



**Program Review Committee
Minutes for April 23, 2026**

2:30- 3:45 pm

Operations Center (OC) 116

Meeting Participants (13 members, Quorum: 6)

Committee Members Present

Laura Adams, Hayley Ashby (co-chair), Rosio Becerra, Quinton Bemiller, Svetlana Borissova, Caitlin Busso, Rosalio Cedillo, Araceli Covarrubias, Sean Davis, Vivian Harris, Starlene Justice, Daniela McCarson, Lindsay Owens, Tim Russell (co-chair), and Dana White.

Committee Members Not Present

Ashlee Johnson

Guest

Cody Jenson

Recorder

Charise Allingham

1. Call to Order

- 2:30 pm

1.1 Comments

2. Action Items

2.1 Approval of Agenda

- MSC (Starlene Justice /Lindsay Owens)

2.1 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

2.2 Approval of March 26, Minutes

- MSC (Starlene Justice /Lindsay Owens)

2.3 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

3. Discussion Item

3.1 Program Review Evaluation Areas for Review

3.1.a Program Review: Curriculum

- The committee reviewed the prompts in Nuventive and discussed the clarity, usefulness, usability, and alignment with ACCJC standards and planning and

continuous improvement of the prompts and the curriculum form. Suggested areas for improvement included:

- Currently, the prompts do not branch. We now have the ability to branch, which can simplify the current prompts and reduce unnecessary responses.
- Suggestion to replace percentage ranges (e.g., 25–50%) with a specific count of out-of-date courses and a prompt to provide an explanation of their status (e.g., in curriculum process, deleting).
- When evaluating your program, it makes sense to review your courses and ensure they are being updated or at least reviewed.
- For the “Do you require help?” prompt, the committee suggested removing the question and instead adding text to provide resources and information on how to get help and who to contact.
- For the DE prompt, we could consider revising or removing it. Consider prompting programs to confirm DE addendums are updated alongside course revisions.

ACCJC Alignment Expectations

- The Curriculum committee is largely operational in the way it functions. Where can we address the evaluation of curriculum quality, currency, and ongoing review processes?
- Consider revising and creating opportunities for reflection that feed into strategic planning and identifying gaps or needed additions, such as building programs that can connect curriculum needs to resource requests (e.g., space, faculty, instructional materials, etc.).
 - Discussed how conversations about gaps in the program can lead to changes in curriculum.
- Currently, this section is compliance-based. One suggestion is to consider adding a prompt that encourages reflection on curriculum and labor market needs to ensure students can earn a living wage.
- Suggestions to consider including information on how to make connections between curriculum and assessment, resources, etc.
- Suggestion to add a prompt to encourage reflection on regional and local considerations (e.g., industry needs, assessment results, college initiatives, new facilities) that may inform changes or additions to the curriculum.

3.1.b Program Review: Information/Publication

- The committee reviewed the prompt in Nuventive and discussed the clarity, usefulness, usability, and alignment with strategic planning and continuous improvement. Suggested areas for improvement included:
 - The prompt may be too vague, which may cause confusion and inconsistency in responses. Consider providing help text and information on how to review publications and information.
 - Consider providing examples of publications in help text: website, flyers, newsletter, policies, reports, etc.
- Suggested areas to consider adding a prompt include:
 - Add a focus on reviewing digital publications for accessibility.

- o Add a focus on reviewing publications and information for clarity, ensuring information is student-centered, easy to understand, find, and uses jargon-free language.
- Suggestion to review previous responses to this section to ensure the intended use is addressed with any updates.

3.2 (N)ISER Responsible Sections

3.2.a 2.2 Designs and Delivers Academic Programs

3.2.b 2.6 Delivery Modes and Teaching Methodologies

3.2.c 2.9 Conducts Systematic Review and Assessment

- The committee reviewed the draft (N)ISER (Norco Institutional Self-Evaluation Report) and confirmed the accuracy of the representation of program review in the sections the committee has oversight of. The committee was requested to provide any evidence, review the sections for accuracy, and provide any ideas or additional information that can support the standards.
 - o Identified evidence included:
 - CTE Programs: minutes from industry advisory board meetings.
 - All Programs:
- Documentation showing how disaggregated data (e.g., SLO results, retention/ success) led to specific action plans to close equity gaps and/or discussion of areas reviewing their data.
- Examples of assessment data being used to request resources.

3.3 Program Review Cycle Area Feedback

No further feedback was provided. The co-chairs will be meeting with Academic Senate leadership in preparation for bringing the proposal to Academic Senate and the college community.

4. Information Items

4.1 APC Faculty Request Form Workgroup Update

The Academic Planning Committee (APC) is revising the faculty hiring form, and the work is still ongoing. It will be reviewed at the next APC meeting.

4.1.a Data needs request

- The workgroup reached out to Institutional Effectiveness for assistance with data needs to support faculty hiring per the proposed new process. The IE Office is currently inventorying available dashboard data/tools to support faculty hiring needs.
- The workgroup is developing a rubric that incorporates both quantitative data and narrative explanation for faculty requests.

4.2 Program Review Summer Retreat

The committee was asked about their willingness to participate in a 4-6 hour summer workday in late June, right after the semester ends, to finalize the evaluation and updates to the prompts in the forms.

- The co-chairs will work on confirming dates, faculty special projects, and logistics, and communicate details to the committee.

5. Good of the Order

- The committee was thanked for doing their homework and coming to the meeting prepared to engage in the evaluation.

6. Future Agenda Topics

- Review the Reflections Section Responses
- Review the Charter membership.

7. Adjournment

- 3:45 pm

Next Meeting

Date: May 28, 2026

Program Review Evaluation Checklist

Instructional Units - Curriculum Review Section

The following checklist is designed to guide the Program Review Committee in the evaluation of the Instructional Units Curriculum Review Section of the Program Review in Nuventive.

Reviewer Name: _____

Meeting Date: April 23, 2026

Clarity & Specificity of Prompts

The prompts clearly communicate what programs are being asked regarding curriculum currency.

The prompts are specific enough to guide meaningful responses (not overly checklist/compliance-based).

Comments:

Usefulness for Understanding Curriculum Health

The prompts generate information that helps assess whether curriculum is current and regularly reviewed.

The prompts go beyond status reporting (yes/no) and encourage explanation of curriculum needs or gaps.

Comments:

Alignment with ACCJC Expectations

The prompts support evaluation of curriculum quality, currency, and ongoing review processes.

The prompts encourage consideration of how curriculum supports student learning and program outcomes.

Comments:

Connection to Planning & Improvement

The prompts encourage programs to identify plans for updating or improving curriculum.

The prompts encourage reflection on regional and local considerations (e.g., industry needs, assessment results, college initiatives, new facilities) that may inform changes or additions to curriculum.

The prompts generate information that can inform resource needs or support (e.g., curriculum development help).

Comments:

Depth vs. Compliance

The prompts move beyond compliance (e.g., % up to date) to encourage meaningful reflection.

The prompts capture enough context to understand barriers or challenges in curriculum updates.

Comments:

Usability & Streamlining

The prompts are easy to understand and complete.

The structure is efficient and avoids unnecessary or redundant questions.

Comments:

Overall Assessment of Prompt

Strong – Prompt is clear and effective

Effective – Minor refinements recommended

Needs Revision – Prompt should be revised for clarity or usefulness

Not Effective – Prompt requires significant redesign

Reviewer Reflection

What one change would most improve this section?

Program Review Evaluation Checklist

Administration/Student Services - Information / Publications Section

The following checklist is designed to guide the Program Review Committee in the evaluation of the Administration/Student Services Information/Publications Section of the Program Review in Nuventive.

Reviewer Name: _____

Meeting Date: April 23, 2026

Clarity of the Prompt

The prompt clearly communicates what areas/departments are being asked to provide.

The prompt is specific enough to guide meaningful responses (not overly broad or vague).

Comments:

Alignment with ACCJC Expectations

The prompt encourages attention to accuracy, currency, and accessibility of published information.

The prompt supports expectations for clear and consistent communication.

Comments:

Connection to Planning & Improvement

The prompt encourages areas/departments to identify needed updates or improvements.

The prompt supports linking communication practices to planning or operational improvements.

Comments:

Usability & Streamlining

The prompt is easy to understand and complete.

The prompt avoids unnecessary complexity and could be answered efficiently.

Comments:

Overall Assessment of Prompt

Strong – Prompt is clear and effective

Effective – Minor refinements recommended

Needs Revision – Prompt should be revised for clarity or usefulness

Not Effective – Prompt requires significant redesign

Reviewer Reflection

What one change would most improve this section?

Assigned Standards:  [\(N\)ISER .docx](#)

[ACCJC Review Criteria and Suggestions for Evidence](#)

1. **Review Narrative & Gather Feedback:** Review your assigned Standard narrative. Please gather feedback from the colleagues involved in this work to ensure the report reflects the "nature and substance" of our actual institutional practices. Please edit the linked (N)ISER document.
2. **Validate "Moving Forward" Plans:** Edit the "Moving Forward" subsections for your standard in the linked document. These are our official improvement plans—such as institutionalizing GELO assessment cycles or strengthening "loop-closing" in program review—and must be meaningful to your area.
3. **Submit Updated Evidence:** Provide documentation to Ms. Charise Allingham that moves the report from description to verifiable impact.

If you have any questions regarding evidence documentation, please utilize Ms. Charise Allingham as a resource.

Thank you for your leadership as we "Own Our Growth" and reaffirm our institutional purpose.