IEC Meeting
November 8, 2012

Present: Doug Dykstra (non-voting), Richard Fulton (non-voting), Frank Palacat, Ann Lemke, Ellen Ishida-Babineau, Jan Lubin (non-voting), Kay Beach, Letty Colmenares, Nalani Kaun, Paul Nash, Peggy Regentine, Tara Severns, Libby Young

Excused: Kathleen French (non-voting), Toshi Ika, Inge White, Mariko Kershaw, Leslie Opulauoho, student representative

Minutes of last meeting were approved.

Discussion on the various new IEC Sub-Committees ensued. All committees are to meet prior to the November 29, 2012, meeting from 1 – 2:30. All committees were formed using methods supporting a random selection. The one committee that remained totally intact from last year was the General Education/AA degree Sub-Committee to maintain consistency.

Ellen will continue to work with Administrative Services on their assessments. The other members of the Non-Instructional Assessment Committee: Nalani, Mariko, Paul, Letty, and Ann should be working with Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, OCET, Academic Support, and the Chancellor’s Office

Ellen asked who was on the SPDA committee. The members of SPDA are Libby, Leslie, Toshi, Frank, and Inge. Libby asked for clarification about the purpose of the November 30, 2012, Workshop, and the connection of Student Learning Outcome Assessment and the Planning and Budget Council. There seemed to be a disconnect on the timeline regarding the Planning and Budget Council and what assessments and reports were necessary for its deliberations, and how these assessments were used.

The assessments that are going into the Departmental Reports that are due on November 15 will be used as evidence of departmental need in the deliberations of the Planning and Budget Council for next year’s budget not this year’s budget. The General Education assessments being done this year will be used as evidence in the deliberations of the Planning and Budget Council for the following year’s budget requests. The rationale for department budget requests should include a discussion of both the Strategic Plan and the assessment of Student Learning Outcomes.

After Frank joined the meeting, the discussion on the GSIEC ensued. Peggy and several other committee members felt that it would be better to have Kathleen at the meeting to answer questions before putting the motion presented by Kathleen at the October 25, 2012, meeting to a vote. Frank said that because the motion in front of the IEC’s was Kathleen’s that she felt that she should be absent during the discussion and subsequent vote. However, Frank will relay the desire of people to ask questions to clarify aspects of the proposal to Kathleen, and hopefully, she will be at the next meeting.

Discussion then went to the Program Review Timeline. Richard asked why a 4-year rather than 5-year cycle was set up since it was his understanding that the UHCC requirement was for a 5-year cycle. Jan clarified that the policy states “....within a 5-year period” and that there are colleges within the UHCC System that do Program Review on a 3-year, 4-year, or 5-year cycle. The majority of members felt that a 5-year cycle was acceptable, so Jan will revise the timeline and present a 5-year cycle to the committee at the next meeting.
Jan also asked the committee to review the Departmental Report Template that was sent out with the agenda for the next meeting. It includes information needed by the ACCJC as well as information needed by the UHCC.

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for November 29, 2012 (Palanakila 117, 1-2:30 p.m.)