IEC Meeting
January 16, 2013
Akoakoa 201

Present: Frank Palacat, Ellen Ishida-Babineau, Jan Lubin (non-voting), Kay Beach, Letty Colmenares, Peggy Regentine, Mariko Kershaw, Libby Young, Kathleen French (non-voting), Toshi Ikagawa, Inge White

Excused: Doug Dykstra (non-voting), Richard Fulton (non-voting), Tara Severns, Leslie Opulauoho, Ann Lemke, Nalani Kaun, Paul Nash, student representative

Minutes of November 29, 2012, meeting were deferred until the February 6, 2013, meeting.

The vote at the end of the Fall 2012 semester was 8 to 4 for keeping the Governance Assessment Committee within the IEC. The primary discussion at this meeting was the make-up of that committee, what the committee’s responsibilities were, and who would send out the information regarding the committee to the campus.

Discussion commenced on the make-up of the committee. Jan stated that she thought the committee should be representative of all campus constituencies. She said she would like the committee to include:

1. APT – one member
2. Clerical/Maintenance – one member
3. Student Affairs – one member
4. Teaching Faculty – one member
5. Non-teaching Faculty – one member

Discussion ensued on how the members of the committee would be chosen. Instead of being appointed, Kay suggested that a memo be written and sent out on the faculty/staff listserv. It was agreed that all full-time WCC faculty and staff (including lecturers) would be able to volunteer for the committee, and that there would be staggered three-year terms, meaning that for the first committee, some people would be appointed for two years and some for three. The committee would choose its own convener at the first meeting.

Faculty and staff could inform any IEC member of their interest. If a huge number of faculty/staff volunteered, then an online election would take place to determine who would serve on the committee.

Jan read an email from Tara suggesting that the committee’s task would be to:

• Identify the governance values that WCC employees, students, and community members perceive as most important
• Develop and vet a set of Governance Outcomes based on those values
• Select evaluation methods to assess the Governance Outcomes
• Schedule and carry out the assessments over the academic year
• Discuss the results of the assessment and make plans for improvement
• Arrange for a campus-wide discussion that would help identify institutional actions

The entities that the committee will formulate assessments for are delineated by the Policy on Governance Assessment (April 2012) and the Mongold Report (January 2012). Accordingly, the committee will report to the IEC, which will be responsible for analyzing the results of the assessments to determine if appropriate changes have been made as well as sending the results to the specific governance groups that were assessed. The IEC adopted this as what should be placed in the memo.

Ellen suggested that Doug could call faculty and staff to ask for participation. Kathleen noted that the committee is under the IEC and not Doug; therefore, Doug should not be involved at this point. Ellen suggested that individual IEC members could call people they thought would do well on this committee, in addition to the request going out over the faculty/staff listserv. Jan will send a draft out to IEC members for review and comment and then post the request on the listserv by the end of the week.

Toshi brought up that the Social Science Department had met and tried to discuss the Form A assessments done in Fall 2012. Since our baseline was 70 percent, and the class assessed were over 80 percent, no change was indicated. Ellen brought up that the assessment is not only looking at changes that need to be made, but also at best practices or new ideas that could be shared among colleagues, which should come out in the discussion of the assessment.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. The next meeting will take place on February 6, 2013, in ALakai Room 118 from 1:30 – 3:00.