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IEC Minutes for September 21st Meeting

The meeting started at 2:00 pm.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: The committee welcomed Judith Girardi, the new Librarian to the IEC. Academic Senate President Randy Pratt thanked IEC for its work and contribution to the college. He added that the Senate is extremely interested in the recommendations that come out of this committee and appreciate committee’s effort.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 4th meeting minutes were approved.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

Accreditation
  • Update on Midterm report-The midterm report has been approved by the Board of Trustee & would be sent to ACCJC in early October. The report was posted on the accreditation webpage.

Strategic Planning
  • No Update

Program Review
  • Update of program review in the CurriQunet – Fahmida informed the committee that she worked with Natalie in the summer and now all the program review templates are in the sandbox. There are some minor changes needed to be made before we go live. Then the system needs to be tested. She reported that the issue of having provision for updating the program review data and templates had been fixed and Natalie’s team still was working on the other issue - adding graphs to the program review. But there is no definite timeline when it would be ready. She added that it would not be possible to use CurriQunet as a repository for old program reviews. President Gilkerson
pointed out that we cannot house the old program reviews right now like that have a different structure but anything that starts to be inputted in there-every year going forward will be in the CurriQunet. So, it becomes a repository for the new program reviews submitted through CurriQunet but not holding the paper copy of the old program reviews.

Vicki asked the question whether we are going to use CurriQunet for this year’s program review. Fahmida said that we do not know yet because we need to test the system before we can let the folks use it. Dean Carothers recommended to test the system by ourselves first. He said that we should just take an old program review and try it with CurriQunet. He added that we should be the ones getting frustrated and trying to fix it rather than using a faculty member who is trying to get his/her program review done.

The president advised that we need to decide about when to go live and when to have the committee test through the different templates. There was a great deal of discussion about when to launch the program review this year since the program review datasets are not ready and whether we would use our old system of program review or CurriQunet. There was also question about whether we need to move back the deadline for program review later than November 30th. The committee agreed to wait up until the next meeting and then reassess where we are at. By then we will have our data hopefully and we can look at our timeline then and go from there.

- Program Review Glossary - Fahmida shared the glossary that she created for Dr. Gilkerson to be posted on the curriculum page and asked for committee’s feedback. The committee agreed on using the term ‘review team’ instead of ‘faculty team’ in the program review process. Dean Herrera advised not to put a specific year in the timeline of program review process so that it does not need to be updated every year. She recommended to add a statement that says anyone can go ahead and submit a comprehensive program review, even though it may not be due for them. Ms. Brewster pointed out that if IEC allows this to occur, we must rethink the program review process because this will allow for more program reviews to be submitted than scheduled for the year. Professor Strickland suggested to use ‘approved comprehensive and mini program review’ instead of ‘approved program review’ in the timeline for review process. Professor Naik proposed to add the process for extending or delaying program review in the program review process.

- Decision about Anthropology Program Review - The Committee approved to defer the Anthropology Program Review one more year since Anthropology does not have a full-time faculty and have only one adjunct faculty recently returned from medical leave. The committee discussed the importance of establishing approval process to delay or provide extension of program review and decided to work on this issue this academic year.

- PR Training Sessions: Sep 28, Sep 30, and Oct 2 - PR training sessions are scheduled to help the PR author with their Program reviews especially with the data questions. The training would be given to only student services and mini
program review authors. The committee decided to hold off the training session for comprehensive program review since the datasets for comprehensive program review are not ready yet.

- Assign mentors for 2020/21 cycle and late PR cycle - Fahmida shared the draft of the assigned mentor list. She is still waiting on the decision of mini program review authors whether they would do their mini or not to finalize the mentor list.

- Establish goals for the IEC 2020/21 academic year – Committee approved the following goals for the 2020/21 academic year:
  I. Schedule and plan to evaluate ILOs
  II. Establish approval process to delay or to provide extension of program review
  III. Develop instructional materials to facilitate the ability of campus community to use the online program review management system
  IV. Create a handbook for program review
  V. Continue to make progress

Meeting was adjourned at 3:46 pm.
IEC Minutes for October 5 Meeting

The meeting started at 2:05 pm.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: There was no public comments.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes from September 21st meeting were approved.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Update of program review on CurriQunet-Fahmida informed the committee that Natalie’s team is finishing up all the updates needed for launching the program review and the work is supposed to be done by Wednesday. She proposed a plan - after all the updates were done, IEC will test the system and depending on how it goes, the committee would then make a decision about the date of launching the program review in CurriQunet in October 19th meeting. The committee agreed. Bob asked whether the program review authors had been notified about this matter. Fahmida said that without knowing how the system works it would be best not to notify the program review authors. Fahmida showed the committee the program review module in CurriQunet especially the section for future needs and resource allocation requests since Natalie’s team cannot make the table the same way as it is in the template.

- How to plan for planned ILO assessment? – Fahmida shared the draft for EVC ILO assessment plan and assessment results and said that the last assessment was done in 2018. The committee discussed the importance of having a planned assessment plan. As Brad pointed out that the ILO assessment falls under SLOAC, the committee decided to pass this information to SLOAC and request for planning for planned ILO assessment.
• Budget Funds as an Incentive for Program Review? - The incentive for program review authors to do the program review is that programs can request resources through program reviews. Bob pointed out that IEC needs to be careful not to send the wrong message because IEC is not the one who gives money and also needs to make people aware that funds are drying up because of the COVID-19 expenses.

• Review How the PR Training Sessions Went – Fahmida reviewed with the committee how the PR training sessions went. The sessions were well attended. Many questions were answered, and help was provided to PR authors for completing the PR template. Two more training sessions are scheduled for next week to help program review authors with their program reviews.

• Assign mentors for 2020/21 cycle and late PR cycle* - Mentors and second readers were assigned for 2020/21 cycle and LATE PR cycle.

• Training for mentor and second reader on October 16th - The training session for the mentor and second readers is scheduled for October 16th.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:39 pm.

* 2020/21 Mentor -Second reader list sent to the committee members on 10/02/20.
Present: Hazel De Ausen, Pat Braun, Vicki Brewster, Bob Brown, Brad Carothers, Fahmida Fakhruddin, Judith Girardi, Antoinette Herrera, Tejal Naik, Guy Ras, Lana Strickland, Song-Ho Tran

Absent: Derek Diaz, Eric Narveson

IEC Minutes for October 19 Meeting

The meeting started at 2:07 pm.
The committee welcomed William Sapigao to IEC. Will is a counselor faculty who will represent student services at IEC.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: There was no public comments.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes from October 5th meeting were approved.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Issues with Program Review Module in CurriQunet - Fahmida informed the committee that the sandbox of program review module is working fine except there are a few issues that needs to be fixed such as the limitation of text editor on how many words can be accepted for answering each question in the program review module. Bob said that he liked the way the program review module looked, and the system works mostly fine except there are two issues that needs to be fixed. One is having a place to put program success rate. Another is when the answer is copied and pasted in the text editor it did not wrap the text but added as a long sentence. Fahmida assured the committee that she will work with Natalie (CurriQunet vendor liaison) to fix these issues. She showed the committee how to fill out the resource request form in the program review module. Pat said it looked great and commented that “somebody who do not know anything about the program can easily fill out by clicking on boxes.”

Fahmida added that she is working with Natalie so that we have provision for updating the questions and data by ourselves. Brad said that it is a good move since having a set up to where we can manipulate numbers and data that goes in otherwise it will impede progress on program review.
• Extension of Submitting the First Draft of Biology Program Review to January 15, 2021 - The committee discussed the request of Biology department for extending the deadline for their program review draft. Vicki pointed out that we need to keep in mind if they submit the draft late there may be delay of getting feedback from mentor and second reader.

• Option for Assigning CADD and BIM Program Review to a Faculty Outside the Program – The program review for CADD and BIM are due this year. But since CADD and BIM does not have a full-time faculty and the adjunct faculty does not want do the work even though he/she will be compensated for the work, the Business and Workforce dean asked IEC whether a faculty outside the program would be able to complete the program reviews. Antoinette said that Surveying and Geomatics facing the same issue with program review due this year and does not have a full-time faculty in the area to complete the program review.

The committee discussed the issue in great length and agreed on adopting a policy that a faculty outside the program can complete the program review but he/she has to be a full-time faculty with FSA in the area and must be compensated for the work. Antoinette asked Fahmida to make a list of the programs which are due for program review this year and do not have a full-time faculty in the area to share with the president so that we can request funding for the compensation of the faculty who will complete the program review.

• Program Review Handbook – Fahmida shared the table of content of the program review handbook that she is working on and asked for feedback whether anything else needs to be added to the program review handbook or not.

**ACTION ITEM**

• Extension of the Deadline for Submitting the First Draft of Biology Program Review - IEC unanimously voted on granting the extension of the deadline for submitting the draft of Biology Program Review.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:43 pm.
IEC Minutes for November 2 Meeting

The meeting started at 2:00 pm.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: There was no public comments.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes from October 19th meeting were approved.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Program Review Pause- The College Council decided to pause program review and SLO assessment for one year for reviewing and reimagining integrated planning process and budget allocation. The committee discussed the effect of program review pause on the following issues:
  - Program Review Data- Since all the program reviews that were due this year will be shifted to the next year, the committee agreed that the program review datasets need to be updated including spring and fall 2020 data and will be sent to the program review authors in spring 2021. Bob said that it would be more interesting since the data will include online classes.
  - Resource Allocation Fund- There was question about what will happen to the resource fund since funds will not be allocated through program review this year. Fahmida said that she learned from the College Council meeting that these funds can be used in any other purposes if they were not used for resource allocation through program review. She asked VP Matias whether this information is correct or not. He responded yes and said that these funds are flexible and can be used for any other purposes.
  - CTE Program Review – The committee discussed how the program review pause will affect the CTE programs since the state’s requirement for CTE programs to do program review is every two years. Lana pointed out that we need to clarify the consequences of not doing it. Fahmida said that there is no penalty for not doing it. Vicki said that even if there is no
penalty, the penalty comes in when we will have our accreditation visit. Dr. Pouncil assured the committee by saying that there is absolutely no injury or penalty related to our accreditation standing or our timeline or later accreditation. He said “this pause is giving us really an opportunity to look at our systems. Accreditation agency actually wants Colleges and universities to do this kind of reflection and it is absolutely consistent with our accreditation practice”. He added that in his experience, there will be no consequence to our CTE funding.

- **Update on Program Review Module in CurriQunet** – Fahmida reported that most of the updates that were requested was completed except the limitation of text editor on how many words can be accepted for answering each question in the program review module. Lana asked the question whether we would be able to make changes to the program review module after we go live. Vicki said that we would be able to make small changes, but major development work would not be possible.

- **List of Programs without Full-time Faculty which Program Reviews are Due in 2021/22 Cycle** – Fahmida shared the list of programs with no full-time faculty that are due for program review in the 2021/22 cycle. In this type of situation, as IEC agreed on a policy that a faculty outside the program can complete the program review but he/she has to be a full-time faculty with FSA in the area and must be compensated for the work. The committee requested the vice president, Dr. Pouncil to provide funding for the compensation of the faculty who will complete the program review. Dr. Pouncil graciously assured that he will make provision for this fund.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:52 pm.
IEC Minutes for November 16th Meeting

The meeting started at 2:00 pm.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: There was no public comments.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes from November 2nd meeting were approved.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- How is all Interconnected?- Dr. Gilkerson pointed out that part of what we are doing is sort of again on there is a lot of interconnection and that is why we are taking what we call the moment of focus or the pause to build out the infrastructure of how everything is interrelated. She eloquently said, “The interconnection between the course at the course level and how it connects to the program and then how that connects to institutional learning outcomes—all of that has to be mapped. Then we also have to take the service area outcomes. We are doing an analysis of where things are so that we can make sure that everything is interconnected. For example, when we ask in a program review how the resources have been used, what does your learning outcomes tell you where you need to go or what the outcomes are for students, part of it is that you have to have the SLO part interconnected to the program review so that it can go into the next part. That it is all interconnected and interrelated. Again, we are wanting to make sure that we have a resource prioritization process that also connects back SLO and Program Review”.

- SAO/SLO Terminology-Fahmida informed the committee that the SLO module in CurriQunet is using the term ‘service area outcome’ (SAO) for student services and administrative service area instead of student learning outcome (SLO) since most of the cases they are providing non-instructional services and
it is not exactly student learning outcomes as in instructional areas. SAO is really connected to determining what the target population is. The SLO assessment that we do in instructional areas are based on course outline of record or the content or like what we are hoping students learn from the work. The SAO is actually focus on a particular service to a target student population that we are trying to make a noticeable difference- how would we measure that and what we are hoping to change by what we are doing so. She added that in the last College Council meeting, it has been announced that we are going to adopt the ‘SAO’ terminology. Judith asked the question how would it work for them since Library have the instructional versus the non-instructional in the more service oriented. President Gilkerson replied by saying that Counseling would be another area like Library which predominantly noninstructional area that would also have SAOs and SLOs and can have both.

• Program Review Handbook- Fahmida showed the draft of the program review handbook to the committee and asked them to review and provide feedback. Judith commented that the document looks great and very through and asked whether it is a new document or not. Fahmida replied that she put together the program review templates and rubrics for the handbook but wrote the rest of the document from scratch. Lana raised the question whether we need to revise some part of the handbook in near future as we are implementing changes. President Gilkerson replied that the fundamental will remain same but some part, for example the timeline or the questions in the module may need to be updated. She added –“ we’re constantly assessing what we’re doing up against our data around student success and equity - that part will stay the same.” Dean Antoinette applaud the committee for having the draft of the program review handbook ready.

• Update on Program Review Module in CurriQunet- Fahmida reported that the option for updating the program review data is completed now and is working fine. Vicki pointed out that we need to have the option of pulling data from SLO module into program review module. Fahmida said that she will work on that.

• Administrative Services Program Review Template- Fahmida Shared with the committee the updated administrative services program review template. The template has been updated to replace the terminology SAO instead of SLO.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:59 pm.
IEC Minutes for December 7th Meeting

Fahmida started the meeting at 2:00 pm.

PUBLIC COMMENTS : There was no public comments.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Bob moved to approve the November 16th Meeting minutes. Pat seconded, everybody approved.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Educational Master Plan (link to the current EMP)- Fahmida informed the committee that President Gilkerson is currently working on the new Educational Master Plan and IEC needs to review the old plan to assess our progress on achieving what was identified. The committee agreed to revisit this in Spring semester.

- Update on Program Review Module in CurriQunet- Fahmida gave an update on the progress of the program review module. She walked through the sandbox and said that the program review authors now have the option to pull out data from SLO module into program review module and also has option to create custom report from the program review. Bob notified that the limitation of text editor on how many words can be accepted for answering each question has been fixed and working fine.

- Updating the Program Review Page on EVC’s Website– Fahmida shared her ideas on updating the program review page since the college will be using CurriQunet Meta for program review in 2021/22 cycle for the first time. She also shared the instructions that she prepared for how to access CurriQunet to
completing the program reviews. Hazel suggested to use instructional video. She added that she would send documentation on how to use zoom recording to create instructional videos.

**ACTION ITEMS**

- **Administrative Services Program Review Template** - Committee approved the updated template for administrative services.
- **Program Review Handbook** - The committee unanimously approved the program review handbook.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:40 pm.
IEC Minutes for February 1st Meeting

Fahmida started the meeting at 2:06 pm.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Vicki shared that Umoja/AFFIRM will be celebrating Black History Month in February and they have four events and the first one will be on this Thursday. President Gilkerson shared the news that ACCJC fully accepted the midterm evaluation report and congratulated everybody for their hard work on this.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Dean Herrera moved to approve the December 7th Meeting minutes. Bob seconded, everybody approved.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- ACCJC Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) Training – VP Pouncil said that EVC will have the self-evaluation training on Friday, March 26th as it was announced by email before. He added that ACCJC will be engaging us in mid-February about what our expectation should be. He also added that all the shared governance as well as the College Council will be engaged to develop a framework in terms of how we are going to move on regarding training, as well as after in terms of a college community.

- Recommendation for Program Review- President Gilkerson started her conversation by saying that “ACCJC accreditation standards do not have a timeframe on anything and there is a misconception that it is the ACCJC standard that we need to evaluate every six years. On the contrary, ACCJC
gave us guidelines about creating our own plan of how we do it and how we get through cycles of assessment and evaluation, so that we can actually show that we are doing the things that we say that we would be doing.” She recommended to create a four-year rotational schedule for academic, administrative and student services program reviews that would provide appropriate scaffolding for departments to coordinate required assessments of programs and services that inform a thorough and comprehensive departmental program review. She shared the draft of the four-year rotational cycle which breaks down the tasks for each year. For example, in year one, doing annual program review, course-level student learning outcome(SLO)/service area outcome (SAO) assessments, and curriculum update for career education only; in year two, doing annual program review, course-level student learning outcome(SLO)/service area outcome (SAO) assessments, and enhanced career education program review; in year three, doing annual program review, program-level student learning outcomes (PLO)/service area outcome (SAO) assessments, and curriculum update for course and program; in year four, doing comprehensive program review course-level student learning outcome(SLO) assessments, curriculum planning guide, SLO/PLO/SAO planning guide.

Dr. Gilkerson added that this would allow us to have a process for programs to update assessment information, report major changes and document anticipated program needs for the year ahead to aid in planning and resource allocation. Dean Herrera commented that the four-year schedule is laid out very nicely and it captured all our outcome assessments. Bob asked what is the difference between comprehensive and enhanced career education program review? The president replied that Career education enhanced program review can be a shorter version of comprehensive program review by taking out couple of the questions that sort of allow us to be able to demonstrate that the career education program has done a level of review. Brad said –“ to me what this is all about is equity and honesty. I do not know how as a college, we can sit here and say that we are going to look at our data every six years and say that we are truly concerned about our students.” Academic Senate President Randy said that he supports Brad’s statement. He continued by saying –“We do need the process to be responsive and I am not sure we are focusing on that part. The concern I have for faculty is that the efficacy of what we are doing- we have done program reviews many times, yet there they get shelved and information in them is never really practiced. I think we need to be looking on the other end of the program reviews that are submitted and taking the recommendations and engaging as best as we can. Money is not a problem in this district. I would like to just see some conversation on what how those recommendations get to the table and not to the table but get to our students”.


• Semester Snapshot- Dr. Gilkerson shared the screen with the draft of semester snapshot. After semester is over- after grades are submitted, the research office would run the semester snapshot and every faculty would get one for each course that he/she has taught in that semester which would include enrollment number, success, and retention rate etc. It also would provide a breakdown of by gender identification and ethnicity and age group of the retention, enrollment, and success rates. The idea here is that it would generate good reflection and conversation. Eric suggested to include the method of course delivery as well.

• Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Partnership Resource Team (IEPI PRT)- Dr. Gilkerson informed the committee that the State offers as part of the institutional effectiveness Partnership Initiative which is called partnership resource teams and colleges can put in a letter and call for and ask for support from state colleagues from across the state. and what happens is a team will come and visit the College. EVC’s partnership team will be led by the President of Oxnard College. EVC asked the partnership team to help to humanize the college through antiracist inquiry and reflection by interrogating the institutional systems and structures that contribute to disparate outcomes for traditionally underrepresented students. The areas of focus will be Curricular: Course & Program, Services, Research & Communication, Policy, Procedures & Practices, and Professional Development.

• Educational Master Plan- President Gilkerson notified that the current educational master plan will be effective until 2025. Therefore, the committee agreed to wait to review and assess the progress on achieving what was identified.

• Update on Program Review Module in CurriQunet-Fahmida informed the committee that most of the development works have been completed and so far, the module is working fine but testing the system is still going on.

• Training on using the Program Review Module in CurriQunet- The committee decided to use one of the upcoming meeting in late March/April to get trained on how to use the Program Review Module in CurriQunet.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:22 pm.
IEC Minutes for March 1st Meeting

Fahmida started the meeting at 2:03 pm.

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Dean Herrera moved to approve the March 1st Meeting minutes. Will seconded, everybody approved.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Upcoming Campuswide Surveys- Hazel shared the dates of the upcoming campuswide surveys. Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Survey is starting on March 2nd and closing on April 2nd; National Assessment of Collegiate Campus Climate Survey is starting on April 6th and closing on May 4th; Race Survey is starting on May 6th and closing on May 21st. The CCSSE data are used for accreditation. CCSSE will be promoted with Josh sending out the student newsletter with a link in it.

- Recommendation for Program Review- Fahmida notified that President Gilkerson, and she presented the program review recommendation at the Academic Senate and are going to present at the Classified Senate soon. She added that we have been trying to have a shorter/more frequent program review cycle or even have a three-year mini program review for the last couple of years even when Brad was the chair. She asked the committee whether they have any comments or concerns about the rotational four-year program review cycle. Brad pointed out that this the fourth time, we are discussing the same issue last three times in the past and every time IEC unanimously supported shorter program review cycle but never got support from Academic Senate. He added by saying that “I hope you don’t feel any pressure
or anxiety about this process, just as if the Senate voted to do something and Randy disagreed.” He said that he wanted to point out that we are under College Council – not under the Academic Senate and the College Council will have this discussion and ultimately make the decision. Bob said that he would like somebody to explain what flawed about our current program review process as Randy claimed in his letter. He continued by saying that he was a mentor and evaluated program reviews last year and they went fine, and he thought the process was working well. Vicki said that no one is thinking about the volume that will come from four-year recommendation and annual program review. She added that curriculum committee normally only meets six times in the semester and the question is with our current system/process is it doable? Pat asked Vicki whether it is doable or not. Vicki replied, “In my opinion, not at this time because it’s too much that’s out of whack right now”. Dean Herrera said that she supports the movement and changing the timeline from six years to four years. Henry asked whether we will be voting on this at some point in the future. Brad replied, “we voted three times- it just feel we are still going on too long - we voted and voted”.

- **Recommendation of Academic Senate Ad hoc Committee regarding program review recommendation**-Fahmida shared with the committee that the Academic Senate has formed a Program Review Ad hoc committee and they had their first meeting last week. They are currently reviewing the program review recommendation and have raised some concerns such as the process by which program review recommendations are considered and implemented; the raw data provided to the faculty rather than simplified data; a clear plan for how the college will staff and complete the increase in workload on the IEC. Responding to the concern of raw data, Hazel said that the research office would be able to provide simplified program specific data to the faculty. Dean Herrera said that she does not know how to respond to Academic Senate’s concern regarding how to staff and complete the increase workload on the IEC. She said, “perhaps it is for our senior administrators to look at if there are other avenues”.

- **Annual Program Review Template and Career Education Enhanced Program Review Template**-Fahmida thanked the committee for sending their feedbacks. Even though the decision has not been made yet at the college level that we would do annual program review, IEC would like to start working with the CurriQnet vendor liaison so that when the time comes it would be ready for using it in the program review module. In the past, mini program review template has been used for two-year career education program review. Career Education Enhanced Program Review Template is a little bit longer version of the mini template as it includes more data questions as suggested by the career education faculty.

- **Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative Partnership Resource Team- Update** – Fahmida reported that EVC’s partnership team, Oxnard College, visited the campus on February 17th - there was informal discussion sessions in the areas of curricular: course & program, services, research & communication, policy, procedures & practices, and professional development. They have learned about our current process and practices and they will come back with recommendations in near future. Hazel added that the team that visited us was trying to examine how we are addressing diversity, inclusion, and equity in our campus and how we do communicate that back to students, and we are waiting to see what they come back with.
Update on Program Review Module in CurriQunet- Fahmida notified the committee that one major issue that we are facing with the provision of updating the program review data each year by ourselves is that if we update the data it changes all the historical data in the program review module. To avoid this problem some development works are needed to be done and it may take one or two months. The other option would be getting a ticket and ask the CurriQunet people updating the program review data every year. The committee decided to think about it more and decide in the upcoming meeting.

ACTION ITEMS
The committee unanimously approved the annual program review template and career education enhanced program review template.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:14 pm.
IEC Minutes for March 15th Meeting

The meeting was started at 2:10 pm.

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 1st Meeting minutes were approved.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Plan on making a repository for Old Program Review Documents- Fahmida said that from last year we no longer posting the approved program reviews on the web because of 508 compliance issue. Since we will be using CurriQunet will not provide a repository for old program reviews, she asked the committee to decide on where to put these old program reviews. The committee discussed and decided to put them in share point. Fahmida assured the committee that she would work with Shashi to make it happen.

- Plan on how to collect information on the use of funds received through Program Review- There was a great length of discussion whether IEC would create a google form and asked program review authors to fill this up to gather this information or not. Vicki pointed out that it would be extra work for the program review authors -extra form to fill up if Budget Committee is already asking these questions. Vicki suggested to check with Budget Committee chair whether they ask this information or not. Judith suggested that if it is not much work then IEC should collect the information directly. She also questioned how we can make a direct point of contact on this issue. Dean Herrera said, “we have a great opportunity, as a committee, to be able to at least for that submission close that loop and follow it, at least for the next year”. She suggested that we should wait up until the new Resource Allocation Model gets implemented.
Henry suggested that the Budget Committee should be a little better integrated with whatever IEC committee is doing. Hazel pointed out that it needs to be outlined when we want the feedback.

- Update on Program Review Module in CurriQunet-Fahmida gave an update of the work that has been finished especially the future resource allocation request part. She walked through the program review module sandbox to show the committee how it changes all the historical data when program review data is updated in data look up. One option to fix this problem is to put an end date in data look up. She added that she is working with Natalie’s team to fix this issue and she has been told that this issue should be resolved by CurriQunet April release.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.
IEC Minutes for April 19th Meeting

The meeting was started officially at 2:06 pm.

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 15th Meeting minutes were approved.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Updated Program Review recommendation- President Gilkerson provided clarification and more detailed information about program review recommendation especially on the workload for IEC and how does the process work. She pointed out that IEC will not necessarily be tracking the annual program review – the annual program reviews would be tracked by the area manager. She added that the college vice presidents annually will give presentation to IEC to talk about their areas and what they saw in the annual reviews so that IEC will be charged with sort of seeing and understanding what is happening across the institution. The program review data, annual program review data gives a sense of how we align strategic goals and educational master plan similar to how we map in student learning outcomes (SLO) from course to the program to the institutional level. She used Nursing Department example to explain how annual program review can be used to document what happens in the department. Dr. Gilkerson used a pictorial presentation to show the planning and decision-making process so everything stems from college’s mission, vision, and values and goes down through educational master plan to strategic plan to these comprehensive and annual program reviews. Grace said, “if departments wanted to have a different cadence, they could but the caveat is, we have to consider accreditation, so they can’t put it off for example for eight years.” Dr. Gilkerson replied
that what she meant was that for example, department can decide to do program level outcome assessments every year even though the recommendation is to do it in year three. Pat commented, “we are trying to do program review every four year, but we are getting push back.” Dr. Gilkerson acknowledged Pat’s frustration and said “we need good conversation so that I can figure out how we can meet multiple needs and make a commitment to the fact that we are going to make actionable.

- **Comprehensive Program Reviews that are due for 2021/22 Cycle-** Fahmida shared the list of comprehensive program reviews that are due for 2021/22 cycle. Including two late program rereviews from 2019/2020 cycle, there will be a total of 23 comprehensive program reviews for the next cycle. Five areas are also due for mini optional program reviews in the 2021/22 cycle. She added that the notification emails will be sent to the division/department by next week.

- **Update on Program Review Module in CurriQunet -** Fahmida reported that the Enhanced Career Education and Annual Program Review templates are ready now to use in the program review module.

- **Training on Program Review Module in CurriQunet-** The committee decided to have a training session on program review module before the spring semester ends.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:12 pm.
Present: Hazel De Ausen, Pat Braun, Vicki Brewster, Bob Brown, Henry Estrada, Fahmida Fakhruddin, Antoinette Herrera, Will Sapigao

Absent: Brad Carothers, Derek Diaz, Judith Girardi, Saeed Maged, VP Pouncil, Guy Ras, Song-Ho Tran

IEC Minutes for May 3rd Meeting

The meeting was started officially at 2:04 pm.

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Bob moved to approve the April 19th Meeting minutes. Will seconded, everybody approved.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Recommendation of Academic Senate Ad hoc Committee for program review recommendation- The Ad Hoc Committee on Program Review recommends the following:

  1. The Academic Senate only consider changes to the frequency of the Program Review cycle after successful implementation of recommendations 2, 3 and 4

  2. All program review data is pre-populated (not by faculty) into the PR template

  3. Develop a formal written process to include the workflow and responsible staff to manage and track all recommendations that are listed within a departments' Program Review

  4. Identify and assign necessary staff to accommodate all Program Review related work
The committee discussed the recommendations at a great length. Bob asked, “Who is on the Ad hoc committee?” Henry asked about recommendation no. 4—“Does that mean the faculty want to know who’s going to be involved in the process, and who they can ask questions?” Fahmida replied, “President Gilkerson added an extra column in the program review recommendation document to identify who is responsible for which work in program review related work”. Guy asked the rationale behind the recommendation number 2—“Is it because there is too much data in the existing process and the program review author just want the data that’s relevant to their program?” Fahmida said, “They think there is too much data to look into”. Hazel said, “The excel spreadsheet for the program review data will be available as well to the program review authors if they want”. Pat asked about the timeline of implementing the AD hoc committee program review recommendations. The committee agreed on providing program review template with prepopulated program review data starting this fall to implement recommendation 2. Recommendations 3 and 4 have already been addressed in the program review recommendation document.

- **Notification emails of Comprehensive Program Reviews that are due for 2021/22 Cycle have been sent to the deans/department last week-** Fahmida reported that all the deans have been notified by email about the program reviews that are due for their division in the 2021/22 cycle.

- **Update on Program Review Module in CurriQunet-** Fahmida provided an update on the development work of program review module. Most of the basic functions are working properly but there are still some issues such as look up data feature is not working properly.

- **Complete the Committee Self-Evaluation Report-** Committee completed the Self-Evaluation Report. IEC accomplished all the goals that was set for 2020/21 cycle.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.