IEC Meeting
October 25, 2012

Present: Doug Dykstra (non-voting), Kathleen French (non-voting), Toshi Ikagawa, Ann Lemke, Ellen Ishida-Babineau, Inge White, Jan Lubin (non-voting), Kay Beach, Letty Colmenares, Nalani Kaun, Paul Nash, Peggy Regentine, Tara Severns, Libby Young

Excused: Richard Fulton (non-voting), Frank Palacat, Mariko Kershaw, student representative

Guest: Ardis Eschenberg

Minutes of last meeting were amended to remove the names of Jean Shibuya and Mark Hamasaki and approved.

Discussion on Setting up a Committee to make recommendations based on the new Policy for Assessing Governance Structures. The new Policy on Assessing Governance Structures was passed by the Faculty Senate in April 2012. Jan suggested that a new committee be formed to make recommendations based on this Policy to the IEC before forming the new GSIEC, as the assessment based on those suggestions would need to be completed in the Spring 2013 semester. Kathleen suggested to remove the governance assessment committee (formerly the GSIEC) from the IEC and instead have it be a standing Governance Committee on campus. Her reasons are summarized below:

1. The Governance committee would be much more effective as its own committee:

   - A governance committee could address governance issues beyond assessment.
   - It could more effectively use assessment results to make recommendations for change.
   - It could review campus policies (sort of like the curriculum committee reviews curriculum).
   - It could also ensure that governance documents are posted properly.

Kathleen’s feeling was that the GSIEC was basically dysfunctional under the IEC, where the process soon became surveys being sent out by Jeff Hunt, and self-assessments being sent back to Jeff Hunt.

2. Assessing governance structures on campus doesn’t seem to fit well with the IEC Directives:

IEC Charge: To plan and oversee an institutional schedule to ensure a systematic, comprehensive, and on-going assessment of the credit programs, noncredit programs, and other units identified in the Program Review Policy. To develop and sustain a culture of assessment throughout the institution. To provide the necessary training and skills for units to assess themselves. To maintain material and reports related to all assessment activities.

   - The IEC was originally suggested as a committee who could oversee this endeavor back in 2008 when the college was responding to ACCJC’s Recommendation 5, simply because that particular committee seemed to be the only committee charged with any kind of college assessment.
   - Since then, after much observation and a better understanding of what the IEC should actually
be doing for the college (see above Charge), assessing governance structures specifically seems to be quite different from the purposes of the IEC.

The belief is that both committees, in fact, would be more effective as two, standing committees. And having a Governance committee wouldn't be like 'creating another committee', since the GSIEC basically functioned independently of the IEC, anyway.

A Motion was brought forward by Peggy and seconded by Paul. Discussion ensued and Ellen recounted how the IEC was formed and that its charge was to be in control of all assessment activities on campus. This was to insure that assessment would not become as fragmented as Staff Development has become. Jan stated that the first two years, the GSIEC reported back to the IEC, but last year the GSIEC did not meet at all due to the time constraints on the convener who was overseeing the building of the library. It was brought to the attention of the convener by Chancellor Dykstra that according to Robert’s Rules of Order that a motion like this should be brought up for a vote in the meeting after it was presented. Ann made a motion to table the vote on the motion to accept or reject Kathleen’s proposal until after the members of the IEC discussed it with their constituents. Kay seconded this motion, which passed (9 for; 2 against).

Therefore, IEC members were requested to take this proposal back to their constituents and discuss it, in order to report back to the Committee on November 8, 2012. Other alternatives brought forward will be discussed at that time as well.

Discussion of Rubrics for Information Literacy. Jan asked the members of the IEC to report back on the discussion with their units regarding changing term “social” to either “discipline” or “academic” in the Information Literacy rubric.

Language Arts reported that the department had two members on the committee who were surprised to see the word “social” used as they thought the word “discipline” had been agreed upon by the Information Literacy Rubric Committee.

Natural Sciences had no comment on the word “social,” but felt that the word “communicate” in the Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose section should be changed as communication was already assessed as a General Education SLO. In the discussion that followed everyone conceded that there would be overlap in what was being assessed, and that the word “communication would not be changed.

Academic Support and Math/Business reported no changes were necessary.

Social Sciences reported that it was not discussed at their meeting.

Humanities reported that their meeting was on Friday, but that they felt the word “social” was the only thing that was supposed to be discussed.

A motion was made by Libby and seconded by Peggy to change the wording in the Information Literacy Rubric from “social” to “discipline.” Passed (9 for; 2 against)
Leslie made a point of order that the rubric itself hadn’t been approved. The Committee voted to approve the rubric (9 for; 2 against)

Jan asked for volunteers for SPDA, Handbook, and other IEC committees. Since there were no volunteers for any committees, An email will be forthcoming. Each member of the IEC must be on at least one of the committees: this includes all department chairs as well as second members from the departments.

Elizabeth Ratliff has posted an Excellence in Education Activity area on the Discussion Board. Please go to the Discussion Board and make suggestions for Excellence in Education Day, March 1. Some possible activities to include are Program Mapping and developing Program Guides.

Each program, whether it be a degree or certificate program needs to review the Program Map for that program. This activity was done once in 2006 and again in 2009, but there have been significant changes in courses and programs offered since then. A Program Guide should also be created for each program. Workshops will be held to help with these activities.

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for November, 2012 (Palanakila 117, 1-2:30 p.m.)