Program Review Committee
Minutes for August 27, 2025

2:30- 3:45 pm
Operations Center (OC) 116

Meeting Participants (Quorum 7)
Laura Adams, Maria Adams, Hayley Ashby (co-chair), Rosio Becerra, Quinton Bemiller, Svetlana Borissova, Rosalio Cedillo, Sonia Gonzalez, Vivian Harris, Cody Jensen, Starlene Justice, Farshid Mirzaei (Zoom), Lindsay Owens, Jason Parks, Tim Russell (co-chair), Dana White, and Jude Whitton.

Committee Members Not Present
Sean Davis and Eric Doucette.

Guests
Brianna Reyes

Recorder
Charise Allingham

1. Call to Order

- 2:30 pm

1.1 Comments

The committee members introduced themselves.

2. Action Items

2.1 Approval of the Agenda

- MSC (Laura Adams/ Starlene Justice)

2.1 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

2.2 Approval of the May 28th, 2026, Minutes

- MSC (Lindsay Owens / Vivian Harris)

2.2 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

3. Discussion Item

3.1 Evaluation Summer Workday Review and Follow-up

3.1.a Decisions

The committee reviewed decisions made during the summer based on the evaluation to streamline and improve the program review platform. Summer workgroup notes attached.

Some key changes include:

- Implementing the new KPI dashboard for data review.
- Updating goal prompt to focus on background and context
- Updating the Information and publications section to focus on public-facing content and allow multiple submissions per unit.
- Removing the separate equity section and implementing equity throughout.
- Simplifying resource request mapping to focus on meaningful connections rather than exhaustive mapping.
- Removing the feedback submission form and replacing it with an anonymous survey after program review completion.

The committee also discussed improvements to the resource request process, including categorizing requests as operational or strategic and improving transparency, with plans to create supporting documentation like how-to guides, a handbook, and a glossary to help users understand and complete the new processes.

3.1.b Workgroups

The evaluation identified the need for three workgroups. Draft workgroup descriptions that included the workgroup charge, membership, and deliverables/outcomes were shared with the committee (attached).

- Instruction-Data Review & KPI Dashboard Workgroup
  - High priority - outcomes and deliverables need to be completed and implemented before Program Review opens in November.
  - Group will meet a few times in the next two months.
- Student Services Data Review Workgroup
  - High priority - outcomes and deliverables need to be completed and implemented before Program Review opens in November.
  - Group will meet a few times in the next two months.
- Resource Prioritization & Transparency Workgroup
  - Lower priority - Outcomes need to be completed by the Fall of 2027 and will probably continue to refine recommendations into the next prioritization process in the 2027-2028 academic year.

Suggested membership for all three workgroups includes committee members and others from the college community that have responsibilities for those areas.

The committee members were asked to sign up for workgroups and suggest members outside the committee who would be interested in participating and contributing to the process.

3.1 Follow-up Items	3.1 Task of	3.1 Due by
Send out an email soliciting volunteers for the three work groups	Charise	ASAP

3.2 Assessment and Program Review Meeting Alignment

The committee discussed the benefits of aligning the meeting time with the Assessment Committee. Proposed working with the Assessment Committee to hold meetings on the same day and time on alternate weeks of the month to allow for integration, where both committees would benefit from being in attendance. Some suggestions included:

- Plan to bring the proposal to the Assessment Committee asking them to move to a Thursday at the same or a mutually agreeable time in the afternoon.
- Wednesday mornings are difficult for many disciplines and departments.
- Suggest moving to an hour and a half meeting moving forward, which is in alignment with the Assessment Committee.

The co-chairs will bring a proposal to the Assessment Committee for consideration.

3.2 Follow-up Items	3.2 Task of	3.2 Due by
Bring a proposal to the Assessment Committee for consideration.	Co-chairs	Before next meeting

4. Information Item

4.1 Program Review Timeline

The goal is to have all the improvements and updates to Nuventive ready to open in mid-November 2026 and close in early to mid-March 2027.

- Will we continue to work on the annual update checklist and make modifications due to the new changes to the process and platform? Yes, the committee will begin working on the annual update in the spring.

4.1 Follow-up Items	4.1 Task of	4.1 Due by
Bring the 5-year cycle proposal to the Academic Senate for approval	Co-Chairs	Before next meeting

5. Good of the Order

6. Future Agenda Topics

- Program Review Charter
- APC Faculty Request Form Workgroup Update

7. Adjournment

- 3:21 pm

Next Meeting

Date: September 24, 2026

Operational vs. Strategic Resources Discussion Guide

Purpose

This information is intended to initiate and support discussion about how Norco College might define and distinguish operational and strategic resource needs within Program Review.

Begin with the Purpose of the Resource, not the Resource Type

Staff, equipment, technology, facilities, supplies, professional development, and budget can all be operational or strategic. Consider what the resource is intended to accomplish.

OPERATIONAL	STRATEGIC
Primarily sustains or maintains what we currently do.	**Primarily improves, expands, innovates, changes, or builds capacity.**

ASK: Would we need this resource even if we were not implementing a new improvement strategy?

Why Resource Purpose Over Type Matters

The reason a resource is needed matters more than the resource category itself.

RESOURCE	OPERATIONAL EXAMPLE	STRATEGIC EXAMPLE
Technology	Replace an aging employee computer.	Purchase specialized technology to implement a new instructional approach.
Equipment	Replace equipment needed to maintain an existing lab.	Upgrade equipment for new curriculum, industry standards, or expanded training.
Facilities	Repair or replace existing furniture.	Reconfigure a space to implement a new student-support model.
Personnel	Maintain existing staffing/service capacity.	Add capacity to expand services or address a documented student need.

Example Working Definitions

OPERATIONAL Resource

> **Definition**: Needed to maintain existing programs, services, equipment, technology, facilities, or day-to-day operations at their current level.
> **Focus**: Sustainability, maintenance, replacement, repair, and renewal

STRATEGIC Resource

> **Definition**: Supports an evidence-informed planned improvement, expansion, innovation, change, or priority that advances a program and/or college goal.
> **Focus**: Improvement, expansion, innovation, change, building capacity

Decision Checklist

Possible prompts to consider the primary purpose of the request. The following are indicators not requirements and not every box must be checked.

More likely OPERATIONAL if …

☐ Needed to continue what we already do.

☐ Replaces, maintains, repairs, or renews something that already exists.

☐ Maintains an existing program or service at its current level.

☐ Normally addressed through an operating budget, replacement cycle, or maintenance process.

☐ Without it, the primary impact is difficulty maintaining the current level of service.

More likely STRATEGIC if …

☐ Supports a Program Review goal or planned improvement.

☐ Evidence from assessment, student needs, enrollment, outcomes, or other data supports the need.

☐ Expands capacity, services, access, or instructional offerings.

☐ Implements a new or significantly improved program, service, technology, or process.

☐ Responds to emerging needs or advances a College priority beyond maintaining current operations.