Minutes of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

December 5, 2011
2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Imiloa 122

Ardis Eschenberg, Interim Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs
Ellen Ishida-Babineau, Language Arts, Interim Dean, Division I
Malia Lau-Kong, Humanities Representative
Mike Tom for Mariko Kershaw, Academic Support
Leslie Opulauoho, Student Services
Kalikokauaiekai Hoe, Department Chair, Humanities
Jean Shibuya, Department Chair, Language Arts
Clayton Akatsuka, Department Chair, Math/Business
Toshi Ikagawa, Department Chair, Social Sciences
Inge White, Department Chair, Natural Sciences
Nalani Kaun, Institutional Research Office

Non-voting members present:
Jan Lubin, Director of Planning and Program Evaluation, Convener and Notetaker; Kathleen French, CCAAC Chair; Richard Fulton, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs

Voting Members excused: Frank Palacat, Social Sciences Representative; William Thomas, Student Representative; Mariko Kershaw, Academic Support

Non-Voting Members excused: Doug Dykstra, Chancellor

Jan convened the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

There were no minutes to the November 21, 2011, meeting as David Mongold presented his GSIEC Evaluation findings, which were posted on the IEC web page. Jan asked if there were any comments regarding the presentation.

Kathleen stated that she thought the presentation was fairly benign and could have been about any college. Ellen asked when the final report would be completed. Jan said that the final report would go into more detail and that it should be ready by the end of the week. Jean stated that there had been no GSIEC surveys done this Fall. Jan thought she remembered doing a survey earlier. Discussion ensued if the surveys were done in Fall or Spring 2011 semester. Jan will ask Jeff and send the outcome back to the IEC.

The question of who would review the final evaluation report came up. Jan said that it would be reviewed by the entire IEC. Ellen felt that a Sub-Committee should be set up to review the report. The IEC committee members felt that a sub-committee would be better suited for reviewing the document as it was easier to find a time for fewer people to meet and time was of the essence because the recommendations of needed to be ready
for implementation in the Fall. This sub-committee would review the findings in the Mongold Evaluation Report as well as the recommendations from the GSIEC Committee. The timeline is:

January – form the committee
January-beginning of March – committee reviews Mongold Report and GSIEC Committee and makes recommendations on Survey
Mid-March – entire campus dialog on Mongold Report and GSIEC Committee and recommendations on Survey
April – sub-committee reviews campus recommendations and forms formal recommendations that are presented to the IEC
May – Present Recommendations to the Faculty Senate and incorporate them into the Self-Evaluation of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness (SEEQIE)

Kathleen mentioned that in the current GSIEC Policy it states that the process will be assessed every year. Jan said that the process does not mean that the survey should be assessed every year, and that the IEC had agreed from the outset that the survey would be assessed after the third year. Ardis mentioned that it all depends on what your operational definition of “process” is, and that we needed to make sure that all our policies and procedures were current when the team comes. Jan mentioned that this was not the only policy that needed updating, and that if there was something that faculty/staff/administration felt needed to be fixed that this should go into the SEEQIE.

Jan then presented information from the meeting held at Maui College on December 2 on AA Degree Assessment. No one is really assessing the AA degree in the same way.

Hawaii CC has just finished revising their assessment procedures. Before, as is outlined in their handout (to be posted on the AA SLO Task Force Laulima site), they had 8 AA Program Learning Outcomes that were separate from their General Ed Outcomes. They have now decided that their AA Program Outcomes and their General Ed Outcomes are the same.

Leeward CC has 7 General Ed outcomes that also serve as the AA Program Learning Outcomes (handout to be posted on the AA SLO Task Force Laulima site). They choose a sample selection of courses with the highest enrollments from 2005-2010, then identified the degree requirements that align to each General Ed Outcome and mapped this to each course.

Maui College has College-Wide Academic SLOs (CASLOs) and AA Program SLOS. The AA Program SLOs (handout to be posted on AA SLO Laulima site) initially used indirect assessments – mainly student knowledge surveys – as their assessments, but have added direct assessments – through quizzes and assignments in Fall 2011. The CASLOs (presentation forthcoming) are assessed through artifacts representing an A piece of work and a C- piece of work from classes designated within the CASLO, then using a rubric.
Kapiolani Community College is using a capstone experience to access its AA Program SLOs (handout to be posted on AA SLO Laulima site). A call for volunteers went out to the campus and 8 course professors volunteered their courses for this pilot program. The courses were then were aligned with the General Education area of Thinking, Communication, Self and Community, Aesthetic Engagement, and Integrative Learning. They had to be mapped to at least 3 out of the 5 areas. Aesthetic Engagement had the least number of courses aligned to it, so they may re-evaluate whether or not it actually is a General Ed area. Student will self assess their learning gains in: Intellectual and Practical Skills, Personal and Social Responsibility, and Integrative Learning (indirect assessment). Pathways were also developed: Malama `Aina, Malama `Ike, and Malama Kekahi. Assignments or projects for each course was aligned with these pathways and was assessed (direct assessment).

Honolulu CC feels as through in order to assess their AA Program correctly, they need to remove the CTE students in the classes that make up their program. They fell that the more accurate assessment of their AA Program is the Writing Intensive Assessment they do.

Windward has established an AA SLO Task Force to look at how we want to access our AA Program SLOs. The members of the Task Force are: Ardise Eschenberg, Ellen Ishida-Babineau, Jan Lubin, Jean Shibuya, Vanessa Cole, Dave Krupp, Janice Nuckols, Frank Palacat, Jamie Boyd, Leslie Opulauoho, Tara Severns, Desiree Poteet, and Philip Goff. The first meeting will be held on December 8 from 2:30 – 4:00 in Imiloa 122. The committee will have the following time table:

January-beginning of March – discuss various College AA Program Learning Outcomes and if possible Assessment Tools used
Mid-March – campus-wide dialog
April – sub-committee reviews campus recommendations and forms formal recommendations that are presented to the IEC
May – Present Recommendations to the Faculty Senate and incorporate them into the Self-Evaluation of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness (SEEQIE)

Jan adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m. The next IEC Meeting will be in January 2012. Place and time to be determined.