Minutes of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

October 21, 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
Frank Palacat, Social Sciences

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; Leslie Opulauoho, Student Services; Richard Fulton, Dean of Instruction; Nalani Quinn, Institutional Analyst

Guests: 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 how to assess the survey that had been developed by the IEC Subcommittee and piloted by IEC, the Office Administrators, and Faculty Senate Chairs. He presented a framework that provided information that both those who were interested in a more quantitative assessment of that data could use with established statistical references such as mean, median, mode, and range and those interested in qualitative assessments could use with discrete counting of the particular items. Jeff said that both sets of data will be given to the Office/unit being surveyed and that they could choose which one to use in their discussion. He also distributed a revised list of governance structures to be surveyed. Since many of the groups on the previous list had been deleted, a set of three dates was established.

Tara asked how the group time frames were decided, and if they reflected the best times for the survey to show what people’s perceptions of that group was. Jeff said that it might not be best for all, but it was what had been decided on. Ellen wanted to know if the perceptions were for this year’s committee or last year’s committee, and Jeff responded it could be both since there are no cut-off dates for perceptions. Since this is the first time such a survey is being conducted people may answer according how long a person has been in position. This will balance once the survey is done regularly. See the updated list of committees and time frame of assessment on the Planning and Program Evaluation Web Site.

Jeff then continued with his Proposal on Recommendation 5. This was to establish a committee called the Governance Improvement Committee (GIC) to oversee the distribution and communication regarding the survey instrument. He again presented the flow chart (see Planning and Program Evaluation web site) of the interactions from the time the survey was taken and the time the final
interpretation appears in the Annual Assessment/Program Review of the Office/Unit. Discussion followed on the flow chart as the IEC wanted to stress that the office/unit was responsible for doing a self-assessment first and that the GIC was there to facilitate and help out when requested. The Office/Unit needs to analyze the information for their work unit and then make suggestions for how to improve or strengthen themselves based on the data. The GIC oversees the process and provides feedback when asked and facilitates the communication across the campus.

The GIC would be composed of 5 talented, trusted, senior faculty and staff. Paul mentioned that since Windward is so small that we would run out of I-5 faculty (Professor) quickly, so that all tenured faculty should be considered. Ellen asked if Jeff had a list of faculty, to which he replied yes. Jeff will present the list of possible faculty/staff for the GIC at the October 28th meeting.

Paul Field suggested that a motion be made to make the GIC a subcommittee of the IEC. Elizabeth Ashley made the motion, which was seconded by Ellen Ishida-Babineau. Discussion continued with an emphasis that a subcommittee of the IEC didn’t necessarily mean that the members of the committee were on the IEC. Jeff stated that ideally he would like the committee to consist of people who are not members of other committees. He said that he would be the ex-officio convener of the GIC.

Elizabeth called for the question. With so many people not at the meeting, the question of whether or not there was a quorum arose. It was determined that we had the necessary 50 percent + 1 to vote. The vote was 8 for the GIC to be a subcommittee of the IEC and 1 against.

Jan then clarified that this meant that the GIC would be a subcommittee of the IEC, but that it could be composed of people who were not members of the IEC. Paul said yes. Elizabeth said that was not her understanding when she voted. She wanted the GIC to be composed of IEC members. Paul said that it would need to be composed of both faculty and staff and that the IEC did not have enough staff on the committee. Ellen said that if the GIC was composed only of IEC members that she would support Jeff’s original request to have the committee totally autonomous. Elizabeth said that she wanted to change her vote, which was not possible, so she made a motion that was seconded by Sarah Hadmack that the GIC be composed of IEC members. The vote was 0 for and 8 against.

Meeting adjourned: 4:25 p.m.

Next meeting: October 28, 2008, at 3:00 p.m. in Palanakila 117.