SBVC *Program Review*	*October 17, 2025* *9:15-10:45 a.m.* **MINUTES** 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:

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

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	FURTHER ACTION
1) Call to Order and Roll Call	The meeting was called 9:35 am. Quorum was established.	
2) Approve October 17, 2025, Agenda	Motion: J. Garcia; Second: F. Michele. Result: Approved unanimously.	
3) Approve October 3, 2025, Minutes	Motion: V. Anemelu to approve; Second: D. Johnson Result: Approved unanimously	

4) Scheduled Division Visits:
  a. Academic Success: Completed (October 3)
  b. Applied Technology: October 17, 11-11:30
  c. Arts & Humanities: Completed (September 19)
  d. Kinesiology, Health, & Athletics: awaiting response
	The committee is continuing its goal of visiting each instructional division as part of the program review process. Chairs noted that participation has been strong and that each area has been receptive to the review visits. Members were reminded that anyone from the committee is welcome to attend these sessions to provide feedback and support.
	Next Steps:
	  • Applied Technology visit scheduled for later today.	

e. Math, Business, & CIT: awaiting response f. Social Sciences: Completed (October 3) g. Science: November 7, 11:00-12:30	• Science Division visit confirmed for November 7. • Follow-up with Kinesiology, Health, & Athletics, and Math/Business/CIT divisions still pending to finalize visit dates.	
5) Website Feedback – things to change /update a. What's one thing we can change?	Updates to the Program Review website are ongoing. The homepage, dates, purpose, and charge have been corrected and are current. Membership information is still under review and will be updated once finalized. The committee discussed what additional content would be helpful to include. Suggestions included: • Posting workshop dates and a timeline graphic for the review cycle. • Including links to data resources and SWOT examples to guide users. • Uploading workshop recordings or slide decks for reference. • Adding a dedicated section for supporting documents and quick-access resources. • Committee members are encouraged to review the current website and submit specific suggestions for updates or missing content. • Continue collecting feedback on what resources or tools would be most helpful for users navigating Program Review.	
6) ASPIRE Walkthrough for Committee	The committee reviewed the META/ASPIRE system to ensure all members understand how to access and assist departments with their Year 3 Program Reviews. • Access Path: From the SBVC website, select META (single sign-on) → navigate to the Program Reviews tab. • Permissions: Committee members generally have view-only access; only chairs and program leads have the "Modify" button that allows them to edit or create proposals. • Adding Contributors: Chairs or leads can add additional faculty/staff as contributors under Tab 2 of the Year 3 report. • For first-time writers, if a previous report exists, chairs should open it and select Modify, Create Proposal (Year 3) to launch the current cycle. • If the program does not appear in META or has no prior report, the system defaults to Year 1 when creating a new proposal.	

	• The committee noted this limitation and requested that Kay Dee enable direct Year 3 proposal creation or provide temporary permissions so affected users can start Year 3 without restarting from Year 1. • Chairs/program leads must ensure contributors are added under their respective program entries so they can access and assist with reports.	
7) Workshop Reminders (5 minutes) 　a. Workshop 1: November 7 　b. Workshop 2: December 5	a. Workshop 1 – November 7: Focus will be on SWOT Analysis and Data Integration. Presenters: Joanne, Jaime, and Erik volunteered to assist with facilitation. The session will include an overview of the new data dashboards on demand and efficiency. b. Will focus on Resource Requests and Submission Preparation. The committee discussed the possibility of offering an in-person option for December to allow participants to complete portions of their reviews with on-site support. Space will be identified if the hybrid format is approved.	Gabriel will verify dashboard access for all members and ensure permissions for viewing data are active. Co-chairs will explore and reserve a potential on-campus space for the December in-person session. A short survey will be finalized and sent after Workshop 1 to gather feedback for improvements.
8) Finalize Workshop 1: 　a. What is SWOT – looking for help presenting 　　i. Past SWOT Presentation 　b. How to use data in SWOT analysis	a. The overview will explain the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats framework and its relevance to the Year 3 Program Review. The existing PowerPoint presentation from prior years will be updated and used for this session. Volunteers: Joanne, Jaime, and Erik will assist with presenting the material. Members discussed the importance of making the content approachable for those new to the process and including examples from different departments. b. Members noted that understanding and applying data continues to be a challenge for many faculty and staff; this workshop will aim to clarify where to find data and how to use it effectively in SWOT and planning sections. Emphasis will be placed on using data to support program narratives and to identify areas for improvement rather than focusing solely on metrics.	Presenters (Joanne, Jaime, Erik) to meet with co-chairs to align the presentation flow. Gabriel to confirm that all dashboard links are active and accessible prior to the workshop. Co-chairs to post the SWOT presentation slides and data resource links to the Program Review website following the workshop.

9) ASPIRE Submission Tracking
  a. Missing reports during ASPIRE process
  b. Outreach ideas
	a. Reviewed current list of submitted reports; identified gaps (e.g., Counseling, History, Library Tech). Discussed reorganization impacts and which programs are required to report under accreditation.
	b. Plan to present at the Student Services Managers Meeting (Oct. 24) to clarify participation expectations. Outreach will include direct follow-ups with division chairs and department leads.
		Co-chairs to reconcile the submission list and update missing areas.
		
		Bethany to request agenda time at the Oct. 24 meeting.
		
		Members to report additional gaps to co-chairs for follow-up.

10) Science Division Funding Request	• Science Division requested to reallocate previously approved instructional materials funds due to vendor and tariff changes. • Committee agreed reallocation is acceptable with written justification from the dean/program chair explaining the change and confirming alignment with original intent.	Science Division to submit written justification. Co-chairs to draft formal language for committee vote and forward to Senate and College Council for approval.
11) Planning (Discussion) a. Proposed Membership Changes	• Discussed potential membership updates in response to campus reorganization. • Emphasis on maintaining balanced representation and meeting quorum requirements.	

12) Faculty Hiring Prioritization (Discussion)
  a. Work group for full process
  b. Sample processes:
    i. Crafton Hills College (p.11)
    ii. De Anza College
    iii. Moorpark College
	• Discussed forming a work group to develop a clear hiring prioritization process.
	• Reviewed sample processes from Crafton Hills, De Anza, and Moorpark Colleges as potential models.
		Co-chairs to identify participants and bring draft framework to a future meeting.

Additional Information: