Minutes of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

October 14, 2008

Palanakila 117

Elizabeth Ashley, Interim Dean of Instruction, Division I
Jan Lubin, Director of Planning and Program Evaluation, Convener and Notetaker
Dave Krupp, Professor of Biology, Natural Sciences
Leslie Opulauoho, Counselor /Student Life Coordinator
Richard Fulton, Dean of Instruction
Leslie Lyum, ETC The Learning Center Coordinator
Ellen Ishida-Babineau, English Professor, Language Arts
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 Serverns, Public Services Librarian
Mari Nakamura, Developmental and Remedial Instructor
Emi Troeger, Professor of Math, Business and Math
Frank Palacat, Professor of Psychology, Social Sciences

Excused: Ingelia White, Associate Professor of Botany and Microbiology, Natural Sciences Department Chair; Brian Richardson, Instructional Developer/Political Science Instructor, Social Sciences; New Student Representative; Margie Coberly, Interim Dean of Instruction, Division 2

Guest: Jeff Hunt, Director Institutional Research, Pam DeGrossa, Faculty Senate Chair

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 of the Survey that had been developed by the IEC Subcommittee and piloted by IEC, the Office Administrators, and Faculty Senate Chairs. Jeff distributed a packet of information to the committee members, and explained that were two sets of results for the Committee to look at: one including Don’t Know and Not Applicable, and one not including them. The results including both these elements changed the percentages. Discussion took place regarding whether or not both these elements should be dropped from the survey so that we would have just a 5-point Likert scale. Pam DeGrossa suggested that one of these elements be dropped and the other be used in a non-count position. Frank Palacat replied that we are limited by what the software would allow us to do. Jeff Hunt added that if we used both these elements, he would have to recalculate the averages based on the scale, but if we used one element, it could be in a non-count position. The Committee voted to include Don’t Know as a non-count item on the survey, and to state in the instructions that if the question is Not Applicable to the respondent to leave it blank (11 for, 0 against, 2 abstentions).

The length of the survey was also discussed. Jeff mentioned that the Subcommittee would be meeting on Friday at 1 p.m. to discuss the comments received from the pilot. Paul Field stated that he felt that some of the questions were too close, that is that they seemed as though they were measuring the same thing. Frank said that the Subcommittee would look into changing some of the questions during this meeting.
Jeff asked whether the Committee felt that the Standard should be included in the questionnaire. Pam thought that it should not be, and Tara agreed saying that reading the Standard sometimes confused the issue. The Committee voted that whoever the monitoring group was should know the standard, but that this was a perception survey; therefore, the Standard should be removed from it entirely. (13 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions).

Elizabeth Ashley felt confused with the orientation of the survey. She felt that her answers for regarding the office and the leader of the office might not be reflected correctly because of her interpretation of the questions. Jeff stressed that originally the survey had been developed without leader questions, but due to feedback from the Committee, he understood that the survey needed to address both the office and the leader. He asked for clarification on this point. Paul Field stated that he was the one who made the suggestion that leader questions be added. He said that if he was assessing the office, he would always be neutral whereas if he was assessing the leader, he would have a more directed response. The Committee voted to assess both the leader and the office, but to change the order of the questions on the survey to assess the leader first and the office second. (13 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

Jeff referred to the handout regarding a outcome assessment for a questions. He showed the total responses for each item on the Likert scale and an aggregate of the total. He asked if this could be a way to measure the perceptions of the respondents to each question. Pam said that by doing the survey, you were already measuring the outcome. She also stressed that looking at just the aggregate could be less meaningful than looking at all the responses separately. This will be discussed further at the next meeting as well as the Proposal regarding Recommendation 5.

Jeff thanked the Subcommittee for the work that they had completed in a short time period. The Committee commended the Subcommittee on what they had accomplished.

Meeting adjourned: 4:00 p.m.

Next meeting: October 21, 2008, at 3:00 p.m. in Palanakila 117.