IEC Meeting  
November 29, 2012

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

**Excused:** Richard Fulton (non-voting), Mariko Kershaw, Leslie Opulauoho, Ann Lemke, student representative

Minutes of last meeting were discussed and approved.

Frank Palacat demonstrated Form B: Departmental Discussion of the Assessment to the Committee and solicited comments. From the discussion, Form B: Departmental Discussion of the Assessment was modified by changing the word “Implementation” to “Rationale.” This facilitates knowing why the change to the course was made rather than just what change was suggested. The presentation was approximately 30 minutes long.

There was a continued discussion on the GSIEC. Kathleen explained her reasons for removing the governance assessment committee (formerly the GSIEC) from the IEC and instead having it be a standing Governance Committee on campus:

1. The Governance committee would be much more effective as its own committee, and;
2. Assessing governance structures on campus doesn’t seem to fit well with the IEC Directives;

Peggy asked why Kathleen felt this way. She stated that the GSIEC that the process became surveys being sent out by Jeff Hunt, and self-assessments being sent back to Jeff Hunt with little or no discussion. She also stated that the response rate was extremely low.

The charge of the IEC “… is 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.”

This shows that course, program and institutional SLO assessment are the privy of the IEC, and since SLO assessment needs to meet the accreditation rubrics, it is the IEC’s main concern. Letty asked for clarification of what assessments the IEC was currently conducting. The Committee is responsible for assuring the GSIEC is conducted; that Non-Instructional units have valid assessments; that faculty and staff are trained in assessment procedures, data analysis techniques, and the creating of SLOs; and that course, program, and institutional SLO outcome assessments are conducted. These assessments should appear in Departmental Reports which are used by the Planning and Budget Council to establish budget allocations on campus.

Letty asked if removing the GSIEC from the purview of the IEC would mean that the charge of the committee would change and name of the committee would change from institutional effectiveness to assessment committee. The response was yes. Committee members were asked again to discuss this with their constituencies so that an online vote could occur before the end of the semester.
Reports from the various IEC Sub-Committees were deferred until the February 2013 meeting as was the discussion of the Proposed Program Review Timeline that includes information needed by the ACCJC as well as information needed by the UHCC.

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m. The next meeting time and place TBD.