1. **Introductions:**
   Martha Davis brought the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. All in attendance introduced themselves.

2. **State of the Web site and Blackboard**
   Dave Arnold shared a template for the IEC website that he had asked Brian Van Pelt to develop. The committee had a discussion about which links are appropriate for the IEC website (e.g. whether to link to Program Review and Curriculum Committee pages, and since these pages don’t exist yet, confirming who will be responsible for maintaining the content of the links). Martha requested confirmation of which links were expected to be available from CR’s public accreditation website before further discussion of which links to include on the IEC page. The page under development is not currently accessible through current navigation links but can be found at www.redwoods.edu/district/iec.

3. **Report on the CCCDUG Conference**
   Steve Grimes gave a brief report on his attendance at the recent California Community College Datatel Users Group (3CDUG) conference. His report included information about how new Title V regulations will impact our work at CR.

4. **Report from Technology Advisory Group (TAG)**
   Roxanne reported that in a discussion of the response to accreditation, the TAG subcommittee that developed the hardware replacement policy requested the Institutional Effectiveness Committee review draft 4.4 to provide feedback on alignment with college-wide goals and objectives, and to ensure that appropriate operational measures are identified so the policy would be likely to successfully pass through the college’s decision-making structure. Steve Stratton offered to electronically send the draft policy to IEC members, and the IEC committee agreed to review the policy for TAG.

5. **Report on Program Review**
   Dave Arnold distributed copies of his analysis of how the program review process might be improved. After discussion, the committee agreed to provide input via email for Dave’s document so it can be further refined and submitted to the Program Review Committee for consideration. Some items the committee discussed include:
   - Data limitations (e.g. related to program graduates, assignment of students to programs)
• Programs for program review are ill-defined
• Authorship is unclear
• Resource needs are discussed from a narrow perspective, does not consider possible resource sharing among programs
• Instructions on how to fill out the tables and other requested items are incomplete
• Program Review guide pages 24-29 relating to assessment all refer to measures for accountability and do not specify the importance of assessment for learning
• A suggestion that CR could adopt an assessment rubric similar to that of Riverside Community College District’s District Assessment Committee, which assigns a score of 0 to 5 related to assessment practices.
• ADA and other compliance requirements should be addressed through Program Review.
• Decisions coming out of program review should address how much money certain decisions may cost students.

Steve Grimes distributed copies of a diagram outlining his conceptualization of how strategic planning, program review, and the work related to institutional effectiveness connect.

Roxanne distributed copies of her collection of technology and facilities related themes from the Group A Comprehensive Reviews and indicated that Group I and Group II Annual Reviews will follow.
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