Program Review Committee
Minutes for September 24, 2026

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

Meeting Participants (Quorum 8)
Laura Adams, Hayley Ashby (co-chair), Rosio Becerra, Svetlana Borissova, Rosalio Cedillo, Eric Doucette, Sonia Gonzalez, Vivian Harris, Cody Jensen, Starlene Justice, Minaal Khan, Farshid Mirzaei, Lindsay Owens, Jason Parks, Tim Russell (co-chair), Dana White, and Jude Whitton.

Committee Members Not Present
Maria Adams, Sean Davis, and Courtney Doussett

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 August 27, 2026, Minutes

- MSC (Farshid Mirzaei / Laura Adams)

2.2 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

3. Discussion Item

3.1 Assessment and Program Review Meeting Alignment

- The co-chairs brought the proposal to align program review and assessment committee days and times to the assessment committee for consideration. Some items discussed included:
- Executive leadership and the Counseling department meet on Wednesday mornings, making it difficult to maintain consistent representation from these areas on this day and time.

- Assessment is concerned with moving to Thursday because they have worked hard this last year to build membership and representation. This growth would be minimized due to scheduling conflicts for many members on Thursday afternoon.
- Some ideas included moving program review to Wednesday mornings or scheduling combined meetings as needed on a day and time that works for the majority of members in both committees.
- Suggestion to have one standing combined meeting once each semester to allow for planned collaboration, suggested for the 2nd month 3rd Friday, intentionally scheduling early in the semester but late enough that both committees have already met and had time to plan/ start their work for the semester.
- Currently, alignment is done through cross-representation, which includes the co-chairs and the accreditation faculty co-chair, who all serve on both committees. If a new co-chair has a conflict with the other committee's day and time, the committee suggested an option could be to send a representative in their place.

3.2 Strategic and Operational Definitions

The Operational vs. Strategic Resources Discussion Guide was developed as a starting point for discussion and to help inform the development of definitions that the college can eventually adopt. The Resource Prioritization & Transparency Workgroup is charged with finalizing these definitions, but their work will not be completed until after Program Review opens for the new cycle.

In the meantime, authors completing Program Review and requesting resources will need some guidance on how to categorize their resource requests.

Some highlights of the discussion included:

- Noted that the decisions on how resources are categorized have consequences.
- Currently, there is no process to request operational resources outside of program review. The workgroup will be addressing this issue.
- Discussed the need for technology rotations/cycles to be transparent and available; this is the purview of the Resources Council.
- Discussed the benefit of requiring strategic requests to include a plan to measure impact, especially for requests that require continued funding.
- Discussed the benefit of providing examples and tailoring the examples for Student Services and Administration units in addition to instruction.
- Discussed the use of a checklist to determine if a request should be categorized as operational or strategic.

The co-chairs will work on refining the definitions and providing examples and a checklist for use in this upcoming program review.

4. Information Item

4.1 Workgroup Updates

All three workgroups have met and have discussed their purpose and deliverables.

4.1.a Instruction Data Review & KPI Dashboard Workgroup

Highlights from the first meeting:

- Does the new KPI dashboard have what we need to respond to the current prompts?
- Suggestion that the prompts are compounded and to consider breaking them out to be less onerous and easier to respond to

An update was provided on the KPI dashboard:

- New dashboard can be filtered down to the course, especially for goal 2 and the equity KPIs, which will work for the data review section.
- District is working on implementing the filters by the November 12 deadline and program review launch date. Might want to consider pushing the open date back a week to ensure the new KPI dashboard is ready for the launch.

4.1.b Student Services & Special/Equity Programs Data Review Workgroup

Highlights from the first meeting:

- Discussed the current prompts and the specific data being reviewed. The current prompts do not fully capture the data and justification programs and services need to develop goals or request resources.
- Current prompts primarily focus on historical college comparison data. There is a need for more current, actionable data that can vary based on the needs and functions of each area.
- Discussed broadening the prompts to better capture the impact of diverse programs and services.
- Suggested shifting from lagging outcomes to leading indicators to better support proactive interventions.
- The workgroup is currently reviewing the data available for their respective areas and evaluating the existing prompts.

4.1.c Resource Prioritization & Transparency Workgroup

Highlights from the first meeting:

- The issue of a lack of transparency in resource request prioritization and funding drove the conversation.
- Discussed the benefits of possibly pulling operational requests out of program review, such as creating a new form in Nuventive that is open all year long so it has a place to be housed and documented.
- Discussed the option of staggering program review submissions: For example, departments and disciplines submit first, allowing administrators time to support resource requests
- We have two cycles of purchasing: the current cycle when the budgets are finalized and then again right before the budgets close and grants end and any remaining funds need to be spent out.
- Would changing the timing of the cycle help the process?
- Discussed the need for a clear flowchart outlining the resource request process, while recognizing that the process may differ across each VP area.

4.2 Nuventive Forms Review

The new and updated Nuventive forms were demonstrated to the committee.

Streamlined the structure:

- The 2027 forms were simplified by removing the Equity and Submission/Reflection forms, along with the use of branching throughout.

New Features:

- Goal Section
  - Goal Assignment: Authors can assign goal updates/progress to colleagues via email.
  - Progress Score: Integrates the college's standardized rubric.
- Resource Request:
  - Users/PR authors can now update a request's status (e.g., "no longer needed").
  - Prompt for justification of the request was simplified ·
  - Categorization includes the "Operational" vs. "Strategic" field.

4.3 Program Review 5-Year Cycle with Annual Updates

The co-chairs have started the “roadshow’ to inform the college community of the proposal.

- Presented to: IEGC (Institutional Effectiveness Governance Council) as an information item.
- Upcoming: Academic Senate for approval, APC (Academic Planning Committee) and College Council as an information item.

4.4 APC Faculty Request Form Workgroup Update

APC is piloting a new data-centric prioritization process while also ranking the faculty requests using the previous forms and data. The requests will be prioritized at the October meeting.

In alignment with the new process, APC asked that the President’s vision be provided before the ranking takes place.

The President's priorities included:

- Growth in dual enrollment
- Adult education
- Allied health
- Math and English success
- Distance education

Faculty positions being prioritized include:

- Counselor – General
- KIN
- MAT
- MUS
- PHY

The IE office has been assisting APC in developing the new ranking rubric.

5. Good of the Order

6. Future Agenda Topics

- Program Review 2025-2030 Charter

7. Adjournment

- 3:35 pm

Next Meeting

Date: October 22, 2026

Council & Committee Charter (2025-2030)

Name of Council/ Committee: Program Review Committee

Description (25-50 words):	The Program Review Committee establishes guidelines, tools, and content requirements for the Program Review process at Norco College. It evaluates Program Reviews and Annual Updates to facilitate intentional self-evaluation and planning to support program quality, improve student success and equity, enhance teaching and learning, and connect resources to strategic planning.
Brown Act (Yes or No):	Yes
Meeting Schedule:	The Program Review Committee meets monthly on the fourth Thursday at 2:30 pm -3:45 pm during the Fall and Spring semesters, with a video conferencing option for non-members.
Chair(s):	Tim Russell and Hayley Ashby

Committee Membership:	The Program Review Committee will be ideally comprised of faculty members who are representative of Norco College's schools structure.
	• Faculty Chair
	  ○ Member of Assessment Committee
	  ○ Member of Governance and Institutional Effectiveness Council
	  ○ Attend Academic Senate to report on Program Review Committee
	• Administrative Chair (Dean of Institutional Effectiveness)
	  ○ Member of Assessment Committee
	  ○ Member of Governance and Institutional Effectiveness Council
	• Faculty Committee Members – At least 1 faculty member from each school. One of the faculty should

	represent CTE programs and one faculty should be a counselor. • Vice President Student Services • Vice President Business Services • Dean of Instruction • Institutional Effectiveness Representative • Student Representative All members of the Program Review Committee including co-chairs are allowed to vote as long as a majority (quorum) of faculty are present at any specific meeting.
Reports and Recommends to:	Academic Senate and IEGC
Required Reports and Updates:	Program Review Process, Program Review Reports
Key Performance Indicators/Goals:	Goal 6 (Effectiveness, Planning, and Governance) Objectives 6.1, 6.2
ACCJC Accreditation Standard(s):	1.3,1.4,1.5, 2.9
Equity Focus:	As part of the Program Review process, each discipline and/or unit at the college regularly reviews disaggregated data to identify if any student subgroups are showing equity gaps. The discipline/unit planning and resource allocation requests should take into consideration these data and ameliorating gaps in achievement and learning.
Edition Date:	October 21, 2026
Link to council/committee site with Membership Roster: **https://www.norcocollege.edu/committees/prc/index.html**	