submitting technology requests without consulting with Campus Technology Services (CTS) prior to submission, resulting in incomplete information and inaccurate cost estimates. The committee makes the following recommendations in response:

- **Require CTS pre-approval for technology requests.** Going forward, all technology resource requests should require sign-off or consultation with the Director of Campus Technology Services prior to submission in Meta. This will ensure that requests are appropriately categorized, properly specified, and accurately priced.
- **Clarify what constitutes an eligible technology request.** Campus-wide communications prior to each ASPIRE submission window should include explicit guidance on the difference between new technology purchases (appropriate for Program Review) versus software renewals, subscriptions, and furniture (which belong in department budgets or other processes).
- **Provide technology request templates.** A standardized request template, developed in collaboration with CTS, would help programs submit complete and accurate information from the outset.

2025–26 Resource Request Rankings

Budget

Rank	Division	Department	Amount	Description	Notes
1	Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Welding Technology	\$60,000	Instructional supplies (electrodes, gas, consumables, etc.)	
1	Arts & Humanities	Communication Studies	\$3,500	Tournament expenses	Operates w/\$700; requests \$2K from ALD + \$1.5K from Student Services
1	Counseling & Matriculation	Student Development	\$30,000	Counseling events and outreach support	
1	Kinesiology, Health & Athletics	Kinesiology	\$333,330	Fitness facility equipment and outfitting	See supporting documents
1	Science	Biology	\$38,000	Scientific equipment maintenance & repair budget	\$15K increase request
2	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	\$20,000	Student travel for conferences, competitions, festivals	ACTF since 2014; not sustainable at current funding
2	Science	STEM-MESA	\$10,000	Anatomy models, IV pump, textbooks, chairs	One-time supply allocation
3	Arts & Humanities	Music	\$22,500	Orchestra pit musician compensation and student stipends	
Division Funded	Social Sciences & Human Dev.	Psychology	\$500	Biannual Research Symposia (supplies, refreshments)	Division moved funding to cover this going forward
Moved to Classified	Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Automotive Collision & Repair	\$35,000	Part-time lab assistant	

Equipment

Rank	Division	Department	Amount	Equipment	Notes
1	Academic Success & Learning	Library	\$15,000	Customized Library Bookmobile Golf Cart	
1	Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Welding Technology	\$30,000	Welding machines and attachments	
1	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	\$10,000	Replacement headsets (20 qty)	Replacement / borrowing from high schools
1	Kinesiology, Health & Athletics	Kinesiology	\$333,330	Fitness facility equipment	See supporting documents
1	Science	Chemistry	\$40,000	50 LabQuest 3 instruments + FTIR instruments	Current equipment cannot be maintained or repaired
2	Academic Success & Learning	Library	\$3,000	4 Little Free Libraries (customized)	
2	Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Automotive Collision & Repair	\$35,000	Squeeze-Resistant Spot Welder	
2	Arts & Humanities	Music	\$3,006	ClearSonic Acrylic Drum Shield (3)	Safety issue
2	Science	Biology	\$21,000	Dual ECG & Spirometer (3 units)	Not enough for number of sections
3	Academic Success & Learning	Library	\$6,500	Additional Library Book Drop	
3	Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Automotive Technology	TBD	Alignment Trainer	Industry-standard mock-up for student skill development

Rank	Division	Department	Amount	Equipment	Notes
3	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	\$45,000	ETC Apex 5 Light Board	Energy efficient & industry standard
3	Science	Biology	\$750	Chest Freezer	
4+	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts / Music	Various	Multiple lighting, audio, and instrument items	See full ranked list
Moved to Facilities	Science	Biology	\$121,000	Laboratory Chairs (220 units)	

Classified Professionals

Rank	Division	Department	Positions	Description	Notes
1	Academic Success & Learning	Library	1 FT	Library Technical Assistant I	Extend evening & Saturday hours
1	Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Automotive Collision & Repair	1 PT	Lab Assistant	Greater student supervision
1	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	1	Increase Senior Theatre Arts Tech to Full-Time	Currently part-time; significant overtime being worked
1	Counseling & Matriculation	Student Development	Up to 20 PT	Counseling Intern & Professional Expert Program	Scalable; estimated ~\$100K/year
1	Science	Pharmacy Technology	1 FT	Allied Health Skills Lab Technician	Institutionalize SWP-funded position
2	Academic Success & Learning	Valley Now!	1 FT	Administrative Secretary I	Dual Enrollment operational support
2	Applied Tech,	Welding Technology	1 FT	Lab Technician I	

Rank	Division	Department	Positions	Description	Notes
	Transport. & Culinary				
2	Arts & Humanities	Art	1 FT	Gallery Assistant	Gresham Gallery; ~3,000 annual visitors
2	Science	Nursing	1 FT	Allied Health Simulation Technologist	Institutionalize currently grant-funded position
3	Academic Success & Learning	Valley Now!	1 FT	Outreach & Relations with Schools Coordinator	Dual Enrollment K–12 liaison
3	Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Hospitality Mgmt / Culinary	1 FT	Lab Assistant – Culinary	
3	Arts & Humanities	Music	1 PT	Lab Technician	
3	Science	STEM-MESA	1 PT	Academic Support Services Specialist	Makerspace oversight
4+	Multiple	Multiple	Various	Additional classified requests ranked by division	See full ranked list

Faculty

Rank	Division	Department	Positions	Description	Notes
1	Academic Success & Learning	Library	1 FT	Archivist Librarian	Archive, curate, and protect SBVC art/collections
1	Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Aeronautics	1	FT Faculty – Powerplant Maintenance	FAA mandate; high demand; adjunct load limits
1	Arts & Humanities	Modern Languages	1 FT	American Sign Language (ASL) Faculty	0 FT currently; all 15 sections taught by adjuncts
1	Math, Business & CIT	Computer Information Technology	1	Medical Coding and Billing Instructor	

Rank	Division	Department	Positions	Description	Notes
1	Science	Pharmacy Technology	1 FT	Pharmacy Technology Full-Time Faculty	Program growth; sole FT overburdened
1	Social Sciences & Human Dev.	Anthropology	1 FT	Tenure-Track Anthropology Faculty (CRM/Archaeology)	95% fill rate; 1 FT since 2013
2	Academic Success & Learning	Library	1 FT	OER/ZTC Librarian	Campus shift toward OER/ZTC needs dedicated support
2	Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Hospitality Mgmt / Culinary	1 FT	Baking Program Instructor	Fragmented instruction; two instructors in one lab
2	Arts & Humanities	Music	1 FT	Choir Director	Previously FT; part-time replacement insufficient
2	Math, Business & CIT	Computer Information Technology	1	CIT Instructor	
2	Science	Nursing	1	Academic Remediation Specialist (.95–1.05)	Post-BRN probation; supports Psych Tech also
2	Social Sciences & Human Dev.	Psychology	1 FT	Tenure-Track Psychology (Clinical/Mental Health)	2 FT support 3,400+ students; 80%+ sections by adjuncts
3	Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Welding Technology	1 FT	Full-Time Welding Faculty	
3	Arts & Humanities	English	1 FT	English Professor (African American Lit/Studies)	SBVC newly designated BSI; Umoja expansion
3	Social Sciences & Human Dev.	Psychology	1 FT	Tenure-Track Psychology (Open Specialization)	Second FT position; broad curriculum coverage needed
4+	Multiple	Multiple	Various	Additional faculty requests ranked by division	See full ranked list

Facilities

Rank	Division	Department	Amount	Description	Notes
1	Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Hospitality Mgmt / Culinary	TBD	Additional lab space, storage, and walk-in refrigeration	Capital project; future bond
2	Science	Biology	\$121,000	Laboratory Chairs (220 units)	\$82,111.94 available from PR Funds
3	Science	Biology	\$1,500	Outdoor locking bulletin board – Botanical Garden	\$10,420 available from PR Funds
4	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	TBD	Additional performance space, tech classroom, storage, loading dock	Capital project; future bond
5	Arts & Humanities	Music	\$20,000	Key fob locks, wiring repairs, future music facilities	Capital project; future bond
6	Arts & Humanities	Film, Television & Media	\$55,000	Darkroom for film photography class	Capital project; future bond
7	Arts & Humanities	Dance	TBD	Dedicated Dance Studio	Capital project; future bond

Technology

Note: The Technology Committee did not return ranked recommendations for the 2025–26 Technology Requests due to substantive concerns about the quality and completeness of submissions (see the Technology Committee Non-Ranking section above). The following requests were submitted and forwarded to the Technology Committee for review. The Program Review Committee recommends that these requests be resubmitted in 2026–27 after consultation with the Director of Campus Technology Services, using a standardized request process.

Division	Department	Amount	Technology Request
Academic Success & Learning	Library	TBD	LIB-109 Lab Updates (flexible hide-away computer workstations)
Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Welding Technology	\$10,000	Tube bending software & site license
Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Automotive Collision & Repair	\$1,500	Alldata Collision reference software
Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Automotive Collision & Repair	\$4,000	MitchellConnect estimating software
Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Automotive Collision & Repair	\$1,500	Genesis 3D Frame Measuring System
Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Automotive Collision & Repair	\$1,500	Rotary Alignment machine software
Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Automotive Collision & Repair	\$3,000	Autel Scan tool subscription renewal
Applied Tech, Transport. & Culinary	Automotive Collision & Repair	\$1,200	iCar Certification online training
Arts & Humanities	Music	\$54,688	25 iMacs for Music Lab
Arts & Humanities	Music	\$7,625	30 Ableton Live Software licenses
Science	Biology	\$12,750	iPads (vintage units need replacement)
Science	Biology	\$275	Replacement printer (Bio 205/206/207)
Science	Biology	\$1,000	Digital signage for museum/natural history collections
Science	Chemistry	\$24,000	Class set of 24 laptops with cart

Looking Ahead: 2026–27

As the committee looks toward the next academic year, several priorities stand out:

- **Fall 2026 Recalibration.** Fall 2026 should be used as a designated period to review and refine the Program Review process, align with the new governance structure, and onboard committee members in preparation for ASPIRE Year 4.
- **ASPIRE Year 4 Launch.** Year 4 of the ASPIRE cycle focuses on Productivity & Growth. Reports will be due at the end of Spring 2027, with the process launching towards the end of Fall 2026.
- **Faculty Hiring Prioritization.** A workgroup was recommended by the committee following discussions with Academic Senate Executive Leadership, but was not formally established during the 2025–26 year. The committee recommends that the creation of this workgroup be a priority at the outset of 2026–27, with the goal of developing a transparent and equitable faculty hiring prioritization process that encompasses replacement, retirement, and growth positions.
- **Technology Request Process Reform.** Establishing a formal pre-submission consultation requirement with Campus Technology Services is a priority, given the challenges encountered this year.
- **Institutional Resource Request Clarity.** The committee reiterates its prior recommendation that College Council and other governing bodies engage in discussion surrounding the creation of a campus-wide Institutional Resource Request Process document. The ASPIRE Resource Request process is one mechanism among several that should be clearly differentiated and documented for the campus community.

Unresolved Questions: Program Review’s Role in the New Resource Request Structure

As the new participatory governance structure takes shape and PRAC and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee are established, significant questions remain about the future role of the Program Review Committee in the resource request process. At the close of the 2025–26 academic year, the committee does not yet have clarity on the following:

- Which resource request categories will Program Review be responsible for collecting going forward, and which will be routed to other processes?
- What, specifically, is the committee expected to do with requests it collects; does it prioritize them, pass them along without ranking, or play some other role?
- Who are the committee’s primary collaborators in the new structure (e.g., PRAC, IEC, College Council, Administrative Services), and what is the handoff process?
- How will programs be informed about which process to use for which type of request, and who is responsible for communicating that guidance?

The committee has discussed these questions and, at this time, offers the following

position as its recommendation for how the resource request process should be structured under the new governance model:

Program Review's Preferred Role: The committee's preference is to serve as the collection and organizing body for resource requests connected to the program review process, and to pass those requests, with relevant context from the ASPIRE reports, to the appropriate bodies for prioritization and decision-making. Specifically, the committee recommends the following division of responsibility:

- **Faculty Positions:** Program Review would collect, review, and prioritize faculty position requests as part of the ASPIRE process, as this falls squarely within the committee's academic purview and directly informs faculty hiring recommendations to the Academic Senate and administration.
- **Budget, Equipment, Classified, Technology, and Facilities Requests:** Program Review would collect these requests through the ASPIRE process and pass them, organized and contextualized by program and division, to PRAC, the Technology Committee, the Facilities Committee, and other relevant bodies as appropriate. Prioritization of these requests would be the responsibility of those bodies, not Program Review.

The committee strongly recommends that these questions be resolved in formal dialogue between Program Review leadership, the Academic Senate, PRAC, and Administrative Services leadership prior to the launch of ASPIRE Year 4. Programs deserve clarity about what the resource request process means for them, and the committee cannot responsibly guide that process without a clear institutional mandate for its role within the new structure.