

Minutes of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

September 30, 2009

Palanakila 117

Ellen Ishida-Babineau, Language Arts
Paul Briggs, Social Sciences (from 12:50)
Richard Fulton, Dean of Instruction (until 12:30)
Dave Krupp, Natural Sciences
Leslie Lyum, ETC
Leslie Opolauoho, Student Services
Nalani Kaun, Institutional Research
Ingelia White, Natural Sciences (from 12:15)
Cherine Fernandez, ASUH-WCC Representative

Guest: Jeff Hunt, GSIEC Convener

Non-voting members present: Paul Field, Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee Chair (until 12:30); Jan Lubin, Director of Planning and Program Evaluation, Convener and Notetaker

Voting members excused: Young-A Choi, Business and Math, Sarah Hadmack, Humanities
Tara Severns, Academic Support

The meeting was called to order by Jan Lubin at 12:40 p.m. Everyone introduced themselves since there were new members of the committee. Jan then gave a brief introduction to GSIEC and turned the meeting over to Jeff Hunt. Jeff reported that the GSIEC members had done an assessment after the Convocation and that the results were posted in the Annual Report on the GSIEC webpage (<http://windward.hawaii.edu/ir/GIC/GovernanceMenu.htm>). Discussions ensued regarding a need to assess longitudinally with the same instrument across time, and whether or not we needed to redefine which Committees were active in governance. Jeff stated that after the ACCJC visit, we would look at whether or not all the governance entities would need to be surveyed each year or if some could go on a once every two year timeline based on perceived improvement. Jeff also mentioned that a question had been added asking whether or not the leader and/or governance structure had improved. In response to this, Paul asked if the goals that had been given in the Self-Assessment would be posted on the survey for review. The GSIEC Committee will look into this.

Richard asked where the information should be presented. Jan said that it is presented in the Annual Assessment/ Program Review. Ellen and Paul Field felt that this was more institutional, and thus should appear in an Institutional Assessment rather than an AA Annual Report/Program Review. Jan said she felt that they should appear in the Program Assessment as each program makes up the sum of the institution. Paul Field and Ellen felt strongly that the GSIEC Assessment should not appear in the AA degree or other instructional Annual Assessment/Program Review unless the goal was important to instruction. Paul Field stressed that the Self Study divided instruction and governance, so we should as well. Jan said and everyone agreed that a discussion of GSIEC activities and a summary of the analysis would definitely appear in the Governance section of the Self Study.

Jan then started a decision of the ACCJC Rubrics that had been emailed to all IEC members. All schools need to be at the Sustainable, Continuous Improvement level for Program Review and Planning, and the Proficiency level for SLOs by 2012. She also mentioned that the Chancellor had written a Postscript to the Mid-Term Report that had outlined Windward's progress against the rubrics. **Committee members were asked to go back to their units and discuss where they felt we were in regards to the rubrics.** Ellen asked if they were to identify evidence, and Jan replied yes. Paul Briggs asked if the departments had to look at and identify all the subsets of the major rubric classification, and Jan said yes. Ellen asked when this task should be completed. Jan said at the next meeting. Paul Briggs asked if someone had questions, where do they go. Jan said that they could contact her, and Ellen said they could discuss as much as possible and bring what they could to the Committee. It was then determined that the next meeting would be the last week in October or first week in November, and that Jan would post the dates and times on Doodle.

Jan brought up that she felt that it would be better if she were not the convener of the IEC. She said that she felt that the convener should be a teaching faculty member. Ellen asked whether or not that person would get assigned time. Richard said that our lecture budget was extremely thin because of all the budget restrictions and reductions. Paul Field said that he felt that the convener of the IEC would be doing as much as the convener of the CCAAC; therefore, they should get assigned time. The committee will discuss this later, when the budget situation becomes clearer.

Jan then asked Paul Field to bring the Committee up-to-date on Curriculum Central. Paul said that discussions were on-going and that SLOs were part of the Curriculum Central battery of questions and that he would keep the Committee informed of progress. Leslie asked where ETC fit into this, and whether they would be using Curriculum Central as well. Jan said that ETC was part of Windward; therefore, they should be able to do their SLO assessment on Curriculum Central. Paul said that he would check to see whether or not ETC could have a stand alone application on Curriculum Central, and that he would forward the questions to ETC.

Jan, then asked Paul Field about currency of courses. It was her understanding that all courses were to be checked for currency in 05 and 10 years, meaning that the IEC would work with the CCAAC to check 100 percent of the courses for currency this year. Paul said that it would be better to put currency on a rotating schedule by department, but that he would check what Windward had said. Ellen said that we said that we would do 100 percent of courses in years ending in 05 and 10. Paul said that in 05, we did it by deleting non-current or offered courses. This year, the Curriculum Committee had already given the Department Chairs a list of courses so that they could archive those courses that hadn't been taught for a number of years to facilitate entry into Curriculum Central, but he still felt that checking 100 percent of the courses for currency would be difficult. This will be an agenda item for all meetings until clarified.

Jan had also distributed the Mission Policy to members. This is the year for Windward to look into revising its Mission/Vision/Core Values Statements. It is also prelude to the Self Study. Discussion ensued on who would take the lead on this. Last time the mission statement had been revised, the Faculty Senate Chair took the lead. Jan thought that it should be the IEC. Paul Field said that the decision should come from the Chancellor. Jan said in discussions with the Chancellor that he felt it was in the purview for the IEC to request the Faculty Senate to start the process. Jan then mentioned that she was going to be out of town from October 1 to October 12, so she couldn't be at the Faculty Senate meeting on October 6. Ellen said that she felt it would be better for a Top-Down approach, with the Chancellor officially initiating this. Jan will discuss this with the Chancellor.

At Convocation, more will be said about the Self Study and the forming of Teams. We are proceeding in much the same way as the 2006 Self Study. Jan will be going to departments in November and Doug and Jan will be making a presentation at Convocation.

Jan had emailed participants a mapping of program SLOs to Institutional SLOs. Ellen reminded everyone that there was a retreat in 2004 that established these SLOs, which were then put up on the IEC site on the web. The AA degree SLOs are embedded in the Institutional SLOs; therefore, once the program SLOs are mapped to the Institutional SLOs, it will be easy to map the individual courses to both the Program and Institutional SLOs. **Departments that have not done so already, need to turn in the mapping of the program SLOs to the Institutional SLOs.** Inge asked if individual instructors should email Jan with the information. Jan mistakenly said yes, but when Ellen clarified agreed that one grid was all she wanted. With the revising of the Mission/Vision/Core Values, the Program and Institutional SLOs probably will need revision. Richard said to his knowledge the Instruction Office did not set its SLOs, but an amalgamated group had set them. Ellen stated that in 2004, the Office had set their own goals, not a group outside of the office. Richard asked if the current group could revise those since the Office is comprised of different people. The answer was yes.

Jan had emailed the group the SLO Evaluation Form and stated that some members had suggested that the form be modified to facilitate the Department Chairs report to the Dean as the information is not in the same order. This is a low priority for the committee, but comments will be accepted. Jan had also emailed the Program Outcome Guide (POG) and an example of an ASC Program Map to members. Ellen indicated that this had done this before and that it was supposed to be placed in the Catalog, but was not. She said that she had this information and would send it on to Jan. Jan said that it was a good time to revisit this especially since we were revisiting the mission, vision, and values this year.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m. The next meeting will be held the last week in October or the first week in November. Time and place to be determined.