This survey (1.1) is the first in a series of three addressing themes from ACCJC Standard IV.A.1. Surveys 1.2 in Fall 2013 and 1.3 in Spring 2014 will consist of the same questions for the purpose of assessing core committees (1.2) and academic departments (1.3). In the 2014-2015 academic year, questions will address themes from Standard IV.2 and 3. The 2015-2016 survey will address themes from Standard IV.4 and 5. The three-year cycle will restart with Survey 1 in 2016-2017; this will allow enough time between surveys for measurable and significant improvement to occur.

Here is the text of the ACCJC Standard being addressed with Survey 1.

_Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning and implementation._

The IEC instructed the CGA to assess offices and their function, not people or positions. Questions were formulated and worded according to this instruction.

Jan Lubin, IEC Chair, has requested that your response to these results be submitted to her no later than June 1, 2013. Please contact Jan with any questions: lubin@hawaii.edu, x 456.
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

252 responses were received. 2 entries were disqualified as duplicates from an identical IP address; they shared identical demographic info but one of each pair skipped all questions. The two blank (skipped) entries were deleted. 250 responses were deemed eligible and are charted in these results.

I.A Distribution of Responses By Roles and Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty-Lecturers</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Prefer not to Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-Time (FT)</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-Time (PT)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prefer Not to Answer (PNA)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Admin and Staff respondents indicated Full-Time status.
I.B Respondents: Number of Years at WCC by Role

*Administration not included in this table. Classification of their three responses could possibly reveal individual identities.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Less Than 1</th>
<th>1 to 2</th>
<th>3 to 5</th>
<th>6 or more</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Lecturers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to Answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty-Lecturer**

- Less Than 1: 12%
- 1 to 2: 6%
- 3 to 5: 22%
- 6+: 60%

**Staff**

- Less Than 1: 8%
- 1 to 2: 13%
- 6+: 50%
- 3 to 5: 29%

**Students**

- Less Than 1: 38%
- 1 to 2: 37%
- 3 to 5: 20%

**PNA (role)**

- 6+: 75%
- 3 to 5: 25%
II. Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Surveys Emailed</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFLSP</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2494</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AFSLP = Administrator, Faculty, Lecturers, Staff and Prefer-Not-to-Answer, in aggregate.
Number of recipients on the WCC-FacStaffList: 282
Number of Students enrolled from UH-System IRO Daily Headcount Enrollment as of Feb. 11, 2013

III. Reporting Method

• Student responses are disaggregated from the whole and reported separately.

• Administration, Faculty, Lecturers, Staff and Prefer Not to Answer (AFSLP) roles are reported in whole.

• The response percentages are based on actual numbers (not weighted by category).

• Blank responses (skipped questions) are noted but not included in calculations.

• All AFSLP “I Don’t Know” and “NA” responses are disaggregated by Role and Years at WCC. This information can help target where improvement(s) might be made.
  • NA = The respondent does not believe that this question applies to them.
  • I don’t know (IDK) = The topic in question applies to the respondent, but s/he does not have enough information on the topic to provide an answer.

All comments were included, unedited, in the summaries delivered to the offices being assessed. Posted copies of the summaries have been edited; a note has been inserted where a comment was omitted as hearsay or personal in nature.

NOTES:

AFLSP Agree and Strongly Agree vs. Disagree and Strongly Disagree responses were disaggregated by length of time at WCC, and weighted for comparison between time categories. The results did not reveal a pattern of change in opinions based on years at WCC.

Percentage totals may be 100% ± 1% due to rounding.
As a student, a lot of these don’t seem to be easy to answer due to the lack of information I have of them. I really appreciate students being able to take part in this; however, for me, not much is known whether these offices are doing their services 100% correctly or not. So far I believe the campus overall is doing quite well for me and has been helpful whenever I needed help, but for when it comes to how much things these offices are doing well in I’m not too sure of. It may help to inform students more about things that happen at higher administrative levels of the campus staff.

I am not knowledgeable about who is who except for Artis. The students that do work under her called mentors, is where I run too because thats all the info I had. And of course theres trio! Wonderful PLACE!!!

I can't say that I receive encouragement to participate in any manner from any department, except Hawaiian Studies, Phi Theta Kappa, and Student Affairs. It is not that I think the other departments don't fulfill their functions, but rather access to and meaningful communication with all other departments has been limited, if at all.

I don't know/ am not familiar with the last two departments so cannot assess them. Which means they are not interacting with me.

I Love Windward Commyunity College they make education enjoyable, and beautiful.

I wish WCC offered a four year (BA, BS) program so that I could stay.

In all honesty I have no idea who any of these people are. Never see them on campus

Although my answers may not match with my comment that I'm about to say, it's only because I never met anyone of the people mentioned other than seeing many emails. Other than Office of the Admin., because there i needed to visit to proceed with my education at WCC. But for the most part of the college...I LOVED IT!

I am just not familiar with any of these offices.

i didnt know anything this survey was asking

I dont know anything about those people in the office and what they do. There is no class or orientation that introduces them to us.

I have had no opportunity to interact with these offices and to be honest I am not aware how their services effect me.

Seeing to many student smoking weed on campus

I use the college library to take exams for kapiolani cc, therefore I am not sure about any of these questions.

great instructor, the best I've had at WCC. she's somebody who really cares about her students.
# AFLSP

#5 is ambiguous. Isn't the real question whether or not they perform in accordance with the mission, not what their role is.

Results would be more accessible to more of the campus community if an Intranet was used to disperse the information rather than Laulima.

We need to change out the HR department they sweep to much things under the carpet and nothing in that office ever gets done. [ omitted as hearsay...]

# 6 makes no sense. If you don't agree that any of the above descriptors apply, you have to select "I don't know".

GSIEC surveys used to be done and the results made available online. I searched and could find no current assessments of administrative offices on the web page. I could also find nothing that described how assessments were done and how they were used.

I am an alumni who truly believes in this school and the success that I have reflects the nature of this institution and commitment of everyone in the WCC Ohana (family)!

I don't know what "assessment results" in #6 means.

The Office of the VC of Academic Affairs was led by someone who talked the talk but did not follow through. It was disappointing in many ways. I initially supported this person but then found that actions were self serving. Unfortunately this person's review is reflected in all responses even though all people in the office should not be rated similarly.

the VC Office of Academic Affairs does a poor job with assessment probably because [omitted personal information] only pay lip-service to assessment and do not try to improve

What assessment results do you mean in #6?

Where are assessment results of the offices posted?

The survey needs to have more detail to assess the college properly. The Chancellor is very effective but those in his office are not.

Other ethnic groups should not be forgotten.

Again, I have limited experience since I am quite new to WCC.

This is my first semester teaching at WCC so I have not had an opportunity to have contact with all of the Offices in the college community.