**EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE**
**I E C**
**MINUTES**
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024
ZOOM MEETING
2:00 PM – 3:30 PM

Present: Tina Abraham, Vicki Brewster, Bob Brown, Grace Estrada, Fahmida Fakhruddin, Angel Fuentes, Judith Girardi, Antoinette Herrera, Jack Ho, Liza Kramer, Will Sapigao, Sean Stewart

Also present: Kelly Nguyen-Jardin, Robert Gutierrez

Absent: VP Pouncil, VP Willis

# IEC Minutes for September 16th Meeting

**Meeting Start Time**: 2:03 PM

**Public Comments**:

Fahmida welcomed three new members to the IEC:

- Liza Kramer: Representing Language and Arts

- Jack Ho: Representing Math, Science and Engineering

- Tina Abraham: Representing Nursing and Allied Health

Grace Estrada was also acknowledged as the Curriculum Chair representing SSHAPE.

**Approval of Minutes (May 6th Meeting)**:

- Vicki moved to approve the minutes, Grace seconded, and all approved.

**Information/Discussion Items**:

- **ILO Definitions Modifications:** Grace presented proposed changes to the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) to enhance inclusivity and reflect the college's values regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion. The revisions also clarify the distinction between "information competency" and "inquiry and reasoning," and emphasize social and environmental responsibility. The proposed changes have been discussed with various constituent groups and have support from the Academic Senate.

  - Antoinette requested that the research and rationale behind the proposed changes be presented to the Administrative Council.

  - Vicki noted that the Classified Senate has not yet been consulted.

- o   Grace agreed to address these concerns.

- **Educational Master Plan (EMP) Implementation Plan Update:**

  - o   Department/Program Goals/Commitments to Action Sheets for 2024-26 are due to the IEC Chair on December 10, 2024.

  - o   Each division's progress update report on completing key action plans for 2022-24 is due to the IEC Chair by December 10, 2024.

- **Program Review:**

  - o   **Update on Program Review Data:** Fahmida reported that the VP of Academic Affairs is working to obtain program review data and prepare the dataset. Program review authors were advised to proceed with sections not requiring data, such as department overview/history, curriculum, and faculty/staff information.

  - o   **Updated Comprehensive Program Review Form:** Fahmida presented the updated form, which includes three new tabs: Prior Budget Usage, Criteria for Resource Allocation, and Manager/VP Prioritization. A technical issue prevents the resource request form from accepting numbers with decimal points or commas. Vicki suggested adding a note to the form specifying the required format for entering numbers (whole numbers only, no commas or dollar signs), and Fahmida agreed to pursue this.

  - o   **August PDD Program Review Session:** Bob reported that the session was successful despite low attendance due to a concurrent session on AI. Attendees were well-informed, and the step-by-step walkthrough of the form proved effective. The budget portion saw improvement compared to last year.

  - o   **Program Review Support Sessions:** Fahmida announced upcoming support sessions scheduled for September 23, 25, 27, October 8, 9, and 10. These sessions are designed to assist with the program review process. Grace pointed out that the Friday, September 27th session overlaps with another workshop (IOTL). Fahmida acknowledged this but explains that the chosen times are based on what usually works best for most people. She emphasized that anyone who cannot attend any of the scheduled sessions can reach out to her to arrange an individual meeting at a more convenient time.

  - o   **BIM Program Review**- The Building Information Modeling (BIM) program requested to defer its program review again due to ongoing challenges with faculty shortages and outdated materials.
    - ▪   Angel suggested potentially hiring an adjunct faculty member from another institution to update the courses.
    - ▪   Antoinette emphasized the need for a clear action plan and suggests tabling the discussion until the next meeting to allow time for developing a plan.
    - ▪   Vicki clarified that decisions about deactivating courses are made by the curriculum committee not by the IEC.
    - ▪   Fahmida will add the BIM program review to the next meeting's agenda.

- Angel, VP Pouncil, or the curriculum committee will provide an update on the plan for the program moving forward.

- **Assign mentors for 2024/25 cycle and late PR cycle**- Committee agreed on the assigned mentor list for 2024/25 cycle and late PR cycle.

- **Establish goals for the 2024/25 academic year** - The committee approved the following goals for 2024/25 academic year:
  o Creating a program review form for Library
  o Updating CurriQunet form as we need
  o Establish a clear process and decision-making framework for programs with out-of-date courses/program/certificates
  o Creating new videos for program review module

**Adjournment**: 2:59 PM

**EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE**
**I E C**
**MINUTES**
**OCTOBER 7TH, 2024**
ZOOM MEETING
2:00 PM – 3:30 PM

Present: Tina Abraham, Vicki Brewster, Bob Brown, Grace Estrada, Fahmida Fakhruddin, Angel Fuentes, Judith Girardi, Antoinette Herrera, Jack Ho, Liza Kramer, Will Sapigao, VP Pouncil, VP Willis

Absent: Sean Stewart

# IEC Minutes for October 7th Meeting

**Meeting Start Time**: 2:04 PM

**Public Comments**: No public comments.

**Approval of Minutes (September 16th Meeting)**:

- Minutes from the September 16th meeting were approved unanimously. (Motion by Grace, seconded by Will)

**Information/Discussion Items**:

- **Educational Master Plan (EMP) Implementation Plan**

  o Fahmida announced that reminder emails for submitting Department/Program Goals/Commitments to Action Sheets (2024-26) and divisional progress reports (2022-24) will be sent by early next week.

- **The Institutional Set Standard (ISS)**
  o The current ISS is 72%, but the college has consistently exceeded this in recent years.
  o The average success rate for 2019-23 is 73.04%.
  o The committee debated on whether to set the new ISS at 73.77% (a 1% increase) or 74% (a 2% increase). Some members feel the college can easily achieve 74% and should aim higher.
  o For the last two years, the aspiration goal was 75%. The aspirational goal is also being discussed, with suggestions to increase it to 76% or even 77%.
  o Concerns are raised about the impact of recent changes like the removal of remedial courses and the implementation of Guided Pathways, and how these might affect success rates in different departments.
  o There's a strong emphasis on aligning goals across different initiatives (e.g., Educational Master Plan, equity goals).
  o The committee seems to be leaning towards 74% for the ISS, but a final vote will be taken at the next meeting.

- **Program Review**
  - **Update on Program Review Data**- Fahmida reported that the VP of Academic Affairs is hiring a consultant to run program review reports. Fahmida has already run reports for some programs and shared the data with the respective authors.

  - **Training Sessions:** Upcoming program review support sessions are scheduled for October 8th, 9th, and 10th. Those unable to attend can schedule individual meetings with Fahmida.

  - **New Member Training:** A training session for new committee members will be held on October 11th.

  - **Develop a clear action plan for BIM**-The committee discussed the challenges facing the BIM program, including outdated courses, lack of faculty, and repeated deferrals of its program review.

    **Proposed Solutions:**

    - The committee leans towards denying further extensions for BIM program review, prompting action.
    - Consider deactivating the BIM program or individual courses if the program review and updates aren't completed.
    - Bring the issue to the Academic Senate and potentially the Union for consultation, especially concerning faculty responsibilities.
    - Establish a clear policy on the maximum number of deferrals allowed (e.g., two) and the consequences of non-compliance (e.g., ineligibility for resource allocation).
    - If a full-time faculty member isn't fulfilling their contractual obligations, explore options like evaluations, conversations with HR and the Union, and potential workarounds to deactivate programs or courses.

    **Action Items:**

    - Fahmida will send Grace a list of programs with deferred reviews for Academic Senate review.
    - Include a detailed history of deferrals and issues in meeting minutes for future reference.

  - **Establish a clear process and decision-making framework for programs with out-of-date courses/program/certificates**- The IEC has been unable to approve some program reviews each year due to outstanding out-of-date courses/programs/certificates. The committee will discuss it further at the next meeting.

**Adjournment**: 3:38 PM

**EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE**

**I E C**

MINUTES
OCTOBER 21ST, 2024
ZOOM MEETING
2:00 PM – 3:30 PM

Present: Tina Abraham, Vicki Brewster, Grace Estrada, Fahmida Fakhruddin, Judith Girardi, Jack Ho, Liza Kramer, Will Sapigao, VP Pouncil, VP Willis

Absent: Bob Brown, Angel Fuentes, Antoinette Herrera, Sean Stewart

# IEC Minutes for October 21st Meeting

**Meeting Start Time**: 2:08 PM

**Public Comments**: No public comments.

**Approval of Minutes (October 7th Meeting)**:

- The October 7th meeting minutes were unanimously approved with the addition of Vicki's suggestions to the Institutional Set Standard section. Vicki made the motion to approve, and Grace seconded it.

**Information/Discussion Items**:

- **Review program review process and handoff to different committees**-

  - Grace said that she was in conversation with Dean Herrera. Dean Herrera emphasized the importance of IEC members ensuring program reviews are complete before moving them on to other committees, as missing information hinders decision-making in the budget and hiring processes.
  - The committee discussed the need for clearer prioritization of faculty requests within departments, potentially with Dean input, especially when multiple positions are requested. This arose from challenges faced by the Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee.
  - There was debate about whether Deans should be able to request faculty positions at the division level, with some arguing it should only be done at the department level. However, there was agreement that Deans should be able to support department requests, especially given that some faculty may need assistance with the process.
  - Concerns were raised about the AURR process, particularly regarding Dean requests for faculty positions within the AURR. There was confusion about whether this was allowed and how to ensure sufficient information is included to justify the requests.
  - The committee acknowledged that the AURR process might be disadvantaged compared to the comprehensive program review in the faculty prioritization process. They discussed revising the rubric to ensure fairness and equal consideration.

- **List of programs with deferred reviews**
  - Fahmida provided a summary of the issues surrounding the deferred program reviews. She highlighted the lack of progress, and the challenges faced in completing these program reviews, emphasizing the need for action and faculty responsibility. She also points out the reliance on part-time faculty to complete reviews that full-time faculty should be responsible for.
  - Four programs in the Business and Workforce division have deferred reviews: Building Information Modeling (BIM), Business Information Systems (BIS), Business Administration, and Medical Front Office.
  - BIM completed a draft but was not approved due to numerous outdated courses and programs.
  - BIS has a history of issues:
    - A full-time faculty member submitted a draft in 2021 but left the college without updating it after receiving feedback.
    - In 2022-23, no one was identified to complete the review.
    - An adjunct faculty member completed a draft last year, but it was not approved due to outdated courses and programs.
  - Business Administration has a full-time faculty member who has not completed the program review despite multiple requests and offers of support. The review was due in 2021-22.
  - Medical Front Office had a draft submitted in 2022-23, but it was not approved due to outdated courses and certificates. No action was taken last year.
  - A part-time faculty member is now working on the Business Administration review after the full-time faculty member failed to do so.
  - Proposed actions:
    - Henry will follow up with the Dean of Business and Workforce division to address the uncompleted Business Administration Review and emphasize the full-faculty members responsibility.
    - Support and training should be provided to the part-time faculty now tasked with completing the Business Administration review.
- **Establish a clear process and decision-making framework for programs with out-of-date courses/program/certificates**
  - Fahmida expressed concern about the ongoing issue of outdated courses and programs preventing program review approval. She shared data from the last three years showing that while previous IEC efforts have helped reduce the number of programs with outdated elements, they haven't eliminated the problem. These efforts included providing update deadlines and lists of outdated materials. Fahmida emphasized the need for a clear process to ensure courses and programs are kept current, considering factors like full-time faculty availability, and asked the committee for collaborative solutions.
  - Grace highlighted the curriculum chair's new authority to deactivate outdated courses/programs, emphasized the need for faculty to update courses, and mentioned

ongoing efforts to address this within the Business and Workforce division. She also urged Deans to communicate the importance of keeping courses current to faculty.
- o Vicki raised the question of how the decision to deactivate courses would affect programs with high student demand but no full-time faculty to update them (using Political Science as an example).
- o Henry acknowledged the problem of high-demand programs lacking full-time faculty and explained that the faculty prioritization process is being revised to favor these departments. He also supported the deactivation of courses in low-demand programs with no instructors.
- **Update on Program Review Data**-
  - o VP Pouncil said there is no update on the program review data, but he has update on campus researcher. San Jose City college (SJCC) is actively working to fill three researcher positions – one for the district, one for SJCC, and one for EVC. EVC will participate in the selection process. He may consider adjusting document submission deadlines, pending discussions with the committee chair and other Vice Presidents.
  - o Grace shared concerned about data timelines. Hiring researchers now might not provide data in time for program reviews. She suggested exploring special assignments for faculty to generate reports if a classified staff member isn't available to do so.

**ACTION ITEM**
- Vote on Institutional Set Standard and Aspiration Goal for 2024-25- The committee unanimously voted to set the Institutional Set Standard at 74% and Aspiration Goal at 76% for 2024-25.

**Adjournment**: 3:29 PM

**EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE**

**I E C**

MINUTES

NOVEMBER 4TH, 2024

ZOOM MEETING

2:00 PM – 3:30 PM

Present: Tina Abraham, Vicki Brewster, Bob Brown, Grace Estrada, Henry Estrada, Fahmida Fakhruddin, Judith Girardi, Jack Ho, Liza Kramer, Will Sapigao, Sean Stewart, Ugonna Udeh

Absent: Angel Fuentes, Antoinette Herrera, VP Pouncil, VP Willis

# IEC Minutes for November 4th Meeting

**Meeting Start Time**: 2:06 PM

**Public Comments**: No public comments.

**Approval of Minutes (October 21st Meeting)**:

- The October 21st meeting minutes were approved with a minor addition suggested by Vicki. Grace made the motion to approve, seconded by Vicki.

**Information/Discussion Items**:

- **Review program review process and handoff to different committees**-
  - Fahmida led the discussion, summarizing the previous meeting and proposing solutions to streamline the program review process. She suggested next steps, including consulting with the Academic Senate, revising the rubric, communicating guidelines to faculty, and continuing discussions with the Budget Committee. She emphasized the need for collaboration and clarified action items. She also confirmed that proposed changes would be tested in the sandbox before going live before implementation. She agreed with Grace that the committee should be able to make minor changes without going back and forth with other committees.

  - Vicky emphasized the importance of including classified staff in program reviews to ensure their needs are considered. She also sought clarification on how prioritization would work with multiple requests and how proposed changes would appear in the system.

  - Henry described the program review process and how AURRs are reviewed. He highlighted Dean's oversight role and the need to consult with affected parties when making system changes. He also confirmed that the IEC's recommendations go through College Council for review.

- Liza sought clarification on the involvement of classified staff in program reviews and raised concerns about situations where key personnel, like Deans, might be missing.
- Grace clarified that Deans currently do not prioritize personnel requests and suggested adding this to the process. She supported the idea that minor changes shouldn't require excessive oversight.
- Judith confirmed that in the library, requests go directly to the Vice President.

- **Medical Front Office Program Review**
  - Fahmida initiated the discussion on the Medical Front Office program review and its repeated deferrals. She proposed establishing a process for assessing program viability after two deferrals and outlined the steps involved. She also raised concerns about the implications of deferring high-demand programs and sought solutions for ensuring faculty accountability in completing reviews.
  - Grace suggested using an existing administrative procedure for program viability reviews and proposed formalizing the process. She emphasized the IEC's role in determining the criteria for initiating the process and highlighted that program reviews provide valuable information for this purpose. She also advocated for consequences for faculty who repeatedly defer reviews.
  - Henry clarified who can initiate the program viability process and emphasized its purpose in protecting programs from arbitrary discontinuation. He expressed willingness to collaborate on establishing a clear process and highlighted the importance of understanding individual roles and responsibilities.
  - Liza sought clarification on the timeline and process for program viability assessment.
  - Judith sought clarification on where the program viability process resides and who the decision-making bodies are. She expressed interest in understanding the process, particularly given the library's context.
  - Robert asked about Dean's role in the program viability process.
  - Vicki emphasized the need to include classified staff in program reviews and sought clarification on how prioritization and proposed changes would function. She also highlighted the issue of viable programs with delayed reviews and confirmed that a part-timer was identified to address the Business program review.
  - Sean stated that completing program reviews is a contractual obligation for faculty and highlighted potential issues with tenured faculty not fulfilling this responsibility.

- **Update on Building Information Modeling (BIM)Program**
  - The committee discussed the Building Information Modeling (BIM) program, which has been deferred multiple times.
  - Committee's recent decision regarding programs with outdated courses and certificates, a Program Viability Review (PVR) needs to be completed.

- o IEC determined that if a program defers its Program Review for two academic years due to outdated courses and certificates, a PVR must be initiated in the 3rd year.
  - o Grace Estrada, the curriculum chair, will formally request the Academic Senate to initiate a program viability review for the BIM program.
  - o This will be the first program to undergo this newly established process.

- **Email Reminders**- Fahmida notified the committee that the email reminders will be sent for the following deadlines:
  - o November 27th: Program review draft submission
  - o December 10th: 2024-26 Educational Master Plan (EMP) implementation sheet and progress update submission
  - o December 13th: Annual Update and Resource Request (AURR) submission

- **Program review feedback form-**

  - o The committee discussed the program review feedback form. They decided to remove the fourth question about CurriQunet experience and rephrase the third question to acknowledge the continuation of program reviews.

  - o The feedback form will be sent out to gather input on the program review template, process, and suggestions for improvement

**Adjournment**: 3:29 PM