

Minutes of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

October 28, 2008

Palanakila 117

Elizabeth Ashley, Interim Dean of Instruction, Division I
Margie Coberly, Interim Dean of Instruction, Division 2
Dave Krupp, Natural Sciences
Leslie Lyum, ETC
Ellen Ishida-Babineau, Language Arts
Sarah Hadmack, Humanities
Tara Severns, Academic Support
Mari Nakamura, ETC
Emi Troeger, Business and Math
Leslie Opolauoho, Student Services
Nalani Quinn, Institutional Analyst

Non-voting members present: Paul Field, Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee Chair
Jan Lubin, Director of Planning and Program Evaluation, Convener and Notetaker

Voting members excused: Ingelia White, Natural Sciences Department Chair; Brian Richardson, Social Sciences; New Student Representative; Richard Fulton, Dean of Instruction; Frank Palacat, Social Sciences

Guests: Jeff Hunt, Director Institutional Research

Old Business

The meeting was called to order by Jan Lubin at 3:05 p.m. Jan then turned the meeting over to Jeff Hunt for discussion the composition of the Governance Improvement Committee. Instead, Jeff stated that the survey was ready to be launched on Wednesday, November 5, 2008, and that he had a few new ideas based on a Web Design webinar that took place in the morning. He asked the Committee how long the survey should be available. The Committee suggested that the survey be closed on November 12, since November 11 was a holiday. Sarah asked if a reminder email could be sent. Jeff said that an email would be sent out on Wednesday to launch the survey, and then another email would be sent out on Monday. He also said that people could respond to any or all of the surveys on the web site. Tara said that everyone could respond to the non-member survey, which Jeff agreed to, but he also emphasized that only those who were a member of the group being surveyed should respond to the member survey.

One of the new ideas from the webinar was the use of incentives. One incentive, which had been employed by a school, which doubled survey participation, was receiving an iPod. Another suggestion was to have more than one prize. Both of these options meant that the person would need to be identified, thus confidentiality would be lost. However, at the webinar, it had been suggested that people could self-identify whether or not they wanted to be entered into the prize drawing by clicking on a link that would take them to another area. This would preserve their confidentiality. Mari said that she viewed confidentiality as a very important aspect of this survey. Emi suggested using a secret word. Paul said if the link was outside of the survey, then confidentiality would not be violated. Ellen

suggested that for the first administration of the survey that we have no incentive. Leslie thought that the topic of the survey was incentive enough for people to take it. The Committee agreed to offer the survey without an incentive the first time it is administered, and then to reevaluate whether or not to offer an incentive in future administrations based on response rate and whether or not monies for an incentive were available.

Jeff then started the discussion on the Governance Improvement Committee. Discussion took place on whether this was the appropriate name or not. Paul suggested the new committee be called the Governance Sub-Committee of the IEC. Tara made a motion, which Leslie seconded. The vote was unanimous. The name of the new committee is The Governance Sub-Committee of the IEC. Dave asked about reporting what the IEC decided to the Faculty Senate. Jeff stated that this was discussed at the last Faculty Senate Meeting. Paul reminded the Committee that the IEC reports directly to the Chancellor, but since the Response to Recommendation 5 came from the Faculty Senate Chairs that they should be informed. Jeff said that he would inform them. Paul asked the Committee to give everyone associated with creating the survey a round of applause – which the Committee did.

Jeff then began to discuss the ideas about the 5 talented, trusted, senior faculty and staff who should be on the list. Dave proposed that they be elected, but Jeff suggested that since time was of the essence that they should be selected. He also mentioned that in an election, you had no control of who would be selected and that it was imperative that these people would do a good job. Jeff reiterated that because we are looking toward the end of November to have this group in place that elections this time around would be difficult. He also reminded the Committee that the progress would be reported in the Accreditation Follow-Up Report – that is the new schedule to assess governance and the process which is employed.

Margie wanted to make sure that the group was a subcommittee of the IEC, and the Committee said that was reflected in the October 21, 2008, minutes. She also wanted to make sure that the group was facilitating rather than evaluating. The discussion revealed that there would be a heavy emphasis on the surveyed group's self-evaluation. The results would go to the leader of the group surveyed who would create goals and outcomes that would help them become better leaders as well as improve the functioning of the office. The goal of the Governance Sub-Committee of the IEC is to help the College reach the ACCJC outcome of sustainability in the rubric that was distributed to the committee on October 21 (see the Planning and Evaluation web site).

The discussion then turned to who would convene the Governance Sub-Committee of the IEC. In his proposal, Jeff suggested that he be the ex-officio, non-voting, convener of this Committee. He said that as caretaker of the data, he wanted the process to be totally objective and transparent, and that the make-up of the committee should be balanced – faculty, staff, instructional, non-instructional, credit, and ETC, for example. Paul agreed that the Committee would need to be balanced and that this mix seemed to make sense. Ellen made a motion that Jeff be the convener of the committee, which Emi seconded. During discussion, Paul reiterated that the convener's role would be to facilitate the group. Ellen asked if someone on the committee would have to take the lead. Paul stated that he felt that the Committee would work by consensus and would need to be composed of 5 people who can come to a consensus. Margie made a friendly amendment that the position rather than the person be the convener of the Committee. The vote was 10 who approved and 1 who opposed the motion. Therefore, the Director of Institutional Research will be the convener of the Governance Sub-Committee of the IEC.

The next question to be answered was how to get 5 people to be on the Committee. Paul suggested that people should go back to their units and come up with names, and that since time was short that these people be selected rather than elected. Since this is a sub-committee of the IEC, then the IEC will decide who should be on the Governance Sub-Committee. Jeff again stated that the ideal would be that members on the sub-committee not be members of other committees. Ellen said that the time spent on committees is more important than getting overload. Therefore, release time should be given. Paul said that the people who are busiest and members of many committees on campus are the people that you want on this sub-committee. Jeff said that if these people recuse themselves from the other committees that they are on then others would have to step up and become more active. He also said that Angela had mentioned giving faculty overload or release time before the governor put a restriction on the UH System.

Elizabeth asked why these people couldn't be on other committees. In fact, Level 3 faculty could use this as College/Community Serve in their dossiers for promotion to Level 4, and Level 4 could use it for promotion to level 5. Paul said that compared to other CC's in the system that Windward had too many committees. Emi said that the Governance Sub-Committee of the IEC would carry more weight than the other committees on campus. She reminded everyone that there used to be a Staff Developer who used to work with placing faculty and staff on various committees as well as work with faculty in general. She said that the College had to show that this is important for accreditation, and that one way that it could do this was by providing money and/or release time.

The Committee agreed to select members from names submitted via email at the November 18, 2008 meeting in Palanakila 117 at 3:00 p.m. People who have been nominated must agree that they are willing to serve on the committee. People who cannot attend the meeting will give their proxy to someone who will be attending, so that a quorum can be established and a vote taken. Emi suggested that Jean Okumura would probably be a good resource for getting a list of who is in which classification since she has just been through the process.

New Business

Jan mentioned that new directions for the IEC were helping the individual units with instruments to do internal assessments and getting ETC Non-Credit courses to assess SLOs on the same level (20% of all courses per year) as credit instructional programs. Paul said that we have to look at what we are doing now and make sure that all programs are assessing at that level. Then we can look at what really needs to be done. Ellen said that one thing that should be done is to reassess how we assess the AA degree. She mentioned that it may be better to follow what KCC is doing then every campus doing something different. Jan said that she had a document, which she would send to the Committee on Wednesday that had been distributed at the Assessment Coordinator's Meeting in September. Paul said that this could be added to what we are doing now, but that we still need to follow BOR-mandated procedure.

Ellen mentioned that there was a WASC-sponsored Assessment Workshop that will take place in Honolulu. She moved and Tara seconded the motion that IEC recommend to the Administration that junior faculty be sponsored to participate in this workshop. The IEC unanimously approved this motion.

Other Business

Ellen told IEC to keep Monday and Tuesday of Spring Break open as the System-wide Committee on Assessment with sponsorship from WOW will be conducting a course, program, and institutional

assessment workshop. Monday will be pre-conference workshops, and Tuesday would be conference workshops.

Meeting adjourned: 4:15 p.m.

Next meeting: November 18, 2008, at 3:00 p.m. in Palanakila 117.