SBVC Program Review	September 5, 2025 MINUTES 9:15–10:45 a.m. Program Review Committee Charge For regular programmatic assessment on campus, the Program Review Committee examines and evaluates the resource needs and effectiveness of all instructional and service areas. These review processes occur on one-, two-, and four-year cycles as determined by the District, College, and other regulatory agencies. Program Review is conducted by authorization of the SBVC Academic Senate.

Members:

	A	P		A	P
Bethany Tasaka Co-Chair		X	Joanne Hinojosa	X	
Danielle Graham Co-Chair		X	Kimberly Johnson	X	
Gabriel Martinez Larzo- Co-Chair		X	Leslie Gregory	X	
Abeir Israeil	X		Melissa Romero		x
Angie Vogel		X	Miguel Ortiz		x
Anthony Blacksher		X	Natalie Peterkin		X
Brandy Major		X	Nathan Yearyean		x
Dominique Johnson	X		Nicole Lambrou	X	
Doris Ontiveros		X	Patty Quach	X	
Ebony Perez		X	Quincy Brewer		X
Eric Mortin		X	Stacy Meyer	X	
Fili Michele		X	Tim Hosford	X	
Jaime Garcia		X	Victoria Anemelu		X
Jessica Gordon		X	Yvette Lee		X
Shyla Cobbett Admin.	X				
Guests					
Christian Sarfo-Poku			Kevin Moreno		

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	FURTHER ACTION
I. Call to Order and Roll Call	The meeting was called to order. Quorum was established.	
II. Community Building Activity		
III. Scheduled Division Visits: a. Academic Success: Being scheduled b. Arts & Humanities: Being scheduled c. Math, Business, & CIT: September 12, 10-10:30 d. Social Sciences: October 3, 11-11:30 e. Science:	I. Academic Success: Being scheduled a. Victoria and PR have a scheduled meeting next week with the Math, Business and Computer Information Technology department for a visit b. Everyone seems to want workshops on October 3rd, so support may be needed to split up ("divide and conquer") across divisions to cover them all i. Work on PowerPoint ii. Waiting on Sci and CTE II. Arts & Humanities – Scheduling in progress III. Math, Business & CIT – Scheduled for Sept. 12, 10–10:30 AM	

	IV. Social Sciences – Scheduled for Oct. 3, 11–11:30 AM V. e. Science – Scheduling in Progress	
IV. What was funded last year (Keith's email)	I. All requests have been funded; however, divisions need to clearly understand that funds must be spent by December 31st or they will be pulled back this year. While approvals often come late in the fiscal year, this new budget cycle has a short spending window, typically around March, and funds are not yet available for disbursement. There is also concern about potential cost changes at the time of disbursement and how that may affect programs or divisions. A follow-up with K. Bacon is planned to review what has been purchased and identify unspent funds, so divisions are encouraged to proactively remind chairs and deans to ensure timely use of their allocations. II. META is not open, and area leads should begin the process once META items are approved, including submitting resource requests as part of the Program Review process. The ASPIRE submission deadlines are set for an early submission on December 19 and a "straggler's day" on January 16. Additionally, there is a recommendation to evaluate last year's ranking process for meeting the campus and committee's needs.	
V. Planning a. Charge & Purpose b. ASPIRE Year 3 Overview – Quick Guide c. CurrIQunet META "draft" forms for approval (Kay Dee) d. Workshop 0 October 3	a. Charge & Purpose i. The Program Review Committee updated its charge and purpose to modernize language and better reflect current practices. The revisions include clarifying program review cycles (1–2 and 4 years), simplifying the description of the committee's role as a resource for instructional and service area self-evaluations, and making the language broader rather than overly process-specific. The committee also streamlined its stated purpose, reducing it from six points to three, with an emphasis on fostering a culture of continuous improvement through an ongoing review cycle. APPROVAL: Brandy Major Motioned; Jaime Garcia second approval to adopt revisions to the charge and	

purpose. - 0 opposed - 1 abstained (Anthony Blacksher)

b. ASPIRE Year 3 Overview – Quick Guide (2025-2026)

   i. The ASPIRE Year 3 Quick Guide (2025–2026) was shared via email with area leads at the end of Spring, along with a review of important dates and deadlines. The committee's discussion highlighted the need to focus on key priorities in greater depth, including external demands, staying current and relevant, and a SWOT analysis. The ASPIRE report writing process was emphasized as a collaborative effort, with an approval workflow that involves program chairs, committee co-chairs, and faculty in the area for review and feedback prior to final approval. Lastly, an overview of available resources was provided to support divisions in this process.

c. CurrIQunet META "draft" forms for approval (email Kay Dee)

   i. An overview of the Year 3 MockUp was provided, pending updates. The discussion included a review of the SWOT framework and the structure of submission spaces. The revised format organizes submissions into clear sections for strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. Contributors are guided to identify 3–5 key items in each category, with dedicated spaces to input their responses, making the process more focused and meaningful.

   ii. The discussion centers on whether the SWOT analysis should focus on demand or currency/relevance. Key points include the importance of completing the program review process before advocating for funding or other support. Program review documents provide the official data and rationale for requests, including FTES, success rates, classroom challenges, and waitlists. Members play a role in aligning department documentation with institutional priorities (e.g., equity) to ensure visibility and support informed decision-making. Leadership relies on these documents to guide decisions,

	though final decision making rests with the College Counsil.
	  a. Decision to join Demand with Currency/Relevance was accepted.
	  ii. Overview of TOASTs
	  iii. Overview of SLO/SAO
	  iv. Resource Request Overview
	    a. Facilities example: dance space
	    b. Motion to approve updated Yr 3 META form (including changes) Melissa Romero motions, Second Jessica Gordon - All approve
	d. Workshop 0 October 3
	i. Materials will be published
	ii. Moved to next meeting	

I. Hiring
  a. Process Work group for full process
  b. Need for clarified "interim" process
	I. Work group for full process
	  a. Asked for Faculty specific process but can be expanded to others
	  b. Develop process for this semester
	    i. President's goal is to have something in place by Spring
	    ii. Need transparency and clarity of the process when certain positions are left vacant
	    iii. An important process is to have these new positions to go through Program Review
	    iv. Questions regarding temporary, full-time hiring process
	    v. Program Review should verify accountability for the process
	    vi. Who is interested in working on this?
	      1. Christian, Brandy, Yvette, Melissa, Anthony
	II. Need for clarified "interim" process	

Additional Information: