



San Bernardino
Valley College

Institutional Program Review

Annual Report

2024-25



San Bernardino Valley College
701 S. Mt. Vernon Avenue
San Bernardino, CA 92410
(909) 384-4400

Institutional Program Review Committee Members 2024-2025

Committee Co-Chairs

Dr. Danielle Graham
Dr. Joanna Oxendine
Bethany Tasaka

Administrative Assistant

Shyla Cobbett

Committee Members

Dr. Victoria Anemelu
Monique Aycock
Dr. Anthony Blacksher
Anthony Castro
Timothy Colbert
Daihim Fozouni
Jaime Garcia
Dr. Jeremiah Gilbert
Francisco Gonzalez
Leticia Hector
Samantha Homier
Timothy Hosford
Dr. Dina Humble
Dominique Johnson
Yvette Lee
Dr. Ana Mayo
Stacy Meyer
Erik Morden
Doris Ontiveros
Vanessa Thomas
Maria Valdez
Nathan Yearyear
Kay Dee Yarbrough

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Program Review Committee Charge	2
Current Charge and Purpose.....	2
Membership.....	2
ASPIRE Year 2: DEIAA	3
Context	4
ASPIRE Year 2 Overview One-Page.....	4
Fall 2024 ASPIRE Timeline.....	6
2024-2025 Resource Requests	6
Changes to Roll-Over Requests for 2024-25 Resource Requests	7
Challenges and Need to Reconsider Resource Request Process	8
2024-2025 Program Review Resource Request Rankings	10
BUDGET.....	10
EQUIPMENT	12
Equipment	12
FACILITIES	14
FACULTY	14
TECHNOLOGY	16
Appendix A.....	17
ASPIRE 2024-25 Submitted Reports	17
The following pages contain the reports submitted by individual programs who participated in this year's ASPIRE process.....	17

Introduction

The Program Review process was established at San Bernardino Valley College (SBVC) in 1992. Program Review is a college-wide, collaborative effort to rigorously evaluate each program so that resources can be allocated where growth and need are indicated and reallocated where there is no longer a clear programmatic need for fiscal support. The resulting document is used for short- and long-range planning and is advisory to the President, the Budget Committee, College Council, and the Academic Senate.

Program Review Committee Charge

The Program Review Committee underwent several leadership changes in the 2024-25 academic year. There was an initial discussion of changes to the charge in the Academic Senate, however, due to a leadership change between Fall 2024 and Spring 2025, this was not finalized. The interim leadership did not feel comfortable finalizing changes to a committee charge while in interim roles.

Starting in the 2025-26 academic year, with elected faculty co-chairs, the committee will revisit the charge to determine whether it represents the direction of the committee. Any updates will follow.

Current Charge and Purpose

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.

The purpose of Program Review is to:

- Provide a full examination of how effectively programs and services are meeting departmental, divisional, and institutional goals
- Aid in short-range planning and decision-making
- Improve performance, services, and programs
- Contribute to long-range planning
- Contribute information and recommendations to other college processes, as appropriate
- Serve as the campus conduit for decision-making by forwarding information to appropriate committees

Membership

For the 2024-25 year, a total of 15 faculty members, three administrators, and three classified professionals were assigned to the committee, however, there are still some vacancies, including a student representative.

The 2023 – 2024 report noted that attendance was a challenge. Attendance at Program Review meetings by committee members did improve over the 2024-25 academic year. There were still multiple meetings where we did not meet quorum. This was due to several different reasons – non-service days for noninstructional faculty, competing events that required members to work or be present, competing meetings (e.g. division meetings), and uncertainty about membership by both the committee and members due to institutional changes. This last reason could be due to the expected committee structure changes that did not end up happening due to the formation of the Participatory Governance Taskforce.

ASPIRE Year 2: DEIAA

This is the second year of the All Services and Programs Institutional Resources & Engagement (ASPIRE) Process, focusing on diversity, equity, inclusion, anti-racism, and access (DEIAA). The process still includes a SWOT analysis, toasts and attestations, and goals and planning.

Meta included a second-year option. Due to miscommunication with Meta in terms of what the form would look like, text boxes were created for every possible prompt question rather than a list of the prompts with one text box to respond. We suspect that this resulted in more shallow responses because of the increased number of text boxes and the implication that more responses were required. We believe that respondents thought they needed to address every single question rather than provide more detailed answers to a few questions. This could also be attributed to stigmas attached to “lacking” in any DEIAA areas. For example, a program might hesitate to acknowledge that they should improve in anti-racism out of fear that they will be judged. The committee discussed how to better define topics and support faculty in genuine reflection rather than feeling like they may be chastised.

Despite this confusion and more shallow answers, the committee identified some additional themes. We found that there was not as much analysis of answers as we hoped to see. In several cases, a statement was offered (e.g. “We did really well in [X]”) without any deeper probing into why this was a success. In past years, there was a heavier dependence on data and evidence. The committee discussed how to encourage writers to include data and evidence that supported their statements without regressing to overburdening writers with overwhelmingly large amounts of data to review.

The Year 2 reports were not as comprehensive as Year 1. This could be for several reasons, including but not limited to, the mid-semester leadership transition, the lack of comfort with DEIAA concepts, and the focus on DEIAA rather than a broad overview of the program or area. The committee is planning more support for writers leading up to the Year 3 due date. Our goal is to provide colleagues with as much opportunity to ask questions and identify evidence as possible.

Context

Due to a changing political climate across the United States, there are areas that are being directly targeted by the federal government. These areas are typically related to DEIAA. The committee discussed the impacts of these outside factors on the Year 2 reports, asking questions such as, “Did the value of DEIAA change on our campus?” “Is this even relevant anymore?” and “What are the long-term implications of this?”

While we did not arrive at any particular answer to these questions, we recognize that we are living in unprecedented times. The committee is committed to supporting our colleagues in every way possible.

ASPIRE Year 2 Overview One-Page

Note: Programs had the opportunity to revise their answers to Questions 1 and 2, however, this was not a requirement because they were answered in the Year 1 report.

1. **Diversity, Equity, Inclusion & Anti-Racism (DEIA) and Access** - Consider what strengths, opportunities, weaknesses, and threats impact your ability to support SBVC's DEIA goals, access to education, and services for student
2. **SWOT Analysis** is an overview of where the department is now. *Suggested length 3 – 5 points per section.*
 - a. **STRENGTHS:** Strengths are internal. What are you already particularly good at? What are your advantages?
 - i. **Diversity:** What strengths does your area have that promote diversity among students and faculty, and how do these strengths contribute to SBVC's DEIAA goals?
 - ii. **Equity:** In what ways does your area ensure equitable access to education and resources for all students, particularly those from underrepresented backgrounds?
 - iii. **Inclusion:** How does your area create an inclusive environment that fosters a sense of belonging for all students, and what specific practices support this?
 - iv. **Anti-Racism:** What measures does your area take to address and combat racism?
 - v. **Accessibility:** How do you ensure that all students have accessible pathways to education and services?
 - b. **WEAKNESSES:** Weaknesses are internal. What areas do you need to improve? What are your disadvantages?
 - i. **Diversity:** What barriers to access exist in your area that hinder diverse representation among students and faculty?

- ii. **Equity:** Are there specific inequities in resources or support that create gaps for certain student populations within your area?
 - iii. **Inclusion:** What challenges does your area face in fostering an inclusive environment, and how might these challenges affect student experiences?
 - iv. **Anti-Racism:** What are the obstacles in your area that impede efforts to combat racism?
 - v. **Accessibility:** What are the obstacles that affect overall accessibility for students?
 - c. **OPPORTUNITIES:** Opportunities are external. What are the factors that can contribute to your success?
 - i. **Diversity:** What external partnerships or collaborations can enhance diversity initiatives within your area?
 - ii. **Equity:** Are there grant opportunities or funding sources available that could support equity-focused programs or initiatives in your area?
 - iii. **Inclusion:** What community events or organizations can your area engage with to promote inclusion and support for underrepresented students?
 - iv. **Anti-Racism:** What resources or training programs are available externally that could help your area improve anti-racist practices?
 - v. **Accessibility:** What resources exist to increase accessibility for all students?
 - d. **THREATS:** Threats are external. What are the potential problems or risk you face?
 - i. **Diversity:** What external factors or societal trends could negatively impact efforts to promote diversity within your area?
 - ii. **Equity:** Are there systemic issues or institutional policies that pose threats to achieving equity in access and support for students?
 - iii. **Inclusion:** What potential resistance or backlash could your area face when implementing inclusive practices and initiatives?
 - iv. **Anti-Racism:** What challenges or threats exist that may hinder progress in anti-racism efforts?
 - v. **Accessibility:** What challenges impede the overall accessibility of education and services for students?
3. **Goals and Planning:** List the department's 5-year goals and the action steps the department will take to achieve those goals. How can department planning utilize strengths and opportunities to mitigate weaknesses and threats? Planning goals will be updated annually. *Suggested length 3-5 planning goals.*

- a. **Goals:** Do any adjustments need to be made to the 5-year goals for your area?
 - b. **Planning:** Does the plan from the previous year need to be revised?
4. **TOASTS: Triumphs, Outcomes, Analysis, Spotlight, Training, Share.** Share something great about your program. It can be a success story, an innovation, cause and effect, observation, or anything. Celebrate your program. *Suggested length 1-3 TOASTS.*
5. **Attestations (as applicable)**
 - a. **SLO, PLO, or SAO Outcomes:** Are your outcomes assessed regularly as per the Outcomes Handbook?
 - b. **Instructional Programs:** Is your curriculum current?
 - c. **CTE Programs:** Is there continuing demand for the program?

Fall 2024 ASPIRE Timeline

DATE	SUPPORT	LOCATION
November 15, 2024 9:15 – 10:45 am	ASPIRE Year 2 Process & Prompts (Launch Event)	AD/SS 207
December 6, 2024 9:15 – 10:45 am	Open Lab: Writers invited to get support	AD/SS 207
January 27, 2025	ASPIRE Submissions due in META	

2024-2025 Resource Requests

The Program Review Committee conducts an annual campus-wide Resource Request process that focuses on growth items in the areas of budget, equipment, facilities, technology, classified professionals, and faculty. To streamline processes, campus-wide Resource Requests are now gathered through the new ASPIRE process and an established rubric and listening session process is applied to scores and prioritize requests.

This year, Resource Requests were only ranked by divisions. The committee did not re-rank after the divisions made their rankings. All #1 rankings were grouped and ordered, then submitted to the Executive Cabinet and College Council. The goal was to allow divisions – where the experts reside – to speak for themselves, giving each division an equal opportunity for their needs to be met. Requests for facilities and technology were submitted to those respective committees for prioritization through their processes.

One unanticipated challenge to the process was the faculty rankings submitted by the Arts and Humanities Division. This division decided to submit all nine faculty requests ranked as #1. The committee decided to take this action to the Academic Senate for direction, and the Academic Senate voted that the Arts and Humanities Division go back and uniquely rank each faculty request. This delayed the finalization of the Resource Request list for faculty by approximately one month.

Changes to Roll-Over Requests for 2024-25 Resource Requests

The intention was to allow all ASPIRE participants to have the option to carry over a score from one year to the next for up to 3 cycles, as stated in our previous report. This year, the Roll-Over Requests did not go as planned and when the interim co-chairs entered the role in Spring 2025, the structure was set. In the transition, the current co-chairs do not have full access to past minutes for record-keeping and consistency of process. We are going to work on this in the fall and hope to recover minutes and records.

There were two separate sets of roll-over requests – one in Meta and one from the previous year's spreadsheets – that did not communicate with each other. This made the process somewhat confusing. We also had two completely separate processes between the years. Year 1 had a formal ranking done by the division and a second formal ranking done by the committee, resulting in a formally prioritized and scored list. Year 2 only had formal rankings done by the division with multiple requests co-ranked as #1, #2, etc.

The committee discussed incorporating a “Would you like to roll-over your previous request?” question in Meta, alleviating the need to copy and paste the previous year's request. This would, at minimum, let the committee know what should be rolled over. This is a theoretical solution that we plan to test in Year 3. We would also like to formalize a way for writers to report which requests were funded and which were not.

Funding: One-time funding is used to purchase equipment and one-time budget enhancements. Upon receipt of the Prioritization List, President's Cabinet and College Council determine which items are funded using one-time funding and identify items that can be funded using existing or categorical funds. In as much as possible, College Council honors the rankings established by the Program Review Committee. Committee members asked for transparency in rationale when the rankings are not honored. Funding results are shared with the Program Review Committee, Academic Senate, Department Chairs, President's Cabinet, and College Council.

Eligible Items: The Resource Request process is used to secure additional funding for growth. This form, which is the final, optional step of the ASPIRE process, should be used to request new faculty, classified professionals, equipment, budget augmentation, technology, and facilities improvements. In previous years, we saw that some items are placed in the “wrong” category, meaning it was placed in one category and should have been placed in another, or a request did not fit the Program Review process to begin with. This is an area where we can further educate colleagues so the requests best align with processes.

The following items are not eligible through the Resource Request process:

- Faculty vacancies due to resignation or retirement are filled based on the Faculty Replacement Rubric.
- Classified or faculty resignations or retirements that are unfilled due to hiring delays, being ‘on hold’ or hiring freezes, but still have a ‘placeholder’ for the

position are not Resource Request items.

- Resignations or retirements positions that are eliminated may come through Resource Requests as a growth position.
- Replacement or repair of existing equipment due to normal use and life of the equipment should follow the Equipment Replacement Process.
- Budget increases to cover inflation or salary increases should be part of the annual Budget process.
- Critical needs that must be addressed before the next Resource Request Process may submit an Urgent or Emerging Needs request through College Council.

There were many questions and discussions this year regarding which requests should come to the Program Review Committee for prioritization through the ASPIRE process. While clarification was made to programs that Program Review funding is limited in scope, there are other campus processes for requesting resources that fall outside of the Committee's purview. It is clear from these discussions that there is a need for an Institutional Resource Request Process and documentation that is shared campus-wide. The Program Review Resource Request process would be one of several means of requesting resources outlined within this document, though it is beyond the scope of this committee alone. It is strongly recommended that College Council and other governing bodies engage in discussion surrounding the creation, documentation, and implementation of such a process to clarify for the campus the appropriate steps when a resource need has been identified. The Program Review Committee also recommends that we work more closely with the Office of the Vice President of Administrative Services to have a better understanding of the overall budget process.

There were additional questions and concerns among the committee with regards to the following employment-related requests coming to Program Review Committee for prioritization:

- Grant-funded positions
- Professional expert positions
- Reclassification of existing positions
- Management positions

Challenges and Need to Reconsider Resource Request Process

There was a concern brought up in the 2023-24 report relating to the burdensome Resource Request process and the fact that those Resource Requests were rarely fulfilled. The Committee continues to express concern that the current Resource Request process is overly time-consuming and detracts from its ability to focus on evaluating program effectiveness and improving the ASPIRE process. There is a growing consensus that the structure of the Resource Request process needs to be revised or expanded to support more informed funding prioritization. Feedback suggests Program Review is perceived by some as a procedural hurdle rather than a meaningful path to resource allocation. One proposal under consideration is to use the ASPIRE process to collect requests, which

would then be reviewed by a separate body, including Program Review representatives. The Committee also emphasized the need for stronger support from Administrative Services to develop a more efficient and effective process. Concerns remain about persistent understaffing and the perception that resource needs are acknowledged but consistently unmet, contributing to a sense of futility among programs.

In Spring 2025, College Council tasked the Program Review Committee with developing a new faculty prioritization process rather than relying upon the Faculty Replacement Rubric. The challenges do not yet have a solution, but we are working towards a process that will, hopefully, alleviate the frustration associated with requests that have no potential of being fulfilled.

The Committee developed a Taskforce that will focus on faculty prioritization for the campus. This includes all faculty vacancies: Retirements, resignations, and growth positions. The Taskforce would like to have a recommendation in place early in the 2025-26 academic year. The recommendation will be widely shared among constituency groups before adoption.

2024-2025 Program Review Resource Request Rankings

BUDGET

Division Ranking	Division	Department	Amount	Budget Description
1	Arts & Humanities	Art	\$50,000.00	Increase Art Department and Gallery Budget
	Science	Architecture & Environmental Design	\$1,350.00	SketchUp Software Licensing
	Student Services	Student Life	\$25,000.00	Funding for events
2	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	\$20,000.00	Budget Increase for Musicals
	Science	Biology	\$5,000.00	Budget increase Instructional Supplies, General Biology (0401)
	Applied Technology, Transportation & Culinary Arts	Welding Technology	\$60,000.00	Instructional Supplies
3	Arts & Humanities	Modern Languages	\$2,000.00	Budget Increase
	Science	Environmental Science	\$2,000.00	Off-Campus Field Trips fees
4	Arts & Humanities	English	\$129,400.00	Embedded Tutoring - Writing Center Budget
	Science	Biology	\$6,000.00	Budget increase Instructional Supplies, Anatomy Physiology (0410)
5	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	\$20,000.00	Budget Increase for Conferences
	Science	Geography	\$1,500.00	Off-Campus Field Trips - Hiring a Bus
6	Science	Geographic Information Systems	\$1,500.00	Off-Campus Field Trips - Hiring a Bus
7	Science	Biology	\$3,000.00	Preventative Maintenance budget increase microscopes
8	Science	Geographic Information Systems	\$500.00	Promotional items, including a professionally designed table cloth, banner, and canopy with the SBVC GIS logo.

CLASSIFIED

Tech. Committee Ranking	Division	Department	# of Positions	Classified Description
1	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	1	Increase Senior Theatre Arts Tech
	Mathematics, Business & Computer Technology	Computer Information Technology	2	Part-time Lab Staff
	Science	Allied Health (Nursing, Pharm Tech & Psych Tech)	1	Allied Health Simulation Technologist
	Student Services	Student Health Services	1	FT Mental Health Professional
	Applied Technology, Transportation & Culinary Arts	Aeronautics	1	Administrative Staff Support
2	Arts & Humanities	Film, Television, and Media	1	Full-time Lab Tech
	Science	Allied Health (Nursing, Pharm Tech & Psych Tech)	1	Allied Health Community Recruitment Specialist
3	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	1	Program Assistant
	Applied Technology, Transportation & Culinary Arts	Welding Technology	2	Lab Technician

EQUIPMENT

Equipment				
Division Ranking	Division	Department	Amount	Equipment Description
1	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	\$35,000.00	Digital Sound Mixer
	Science	Chemistry	\$15,000.00	IR maintenance & software updates
	Student Services	Student Health Services	\$5,000.00	Feedback Kiosks
	Applied Technology, Transportation & Culinary Arts	Welding Technology	\$60,000.00	Welding Machine
2	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	\$20,000.00	Budget Increase for Musicals
	Science	Biology	\$5,000.00	Budget increase Instructional Supplies, General Biology (0401)
3	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	\$13,000.00	Soldner clay mixer
	Science	Biology	\$5,700.00	Plastination female whole body slice, HG6005
4	Arts & Humanities	English	\$13,000.00	Lighting Board
	Science	Biology	\$3,000.00	NMR maintenance & software updates
5	Arts & Humanities	Music	\$890.00	NMR maintenance & software updates
	Science	Biology	\$1,500.00	Electronic Headphones
6	Arts & Humanities	Geographic Information Systems	\$1,500.00	Off-Campus Field Trips - Hiring a Bus
	Science	Theatre Arts	\$4,784.00	Mic for Pacs
7	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	\$9,072.00	Mic Pacs
	Science	Biology	\$1,948.00	Respiratory models, Item #: 566915C
8	Arts & Humanities	Music	\$1,500.00	Headphones
	Science	Biology	\$2,100.00	Half life-size human circulatory model, A-100137
9	Arts & Humanities	Music	\$1,798.50	Keyboard Stands
	Science	Biology	\$29,820.00	Plasticized whole & half brain, HP1201 & HP

				1202
10	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	\$13,000.00	Lighting Board
	Science	Biology	\$42,480.00	Plasticized Heart, HP1303 & HP 1301
11	Arts & Humanities	Music	\$885.00	Midi Keyboards
	Science	Biology	\$20,200.00	Plasticized Whole male Pelvis, HP0902
12	Arts & Humanities	Music	\$335.00	Ear Plugs
	Science	Biology	\$23,600.00	Plasticized pelvis & female genital system, HP 0904
13	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	\$960.00	Storage Bins
	Science	Biology	\$8,580.00	Plasticized kidneys and suprarenal glands with blood vessels, HP1611
14	Science	Biology	\$20,915.00	Lab chairs with casters - micro, HLS 222, and HLS 230
	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	\$600.00	Drum Shield
15	Science	Chemistry	\$1,000.00	Class set of Organic Technique books
16	Science	Biology	\$97,800.00	Plasticized whole body NO.1, HP0101 or HP0103 deep tissue

FACILITIES

Tech. Committee Ranking	Division	Department Amount	Facilities	Description
1	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	\$123,456,789	Theatre Facilities
2	Arts & Humanities	Art		Student Run Art Gallery
3	Arts & Humanities	Dance	\$123,456,789	Dedicated Dance Facilities
4	Arts & Humanities	Film, Television, and Media	\$13,000	Build a Dark Room

FACULTY

Division Ranking	Division	Department	# of Positions	Faculty Description
1	Academic Success and Learning Services	Middle College High School	1	Institutionalized full-time tenure counselor
	Mathematics, Business & Computer Technology	Computer Information Technology	1	Full-Time Faculty for AI and Cybersecurity
	Science	Pharmacy Technology	1	Pharmacy Technology Full-time Faculty
	Social Sciences, Human Development, Kinesiology & Health	Psychology	2	Full-Time Faculty
	Student Services	Student Life	0	Faculty Release Time
	Applied Technology, Transportation & Culinary Arts	Aeronautics	1	Full-Time Faculty Professor-General Maintenance Aviation
	Arts & Humanities	Film, Television, and Media	1	Tenure Track Faculty

2	Academic Success and Learning Services	Library Technology	1	Full-time faculty member
	Mathematics, Business & Computer Technology	Mathematics	1	Retired Faculty Replacement
	Science	Psychiatric Technology	1	Faculty
	Social Sciences, Human Development, Kinesiology & Health	Ethnic Studies	1	Full-Time Faculty
	Arts & Humanities	Modern Languages	1	Full-Time Faculty Member
3	Academic Success and Learning Services	Academic Success and Learning Services	1	Three mentors
	Science	Science	1	Academic Remediation Specialist
	Applied Technology, Transportation & Culinary Arts	Applied Technology, Transportation & Culinary Arts	2	Full-Time Faculty
	Arts & Humanities	Arts & Humanities	1	Faculty
4	Academic Success and Learning Services	Middle College High School	1	Academic Success Counselor (Adjunct)
	Arts & Humanities	Music	1	Full Time Faculty
5	Applied Technology, Transportation & Culinary Arts	Aeronautics	1	Full-Time Faculty Professor-Powerplant Maintenance
	Arts & Humanities	English	2	Full-Time Faculty
6	Arts & Humanities	Music	1	Full Time Faculty
7	Arts & Humanities	Theatre Arts	1	Technical Theatre Faculty
8	Arts & Humanities	Dance	1	Dance Faculty

Not Ranked*	Applied Technology, Transportation & Culinary Arts	Aeronautics	1	Full-Time Faculty Professor-Flight Operations
Not Ranked*	Applied Technology, Transportation & Culinary Arts	Aeronautics	1	Full-Time Faculty Professor-Airframe Maintenance

*Waiting for clarification from Division Dean

TECHNOLOGY

Tech. Comm ittee Rankin g	Division	Department	Amount	Technology Description
1	Science	Biology	\$41,500	30x Dell Latitude 5550 Laptops and Laptop Cart
2	Science	Biology	\$12,400	8x Student Lab iMac Computers, HLS 235 & HLS 207
	Science	Chemistry	\$1,000	Chem Draw Software License
4	Science	Pharmacy Technology	\$800	Pioneer Rx Software
5	Science	Biology	\$14,200	30x iPads, iPad Cases, JAMF Licenses, and iPad Cart
6	Mathematics, Business & Computer Technology	Computer Information Technology	\$40,000	Allenware PC computers and AI software (30)

Appendix A

ASPIRE 2024-25 Submitted Reports

The following pages contain the reports submitted by individual programs who participated in this year's ASPIRE process.