Minutes of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

March 20, 2009

Kuhina 106

Elizabeth Ashley, Interim Dean of Instruction, Division I
Richard Fulton, Dean of Instruction
Leslie Lyum, ETC
Leslie Opulauoho, Student Services
Frank Palacat, Social Sciences
Young-A Choi, Business and Math
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: Ellen Ishida-Babineau, Language Arts, Sarah Hadmack, Humanities
Tara Severns, Academic Support, Dave Krupp, Natural Sciences, Inegia White, Natural Sciences; Brian Richardson, Social Sciences; New Student Representative;

Old Business
The meeting was called to order by Jan Lubin at 1:40 p.m. Jan stated that the second round of Governance Perception Surveys were sent out and that exactly the opposite of what she forecast to happen had happened. Those who were not members of the Committees that were surveyed in this round had responded in greater number than those who were members of the Committees. She reported that non-members and members had until Friday, March 20 to respond to surveys for the Aesthetics Committee, the CCAAC, the ETC Curriculum Committee, the International Education Committee, Ke Kumu Pali, the Marketing Committee, Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Council, the Tech Vision Committee, and the Master Planning and Space Utilization Committee, and because of a delay in certifying membership that Staff Development respondents had until March 23. She also reported that names were submitted to Jeff Hunt, the convener of the GSIEC by the Webmaster, Brian Richardson, and some people who felt that they should have been members were not on the list. Paul said that this was not unusual as some people are liaisons and not true members of the Committee although they attend every meeting. Jan said that the last group of surveys would be going out at end of March or beginning of April. The committees to be surveyed at that time are the Budget Committee, the Enrollment Management Committee, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and the Strategic Planning Committee as well as the ETC Coordinators and WCC Department Chairs.

Jan then updated the Committee on the departmental meetings she has attended. She has received updates from Math and Business the Course Alignment Charts and Worksheets 1 and 2 from previous years. Frank responded that he was almost done updating the Social Science sheets. Jan still hasn’t heard back from the Social Science Chair about meeting with the Department. Frank said that he would let Jan know when the next meeting was. Paul said that Humanities had gone through their sheets and were assessing all the courses they should. Jan said that she had not heard back from the Humanities Chair yet, and Paul said that he would follow up. Jan needs to follow up with Language Arts and reschedule a meeting for April.
Jan also clarified that the IEC would still be assessing SLOs. It is just that the College might have to assess more than just course SLOs to move to the next level of preparedness as mandated by the ACCJC. The discussion at the last meeting, which is stated below, was not intended to stop course assessment, but to look at Program and Institutional assessment as well.

(From February 25 Minutes)
Jan brought up the use of Themes which cut across the curriculum rather than Department-Specific SLOs as a means of assessing the AA degree by presenting part of a presentation that Christine Kory-Smith did for the Assessment Coordinators. A very animated discussion took place. The AA degree mapping that took place was designed to assess the AA degree, but had discipline-related outcomes. These could be reworked into Themes that would stress what students should be able to accomplish once they are out of the program. To sell this to the faculty, the exercise should be tied to revisiting the mission and vision of the College. This may be done at a retreat looking at the mission and vision.

Currently disciplines are charged with mapping and assessing their SLOs. There was Course-Level alignment to General Education requirements that was supposed to lead to the assessment of the AA degree. The middle-level (Program or Department) was bypassed. However, the course-level assessment was part of the Departmental Report that was submitted to the Office of Instruction by the Department Chairs.

Since there had been no Program Review at Windward prior to 2004, Jeff mentioned that he had been assessing the AA-Transfer Degree, which is a subset of the AA Liberal Arts degree. There are about 50 courses that are omitted from the AA-Transfer Degree that are currently taught at Windward. All the rest of the CCs in the System are currently assessing the AA Liberal Arts degree. Windward, on the other hand is assessing the Agriculture Program, Developmental Education, and the AA-Transfer Degree, along with all the ETC Programs. System would like us to assess the AA Liberal Arts degree.

This was just the beginning of the discussion, but we need to form definitions before we proceed: What is General Education? Is it Foundation Courses? In addition, how do we develop themes from what already has been developed? Is it too soon to change? Should we assess the AA-Transfer degree or the AA Liberal Arts degree?

Old Business Continued

Frank asked about using Curriculum Central to do course assessment, and what Windward’s position was. Vice Chancellor Fulton stated that he heard that inputting the data was a lot of work. Frank suggested that we may want to change the forms used for course-level assessment whether or not we decided to go with Curriculum Central or not. Frank asked if Curriculum Central had substantially changed since he first saw it at Leeward. Jan said that she had heard that it had changed, but didn’t know how much. Frank said that he would like to see what it was like now and if it would be a useful tool. He wondered who would be able to give a demonstration. Jan said that Joanne Itano was the person at the System level who would be able to give a demonstration, and either the Curriculum Committee or the IEC could ask her to do so. Vice Chancellor Fulton said that he thought that any request should come from him rather than from anyone else as his office would probably be the office of first response to any request from the System.

Paul asked if there was a policy in place to force departments to do the course assessments that had been requested. The time line was 20 percent of all departmental courses per year per department.
over a five year period. Jan said there was no policy and that she was the person who was in charge of trying to make sure that this was done, which was why she had sent out the Course Alignment Chart and Worksheets to the departments for updating. Paul said that that was not enough of a hammer, and that a policy should be put in place that would force the departments to adhere to the timeline. Discussion ensued about what that policy might be – i.e. if you didn’t do a course assessment on a course that you were teaching that was up for assessment then you would not be able to teach that course. Vice Chancellor Fulton thought that this was too harsh and whether a policy was actually necessary as this was part of the professional responsibility of the faculty. Frank wondered what Union implications were. Representatives were asked to go back to their departments for suggestions on how to best assure that assessment of course slos was progressing at the correct rate.

Other Business

Members were encouraged to participate in the Assessment Conference at Windward on March 23 and 24.

Meeting adjourned: 2:35 p.m.

Next meeting: April 2009, time and place to be determined.