COMMITTEE MINUTES

San Bernardino Community College District
VALLEY COLLEGE
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE • MEETING MINUTES

DATE	October 26, 2026	TIME	2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
LOCATION	North Hall 150	CHAIR(S)	☐ Dr. Dani Pearson, Psychology Faculty ☑ Bethany Tasaka, Mathematics Faculty ☐ Mike Cordero, Dean
MEETING TYPE	X Regular ☐ Special ☐ Emergency	NOTE-TAKER	Jessica Velasquez

Committee roster

VOTING MEMBERS —2026-2027

NAME	DIVISION/UNIT REPRESENTED	CONSTITUENCY	ROLL CALL
Jesse Chou	Academic Services, Business, & Computer Technology	Faculty	X
Vacant	Academic Services, Business, & Computer Technology	Faculty	☐
Melinda Fogle	Arts & Humanities	Faculty	X
Jessica Gordon	Arts & Humanities	Faculty	X
Ben Laskowski	Career Technical Education	Faculty	X
Alex Cruz	Career Technical Education	Faculty	☐
Dominique Johnson	Counseling & Student Development	Faculty	X
Fili Michel	Counseling & Student Development	Faculty	X
Stacy Rollstin-Weiland	Instructional Support Services	Faculty	X
Patricia Holder	Kinesiology, Health, & Athletics	Faculty	X
Vacant	Kinesiology, Health, & Athletics	Faculty	☐
Ebony Perez	Science & Mathematics	Faculty	X
Soha Sobhanian	Science & Mathematics	Faculty	☐
Anthony Blacksher	Social Science & Human Development	Faculty	X
Jeff Demsky	Social Science & Human Development	Faculty	X
Alejandro Barrera or Anniah Estrada	ASG/Student Senate Designee	Student	X-both attended

Quorum (50% + 1): 7.5	# (Vacant seats are excluded from quorum calculation)	
RESOURCE MEMBERS (non-voting) —2026-2027		
Managers (#)	• Vacant, VPI Designee • Vacant, VPSS Designee	
Classified Professionals and/or Faculty and/or Student (#)	• Tim Hosford, Classified Senate designee • Tatiana Vasquez, Academic Senate President • Jessy Lemieux, Chair or Chairs • Angela Vogel, Outcomes Faculty Lead • Maria Lopez, Non-Credit Faculty Lead • Keenan Giles, Institutional Effectiveness Committee Tri-Chair • Daihim Fozouni, Planning and Resource Allocation Committee Tri-Chair	**X** **X**
Guests: Jamie Garcia, Victoria Anemelu, & Yvette Lee		

#	AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION / MINUTES	MOTIONS / FOLLOW-UP
Call to order: approximately 2:01 p.m.			
Motion to approve both: Patricia Holder Second: Fili Michel. Motion carried; no opposition or abstentions voiced.			
No action.			
1		—	—
2		—	—
Continue outstanding data and submission-process follow-up.			
1		—	—
2		—	—
See workgroup motion below.			
1	Establish workgroup to draft ASPIRE Year 4 submission form and guidelines	Members discussed building an ASPIRE Year 4 submission process with Microsoft Forms, with a possible separate reviewer workflow, uploaded narrative documents, tracked comments, acknowledgment receipts, and a committee-owned service account. A draft is desired for the November 9 meeting, recognizing the short timeline. Tim Hosford, Stacy Rollstin-Weiland, Dominique Johnson. Co-chairs offered support.	Motion to establish workgroup: Stacy Rollstin-Weiland. Second: Dominique Johnson. Carried without voiced opposition or abstentions. Workgroup to prototype a form/workflow and bring a draft or progress update November 9.
2		—	—
3		—	—
F. Information Items (For awareness and context)			
1	CTS to provide the committee with a technology tools demonstration (U. Sifuentes)	Aldo (CTS presenter; surname not established in transcript) demonstrated Microsoft	Motion to try Microsoft Forms for ASPIRE

		Teams/SharePoint, Microsoft Forms and Excel response collection. The committee explored multi-paragraph responses, Word/PDF attachments, collaborative comments, tracking edits, multiple reviewers, notifications, and access controls. Laserfiche and Adobe workflows were also mentioned as alternatives requiring further investigation. CTS offered assistance after the committee defines its workflow; a web submission entry point and single sign-on were discussed.	submissions: Anthony Blacksher Second: Fili Michel. Motion carried without voiced opposition or abstentions. CTS follow-up after workgroup maps workflow; explore committee-owned account and possible Laserfiche support.
2	Participatory governance processes: Program Review and PRAC (T. Vasquez)	Academic Senate President Tatiana Vasquez explained participatory-governance routing and the evolving roles of Program Review, Academic Senate, College Council, PRAC, and facilities/safety/technology committees. Academic Program Review recommendations and rankings will be forwarded to Academic Senate; Senate leadership will present endorsed recommendations to College Council. PRAC is developing broader budget/planning processes and is not expected to re-rank academic requests this year. Classified staffing requests are being addressed through management; facilities and technology routing still requires clarification. The committee discussed one-time funding, recurring needs, transparent rationale, feedback/closing the loop, and data-based prioritization.	Information/discussion only; no motion recorded.
3	Academic Senate list of faculty hires and last year's recommended list from Program Review	Members were informed that the Academic Senate faculty-hire list and prior-year Program Review recommended list were shared for comparison with positions ultimately funded. Members	Information item only; members to review circulated lists from email.

		were encouraged to review discrepancies and consider the need for decision feedback.	
G. Discussion Items (For deliberation and input. No formal action taken.)			
1	List of Academic Programs to complete ASPIRE Year 4 (T. Vasquez)	The list of academic programs required to complete ASPIRE Year 4 was not finalized. Members were asked to consult programs at the boundary of academic/instructional versus non-academic classification, including athletics and counseling, and return input. Any committee recommendation will go to Academic Senate.	Tabled/deferred to November 9 for a more informed discussion. Members to consult constituencies; no final classification decision.
2	The future of Program Review & ASPIRE	The committee discussed the Academic Senate request to explore multiple external Program Review models and incorporate the 2009 Program Review paper. Options included a four-year cycle with a mid-cycle report, three-year cycles, older six-year models, and staggered program schedules. Members weighed report size, chair turnover, committee workload, ratings/rubrics, self-evaluation versus resource-request rankings, and whether annual resource requests should be decoupled from multi-year program evaluations. The committee discussed using standardized data and a clearer rubric, while keeping flexibility for program-specific measures.	Each member asked to review another college's Program Review process and bring back a useful example. Members to read the 2009 paper. Co-chairs to aggregate models and bring possible recommendations to Academic Senate; no model adopted.
No separate committee-report motions recorded.			
1	Program Review Chairs	Co-chairs Bethany Tasaka and Dr. Dani Pearson will support the workgroup and consider a collection method for examples of other colleges' review processes. Bethany indicated she would send a follow-up email listing assignments.	Co-chairs: circulate homework and follow-up; support ASPIRE workgroup.
2	Academic Senate	Tatiana Vasquez summarized the Academic Senate motion	Members should communicate program

		requesting external models and consideration of the 2009 paper. She described Senate endorsement and advocacy for data requests and academic resource priorities.	data needs to co-chairs and Senate representatives.
3	Classified Senate		
4	Outcomes Faculty Lead		
5	Non-credit Faculty Lead		
6	Planning and Resource Allocation Committee	PRAC is reviewing institutional budget information and developing its planning/resource allocation processes; its academic-versus-nonacademic interface remains under development.	Continue coordination; no formal committee action.
7	Institutional Effectiveness		
Members: send additional data needs to co-chairs; co-chairs: relay requests and follow up with Academic Senate.			
1	Resource Request funding allocations from College Council	The committee discussed resource request allocations and the gap between prior recommendations and funded outcomes. This year, the committee expects to rank academic requests across divisions as one prioritized list rather than forwarding multiple division-level number-one requests. The process and rubric require further refinement.	Future follow-up: review allocation results and clarify feedback/closing-the-loop process; no funding decision made.
2		—	—
3		—	—
Adjournment: 3:55 p.m.			

Next Scheduled Meeting: Mon. Nov 9 2:00 pm (IN-PERSON NH-150)

FUTURE MEETING DATES
Mon. Dec 14, 2026 (IN-PERSON NH-150; Tentative)
Mon. Jan 25, 2026 (IN-PERSON NH-150)
Mon. Feb 8, 2026 (IN-PERSON NH-150)

SBVC MISSION:	VALLEY UP INITIATIVE 2025-2030

San Bernardino Valley College provides innovative instructional programs and cohesive student services to support the educational goals of a culturally diverse community of learners by engaging in continuous improvement and actively working towards an antiracist culture to foster an environment of meaningful learning and belonging for our students, employees, and the community.	The Initiative organizes its strategic commitments around four interconnected priorities that together define the college's direction through 2030 as follows: 1. Career and Transfer 2. Health and Safety 3. Boldly Student-Centered 4. Opportunities for All
COMMITTEE CHARGE	**MEMBERSHIP & PARTICIPATION EXPECTATIONS**
The Program Review Committee leads and manages the academic program review process, in alignment with ACCJC accreditation standards and linking self-evaluation to institutional planning. For purposes of this committee's scope, academic programs are defined as instructional programs and student services programs in which faculty hold primary responsibility for design, delivery, or oversight of program outcomes. The committee develops and refines program review processes, standards, and criteria through faculty-driven, evidence-based evaluation. Resource needs are collected and synthesized through academic program review and they shall be forwarded to the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee.	*Constituency Communication:* Voting members are responsible for reporting back to their constituency groups and bringing constituent input to deliberations. *Equity Commitment:* All members are expected to center student success, equity, and the elimination of achievement gaps in their participation and decision-making. *Appointments:* Voting members are appointed by their respective constituency bodies (Academic Senate, Classified Senate, ASG, or management) prior to the start of fall semester.

DRAFT — PENDING APPROVAL AT THE NOVEMBER 9, 2026 MEETING. Prepared from user-supplied speech-to-text transcript; verify uncertain names, motions, attendance, and exact call-to-order time against the recording before adoption.