



Program Review Committee

Minutes for May 28, 2026

2:30- 3:45 pm

Operations Center (OC) 116

Meeting Participants (17 members, Quorum: 6)

Committee Members Present

Laura Adams, Hayley Ashby (co-chair), Quinton Bemiller, Svetlana Borissova (via Zoom), Rosalio Cedillo, Araceli Covarrubias (via Zoom), Sonia Gonzalez, Vivian Harris, Ashlee Johnson, Starlene Justice, Daniela McCarson (via Zoom), Lindsay Owens, Tim Russell (co-chair), and Dana White.

Committee Members Not Present

Sean Davis, Sonia Gonzalez, Ashlee Johnson, and Maile Takahashi (ASNC Rep).

Guest

Eric Doucette, Cody Jensen, and Jody Tyler

Recorder

Charise Allingham

1. Call to Order

- 2:30 pm

2. Action Items

2.1 Approval of Agenda

- MSC (Starlene Justice /Lindsay Owens)

2.1 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

2.2 Approval of April 23, 2026 Minutes

- MSC (Laura Adams/Rosalio Cedillo)

2.2 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

2.3 Program Review 5-Year Cycle with Annual Updates

- The committee voted to approve the moving program review from a 3-year cycle to a 5-year cycle. This vote provides committee support for the proposal before it goes to the Senate.
- MSC (Vivian Harris /Lindsay Owens)

2.3 Conclusion

- Approved by consensus.

3. Discussion Item

3.1 Resource Request and Prioritization Process

Dr. Jody Tyler presented systemic issues with the resource request and allocation process, which have created operational challenges.

While these issues may fall outside the committee's direct purview, the committee may still be able to help inform and influence improvements to the overall process and support continuous improvement efforts.

School-Level Ranking Disadvantages for Large Departments:

- Under the current ranking structure for Academic Affairs, all instructional departments with multiple disciplines (e.g., National Sciences, Health & Kinesiology: Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Geography, Kinesiology) rank requests internally before competing college-wide.
- Multiple discipline departments' current ranking by schools is causing too much competition especially in high-cost programs.
- National Sciences, Health & Kinesiology participates in a rotating system for first-choice picks, which means a discipline ranked fifth in a given year is already at a disadvantage, with subsequent requests falling further down the list.
- Impact: This process delays critical needs, such as a lab retrofit for ADA compliance that has been requested for five years.
- Question: Are disciplines submitting everything or only new items? Currently, all items, budget, annual needs are being requested.

Is Program Review (PR) the correct process for requesting basic operational needs?

- Currently, faculty are directed to use Program Review for basic items like whiteboards or replacing broken chairs.
- Problem: This creates a year-long delay for instructional needs and facility repairs/upgrades, which is inefficient because some items are needed to be in compliance and faculty may not teach in the same room the following semester.
- Suggestion: The college should work to develop an institutionalized process to fund basic instructional needs through a separate operational budget.

Lack of Transparency and Communication:

- A concern was shared that the current process becomes a "black box" after faculty submit their resource request, and faculty rarely receive feedback on unfunded requests.
- Example: A classroom (Western Quad 7) was repurposed without faculty consultation, forcing a class to be moved into a lab with inadequate AV and inadequate space. These decisions are often made by deans and chairs but not communicated to faculty.

3.2 2024-27 Reflections Questions Review

The committee reviewed a summary of the reflection questions collected in program review from the last three years. The summary is attached.

The committee found the summary helpful for inclusion in the overall evaluation. It was also suggested that the reflection questions in program review were a great addition and have provided guidance for past improvements to the platform and the process.

3.3 Program Review Evaluation Areas for Review

3.3.a Resource Requests

The Resource Request form in Nuventive was reviewed for clarity, usability and functionality in the program review process.

- A question was asked about the purpose of the “What resources do we already have?” question.
- This question was added originally with the intent of being a place to indicate resources that are already available but may still be insufficient. Also, as a place to indicate that there are no current resources.
- Currently, the question has been used to justify the need, such as to justify a partial funding request for a new position and explain why existing items are insufficient.
- Suggestion to add help text to clarify the purpose of the question and what information to provide.

Suggestion to add an additional option to the Request Type drop down:

- Do New and Revised options suffice for a request type? Is a ‘Replacement’ option needed?
 - Suggestion that a replacement option would qualify as a new item.
- Suggestion that there is a need to separate operational (which includes replacement items) and strategic resource requests.
 - Is PR the right place to request operational items that are needed annually or need to be replaced, such as broken or outdated items?

The justification question is compounded and asks for links to multiple areas of program review, such as goals and assessment, which can make the question hard to answer concisely.

- Suggestion to separate the question into sections asking for specific linkages and provide clear directions on how to answer and what information is necessary.
- Suggestion to provide clearer instructions about providing evidence for resource requests and more explicit guidance on how information would be used in the decision-making processes.

Suggestion to explore options for separating operational and strategic needs within the resource request form, as well as identifying alternative funding pathways for operational needs. This would allow the longer prioritization process to focus primarily on strategic needs that are supported by program review and assessment findings.

Overall, the committee found the current process to be effective but could use some improvements.

- Motion to add 10 minutes to the meeting
(Lindsay Owens /Vivian Harris)
Approved by consensus.

3.3.b Mapping

The drop-down menu for mapping is often overlooked and unused.

- Suggestion to provide help text or intentional instructions for finding and using the drop-down.

Suggestion to rethink the mapping section, to possibly use as a way to link to initiative needs.

- Strong vs. weak alignment to goals.
- Indicate where evidence for the request can be found.

4. Information Items

4.1 APC Faculty Request Form Workgroup Update

- APC will pilot a new faculty prioritization form but maintain the current process for use in program review. Chairs will test the new form and make any adjustments needed before full implementation.
- The pilot will test the new form's functionality without impacting decision-making.

4.2 Program Review Summer Retreat Workday June 30th

- Special projects are in process for the faculty who volunteered to participate.
- There are a total of 10 faculty, classified, and administrative staff who will finalize the evaluation and inform the updates that will be implemented to the process and platform during the summer.

5. Good of the Order

- Eric Doucette will join the committee as the new faculty assessment chair, starting Fall 2026.

6. Future Agenda Topics

- Program Review Charter
- Propose aligning the day and time of Program review meetings with Assessment meetings to facilitate stronger collaboration.

7. Adjournment

- 3:50 pm

Next Meeting

Date: September , 2025

Program Review Reflection Summary

2024–2027 Reflection Responses

Introduction

This report summarizes the overarching themes that emerged across the responses to the following reflection questions:

1. What would make program review meaningful and relevant for your unit?
 2. What questions do we need to ask to understand your program plans, goals, and needs?
 3. What types of data do you need to support your program plans, goals, and needs?
-

Question 1

What would make program review meaningful and relevant for your unit?

Key Themes

1. Connection to Improvement and Student Learning

Program review is most meaningful when it directly supports student learning, continuous improvement, and program development rather than serving as a compliance exercise. Many participants noted that the process is most valuable when it directly informs planning and supports measurable improvements.

- “Program review becomes meaningful and relevant for our discipline when it directly reflects the work we do to improve student learning, assessment practices, and continuous refinements that strengthen our program each year.”
- “I use program review as a checklist to ensure our goals are aligned correctly, data-driven, focused on student needs (student centered), and identifying opportunities for innovation and growth.”
- “This program review is only meaningful and relevant if those that are writing them are doing so for their own knowledge to improve student learning and their programs and are honest in their assessments.”

2. Actionable Follow-Through and Resource Alignment

Concern that program review findings do not consistently lead to visible action or resource allocation. Participants emphasized the importance of creating clearer connections between program review, resource allocation, staffing decisions, and institutional planning processes. Respondents indicated that the process would feel more meaningful if recommendations and identified needs resulted in tangible institutional support or follow-up.

- “The committee should acknowledge the importance and usefulness of the data within the document, and how it closely relates to the college’s educational master plan.”
- “It is most valuable when it provides a clear, honest picture of our instructional needs and successes, helping us align resources, curriculum, and professional development.”

3. Collaborative and Reflective Dialogue

Emphasized the importance of reflection, feedback, and collaborative discussion.

Expressed interest in opportunities for team discussions, collective analysis of results, and broader dialogue across departments and divisions. Participants noted that meaningful conversations about strengths, challenges, and opportunities for improvement enhance the value of the process.

4. Improved Technology and Streamlined Processes

Several responses identified frustrations with existing systems.

- “Nuventive feels disjointed, it is not continuous and because of this it is difficult to see the big picture.”

5. Better Timing and Coordination

Some respondents identified challenges related to timelines, coordination, and dependencies between departments. Administrative and support units, in particular, noted that program review timelines sometimes conflict with other institutional processes or rely on information that may not yet be available.

- “Shifting the timeline so that the units that roll up to the Administrative Program Review submit first...”
 - Budget Priorities are provided after Program review closes
-

Question 2

What questions do we need to ask to understand your program plans, goals, and needs?

Key Themes

1. Alignment with Institutional Priorities and Workforce Needs

Many respondents emphasized the importance of asking questions that connect program goals to institutional priorities, Guided Pathways initiatives, workforce trends, equity goals, and community needs. Participants noted that understanding alignment helps clarify program relevance and strategic direction.

- “Nowhere in this program review does it ask the importance of the discipline or CTE and how it aligns with the state’s guided pathways requirements.”

2. Understanding Outcomes, Challenges, and Resource Needs

Participants wanted questions that identify barriers, support needs, and program priorities. Responses frequently focused on understanding how programs define success and evaluate effectiveness.

Several responses emphasized the importance of asking how assessment findings are being used to improve instruction, curriculum, services, and program effectiveness. Respondents highlighted the value of questions that encourage reflection on improvement efforts and future planning.

- “The committee should ask how our assessment results shape both our immediate and long-term goals.”
- “What outcomes are we aiming to achieve, what resources or support are essential, and what challenges might impact success?”

3. Resource and Operational Needs

Respondents identified the need for more intentional questions regarding staffing, facilities, funding, technology, equipment, tutoring, and operational support. Participants indicated that understanding resource needs is essential for evaluating a program’s capacity to achieve its goals.

- “What technology or equipment needs to be replaced on a regular basis or cycle? What equipment needs regular maintenance or yearly contracts to be maintained?”
- “What resources would most effectively support student completion of degrees and certificates...?”

- “What barriers prevent students from fully participating? How are we improving equitable access to resources and opportunities?”

4. Open-Ended Reflection and Dialogue

Several participants recommended including more open-ended questions that encourage discussion, reflection, and collaboration rather than focusing solely on reporting metrics. Respondents expressed interest in creating a more supportive and improvement-oriented process.

- “These questions would uncover priorities, requirements, and potential obstacles.”
 - “This would make this program review larger in scope, more relevant and much more meaningful.”
-

Question 3

What types of data do you need to support your program plans, goals, and needs?

Key Themes

1. Student Success and Equity Data

Respondents frequently identified the need for data related to retention, course success, completion, equity gaps, assessment outcomes, and student satisfaction. Participants emphasized that disaggregated data is critical for identifying areas of improvement and supporting equitable student outcomes.

Respondents requested data that helps evaluate student outcomes and achievement gaps.

- “Reporting of core metrics on our student aide population as compared to other student programs on campus.”
- “Student satisfaction survey information.”
- “We need to be able to separate our dual enrollment data from traditional college data.”

2. Enrollment and Operational Metrics

Many units requested access to operational data such as FTES, enrollment trends, efficiency metrics, productivity measures, utilization rates, and student counts. Respondents noted that these metrics are necessary for program planning, scheduling, staffing, and resource allocation decisions.

- “Daily on-campus student counts.”
- “KPI data and other college level data.”
- “The implementation of the Standard of Care needs data dashboards created to assist with assessment.”

3. Labor Market and Workforce Data

Career and Technical Education programs emphasized the need for labor market information, Bureau of Labor Statistics data, and Center of Excellence reports to support program development, justification, and alignment with industry demand.

- “CTE programs require data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) to show their need within our educational programs.”
- “We always rely on the Center of Excellence, the Bureau of Labor Statistics and a variety of other sources.”

4. Dashboards and Data Visualization Tools

Participants expressed interest in improved dashboards, easier access to reports, and clearer data visualization tools. Respondents indicated that simplified data displays and downloadable reports would improve usability and support more effective analysis.

- “Data on CTE programs, separated from GE course, should be made available to make connections within CTE.”
- “We should be allowed to separate out our actual GE program courses from all others to see actual GELO data.”
- “A tutorial on how to retrieve the information, or an export file uploaded into Nuventive would be helpful.”
- “Clearer visual displays of trends and outcomes would make it easier to interpret and apply the data.”
- “The data is often available in multiple locations, which makes the process inefficient.”

Program Review Evaluation Checklist

Resource Request Section

The following questions are designed to guide the Program Review Committee in the evaluation of the Resource Request section of the Program Review in Nuventive.

Reviewer Name: _____

Review Date: _____

Meeting Date: May 28th, 2026

Clarity & Usability

The prompts clearly communicate what information is required for a resource request.

The prompts are specific enough to guide meaningful responses (beyond basic fields like title and cost).

The template avoids unnecessary complexity or redundancy.

Comments:

Usefulness for Decision-Making

The prompts generate information that helps reviewers understand the need for the resource.

The prompts encourage clear justification that supports prioritization decisions.

Comments:

Connection to Institutional Priorities, Evidence, and Outcomes

The prompts effectively encourage alignment with EMP goals, equity goals, program goals/outcomes, etc.

The prompts encourage use of data or outcomes assessment to justify requests.

The prompts ensure that request justification is summarized in a way that is clear, concise, and actionable for reviewers.

Comments:

Planning & Prioritization Value

The prompts support clear prioritization (e.g., ranking, urgency, and/or compliance with external regulations).

Comments:

Overall Assessment

Strong – No revisions needed

Effective – Minor refinements recommended

Needs Revision – Structural changes needed

Not Effective – Significant redesign recommended

Reviewer Reflection

What one change would most improve the usefulness of the Resource Request section?

Program Review Evaluation Checklist

Mapping Section

The following questions are designed to guide the Program Review Committee in the evaluation of the Mapping section of the Program Review in Nuventive.

Reviewer Name: _____

Review Date: _____

Meeting Date: May 28th, 2026

Clarity & Usability

The mapping process clearly communicates what users are expected to map (e.g., resource requests to goals or plans).

The mapping process is understandable without additional explanation or training.

The mapping interface and prompts are easy to use and complete (e.g., clicking cells, saving selections, etc.).

The process avoids unnecessary complexity and supports efficient completion.

Comments:

Alignment & Connection to Outcomes

The mapping process generates information that clearly shows alignment between resource requests and institutional goals (EMP, Equity, etc.).

The prompts help distinguish strong vs. weak alignment between requests and goals.

The prompts support linking resource requests to outcomes, KPIs, or equity metrics.

Comments:

Overall Assessment

Strong – No revisions needed

Effective – Minor refinements recommended

Needs Revision – Structural changes needed

Not Effective – Significant redesign recommended

Reviewer Reflection

What one change would most improve the usefulness of the Mapping section?