

SBVC**Program Review**

March 7, 2025
9:15-10:45 a.m.

MINUTES

San Bernardino Valley College maintains a culture of continuous improvement and a commitment to provide high-quality education, innovative instruction, and services to a diverse community of learners. Its mission is to prepare students for transfer to four-year universities, to enter the workforce by earning applied degrees and certificates, to foster economic growth and global competitiveness through workforce development, and to improve the quality of life in the Inland Empire and beyond.

Members:

	A	P		A	P
Bethany Tasaka Co-Chair		x	Jaime Garcia	x	
Joanna Oxendine- Co-Chair	x		Jeremiah Gilbert		x
Danielle Graham		x	Maria Valdez		x
Ana Mayo	x		Monique Aycock		x
Anthony Blacksher		x	Nathan Yearyea		x
Anthony Castro	x		Samantha Homier	x	
Daihim Fozouni		x	Stacy Meyer		x
Leticia Hector	x		Timothy Colbert		x
Dominique Johnson	x		Timothy Hosford		x
Doris Ontiveros		x	Vanessa Thomas	x	
Erik Morden	x		Victoria Anemelu		x
Francisco Gonzalez	x		Yvette Lee		x
Shyla Cobbett Admin.		x			
Guests					
Kay Dee Yarbrough		X			
Thomas Berry		X			

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	FURTHER ACTION
1. Call to Order and Roll Call	The meeting was called to order at 9:15 am.	
2. Approval of Minutes a. 12/6/2024 b. 2/7/2025 c. 2/21/2025	<p>Quorum confirmed.</p> <p>Discussion Regarding February 21, 2025, Minutes: A committee member noted that while the minutes referenced “significant discussion,” they did not capture the outcomes or conclusions of those discussions.</p> <p>It was suggested that the minutes be updated to reflect that there was general discontent with the process expressed by many members.</p> <p>A specific wording change was requested: Original: “some of the reviewing processes appeared to undermine the intended outcomes.” Revised: Change “undermine” to “challenge” to better reflect the committee’s intent.</p> <p>Motion to approve February 21, 2025 minutes with the suggested edits was made by D. Fozouni. Seconded by V. Anemelu.</p> <p>Vote: All in favor: Approved Opposed: None Abstentions: J. Gilbert, B. Tasaka.</p>	Change 2/21/25 meeting minutes to reflect challenge instead of undermine.

	<p>Motion to approve the December 6, 2024, and February 7, 2025 minutes was also made – D. Fozouni</p> <p>Seconded S. Meyer</p> <p>Vote results:</p> <p>All in favor: Approved</p> <p>Opposed: None</p> <p>Abstentions: None</p>	
<p>3. ASPIRE Year 2 Program Reading</p> <p>a. META Feedback Loop Tutorial (Kay Dee Yarbrough)</p> <p>b. Division of ASPIRE Reports for Reading/Feedback</p> <p>c. Purpose of and Best Practices for Providing Feedback on ASPIRE Reports</p> <p>d. Process for Collecting and Sharing Trend Information from Reports</p>	<p>a. META Feedback Loop Tutorial (Presented by Kay Dee Yarbrough):</p> <p>Kay Dee provided a comprehensive demonstration of how to navigate and use the META system for ASPIRE Year 2 program review.</p> <p>Instructions were given on:</p> <p>Logging in using single sign-on, Accessing assigned program reports via the "Approvals" tab. Reviewing full proposal reports and module views, Entering comments using the reviewer text box, committing a review action, which removes the report from the reviewer's queue</p> <p>Key Reminders:</p> <p>Once submitted, comments cannot be deleted or edited. Comments become part of the official record. Reviewers should take care to ensure their comments are accurate, constructive, and professional. Kay Dee mentioned she will provide step-by-step training videos and screenshots for the committee members and will share these for distribution.</p> <p>b. Division of ASPIRE Reports for Reading/Feedback:</p> <p>The committee discussed strategies for assigning program reports:</p> <p>Priority is given to maintaining reviewer continuity with programs from the previous year. Consideration of reduced group sizes to lighten individual workloads. Ensuring that groups are composed of actively participating members to prevent uneven distribution of work. A proposal was made to do away with formal "teams" and instead assign programs directly to individuals. Members were assured that each person would submit their own comments, and no consensus from a team was required.</p> <p>c. Purpose of and Best Practices for Providing Feedback:</p> <p>Members emphasized that feedback should be constructive, non-punitive, and respectful. The feedback process is designed to support programs by: Highlighting strengths</p> <p>Identifying inconsistencies between SWOT analysis and planning goals, suggesting improvements or clarifications for future submissions. Discussion highlighted the value of cross-disciplinary feedback, offering outside perspectives to programs. It was agreed that reviewers may wish to identify their perspective or background in comments to provide context.</p> <p>d. Process for Collecting and Sharing Trend Information: There was an agreement that the committee needs a structured method to identify and report common themes across programs.</p> <p>Suggestions included:</p> <p>Creating a centralized report to summarize issues such as underfunding, staffing gaps, and resource inequities. Using comments within META to help track recurring concerns. Ensuring that feedback provided to programs is also aggregated for institutional planning</p>	

<p>4. Faculty Prioritization (information item)</p>	<p>The committee revisited ongoing concerns with the faculty prioritization process.</p> <p>Issues discussed:</p> <p>Discrepancies across divisions in ranking full-time faculty requests Lack of clarity on how administrative decisions are made post-ranking Concerns over positions being carried over or skipped without rationale</p> <p>Key Takeaways: A motion to forward rankings with multiple #1 priorities did not pass in Academic Senate. Arts & Humanities was asked to resubmit a traditional, unique-ranked list by Spring Break. Several committee members raised concerns that the prioritization process lacks transparency and does not reflect actual faculty growth needs.</p> <p>Action Plan: A meeting with administration (including the college president) is scheduled to clarify expectations and determine the committee's role in developing a new prioritization model. Members are encouraged to brainstorm: What data points should inform prioritization (FTEF, FTES, fill rates, etc.) How to ensure smaller departments are fairly represented. Whether to reinstitute objective scoring tools or rubrics</p>	
<p>5. Announcements and Meeting Closure</p>	<p>Spring Break reminders were given; members were encouraged not to work unless necessary. A list of assigned ASPIRE program readings and guiding questions will be shared after the upcoming chairs' meeting. Members were asked to track recurring themes as they review reports to inform the year-end summary report.</p> <p>Meeting Adjourned: 10:45 AM</p>	

Additional Information: