

Minutes of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

September 9, 2008

Palanakila 117

Richard Fulton, Dean of Instruction
Elizabeth Ashley, Interim Dean of Instruction, Division I
Margie Coberly, Interim Dean of Instruction, Division 2
Jan Lubin, Director of Planning and Program Evaluation, Convener and Notetaker
Dave Krupp, Professor of Biology, Natural Sciences
Ingelia White, Associate Professor of Botany and Microbiology, Natural Sciences Department Chair
Leslie Lyum, ETC The Learning Center Coordinator
Leslie Opulauoho, Counselor /Student Life Coordinator
Brian Richardson, Instructional Developer/Policial Science Instructor, Social Sciences
Paul Field, Professor of History, Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee Chair
Sarah Hadmack, Religion Instructor, Humanities
Nalani Quinn, Institutional Analyst, Office of Institutional Research
Tara Servens, Public Services Librarian
Mari Nakamura, Developmental and Remedial Instructor

Excused: Frank Palacat, Professor of Psychology, Social Sciences; Mikki Ikaikailio, Student Representative; Emi Troeger, Professor of Math, Business and Math; Ellen Ishida-Babineau, English Professor, Language Arts

The meeting was called to order by Jan Lubin at 3:10 p.m. Jan began the discussion on what to do for the Evaluation section of Kathleen French's report, which was submitted in May 2008 to Chancellor Meixell on Recommendation 5. Three recommendations were presented in this report:

- (1) Development of a survey to assess governance;
- (2) Establishment of a group to monitor the assessment of governance; and
- (3) Implementation of the suggestions triggered by the survey.

The report contained two surveys: one for members of governance groups and one for non-members. We could use these or update them, if necessary.

Paul Field commended Kathleen for her work, and went on to say that the survey was developed to align with the standard. It was divided into four areas:

- (1) Encouraging Initiatives;
- (2) Systematic Participative Processes;
- (3) Assessment and Evaluation; and,
- (4) Institutional Improvement

The two surveys could be used to assess the functioning of governance structures for the entire campus. Jan reported that in discussions with Chancellor Meixell, Kathleen French, and Jeff Hunt that the timeline for giving the first survey was April 2009.

Paul Field stated that IEC could massage the surveys prepared in the report so that the survey could be taken by the end of October. He felt that not having the survey completed and used before the Accreditation Progress Report was detrimental to the College.

Richard Fulton wanted to know how and where benchmarks for the survey were going to be established. Jan Lubin reported that the team mentioned previously were thinking of the following scale for the first survey.

90 – above	is performing above a satisfactory level
80 – 89	is performing at a satisfactory level
70 -79	is performing below a satisfactory level
60 – below	is performing at an unsatisfactory level

Dr. Fulton suggested using the first survey administered to set the benchmark for each governing entity since each is different instead of using such a scale. He thought that we might be putting higher expectations on the unit than necessary.

Tara Severns reminded the group that we should be using the instrument as an assessment tool not as an evaluation tool. Groups should not be graded, they should be assessed to make improvement. Margie Coberly asked if the scale needed to be seen or if only descriptions could be used. She softened the wording so it would not be as threatening. The group agreed that the survey should be used for the improvement of the school not just to satisfy the ACCJC requirement.

We decided to meet on Tuesday, September 16 to discuss whether or not to use the surveys that had been developed or to massage the questions to best fit what we were trying to assess. Updates to the survey should be forwarded to Jan by 12:00 p.m. on Tuesday, so she can bring these to the meeting at 3 p.m.

Meeting adjourned: 4:15 p.m.