IEC MEETING
May 25, 2011
MINUTES

Present: Eileen Acker (Staff Resource), Angelina Duarte (Chair), Jon Gudmundsson, Andy Haber, Arthur Lutz, Carol Scialli (Staff Resource), David Snyder

Absent: Paul da Silva, David Erlenheim, Ron Krempetz
Others Present: Mike Irvine, Sara McKinnon, Marshall Northcott

Agenda Review
- Agenda approved.

Approve Minutes
- Minutes of May 11 meeting approved.

Finalize IE Recommendations
- Have submitted recommendations to PRAC for IE, Hardware, Software.
  - Instructional Equipment: $33,647.73
  - Hardware: $5,394.35
  - Software: $16,161.80
  - TOTAL: $55,203.88

IEC Process for Considering Requests in 2011-2012

Review of Recommendations for Changing the Review Process
- Sara is involved with IE in her capacity as Program Review Coordinator.
- Difficult for those without academic background to do ratings on academic rubrics.
- Rubric was ineffective and difficult to discriminate between requests. Scoring it is complicated.
- Does it make sense to have 6 different parts to fill out.

Comments/Discussion About Process and Committee’s Task
- Original charge was to develop rubric and rate requests based on rubrics. Does revised process change responsibility to Deans what was originally faculty generated, bottom up requests? Question whether we would be rubber stamping what Deans and Chairs decide upon.
- Suggest rubric rating be done by academic people on the IEC.
- Suggest condensing number of columns re: criteria.
- May be a function of committee to review rankings and look at bigger picture. Fill in gaps that are not being communicated. Example: Counseling ordered projectors awhile ago, approved by IEC, yet no reason for them to have these.
- Questions about usage, health and safety, sound reasonable. Health and safety or essential to teach class are priorities.
- Invite Deans and Chairs to IEC for additional information.
- We need criteria but not necessarily a rubric; could have a checklist.
- Tie between Program Review and the IEC process:
  - Faculty need to address the different criteria.
  - Maybe limit what people can ask for because too many requests.
  - Bundle requests into 1 requests when two items go together.
- Discussion about technology related requests and where they should be addressed. Per Marshall: Anything that is annual should not come to IEC.
  - Question about purchasing of computers outside of IEC. Good for committee to know as information.
  - Marshall thinks there is an Instructional Technology funding source.
• Film Department has editing software, 3 years old. Jon is buying 3 new upgrade licenses. Have been doing editing without newest software.
• Subscription would be budget augmentation that goes to PRAC. Upgrades can come through IEC.
• In Program Review, Sara will add questions about system requirements and machines.

Suggested changes to document
• Number 2: Add “in consultation with related faculty member making request.”
• Number 3: Put ABC in a sortable location in Program Review. Add: “Additional ratings relevant to other considerations will be considered as well.”
• Number 5: Add “Faculty may be invited to provide additional information to justify their requests.”
• Number 6: Add wording in template (moving to another building) to check if item could be paid for by Bond.
• Number 7: Could be incorporated into number 3.

In Summary
• Submitting about $55,000 this year. If all not funded, how determine which ones get funded?
  o Reconvene committee in fall to decide.
  o Hold meetings in fall to revise rubric and ratings.

Wrap Up/Assignments
• Marshall will find out more about Instructional Technology fund as a possible resource.
• AD will revise process document, return to IEC, then forward to PRAC.