SBVC Program Re	view		high-quality education, innovator to prepare students for transfer	tive ins er to fou omic gi	ructi ir-ye owtł	Culture of continuous improveme on, and services to a diverse com ar universities, to enter the workd h and global competitiveness thro and Empire and beyond.	nmunity force by	of lea earn	arner: ing ap	s. Its mission is oplied degrees	
Joann Ana M Antho Antho Daihin Danie Letici Domi Doris Erik M Franc Shyla Guests Dan M		ony Blacksher ony Castro m Fozouni elle Graham a Hector nique Johnson Ontiveros Aorden isco Gonzalez Cobbett Admin.	A X X X X X X X X X X	P X X X X X X X	Jaime Garcia Jeremiah Gilbert Maria Valdez Monique Aycock Nathan Yearyean Samantha Homier Stacy Meyer Timothy Colbert Timothy Hosford Vanessa Thomas Victoria Anemelu Yvette Lee Fernando Gomez			P X X X X X X X X X X			
ТОРІС			DISCUSSION					FURTHER ACTION			
<ol> <li>Call to Order and Roll Call</li> <li>Approval of Minutes         <ul> <li>12/6/2024</li> <li>2/7/2025</li> </ul> </li> </ol>			The meeting was called to order at 9:30 am. Quorum not met; Members will review the minutes and provide any feedback or corrections.					Review Meeting minutes			
<ul> <li>Participatory Governance Survey         <ul> <li>Revised Charge &amp; Purpose written in Fall 2023 moving to Academic Senate for approval with update reflected in Senate bylaws</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			The committee revisited the revised charge and purpose document that was drafted in Fall 2023. Key Points: The revised document outlines the committee's role in guiding the college through an ongoing self-examination of how instructional and service areas align with the campus' mission, vision, and values. The purpose also emphasizes fostering a culture of continuous improvement by providing recommendations and needs assessments.					The charge will be resubmitted to Academic Senate for approval and subsequently updated in the Senate bylaws. Members were encouraged to review the current language (available on the website and in Academic Senate documents) and share any concerns.			

4.	Resource Requests a. Review resources requests by list, prioritized by division ranking process b. Discuss and finalize process for sending prioritized recommendations to President's Cabinet, College Council, and Senates Senates	Overview of Resource Request Process: The committee reviewed spreadsheets received from each division that document resource requests and division rankings. Discussion Points: Ranking Process: Each division was asked to rank their requests. In some cases (notably within Arts & Humanities), every request was ranked "1" following faculty discussions—a move interpreted as a protest the existing process. Criteria for Requests: There was significant discussion on differentiating "growth" positions from "replacement" positions. Concerns were raised about the lack of transparent, standardized criteria, especially since some divisions' ranking processes appeared to undermine the intended decision-making framework. Spreadsheet Details: The resource request list included not only rankings but also details such as the number of positions requested, departmental notes and budget alignment. Some requests (especially those that seemed duplicated or shared across programs) were noted as "zero" or unranked because they did not fit the conventional format. Action Items and Next Steps: Forwarding for Further Discussion: The committee agreed to forward the prioritized resource requests to the President's Cabinet, College Council, and Senate for further discussion. The committee will send the faculty-related requests separately for additional deliberation before final submission. Data Review: It was suggested that a historical review be conducted to understand trends in faculty requests, particularly in departments with only one full-time faculty member. Update on Submission List: The committee reviewed the undated list of ASPIRE	Each member is to
	a. Submission list update b. Reading for feedback – focus and best practices	The committee reviewed the updated list of ASPIRE submissions. Feedback Process: Kay Dee will lead the next meeting on 3/7/25, by demonstrating how to use the meta tool to read and analyze the submissions. Members were encouraged to consider: Which areas (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) are most relevant. Best practices for providing constructive, actionable feedback.	review the submissions in advance and think about how the feedback should be structured. The group will decide on a division of labor for reviewing and compiling feedback at the next meeting.
6.	Announcements and Meeting Closure	The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 am with a note that the next meeting will include further review of ASPIRE submissions and additional discussion on the resource ranking process. Members were thanked for their participation and encouraged to attend the upcoming chairs' meeting for further dialogue.	

Additional Information: