

Minutes of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

September 16, 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
Ellen Ishida-Babineau, English Professor, Language Arts
Brian Richardson, Instructional Developer/Political 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: Leslie Opulauoho, Counselor /Student Life Coordinator; Mari Nakamura, Developmental and Remedial Instructor; Frank Palacat, Professor of Psychology, Social Sciences; Mikki Ikaikailio, Student Representative; Emi Troeger, Professor of Math, Business and Math

The meeting was called to order by Jan Lubin at 3:05 p.m. She distributed the two iterations of the survey that she received to the IEC Committee members. Jan, then outlined the Recommendation 5 Proposal submitted to Chancellor Meixell and presented to the Faculty Senate Chairs at their monthly meeting with the Chancellor's Staff by the committee (Kathleen French, Jeff Hunt, and Jan Lubin) she had tasked to discuss how best to implement this new procedure.

The essence of the proposal was that a new committee, the Governance Improvement Committee comprised of 5 people (senior, tenured faculty and permanent APT and clerical staff) and convened by the ex-officio, non-voting Director of Institutional Research would provide oversight to the process. The timeline was set so that the surveys presented in the original report could be massaged, and then vetted across campus from September – November so that the process could appear in the ACCJC Progress Report in December. The survey would be modified based on campus-wide feedback from January – April, and then would be taken in April and analyzed in May. Results would then be presented to the appropriate departments during when the faculty returned in August. Jan will send the documents via email to the IEC members ASAP.

Paul Field voiced his concern again that the timeline was too slow. He said that the ACCJC will expect more progress. The IEC members agreed. Paul proposed surveying the Administrative Offices in the Fall 2008 semester in October and the Committees and Departments in the Spring Semester 2009 in April. He also felt that we shouldn't use the word pilot. The Committee voiced support for this proposal.

The Committee agreed that there should be one survey for all Administrative Offices but that the respondents should be broken down by staff type, i.e. faculty, APT, clerical, etc. This survey would not

be broken-down between internal or external constituency, but would be broken down by staff type. The question arose about who was going to establish performance benchmarks? The five-person group or the first survey?

The issue of the size of the survey came up. One of the modifications was to have one survey with questions that could be omitted depending on whether the respondent was an internal or external constituent because of the concern that people do not take long surveys – they lose patience.

The group went over the non-member survey and revised the questions so that they fit Administrative Offices and not committees. Jan was to send the modifications to the Committee ASAP, and we would meet again next week to make sure that nothing was left out.

Paul Field reminded the IEC that the survey could be sent out prior to the establishment of the oversight committee. He reiterated the need to show progress.

Meeting adjourned: 4:15 p.m.