March 21, 2012

Recommendations in Response to the Mongold Report

Aloha,

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee formed an ad hoc committee to make recommendations in light of a report by David Mongold on the GSIEC surveys.

The subcommittee wishes to express its thanks to David Mongold for producing a report on the college’s governance structure. We hope that the report will be a catalyst to help the college continue to improve both the governance structures and the assessment of those structures.

The sub-committee’s specific recommendations are in two parts: the first are general recommendations found in this cover letter; the second is a draft of a policy regarding the assessment of a college’s governance structure.

The following are general recommendations for improving the assessment of governance on campus:

1. The member/non-member distinction should be removed because it is confusing and does not significantly improve the results.

2. The low response rate and the time it takes for everyone to fill out the surveys are recognized problems. The college also ought to ensure that the surveys are seen as meaningful, perhaps by setting time aside during convocation or other times in the semester and by providing lunch and other encouragements.

3. The surveys ought to be as effective and efficient as possible, recognizing that there will have to be multiple surveys. The college should also try to distribute the survey load so that everyone is not expected to respond to every survey. The problem here is that self-selection will tend to skew the sample. One solution is to create a random sample chosen from the college for each survey. Anyone on campus could be allowed to self-select, so long as the self-selected responses are kept distinct from the random sample.
We suggest the following timeline for creating and implementing the policy:

March 22nd to 29th: post on Discussion Board and send to the Faculty Senate and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, who will be encouraged to post official responses on the Discussion Board

March 30th: subcommittee meet to consider feedback and finish report

April 2nd: report provided to IEC for adoption

later in April: policy submitted to Chancellor for approval

If this report is accepted by IEC, the next step would be to take the recommended policy through the established policy adoption process, as outlined in http://windward.hawaii.edu/policies/Policy_on_Policies.pdf

We feel that the surveys, the results, and the responses should promote communication on campus between and within all constituent groups. Surveys should be concise, focused on the key issues, and unambiguous.

Sincerely,

Kathleen French       Winston Kong       Brian Richardson

Jean Shibuya        Lance Uyeda
Title
Assessment of the College Governance Structures

References
ACCJC (specifically references to Standard IV)

Institutional Effectiveness Committee
http://windward.hawaii.edu/committees/Institutional_Effectiveness/

Windward CC Strategic Plan (available via the college’s Governance page)
http://windward.hawaii.edu/Governance/


Kathleen French’s Report

GSIEC Report, 2009

Background and Purpose
In 2007, the ACCJC recommended that Windward Community College improve the assessment of its governance structures. Standard IV.A indicates the need for a college to regularly assess its governance structures to create the conditions for evidence-based, continual improvement.

Windward Community College is committed to shared governance, open communication, and constant improvement. To ensure appropriate participation and input, the college will continue to refine its current governance policies by developing written definitions of the roles and responsibilities for all constituent groups and establishing processes for clear and effective communication and reporting relationships.

The purpose of this policy is to establish clear and comprehensive procedures that will guide the overall assessment and promotion of effective college governance through the use of evidence.

To this end, the college will implement a regular evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of the college’s leaders and decision-making structures.

Authority
The authority of this policy is with the Chancellor.

**Procedures**

**A. Creation of the Assessment Tools**

The college will plan and ensure systematic, collaborative, and continual evaluation of the effectiveness of leadership and groups connected to decision-making and governance.

The goal of assessment is to improve governance through evidence that is both diagnostic and reflective. A variety of assessment methods may be used, including institutional data and surveys with Likert scale and open-ended questions.

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is responsible for creating any surveys, and rubrics where appropriate, in collaboration with stakeholders. Significant concerns about the survey design can be directed to the Chancellor, who has final authority over survey design.

Assessments will be guided by ACCJC’s Standard IV.A, the college’s mission, and accepted ideas of effective governance.

**B. Administering the Assessments**

Assessments of leaders and governance structures are conducted on a regular basis, with administrators, core committees, and departments evaluated annually.

The assessment data will be a combination of perception surveys, institutional data, and other evidence.

The following will be assessed annually:

Offices (some in the Fall and some in the Spring)
- Chancellor
- Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs
- Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs
- Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services
- Director of the Office Continuing and Community Education
- Dean of Academic Affairs, Division I
- Dean of Academic Affairs, Division II

Core Governance Committees (some in the Fall and some in the Spring)
- Curriculum
- Faculty Senate
- Institutional Effectiveness
- Ke Kumu Pali
- Planning and Budget
- Master Planning and Space Allocation
Departments (in early Spring)
   Humanities
   Language arts
   Mathematics and Business
   Natural Sciences
   Social Sciences

Other chartered groups and offices connected to college governance (as requested by the group, its authority, or the Chancellor)

Where possible, assessments will be completed during the Fall and Spring convocations.

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee will direct the Institutional Research Office or other entity to conduct the surveys and oversee their implementation.

C. Analysis and Communication of Assessments
For surveys to be useful, their results must be communicated in a timely and meaningful manner.

i. Preparing the Results
The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is responsible for editing the raw results from surveys to exclude derogatory or overly personal comments.

ii. Communicating the Results to Those Surveyed
The results of the survey and other assessment tools are transmitted to the offices and groups surveyed in a timely manner.

iii. The Use of Results
Offices and groups will conduct self-assessments and formulate improvement outcome statements based on the evidence provided.

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee will, as needed, organize trainings and provide materials to assist groups in understanding how to use assessment results.

iv. Communicating the Results to the Campus
The survey and the self-assessment will be posted on the website in the documents page for that office or group.

The group has the option of excluding specific comments from the published results, though the fact that comments have been excluded will be indicated in the final document.

The results of quantitative data will not be changed.

The group surveyed or its governing authority may organize a public forum to discuss
the results.

**v. Ensuring Improvements**
Every three years, or as needed, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee will be responsible for analyzing previous assessments and self-assessments to determine if appropriate changes have been made. The result will be sent to the group and to the group’s governing authority indicating to what extent improvements have been made and making recommendations regarding the group’s use of the assessment process.

**vi. Modification of the Assessment Tools**
After every assessment cycle, changes to the assessment tools can be suggested by the stakeholders to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. The chair of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee will ensure that there are adequate opportunities for feedback on assessment tools.

**Exclusion**
There are no exclusions for this policy.

**Revision**
The policy will be reviewed by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee in the early fall of every year and recommendations, if any, will be sent through the standard policy revision process. The Chancellor has final authority over all changes.

**Date**
Initially adopted: Fall 2008
Last revised: Spring 2012