Members Present: Letty Colmenares, Mariko Kershaw (Convener/Recorder), Ann Lemke, & Paul Nash

Guests Present: Ellen Ishida-Babineau

Members Excused: Nalani Kaun

Meeting convened at 2:07pm

1. Approval of the Minutes of the Last Meeting

The minutes were approved as read.

2. Members’ Reports
   a. Nalani (Chancellor’s Office)

   Nalani was unable to attend, so she briefly gave her update via e-mail:
   “Jeff and I are going to discuss the institutional survey as we both think it would be beneficial for the college to have it done frequently.”

   b. Ellen & Paul (Various Administrative Offices)

   Ellen mentioned that Safety & Security did their assessment last year and it was very thorough. Then Ellen handed out a draft of a survey that Renee Arakaki is developing for Administrative Services. The goal of the survey to find out if WCC staff are aware of the various services that Administrative Services provides. They plan on administering the survey on Valentine’s Day and closing it at the end of February. Currently, the Cashier’s Office is conducting a five question point-of-service survey. They will use Robert De Loach’s assessment form for documenting their assessment process. Ellen will e-mail the form to the committee.
c. Letty (OCCE)
Letty spoke with Gerri Kabei, the interim head of OCCE, and Jane Uyetake, the OCCE coordinator, a couple of times. They did not know where their outcome statements from the Teri Manning workshop were located. Mariko was able to find them in an old NIUA e-mail and resent them to Letty. Letty will take the outcomes back to them and work with them. Letty asked whether the committee is responsible for ensuring that the OCCE classes are assessed. The committee agreed that that is not under its purview. Letty also worked with Mary Beth Laychak, the Imaginarium Manager. The Imaginarium currently has two surveys in place, but they have a low response rate—which she wants to improve. Currently, the Imaginarium surveys community members who attend their shows and school teachers who bring their children on field trips to the Imaginarium. Mary Beth is looking to survey WCC faculty who use the Imaginarium for their classes. The Imaginarium has six outcomes, which the committee discussed and recommended that some be combined and some be reworded. Letty will give Ellen’s assessment template to the two units.

d. Mariko (Academic Support & Academic Affairs)
Mariko is waiting to hear back from Computing Services and Media/Duplication on where they are at with assessment. She will follow-up with them before the next NIUA meeting. Mariko was able to contact Richard Fulton, the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Richard is looking to conduct another survey this semester, in order to assess his office’s third outcome (in Spring 2012, the Academic Affairs Office assessed their first two outcomes using a survey).

e. Ann (Student Services)
Since this was Ann’s first committee meeting she had nothing to report, but promised to follow-up with Leslie Opulauoho, the previous committee member assigned to work with Student Services.

3. Old Business
   a. Decide on how often an institutional survey should be performed and make a formal recommendation to the IEC.

Ellen expressed her concern that the “new GSIEC” assessment may duplicate this
committee’s work and suggested that the surveys should be combined, or at least the two committees should coordinate their efforts so they do not duplicate each other’s work. In regards to the frequency, Paul thought that the surveys should be done as little as possible and that every three years is sufficient. Ann suggested making a schedule for when to assess each unit. Ellen agreed that the institutional survey should be done every three years and that the units should be staggered in assessment. Ann said she will ask her unit for feedback on this issue. Letty said her units want to do assessment often. Mariko thought that two year was better because three years may be too long and units may forget to do it consistently. Also, Mariko gathered feedback from her units and all of those who responded said that they prefer a schedule of every two years. Someone brought up that it would be better for the college’s accreditation that the survey be done every two years, so that within the six year accreditation cycle (and by the time the next accreditation visit happens in 2018) each unit would have gone through two assessment cycles and be in the middle of their third. This would demonstrate the college’s commitment to continual assessment. After this was discussed, the committee voted and agreed that we should have an institutional survey every two years. Someone emphasized that the units should be staggered over the two years in order to prevent survey fatigue and committee members agreed. Next, Ellen asked at what point in the two year cycle should the assessment be done and mentioned the IEC timeline. Mariko did not recall said timeline and Ellen said she would e-mail it to everyone. The committee continued to discuss this issue, but were unable to resolve it in a timely manner, so the discussion was tabled for the next meeting.

4. New Business

a. Decide where committee minutes and other documents should be stored
The committee agreed that committee documents should be posted on the College’s web site. Mariko will ask Brian Richardson to make a web page for the committee.

b. Decide on frequency of committee meetings and schedule meetings for the rest of the semester
This was briefly discussed, but no conclusion was reached. Mariko will send out a "When is Good" to schedule the next meeting for mid-February.
Next Actions

- Committee members will continue to work with their assigned units
- Mariko will send out a “When is Good” to schedule the next committee meeting
- Ellen will e-mail the assessment form to the committee
- Ellen will e-mail the IEC timeline to the committee
- Ellen will look for CCE outcomes (besides those for OCCE and Ready, Set, Grow) and send them Letty

Meeting adjourned at 3:25pm