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This Institutional Follow-Up Report is submitted to provide information regarding the specific recommendations identified by the Commission in its evaluation of Windward Community College based on a site visit on November 17, 2007, and to report that the College has met those recommendations.

We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community, and we believe that this report accurately reflects the progress made in responding to the Commission’s recommendations.

Dr. David McClain, President, University of Hawaii

Date

Dr. John Morton, Vice President for Community Colleges

Date

Dr. Angela Meixell, Chancellor, Windward Community College

Date

Mr. Allan R. Landon, Chair, Board of Regents

Date
STATEMENT OF REPORT PREPARATION

In a letter dated January 31, 2008, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges reaffirmed Windward Community College's accreditation with the requirement that the College submit a Follow-Up Report by March 15, 2009. The report was to focus on two Recommendations from the Evaluation Report of the November 17, 2007, site visit.

Upon receipt of the letter, Chancellor Meixell appointed Kathleen French, Instructor in Sociology, to research and report on Recommendation 5, and Jan Lubin, Director of Planning and Program Evaluation, to research and report on Recommendation 1. The findings and recommendations of their reports resulted in several actions by the College to assure compliance with all standards. Jan Lubin, as Accreditation Liaison Officer, then compiled and edited the Follow-Up Report. The report was uploaded to the web for campus-wide comment and revised accordingly before being sent to the Board of Regents for certification.
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS
BACKGROUND

An ACCJC letter dated January 31, 2007, made recommendations based on the Self Study and the Team Evaluation Report. It stated that the Commission had removed WCC from warning and reaffirmed its accreditation status. The letter outlined five recommendations that were to be addressed in a Progress Report by October 15, 2007, to be followed by a visit thereafter. The recommendations were:

1. To evaluate institutional effectiveness, the College should continue to improve its strategic planning processes by developing measurable performance indicators for setting institutional goals and strategic directions;

2. To improve student learning and success, the team recommends that the College completes its cycle of program reviews and incorporates into these program reviews the assessment of SLOs at course, program, and degree levels;

3. The College should define the at-risk population, develop and implement strategies for addressing the needs of the at-risk population, and create mechanisms for the continuous assessment and improvement of services to this population;

4. In the interest of improvement beyond the standard, the College should act diligently to secure funding which will ensure the construction of the proposed future library facility;

5. The team recommends, to ensure appropriate participation and input, that the College refine its current governance structure policies by including written definitions of the roles and responsibilities for all constituent groups and formalize processes and structures for clear, effective communication and reporting relationships. In addition, the College should implement an annual evaluation process to access the effectiveness of leadership and decision making which leads to institutional improvement.

WCC’s October 15, 2007, Progress Report outlined in detail what the College had done to improve and what had been accomplished regarding the aforementioned five recommendations. An Evaluation Team came to Windward on November 13, 2007, and in its letter dated January 31, 2008, the ACCJC acknowledged that Windward had met recommendations 2, 3, and 4, but still had not completely met Recommendations 1 and 5. The team noted that the College had not met Recommendation 1, as the strategic planning process that would tie strategic planning to the budget process had just been implemented. They also noted that the College had not developed measures to determine its institutional effectiveness nor had it defined how its plan and processes relate to the research function and accountability measures. The team also found that the College had partially met Recommendation 5 by defining its governance structure, but still had no governance evaluation process in place. In addition, one group needed to be established as the monitor of the evaluation process with the responsibility of making recommendations based on what is learned from the evaluation.
RECOMMENDATION 1: IMPROVING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

To evaluate institutional effectiveness, the College should continue to improve its strategic planning processes by developing measurable performance indicators for setting institutional goals and strategic directions. (Standard 1.b.7)

DESCRIPTION

The Strategic Planning Process

The Strategic Planning process at the college has undergone major transformation since the November 2007 Progress Report and visit. As the following description illustrates, this has been due to factors both internal and external to the College.

In July of 2007 the College began reworking its strategic plan with planning consultant Dr. Julie Slark who had been recommended by the 2006 Visiting Team. In October 2007, Dr. Slark and approximately 35 of Windward’s faculty, staff, and administrators spent three days dissecting the existing plan and came to the following conclusions: First, the College’s current Strategic Plan also included the College’s Operational Plan, Budget Plan, and Staffing Plan, and these needed to be separated if the College was to plan more effectively. Second, the College needed to make sure that the Strategic Plan had an over-arching vision statement. Third, the College needed to establish goals with measurable outcomes that had established timelines, assigned responsibilities, and monitoring mechanisms. The College immediately set out to accomplish these items.

During the Fall 2007 semester, while Windward was reworking its Strategic Plan, The University of Hawai‘i System (UH System) and the University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges (UHCC) modified their System Strategic Plans. The original UH System and UHCC plans, which ran from 2002 to 2010, were supplemented by strategic outcomes documents with performance measures set to run from 2008–2015. The documents contained initiatives committing the University System to participate in Achieving the Dream (AtD) and enhance the output of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) students for the state’s workforce.

AtD is a national initiative that was created to help more community college students, particularly low-income and minority populations, succeed -- that is, to complete courses and earn certificates and degrees. It is built on the belief that broad institutional change should be informed by student achievement data. Participating colleges, like the UHCCs, have agreed to use data to drive strategies, monitor progress, and evaluate outcomes; develop strategies to close performance gaps among students; involve their faculty, students, staff and communities in their efforts; report data and outcomes broadly, both on and off campus; form partnerships with their communities, local businesses and others; and advocate for state and national policy changes as
needed. The initiative, therefore, helps member colleges to focus on a student-centered vision, build a culture of evidence, and promote the twin goals of equity and excellence.

In light of the UH System initiative, the UHCC System Strategic Planning Council began to evaluate and propose UHCC Strategic Outcomes and Performance Data that would conform to the UH System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015. The Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC) visited each college to review benchmarks, baseline data, and suggested performance targets. The colleges were asked to review the proposals and agree or suggest new targets. The Office of the VPCC compiled the responses and established the UHCC System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015 for each College. The Performance Measures for 2015 became the Strategic Plan Action Outcomes measures for the updated 2008-2015 WCC Strategic Plan (Appendix I).

To stay in sync with these changes, Windward once again had to revisit its Strategic Plan. The broad areas that had just been modified in July and October with Dr. Slark now had to be aligned with the directives and outcomes of the new UH System and UHCC Strategic Plans before being presented to the campus for review and comment.

To coordinate its strategic planning activities, the College hired a Director of Planning and Program Evaluation in December 2007. The Director supports the Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committees and sits on the Budget Committee. At Convocation on January 8, 2008, after reviewing the UH System and UHCC Strategic Plans, the Director led an activity in which both non-credit and credit faculty and staff participated in developing the overarching vision of the new Strategic Plan.

The Director then made appointments to participate in a follow-up activity with individual departments during the Spring 2008 semester. For Instruction, this activity was based on each department’s Annual Assessment or 5-Year Program Review and culling out data pertinent to the Strategic Plan. Unfortunately, soon after the Convocation, the Director of Planning went on medical leave, so a faculty member on the Strategic Planning Committee visited each of the academic departments and worked with them on the follow-up activity. The Chancellor, the Dean of Administrative Services, the Dean of Students, and the Director of Vocational and Continuing Education met with their constituencies and developed new outcomes as well. These were presented to the Strategic Planning Committee for review and comment throughout the Spring 2008 semester. The modified version of the 2008 Strategic Plan, using comments and suggestions from the Committee, was used for the Biennium Budget Stocktaking presented by Chancellor Meixell on April 28, 2008, and for the Legislative Budget Requests submitted to the Vice President for Community College’s Office on June 1, 2008. It was uploaded to the web for review and comment from the entire campus beginning in May 2008.

After feedback was received from the entire College, the Strategic Plan was discussed thoroughly and modified once again at the first meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee in October 2008. This modified plan (Appendix I) and the separate Operational Plan were presented to the Faculty Senate on November 18, 2008. The Operational Plan is still under development and will be under constant review by the Strategic Planning Committee and Budget Committee as they assess the Strategic Plan Performance Outcomes.
MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

University of Hawai‘i System Philosophy

This section of the Follow-Up Report contains the Windward Community College Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures developed by the Strategic Planning Committee which were reviewed by the Faculty Senate, and the faculty and staff as a whole. They are aligned with the objectives introduced by the UHCC Strategic Planning Council and the goals of the UH and UHCC Strategic Plans 2008-2015.

The following quote from the UH System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures, 2008-2015 brochure dated May 2008 sums up the University of Hawaii System philosophy for measuring outcomes. (http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/uhplan/SOPM.pdf):

During the 2007-08 academic year, the University community and its public revisited the strategic plan. Participants broadly affirmed our strategic goals and the values underlying our goals. They recommended we better differentiate system and campus roles, and establish clear and measurable outcomes to assess performance and progress. Participants agreed that articulating our plan in terms of the higher education needs of the State adds a valued dimension and reaffirms our University’s commitment to serving the State. Based on these recommendations, the University developed this companion piece to our plan which assigns strategic outcomes and performance measures to be accomplished by 2015. This update will guide the future priorities of the University and inform our budget planning process for the next three biennia.

Performance measures assigned to each strategic outcome demonstrate our willingness to be held accountable and enable us to effectively assess our progress. The goals we have set for 2015 are stretch goals, and challenge us to reinvent ourselves. We use quantitative measures to provide evidence of our efforts, but acknowledge that many of our core values – academic rigor and excellence, integrity and service, aloha and respect – while not addressed here, are central to our mission.

The Process of Measuring Outcomes at Windward Community College

In the 2008-2010 Academic Years, the Strategic Planning and Budget Committees will adhere to the following cycle:


2. The measurable outcomes for the year 2015 were included in the WCC Strategic Outcome Objectives, which were reviewed and revised by the Strategic Planning Committee, and then posted on the web for review by the entire campus prior to the end of the Spring 2008 semester.
3. These outcomes were revised based on discussions with the Achieving the Dream
campus leaders, the Strategic Planning Committee, the ETC, and other constituencies
involved in achieving Windward’s Strategic Plan Outcomes.

4. The revised outcomes were placed up on the WCC web site before the end of the Spring
semester, and were available for Campus comment until the middle of September.

5. The Strategic Planning Committee reviews the expected outcomes with the actual
outcomes based on census and end-of-term data beginning in September 2008 and
continuing through the end of the Spring 2009 semester.

6. If in reviewing the expected outcomes with the actual outcomes, it is found that the
College has matched or exceeded the expected outcome, then the College has met
expectations. If the College has not matched the expected outcome or the outcome was
lower than the expected outcome, then the College did not meet expectations.

7. The Strategic Planning Committee will provide feedback on the meeting/non-meeting of
expectations at the Convocation at the beginning of the Fall 2009 semester.

8. The feedback and procedures and policies instituted to meet the performance expectation
will be addressed in the organizational structures Annual Assessment or 5-Year Program
Review due on November 1, 2009.

9. The Strategic Planning Committee will use the information provided in the Annual
Assessment/5-Year Program Review to modify the Strategic Plan and the outcome
measures during the Fall 2009 semester.

10. The modified Strategic Plan will be put on the WCC website for campus-wide review
and comment before the end of the Spring 2010 semester through September 2010.

11. The next revised Strategic Plan and performance measures will be presented to the
Graphics Department in October 2010.

12. The revised Strategic Plan and performance objectives will be presented to the Faculty
Senate in November 2010.

13. The revised Strategic Plan and performance objectives will be presented to the Campus
and UH System Offices in December 2010.

14. The entire process continues throughout the life of the current Strategic Plan, and is used
in the development of the new Strategic Plan and Performance Measures from 2016
onward.
Analysis

As the descriptive summary illustrates, through a collaborative process, WCC has developed strategic institutional goals that are aligned with the UH and UHCC Systems. It has also developed measurable performance indicators to determine if these goals have been met. The Director of Planning and Program Evaluation will monitor the implementation of the Strategic Plan modifications necessary to meet strategic outcomes. It is also the Director’s responsibility to keep abreast of any changes made to the System and Community College Strategic Plans and to ensure that the College’s Strategic Plan remains aligned with them.

Action Steps

Continue to carry out the process displayed above for measuring Strategic Plan outcomes at Windward Community College.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Governance Structure Policy

The team recommends, to ensure appropriate participation and input, that the college refine its current governance structure policies by including written definitions of roles and responsibilities for all constituent groups and formalize processes and structures for clear, effective and reporting relationships. In addition, the college should implement an annual evaluation process to access the effectiveness of leaders and decision-making which leads to institutional improvements. (Standard IV.A.1, A.2, A.3, and A.5)

As mentioned in the Background Section of this Follow-Up Report, the first part of Recommendation 5 was completed before the Team Visit in November 2008. In the Spring 2008 semester, Instructor Kathleen French wrote an in-depth analysis on the second part of Recommendation 5 (Appendix 2). The French Report stressed that this part of Recommendation 5 needed to be understood as three equally important parts. First, Windward had to develop an evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of its leadership and decision-making structures. Second, the College had to identify one group as the monitor of the evaluation process, with the responsibility of widely communicating the results of the study to the campus community, and then use the results to make suggestions for improvements. Finally, the College had to act on these suggestions to implement needed institutional improvements.

The French Report also stated what other colleges did in order to satisfy the Standard IV.A.5 requirement. Most conducted some form of perception survey (pg. 4). The difference between what these colleges did compared to what WCC had previously done to evaluate governance was that the questions on the surveys done by the other colleges were better aligned with Standard IV.A. Some even measured leadership and governance at the level of individual offices, departments, and committees. In addition, these other colleges also utilized their survey results to help them make changes in their governance structures and processes.
Therefore, in order for WCC to develop a valid survey, the questions needed to align with Standard IV.A’s four themes: (a) encouraging initiatives; (b) systematic participative processes; (c) assessment/evaluation; and, (d) institutional improvement. Indeed, the Recommendation states “…the college should implement an annual evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of leaders and decision-making which leads to institutional improvements” (ACCJC, 2008, p. 1). In order to measure WCC’s effectiveness of its governance structures and processes as described in Standard IV.A, a survey had to be created that was directly aligned with each of the four themes.

In addition to aligning the questions with the Standard, the survey needed to allow people to respond based on different contexts—i.e., a faculty member who teaches political science would take a survey for the Social Science department, as well as for the various committees to which they belong—same questions, different context (Appendix B). Moreover, in measuring constituent satisfaction of governance structures and processes, all people’s views are important. Therefore, it is not only essential to ask the members of the governance structure about whether they feel encouraged to bring forth ideas to the group, but non-members need to feel encouraged as well (pg. 6-7). The process of measuring the particular parts of the College, along with the various viewpoints, not only provides data that is more meaningful, but also provides a more thorough understanding of the entire governance structure, allowing the College to better utilize the results for institutional improvements.

However, surveys are not the only way to assess WCC’s governance structures. In fact, the October 2006 Evaluation Report states: “To evaluate the effectiveness of its governance structure and processes, the college needs to focus on the outcomes of its institutional goals achieved versus relying on perception of effectiveness and then make the appropriate changes for improvement” (Sheehan, 2006, p. 42). The Strategic Plan’s Action Outcomes, Appendix 1 of this report, clearly specify what the College intends to do from now through 2015, and are directly connected to larger System goals. In order to assess each of the Action Outcomes, the Strategic Planning Committee needs to remain clear about which particular groups are responsible for each of the outcomes. Therefore, the College will revisit these goals each year and take note of what has and has not been satisfactorily accomplished. The extent to which the College meets these goals provides preliminary information on the effectiveness of the college’s governance structures and processes.

As stated in the November 2007 Progress Report Vis it document, “The college needs to determine whether the structures and policies developed and implemented are effective and lead to institutional improvement over time. Also, one group needs to be identified as the monitor of the evaluation process which has the responsibility to make recommendations based on what is learned from that evaluation” (Amador & Perri, 2007, p. 9). It became clear that institutional assessment of the effectiveness of leaders and decision-making would require a team of people whose job it is to refine and properly administer the survey instruments each year, gather and analyze the data, and put the data into some meaningful format to facilitate communication and suggestions for improvement.

Based on the recommendations in The French Report, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) formed a Survey Subcommittee that reviewed the member and non-member survey
instruments (Appendix C) included in The French Report and made modifications (Appendix 3) to them. Simultaneously, a Proposal on Recommendation 5 with a flow chart showing the process (Appendix 4) and timeline (Appendix 5) of when each governance structure and the leader of that structure would be evaluated was presented to the Faculty Senate Chairs, the Administrators, and the IEC. The first series of surveys were taken by the campus as a whole in November 2008. These surveys assessed the Chancellor’s Office, the Instructional Services Office, the Administrative Services Office, the Student Services Office, the Vocational Education Office, and the Faculty Senate. The office as a whole and the leader of the office were assessed. For example, in the case of the Faculty Senate, all three Faculty Senate chairs were assessed, and in the case of Instructional Services, the Vice Chancellor for Instruction, and the Dean of Division 1 and Dean of Division 2 were assessed. Overall returns of the constituents taking the survey were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Non Member</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Member Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair 1 - Windward Faculty Senate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair 2 - System Faculty Senate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair 3 - Recording Faculty Senate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Organization</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor Office</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Unit One</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Unit Two</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor Office</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VocEd and Community Education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>48.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, in accordance with the Proposal on Recommendation 5 and The French Report, the IEC established the Governance Sub-Committee of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (GSIEC). The GSIEC will continue to follow the yearly sequence in Appendix 5, to administer,
analyze, and present information from the “Leaders and Governance Structures Surveys” to facilitate institutional governance improvement. The GSIEC is convened by the Director of Institutional Research and is composed of five senior faculty and staff. It has established policies and procedures that will guide the governance improvement process.

The results of the first set of surveys of leaders and governance structures have been presented (see example, Appendix 6) to the leaders and governance groups for their self-assessment, and the self-assessments and governance improvement statements have been returned to the GSIEC. The self-assessments and governance improvement statements will also be used to assess governance improvements for the following year. They also will be included in forthcoming Annual Assessments/Program Reviews, posted on the College web site, and available in the library for review. The IEC has also developed the surveys for the second and third groups of leaders and governance structures in preparation for the surveys to be administered in the February-March and April-May periods as shown in Appendix 4.

ANALYSIS

As the descriptive summary illustrates, the College has created and implemented a process for effectively evaluating its governance.

The following was accomplished in 2008.

January 2008 – May 2008
Instructor Kathleen French is tasked to research and report on Recommendation 5. She submits her report to Chancellor Meixell at the end of the Spring 2008 semester.

May 2008 – August 2008
The French Report is circulated and discussed with Administrators.

August 2008
The French Report is posted on the WCC web site and discussion begins amongst faculty, staff, and administrators regarding its content.

September 2008
A draft of the survey was developed by the IEC based on the timeline seen in Appendix 10.

October 2008
The surveys were revised and finalized.

November-December 2008
The member and non-member surveys for the first group of governance entities were administered.
The composition of the GSIEC was determined and policies and procedures established.
The data was summarized and provided to the governance entity for their self-assessment. Self-assessments with outcome statements were returned to the GSIEC.
The following will be accomplished in Spring 2009:

**January–March 2009**
The process for the second group of governance entities was conducted.

**March-May 2009**
*The process will be repeated for the third group of governance entities.*
*The GSIEC and IEC will assess the governance evaluation process and revise the process as needed.*

**Action Steps**

Continue to carry out the process displayed above for assessing governance structures at Windward Community College.
WEBLINKS

Statement of Report Preparation

ACCJC January 31 Letter,
Team Evaluation Report

Background

Windward Community College 2006 Self Study
Team Evaluation Report
Windward Community College October 15, 2007, Progress Report
ACCJC January 31 Letter,
Windward Community College Governance Structure

Recommendation 1: Description

UHCC Strategic Plan Performance Outcomes
UH Strategic Plan Performance Outcomes
http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/uhtplan/SOPM.pdf
Windward Community College Strategic Plan Performance Outcomes
http://windward.hawaii.edu/ir/Planning/Plans/Strategic/Strategic%20Plan%20May%202008%20Windward%20CC.pdf
Windward Community College

Strategic Plan
Action Outcomes

November 2008
## Contents

### Introduction

I. HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE COLLEGE .............................................. 1

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE COLLEGE PLANNING PROCESS ............................... 3
   A. The Strategic Planning Committee ...................................................... 3
   B. The Strategic Plan ............................................................................. 3
   C. Program Evaluation and Review in the Strategic Planning Cycle ............. 5

III. MISSION, CORE VALUES, AND VISION OF THE COLLEGE ......................... 6
   A. Mission of Windward Community College ......................................... 6
   B. Core Values of Windward Community College .................................... 6
   C. Vision for Windward Community College .......................................... 7

IV. PLANNING CONTEXT .................................................................................. 7
   A. External Factors ................................................................................ 7
   B. Internal Factors ................................................................................. 7
   C. Infrastructure Influences .................................................................. 8
   D. Planning Assumptions ....................................................................... 8

### Strategic Plan

- Strategic Outcome 1 .................................................................................. 9
- Strategic Outcome 2 .................................................................................. 10
- Strategic Outcome 3 .................................................................................. 12
- Strategic Outcome 4 .................................................................................. 12
- Strategic Outcome 5 .................................................................................. 13
I. History and Description of the College

Windward Community College (WCC) is located in Kāne‘ohe on the island of O‘ahu at the base of the Ko‘olau mountains. It primarily serves residents from Waimanalo to Kahuku on the North Shore. Established in 1972, the College operates out of renovated former Hawai‘i State Hospital buildings and some newly constructed buildings on approximately 64 acres of land. The Master Plan for the College developed in 1989 and is being updated. The Master Planning and Space Utilization Committee is responsible for making recommendations to the Chancellor on short-, mid-, and long-term facilities use, planning for the renovation of existing facilities and the construction of new facilities. Recommendations are made linking the institutional mission, strategic plan, long-range development plan (LRDP or Master Plan), available funding, and programmatic priorities to the physical development, renovation, and space assignment of the campus.

The College is governed by the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai‘i. The daily operations of the College are directed by the WCC Chancellor, who is directly responsible to the UH System President. By State law the College has an open-door policy that includes, but is not limited to, residents who have completed high school or who are 18 years of age or older. Credit enrollment for Fall 2008 was 1,959 students.

The College credit program has a global approach to learning with a particular sensitivity to Hawaiian values that connects liberal arts with career exploration, technological skills and literacy, and community involvement. WCC is best known for its offerings in creative writing, journalism, Hawaiian studies, the fine arts, and the marine, earth, and planetary sciences. In addition to the Associate in Arts degree, the College also offers Academic Subject Certificates in:

- Business
- Art
- Bio-Resource Development and Management
- Hawaiian Studies
- Plant Biotechnology
- Psycho-Social Developmental Studies

Certificates of Completion in:

- Plant Landscaping
- Subtropical Urban Tree Care
- Agricultural Technology
Certificates of Competence in

- Applied Business and Information Technology
- Information Computer Science in Web Support


The College is in the process of developing learning communities and enhancing its tutoring, counseling, and student support areas in order to increase student persistence and retention rates. It is also creating articulated relationships with other colleges through the University Partners Program that will increase baccalaureate program options for WCC students.

A variety of short-term, noncredit vocational courses are offered at Windward through the Employment Training Center (ETC). The instructional programs offered at ETC are designed to address appropriate pacing, educational material, and pedagogy for its at-risk student population. Students who complete the structured approved curriculum in:

- Auto Body Repair and Finishing
- Introduction to Culinary Arts
- Facilities Maintenance and Construction
- Office Administration and Technology
- Office Skills
- Health Career Options
- Essential Skills – Math and Communication, and
- Workforce Development

receive a Certificate of Professional Development, Certificate of Preparation, or Certificate of Competence. ETC enrollment is approximately 1,000 students per year.

The Office of Community Education (OCE) offers a wide selection of noncredit courses and cultural programs. It includes the Fujio Matsuda Technology Training and Education Center, which was established in 1985 to serve as a technological education center for the Windward O’ahu community. Additionally, the College offers many enrichment activities, including theatrical performances, the Star Poets series, art exhibitions, and the Hawaiian Music Institute. The College hosts an annual Ho’olaule’a for the Windward community.
II. Description of the College Planning Process

A. The Strategic Planning Committee

The Strategic Planning Committee is a standing committee that reports to the Chancellor and is charged with reviewing, evaluating and updating the College's strategic plan. The committee also prioritizes strategic actions based on program reviews, annual reports and summary reports from the deans and directors so it can make recommendations to the Chancellor and the Budget Committee regarding the use of resources in the college operating budgets, and regarding resource requests for future college funds following the guidelines of WCC Policy 4.2 Strategic Planning Policy. It is composed of representatives from Vocational and Community Education, Administrative Services, Credit Instruction, Academic Support, Student Services, Administration, the student body, and a representative from the Budget Committee. Members include faculty, administrators, APT's and Civil Service employees who serve a 2-year term that is staggered, with opportunity to be reappointed. Members are nominated by their campus groups to the Chancellor.

B. The Strategic Plan

The ACCJC Standards govern institutional mission and effectiveness; evaluation of student learning, programs, and services; appropriate resource distribution and adequacy; and evaluation to verify that financial resources planning is integrated with institutional planning. Strategic planning is the core process that allows the College to effectively meet the requirements of its mission. It is the responsibility of Windward Community College's Chancellor to provide effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness (http://windward.hawaii.edu/Accreditation/ACCJC_Guide_to_Evaluating.pdf). Additionally, the University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents policy on planning provides for the regular and systematic assessment of programs, campuses, and the University as a whole to ensure that:

- The goals and objectives of each unit of the University reflect the unit’s mission
- Planning is complemented by systemic monitoring of progress towards achieving planned objectives
- The collection of information about the achievement of goals and objectives is an ongoing activity designed to maximize the use of existing data
- The information collected is used to improve programs and services

The Strategic Plan is the fundamental document driving types of programming, new initiatives, program improvement activities, staffing, and facilities improvements and additions. It drives WCC's biennium budget request, integrating the College's programs and services to meet the College's mission. It is linked to an evaluative process of program review, both annual major five-year reviews and annual reviews of the Liberal Arts, CTE Programs and Certificates in addition to the annual CTE Program Performance Health Indicators (PHI).
Windward Community College's planning process encompasses a number of elements. The cycle begins with the original development and annual review and revision to the campus strategic planning as approved by the University of Hawai'i, Board of Regents. The University of Hawai'i System-wide strategic plan was updated with feedback of all constituencies in the Fall of 2007. The updated UH System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures may be found at http://www.hawaii.edu/ovppp/uhplan/SOPM_web.html. In light of this UH System initiative the UHCC System Strategic Planning Council began to evaluate and propose UHCC System strategic outcomes and performance measures that would conform to the UH System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures.

The Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC) visited each college to review benchmarks, baseline data, and suggested performance targets. The colleges were asked to review the proposals and agree or suggest new targets. The Office of the VPCC compiled the responses and established UHCC System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures. Strategic Plan Meeting Materials. Windward Community College's Strategic Performance Measures as agreed in the meeting with the VPCC are found at http://windward.hawaii.edu/it/Planning/Plans/Strategic/Strategic%20Plan%20May%202008%20Windward%20CC.pdf.

The monitoring of the progress and the achievement of these strategic outcomes and performance measures are essential to the college's future success. It begins with the Annual Assessments and Program Reviews. WCC Annual Assessment and Program Review Schedule is available on the WCC website at http://windward.hawaii.edu/Assessment/Program_Review_Timeline.pdf.

The following are identified as programs and support units that must submit Annual Assessments and Program Reviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-Year Program Reviews</th>
<th>Annual Assessment Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit Programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support Units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Arts Transfer Degree</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Technology</td>
<td>Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Education</td>
<td>Office of the Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit Vocational Programs</td>
<td>Office of Continuing Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Technology, Office Skills, and OAT</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Workforce Development</td>
<td>Academic Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Skills</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Occupations</td>
<td>Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>Math and Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades (Auto-body Repair, Construction Occupations, Culinary Arts, and Facilities Management</td>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Services (summary report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Academic Subject Certificate Programs and Certificate of Completion programs are now reviewed as part of the academic department to which they belong. Furthermore, programs or activities that receive special funding through grants are excluded from this policy. Title IV: Students Toward Academic Achievement and Retention; Windward Talent Search; Upward Bound; and the USDA-CSREES grant are examples of these programs. These programs are unique in that they have different reporting and evaluation timetables, reporting format requirements, and mandated outcomes methods. The assessment processes for these programs are mandated by the granting agencies, and while not identical in format, provide essential data for decision-making.

C. Program Evaluation and Review in the Strategic Planning Cycle

The program review process is an on-going, year-round assessment of the academic programs and support units of the College. The cycle begins in April when the Office of Institutional Research receives institutional specific departmental data from the Vice President of Community Colleges Office, then gives this data related to demand, effectiveness, efficiency, and overall program health to the departments. At this time, the Director of Strategic Planning notifies the campus that the Strategic Planning Process is beginning. The Department Chairs work with the Director of Strategic Planning and Director of Institutional Research to submit their Annual Assessments, Program Reviews, Departmental Progress Reports and Departmental Plans to the Deans of Instruction or the Director of Vocational and Community Education (who is responsible for all noncredit programs offered by ETC and OCE) by the end of May. These reports include Action Strategies for the department. These reports allow the Vice Chancellor of Instruction and the Director of Vocational and Community Education to prepare Summary Reports that may have impact on the Strategic Plan.

It is incumbent on the Deans of Instruction, the Vice Chancellor of Instruction, and the Director of Vocational and Community Education to review these documents and to make recommendations to the Departments about which Action Strategy additions, modifications or deletions they believe should be considered for the Strategic Plan before the final November 1 submission date. The documents are then forwarded to the Director of Strategic Planning by November 15. The Director of Strategic Planning then compiles all the information into the new revised Strategic Plan and holds a campus-wide forum. Suggestions from the forum are then incorporated into the revised Strategic Plan, which is, then, presented to the Strategic Planning Committee in January.

In February, the Strategic Planning Committee reviews the Budget Committee's final recommendations for discretionary funds and for monies exceeding the adjusted discretionary total, with prioritization and/or adjustments to ensure alignment with the current Strategic Plan. After reviewing the comments of the Strategic Planning Committee, the Budget Committee then finalizes the budget request for submission to the Administration. From March to May, the Administration determines the beginning budget for the year based on the Budget Committee's recommendations and other sources of funds, and shares
this information with the Budget Committee and the campus as a whole posting the proposed budget on the WCC Web site. From April to August, the budget is adjusted as necessary to meet system guidelines, and the Budget Committee is kept informed and is consulted before the Chancellor presents the budget to the Office of the Vice President of Community Colleges. This is the budget that is presented to the BOR and the legislature in September.

III. Mission, Core Values and Vision of the College

A. Mission of Windward Community College

Windward Community College is committed to excellence in the liberal arts and career development; we support and challenge individuals to develop skills, fulfill their potential, enrich their lives, and become contributing, culturally aware members of our community.

Windward Community College is further committed to the mission of the Community Colleges of the University of Hawai‘i:

- To position the University of Hawai‘i as one of the world’s foremost indigenous-serving universities by supporting the access and success of Native Hawaiians.

- To increase the educational capital of the state by increasing the participation and completion of students, particularly low income students and those from underserved regions.

- To contribute to the state’s economy and provide a solid return on its investment in higher education through research and training.

- To address critical workforce shortages and prepare students (undergraduate, graduate, and professional) to be leaders in a globally competitive economy.

- Acquire, allocate, and manage public and private revenue streams and exercise exemplary stewardship over all of the University’s resources, for a sustainable future. (University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges, Strategic Plan Update 2008-2015, Draft 02/08/08)

B. Core Values of Windward Community College

- Learning and teaching
- Academic excellence
- Critical thinking
- Creativity and innovation
- Collegial and family or ‘ohana spirit
- Diversity
- Intellectual freedom
• Service
• Cooperation and collaboration
• Scholarly communication and research
• Global perspective
• Commitment to the use of technology

C. Vision for Windward Community College

Students and community members will be enriched and able to live full, productive lives in a quickly changing, technologically oriented society through the quality education, effective training, dedicated support services, and imaginative artistic productions provided by Windward Community College and its partners in the community.

IV. Planning Context

A. External Factors

Supporting a process of review, analysis, strategic plan revisions, and budgeting requires that the Windward community be kept informed of major initiatives and external factors. WCC must be responsive to the workforce and social needs of its constituency as the College is required to interface with businesses, community organizations, legislative bodies, executive agencies, workforce and apprenticeship councils, lower education partners, and the university system leadership.

New demands based upon shifting employment patterns, new technologies, and policy changes need to be recognized and articulated in the evaluative process as major drivers. Liberal Arts is tasked to keep their curriculum vibrant and integrated with the University of Hawai‘i System through program articulation. Their service mission to support holistic learning requires an understanding of the demands of the external community.

Every dynamic institution must be responsible to major community needs and initiatives. Programs may have to respond to those societal factors. Major program changes may be originated through external economic change and educational articulation by groups directly to the Chancellor and the ETC. It is the responsibility of the Chancellor and the Director of Vocational and Career Education to work with these groups to develop the capacity to implement major state initiatives through appropriate consultation, budgeting, and implementation.

B. Internal Factors

Additional facilities’ maintenance personnel, faculty, and instructional support staff are sorely needed. With the science, humanities, and student services buildings completed, and a new library/media/learning center complex being constructed, there is a definite need to expand the facilities and instructional support staff of the College. Also, with the development of new credit and
noncredit programs i.e., Plant Biotechnology and Bio-Resources Development and Management; the Ocean Recreation Program; the Hawai'i Music Institute; and the Atelier program, additional faculty and staff positions are needed to ensure successful implementation and maintenance.

C. Infrastructure Influences

The State and the University plan to continue to develop telecommunications systems and to provide alternative methods of instructional delivery. Distance-delivered courses are expected to increase as instruction is delivered directly to the home and workplace.

Funding will continue to be a challenge, increasing reliance on tuition revenues, special program revenues, gifts and grants.

D. Planning Assumptions

The following planning assumptions were used in the compilation of this Strategic Plan:

External

- As in past decades of economic downturn, the State's economic picture is expected to slowly recover over the upcoming seven-year period.

- There will be an increase in the number of students enrolling at WCC due to the publicity of the college’s offerings, the quality educational experience offered, smaller class sizes, convenient location, reasonable tuition, and free parking.

- New students will be attracted to the College due to improved facilities, such as the new library, the science building, the humanities complex, the Imaginarium, and the Student Campus Center.

Internal

- The student population will remain predominantly Liberal Arts majors.

- System-wide efforts to make the University of Hawai'i a truly seamless system will help the Community Colleges to provide area residents with the basic educational requirements for any of the System's degree and certificate programs. To this end, WCC hopes to offer the residents of the windward side of O'ahu the core courses required for programs offered at any of the UH campuses.

- The needs of employers and special-needs students and the vocational interests of area residents will be served through the Employment Training Center/Office of Continuing and Community Education.

- WCC will remain an open-admission college and will develop new programs or modify existing programs that will increase enrollment among the working adult student population by offering classes in the evening, off-campus, and through distance education.
• The need to assist underprepared and underserved students will continue and will be served through joint efforts of the Windward Community College credit and noncredit programs and the State Department of Education (DOE).

• The implementation of enrollment enhancing outreach programs such as the Running Start program and other DOE and grant-funded programs

• Campus technology will continue to be important to academic support and to the enhancement of successful teaching.

• WCC will be a leader in Hawaiian Studies, the fine and performing arts, and the sciences.

---

**University of Hawai‘i- Strategic Outcome # 1:**

**Native Hawaiian Educational Attainment**

To position the University of Hawai‘i as one of the world’s foremost indigenous-serving universities by supporting the access and success of Native Hawaiians.

**Community College System Action Outcomes**

1.1 Increase Native Hawaiian enrollment by 3% per year, particularly in regions that are underserved.

1.2 Promote low-income Native Hawaiian success and graduation by increasing the overall financial aid participation rate by 1.13% per year to 2,101 students, the total amount of financial aid disperses to $14,391,428, and the number of aid recipients making satisfactory financial aid progress by 2015.

1.3 Increase the number and percent of Native Hawaiian students who, if assigned to a developmental intervention, successfully complete that sequence and move on to college-level instruction.

1.4 Increase by 6-9% per year (805 by 2015), the number of Native Hawaiian students who successfully progress and graduate, or transfer to baccalaureate institutions, while maintaining the percentage of transfers who achieve a first year GPA of 2.0 or higher at the transfer institution.

**Windward Community College Action Outcomes**

Action Outcomes 1.1 - 1.7 concern the Native Hawaiian subset of the entire Windward Community College population.

1.1 Design and implement an effective enrollment management and recruitment plan to increase Native Hawaiian enrollment by 3% or 162 students (from 555 to 717) by 2015, especially targeting students from Kahuku and Waimanalo.
1.2 Promote low-income Native Hawaiian success and graduation by increasing Pell Grant participation to 250 by 2015 to equal approximately $501,679.

1.3 Increase the number of Native Hawaiians that complete developmental reading (from 3 to 31), writing (from 12 to 33), and math (from 29 to 51) classes to between 83% and 86% by 2015.

1.4 Increase the number of full-time Native Hawaiian students (from 25 to 37) who complete at least 20 credits in the first academic year with a GPA of 2.0 or higher, and the number of part-time Native Hawaiian students (12 to 18) who complete at least 10 credits in the first academic semester with a GPA of 2.0 or higher by 5% per year.

1.5 Increase by 5% the number of Native Hawaiian students (from 96 to 142) who reenroll in the Spring semester and persist until Fall each year.

Develop methods other than surveys to ascertain student satisfaction with AA degree program

Enhance tutoring and mentoring activities

Plan and develop learning communities

Research why high attrition rate exits

Develop an incentive program to improve student persistence

1.6 Increase by 6-9% the number of Native Hawaiians (from 45 to 78) who receive degrees or certificates in each Annual Fiscal Year.

1.7 Increase by 5% per year compounded the number of Native Hawaiian transfers to UH System and non-system baccalaureate institutions who achieve an average GPA of 3.14.

University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Outcome #2:

Hawai‘i’s Educational Capital

To increase the educational capital of the state by increasing the participation and completion of students, particularly Native Hawaiian, low-income students and those from underserved areas.

Community College System Action Outcomes

2.1 Increase enrollment to 27,943 students by 2015, particularly in regions and with groups that are underserved.

2.2 Promote low-income student graduation and success by increasing the PELL Aid participation rate to 38% of eligible students by 2015, increasing the total amount of PELL aid disbursed to $17,829,873, and increase the number of aid recipients making financial aid satisfactory progress.
2.3 Increase the number and percent (to 80%) of students who, if assigned to a developmental intervention, enroll in and successfully complete that sequence and move on to degree applicable instruction and increase CCSS EE Active and Collaborative Learning Benchmark.

2.4 Increase by 3% the number of students who successfully progress and graduate (4,181 degrees by 2015), or transfer to baccalaureate institutions, while maintaining the percentage of transfers who achieve a first year GPA of 2.0 or higher at the transfer institution.

2.5 Increase the diversity and number of programs offered to or in underserved regions by increasing the number and types of programs offered by at least one per two years that can be completed through distance learning technologies.

**Windward Community College Action Outcomes**

Action Outcomes 2.1 - 2.8 concern the entire Windward Community College population.

2.1 Increase enrollment, particularly in regions and with groups who are underserved, from 1781 to 2001 students by 2015.

2.2 Provide low-income student success by increasing PELL aid participation rate to 38% of eligible students (from 428 to 651) by 2015, increasing the total amount of PELL aid disbursed to $1,325,093, and increase the number of aid recipients making satisfactory academic progress.

2.3 Increase the number of students that complete developmental reading (from 7 to 55), writing (35 to 102), and math (105 to 178) classes by 84% by 2015.

2.4 Increase the number of full-time entering students (from 91 to 134) who complete at least 20 credits in the first academic year with a GPA of 2.0 or higher, and the number of part-time entering students (47 to 69) who complete at least 10 credits in the first with academic semester with a GPA of 2.0 or higher by 5% per year.

2.5 Increase the number of students who reenroll in the Spring semester and persist until Fall (from 315 to 465) by 5% per year.

2.6 Increase the number of students (from 127 to 175) who receive degrees or certificates in the Annual Fiscal Year by 3-6%.

2.7 Increase the number of transfers to UH System and non-system baccalaureate institutions who achieve an average GPA of 3.14 by 5% per year.

2.8 Increase the diversity and number of programs offered to or in underserved regions by increasing the number and types of programs offered by at least one per two-year period.

2.9 Increase CCSS EE Active and Collaborative Learning Benchmark to 80% by 2015.
University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Outcome #3:

Economic Contribution
To contribute to the state’s economy and provide a solid return on its investment in higher education through research and training.

Community College System Action Outcomes
3.1 Increase UH Extramural Fund Support (E&E) by 3% per year

Windward Community College Action Outcomes
3.1 Expand and enhance WCC initiatives to secure private giving, major gifts, and extramural grants (from $2,093,351 to $2,651,796).

University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Outcome #4:

Global Competitive Workforce
Address critical workplace shortages and prepare students (undergraduate, graduate, and professional) for effective engagement and leadership in a global environment.

Community College System Action Outcomes
4.1 Increase by 3% per year the number of degrees awarded, and/or transfers to UH baccalaureate programs that lead to occupations where there is a demonstrated state shortage of qualified workers and where the average wage is at or above the U.S. average ($38,651 YR 2006).

4.2 Contribute to meeting the State’s incumbent worker goal by increasing enrollment of 25-49 year olds in credit programs by 3% per year.

4.3 Increase by 3% per year the number of degrees and certificates awarded in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) fields.

4.4 Increase by 3% per year the number of individuals enrolled in noncredit certificate programs that lead to occupations where there is a demonstrated state shortage of qualified workers and where the average wage is at or above the U.S. average ($38,681 YR 2006).

4.5 Increase International (F1) student enrollment by 3% per year.

4.6 Increase CCSSE Support for Learners Benchmark. Research shows that services that target, support, and assist students with academic and career planning, academic skill development, and other issues affect both learning and retention.

Windward Community College Action Outcomes
4.1 Contribute to the development of a high-skilled, high-wage workforce
through the establishment of at least one new specific, career-focused degree, certificate or career pathway per year that leads to employment in emerging fields (innovative, knowledge-intensive – DBEDT fields, including life sciences, health and wellness, information technology, film and digital media, alternative energy, ocean and marine science, earth and space sciences, astronomy, diversified agriculture, and dual-use (military/civilian) technology.

4.2 Establish 50 partnerships with employers to create internships and job placements, then increase 3% per year.

4.3 Expand the curriculum that prepares students for nursing, social work, information technology, and other critical workforce shortage areas by adding at least one new course per year.

4.4. Create internships and service learning opportunities in the community with successful completion by 180 students per year.

4.5 Promote the knowledge, skills, and opportunities that support current and emerging STEM fields and careers by increasing credit and noncredit STEM course enrollments by 3% per year.

4.6. Increase the number of degrees awarded, and/or transfers to UH baccalaureate programs that lead to occupations where there is a demonstrated state shortage of qualified workers and where the average wage is at or above the U.S. average ($38,651 YR 2006) by 3% per year.

4.7. Contribute to meeting the State’s incumbent worker goal by increasing enrollment of 25-49 year olds in credit programs by 3% per year.

4.8. Increase the number of degrees and certificates awarded in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) fields. (includes both credit and noncredit) by 3% per year.

4.9. Increase CCSSE Support for Learners Benchmark to 80% by 2015.

---

**University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Outcome #5:**

**Resources and Stewardship**

To acquire, allocate, and manage public and private revenue streams and exercise exemplary stewardship over all the University’s resources for a sustainable future.

**Community College System Action Outcomes**

5.1 Recruit, renew, and retain a qualified, effective, and diverse faculty, staff, and leadership.

5.2 Build and/or acquire appropriate facilities to deliver educational programs and services in underserved regions of the State, and identify repairs and maintenance requirements to properly maintain facilities.

5.3 Increase non-state revenue streams by 3-17% per year.
5.4 Promote sustainability by making more efficient use of existing resources.

5.5 Develop and sustain an institutional environment that promotes transparency, a culture of evidence that links institutional assessment, planning, resource acquisition, and resource allocation.

**Windward Community College Action Outcomes**

5.1 Increase the number of faculty and staff from underrepresented demographic groups within EEO parameters.

5.2 Develop and support professional development opportunities for all faculty and staff, and include professional development funding as a base budget line item equaling 1-5% of each division's personnel costs.

5.3 Build and open a new Library Learning Commons and initiate the design and construction of all new facilities called for in the College's CIP Master Plan.

5.4 Renovate, repair, and maintain all College facilities to meet or surpass established standards for health and safety, handicapped access, energy-efficient climate control and lighting, functionality, and aesthetics.

5.5 Based on data submitted in the Annual Assessments/Program Reviews, equip all personnel and college facilities with appropriate technologies and tools for effective communication, teaching, learning, and other professional work and scholarly activities.

5.6 Increase non-state revenues by 3-10% per year (from $5,221,178 to $8,261,465).

5.7 Refine, document, and annually assess College governance structures, policies, and procedures to ensure appropriate participation, input, and effectiveness.

5.8 Expand and enhance institutional research data collection and analysis for measuring student success, course and program outcomes, and institutional effectiveness.
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Windward Community College

A Recommendation for the Recommendation:
Achieving Excellence Through Standard IV.A

Letter and Report from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), January 21, 2008: Recommendation 5:

The team recommends, to ensure appropriate participation and input, that the college refine its current governance structure policies by including written definition of the roles and responsibilities for all constituent groups and formalize processes and structures for clear, effective communication and reporting relationships. In addition, the college should implement an annual evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of leaders and decision-making which leads to institutional improvements (p. 1).

Three Recommendations for Recommendation 5

Recommendation 5 needs to be understood as three equally important parts: First, WCC needs to develop an annual evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of its leadership and decision-making structures. Second, the college needs to identify one group as the monitor of the evaluation process, with the responsibility of widely communicating the results of the study to the campus community, and then using the results to make suggestions for improvement. Finally, the college needs to act upon these suggestions to implement needed institutional improvements. By incorporating all three parts into an annual evaluation process, the college can be sure that it will satisfy Recommendation 5—and, in doing so, promote continuous improvements for the institution.
Part I: Assessing the Effectiveness of Leadership and Decision-Making Structures

Understanding Recommendation 5

Recommendation 5 is based on the assertion that WCC has not met the evaluation component of the college’s governance and decision-making structures, as specified in Standard IV.A\(^1\). This is indicated in the October 2006 Evaluation Report, that the college does not yet have “...a defined systematic evaluation process in place to determine whether the structure effectively informs college decision-making, improves lines of communication, or contributes to institutional effectiveness” (Sheehan, 2006, p. 39). WCC has attempted to address this recommendation; however, the conclusion of the November 2007 Progress Report states: “The college has refined its governance structure and policies, but the evaluation component of this recommendation still needs to be completed. The college needs to determine whether the structures and policies developed and implemented are effective and lead to institutional improvement over time”(Amador & Perri, 2007, p. 9). Thus, in order for WCC to satisfy Recommendation 5 and promote continuous improvements for the college, a systematic process needs to be developed to evaluate the effectiveness of its leadership and decision-making structures. First, however, it is important to examine what WCC has already done, and why ACCJC has considered it deficient.

Previous Responses from WCC to ACCJC

In its 2006 Self-Study, WCC used both the 360 Assessment evaluation and a faculty/staff perception survey as ways to evaluate its institution’s leadership and governance. The 360 assessment is a web-based evaluation tool consisting of a few fixed-response questions and one open-ended question, sent to particular faculty and staff who

\(^1\) Please see Appendix A for a copy of Standard IV.A.
are governed by a specific administrator. The problem, however, is with the confidential nature of these evaluations. According to the Progress Report Visit of November 13, 2007, "The System does have in place a ‘360 degree performance assessment’ for executive leadership, but since these are personnel evaluations they are not shared publicly" (Amador & Perri, 2007, p. 9). Because a critical part of Standard IV.A.5 is not only evaluating governance and decision-making structures and processes, but also widely communicating the results of these evaluations to the entire college community, the 360 evaluations were not enough to meet the Standard.

The Faculty and Staff Institutional Survey was another method used by the college to assess leadership and governance. One of the objectives of this survey was to measure faculty and staff’s perception of the institution’s leadership and decision-making structures. Unlike the 360 assessments, all faculty and staff had the opportunity to participate in the survey, and the results were posted on the college’s website, as well as included in WCC’s 2006 Self-Study (Windward Community College Faculty Institutional Survey, 2005). Even so, the Evaluating Team did not believe that the survey was sufficient to assess the governance structure and processes. Their assertion was based primarily on the timing the survey was administered, as well as on WCC’s lack of planning regarding how the results would be utilized. According to the 2006 Evaluation Report, “The college used a perception survey to evaluate the role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structure and processes…the survey was administered at the same time the new governance structure was being implemented, so the results cannot be an evaluation of the new structure” (Sheehan, 2006, p. 40-41). Moreover, the Evaluating Team did not find evidence that the survey results would be used as a means of institutional
improvement, which is a critical part of assessing governance (Standard IV.A.5). The 2006 Evaluation Report states, “The self-study report does not indicate any systematic policy with time-lines to determine its effectiveness in governance” (Sheehan, 2006, p. 41). Along with the problems discussed in the Team’s Evaluation Report, it should also be noted that WCC’s survey questions only addressed part of Standard IV.A; the questions themselves were only loosely aligned with the Standard; and the questions were extremely broad. Here, questions such as “Overall effectiveness of college committees,” for example, are so general, that they do not tend to produce useful data. In order to find a more effective way of evaluating the college’s governance structure and processes, it is important first to consider how other colleges have met Standard IV.A.5.

What Other Colleges Have Done

All of the colleges found that satisfied Standard IV.A.5 conducted some form of perception survey (Cabrillo College Accreditation Survey, 2003; Cuyamaca College Faculty Accreditation Survey, 2003; Grossmont College Accreditation Surveys, 2006; Skyline College Employee Voice Survey, 2006). Like WCC’s, their surveys were inclusive, attempting to measure several other Standards beyond merely the Standard related to leadership and governance. The difference, however, is that compared to WCC, other college’s questions that did measure perceptions of leadership and governance were better aligned with Standard IV.A, and some even measured leadership and governance at the level of individual units, departments, and committees within the college (e.g., within Academic Services, the Humanities department, and the Budget Committee, to name a few). In addition, other colleges utilized their survey results to help them make changes in their governance structures and processes. Clearly, there is potential in assessing
governance and decision-making structures and processes through perception surveys, as long as the surveys are aligned with the Standard, measure all parts of the institution’s governance structure, and are used as a means for institutional improvement.

**The Importance of Operationalizing Standard IV.A**

In order to develop a valid survey, the questions need to align with Standard IV.A’s four themes: (a) *encouraging initiatives*; (b) *systematic participative processes*; (c) *assessment/evaluation*; and (d) *institutional improvement*. The first theme, *encouraging initiatives*, establishes the importance of faculty, staff, administrators, and students to feel encouraged by the institutional leaders to take initiative and bring forth their ideas. Here, it is important that everyone, no matter what their official titles, feel inspired to improve the practices, programs, and services in the institution. Once an idea has been introduced, the next theme of the Standard, *systematic participative processes*, indicates that there should be written policies that assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation of these ideas. Here, the Standard emphasizes the need for clearly defined roles in the decision-making process, as well as how to communicate throughout the process effectively. The third theme, *assessment/evaluation*, represents the importance of the college’s own self-assessment, to determine the level of effectiveness of the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes. An important part of this theme is effectively communicating the results of the assessment to the college community. The last theme, *institutional improvement*, focuses on how well the college utilizes the assessment and

---

2 These four themes are also aligned with the qualities of the best governance practice, as discussed in *Leadership and Governance: Creating Conditions for Successful Decision Making in the Community College*, by Thomas Fryer Jr. and John Lovas, leading scholars in the field of leadership and governance in community colleges. Thomas Fryer Jr. is also a former chairperson of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC), among other noteworthy positions.
evaluation results as a basis for improving the institution. Indeed, these third and fourth themes, *assessment/evaluation* and *institutional improvement*, are the central focus of Recommendation 5. The Recommendation states "...the college should implement an annual evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of leaders and decision-making which leads to institutional improvements" (ACCJC, 2008, p. 1). In order to measure WCC’s effectiveness of its governance structures and processes as described in Standard IV.A, I have created survey questions that directly align with each of the four themes. These survey questions are part of a pilot study I am proposing to the college, both as a means to encourage institutional improvement, as well as a way to satisfy Recommendation 5\(^3\).\(^4\).

**The Importance of Measuring All Parts and All Viewpoints in a Survey**

In addition to aligning the questions with the Standard, the data generated from a perception survey is only meaningful if it measures all parts of the governance structure, as opposed to one general survey that lumps all of the units, departments, and committees into one category. Thus, the survey needs to allow people to respond based on different contexts—i.e., a faculty member who teaches political science would take a survey for the Social Science department, as well as for the various committees to which they belong—same questions, different context. Moreover, in measuring constituent satisfaction of governance structures and processes, it is clear that all people’s views are important. Not only is it essential to ask committee members, for example, about whether they feel encouraged to bring forth ideas to the group, but non-committee members as well. The college’s course offerings can only grow and expand, for instance, if faculty feel

---

\(^3\) Please see Appendix B for table showing how all of the survey questions align with each theme of Standard IV.A, as well as how they align with the qualities of best governance practice, according to Fryer and Lovas.

\(^4\) Please see Appendix C for the 2008 Faculty/Staff Pilot Survey.
encouraged to submit courses through the Curriculum Committee. Certainly, this is a critical part of the Standard. The Standard states, “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” (ACCJC, 2002, p. 22). Thus, the only way to measure this part of the Standard is to ask the perception of all members of the college community, not simply those involved in that particular part of the structure. This process of measuring the particular parts of the college, along with the various viewpoints, will not only provide data that is more meaningful, but also a more thorough understanding of the entire governance structure. In this way, the college can better utilize the results for institutional improvements.

The Importance of Assessing Institutional Goals

Finally, assessing the outcomes of the college’s institutional goals is another indication of the effectiveness of its governance structures and processes. The October 2006 Evaluation Report states: “To evaluate the effectiveness of its governance structure and processes, the college needs to focus on the outcomes of its institutional goals achieved versus relying on perception of effectiveness and then make the appropriate changes for improvement” (Sheehan, 2006, p. 42). The Strategic Plan’s Action Outcomes, for example, clearly specify what the college intends to do from now through 2015, which is directly connected to larger system goals. Although making goals is a central part of governance and decision-making, however, it is certainly not enough—though this seems to be the most popular part of planning processes. According to Thomas Fryer Jr. and

\footnote{The information is based on the most current draft of Windward’s Strategic Plan, as of May 2008.}
John Lovas (1991), "Our observation suggests that even colleges with reasonably effective governance arrangements are more conscious of the processes of planning and deciding than the processes of implementing and evaluating" (p. 91). Certainly, once the college has created goals, it is imperative that it revisit those goals each year—as the college has done previously with the Strategic Plan Updates—and take note of what has and has not been accomplished to its satisfaction (*Windward Community College Strategic Plan - 2007 Update*, 2007). Certainly, the extent to which the college meets those goals could provide some preliminary information on the effectiveness of the college’s governance structures and processes. For example, the UH System Strategic Outcome #2: Hawaii’s Educational Capital, is “To increase the educational capital of the state by increasing the participation and completion of students, particularly Native Hawaiian, low-income students, and those from underserved areas” (*Windward Community College Strategic Plan - Draft*, 2008). In response, one of Windward’s Action Outcomes is to increase enrollment to 1962 students by 2015, particularly in regions and with groups who are underrepresented (Action Outcome 2.1). At the end of the year, this Action Outcome will need to be updated and assessed. Was there an increase in enrollment amongst underrepresented groups, and does that increase reach the level of satisfaction? In order to assess each of the Action Outcomes, the Strategic Planning Committee will need to be clear about which particular groups are responsible for each of the Outcomes, for further investigation. First, however, the college needs to identify a group who will monitor the evaluation process and make recommendations for institutional improvements.
Part II: The Job of Monitoring and Communicating Results with Suggestions for Improvement

Potential Campus Monitoring Groups

The second recommendation put forth in this paper to both satisfy Recommendation 5 and promote continuous improvements for the college is to identify one group as the monitor of the evaluation process, with the responsibility of widely communicating the results of the study to the campus community as well as providing suggestions for improvement. In the conclusion of the November 2007 Progress Report Visit document, the Team states that, “The college needs to determine whether the structures and policies developed and implemented are effective and lead to institutional improvement over time. Also, one group needs to be identified as the monitor of the evaluation process which has the responsibility to make recommendations based on what is learned from that evaluation” (Amador & Perri, 2007, p. 9). Indeed, institutional assessment of the effectiveness of leaders and decision-making requires a team of people whose job it is, for instance, to refine and properly administer the survey instruments each year, gather and analyze the data, and put the data into some meaningful format to facilitate communication and suggestions for improvement. It is a process that is necessary, both to satisfy the Recommendation of ACCJC, and also for continued institutional improvement.

Windward has three groups who could potentially be part of this important assessment process⁶. First, the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) is one such group. From the college’s website: “Established in Fall 2004, the Windward Community College Office of Institutional Research supports faculty and staff in reporting the institutional

---

⁶ These are just the overall suggestions; which of these groups that could be in charge of gathering the data and which could be in charge of the survey instrument, communicating the results, and offering suggestions for improvement could be decided at a later date.
information of the College. It also presents this information to students and prospective students for their decision-making regarding the College” (Windward Community College: Institutional Research, 2008, para 1). Second, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) could also play a central role in assessing the college’s governance structure and processes. The IEC’s charge, as posted on the WCC website, is “To plan and oversee an institutional schedule to ensure a systematic, comprehensive, and on-going assessment of the credit programs, non-credit programs, and other units identified in the Program Review Policy. To develop and sustain a culture of assessment throughout the institution. To provide the necessary training and skills for units to assess themselves” (Windward Community College: Institutional Effectiveness, 2008, para 9). Third, the college employs a Director of Planning and Program Evaluation who could also be involved in this process. The Director of Planning and Program Evaluation’s job is to “Coordinate the program review process for all vocational and academic programs, non-credit programs, and support programs; convene the Strategic Planning Committee, assuring that planning processes are taking place, are on schedule, and are widely communicated. Convene the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, supporting and facilitating assessment and student learning outcome processes” (A. Meixell, personal communication, December 3, 2007). Here, the Director of Planning and Program Evaluation is the Chair of the IEC, which would help facilitate the assessment process. As for evaluating the Outcomes of the Strategic Plan, the Director of Planning and Program Evaluation is also the convener of the Strategic Planning Committee—the committee in charge of updating the Strategic Plan each year. Having the people in place to conduct these types of assessments may be critical, especially in terms of satisfying the requests of ACCJC. In the conclusion of the October 2006 Evaluation
Report, the Team writes, “The college might benefit by reducing the number of committees and councils and focusing on an institutional perspective of what is to be accomplished and how it will be accomplished versus creating more groups to handle facets/functions without first determining relationships among the various groups” (Sheehan, 2006, p. 42). Along with identifying the evaluating group, measurable performance indicators need to be established.

**Establishing Measurable Performance Indicators for Both Survey Questions and Strategic Plan Action Outcomes**

In order to measure the effectiveness of its governance structures and processes, Windward must first identify some measurable performance indicators for each of the survey questions. In this way, the college can be clear about the specific goals it is attempting to reach, and know how successful it is in achieving those goals. For example, one of the possible questions for the theme of *encourage initiatives* may be “I am encouraged to bring forth ideas to this department/unit/committee.” If 60% of the faculty and staff surveyed fall into the “strongly agree” and “agree” categories, does that meet the college’s level of satisfaction? The college will need to decide what is acceptable prior to giving the survey, so that the evaluating group can better assess and communicate the results. This is also true when looking at the Action Outcomes of the Strategic Plan. One of the Action Outcomes for the System Strategic Plan Outcome #2, for example, is to increase the number of students who reenroll in the Spring semester and persist until Fall (465) by 5% per year (*Windward Community College Strategic Plan - Draft, 2008*). What if, in doing an annual assessment of this particular Action Outcome, the college finds that there was a 2% increase? Would this be satisfactory? Moreover, some of the Action
Outcomes set forth in the Strategic Plan have benchmarks of 2015. In these cases, how will the college know that progress is being made after one year? For instance, one of the Action Outcomes for System Strategic Plan #1 is to promote low-income Native Hawaiian Success and graduation by increasing Pell Grant participation to 223 by 2015 to equal approximately $122,488 (Windward Community College Strategic Plan - Draft, 2008). Here, progress may be challenging to assess after just one year—although with some forethought, it is possible to create an annual goal.

**Communicating Results to the Campus Community**

Setting measurable performance indicators will also facilitate the evaluating group’s ability to communicate the results and offer suggestions for any improvement. To satisfy Recommendation 5 and promote improvements for the college, the evaluating group needs to communicate the results of the study to the entire campus community. Clearly, this is a main objective of Standard IV.A.5. According to the Standard, “The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement” (ACCJC, 2002, p. 23). According to Fryer and Lovas (1991), “As part of its system of internal governance, every community college must establish regular structures and processes for communication...a regular, predictable, well-understood communication structure is essential to create a sense of trust and credibility among members of the organization” (p. 124). The authors argue that when a message is important enough that it must reach all parts of the organization, it should be presented in print, in speech, and electronically. The group in charge of assessing governance and decision-making structures and processes at
WCC needs to find multiple channels with which to communicate the results of the surveys and the outcomes of its institutional goals. One suggestion would be for the evaluating group to post the survey results and the Strategic Plan updates on the college’s website, with links to the reports emailed to all faculty and staff, allowing time for the college community to see the results and offer possible suggestions for improvement. This process would be similar to what the college did with the Strategic Plan in spring of 2008, where it was posted on the college’s website, and faculty and staff were allowed to comment on the various parts of the Plan. The evaluating group could then use the information on the web to help them make suggestions for improvement. All of the data from the surveys as well as the updates of the Strategic Plan could also be available in print format, as well as more complete reports available for review in the Dean’s Office. This process of sharing the results from the surveys and the Strategic Plan updates could become institutionalized, so that the survey is simply something that all faculty and staff participate in, possibly towards the conclusion of the spring semester, with the knowledge that the data will be used for the improvement of the college. For all parts of the structure, seeing those results and being aware of any deficiencies would allow the college to make new goals for progress in those areas. To be sure, only when the entire campus community is informed can decisions for improvement be made.

**Communicating Results and Suggestions to Units/Departments/Committees**

Once the college community has the opportunity to see and comment on the results of the various surveys along with the updates to the Strategic Plan Outcomes, the evaluating group would assemble the information into reports for the various units,

---

7 Please see Appendix D for a possible time-line for administering the pilot survey.
departments, and committees. For all of the survey questions and Strategic Outcomes that fall below some certain standard, the evaluating group could investigate the data further, outline a few suggestions for improvement, and report its findings to the particular groups\textsuperscript{8}. For instance, the faculty/staff perception survey results for the Master Plan and Space Utilization Committee may identify a weakness in the part of Standard IV.A that stresses the importance of having \textit{systematic participative processes} (IV.A.2), where 75\% of the respondents "disagree" that the college has established a written policy regarding how to bring forth ideas to that particular committee. Upon closer inspection, the poor satisfaction rating may be a result of certain faculty or staff members not knowing how to ask for more office space because there are no established procedures. Once the lack of policy is uncovered in the perception survey, those results can be communicated to that particular committee, along with possible suggestions for improvement; ultimately, in this case, a policy can be implemented.

As for the Strategic Outcomes, it could first be the Strategic Planning Committee's charge to communicate to the evaluating group the Outcomes that have and have not been accomplished. Here, the Strategic Planning Committee could compile a list for the evaluating group of the various units, departments, and committees responsible for each of the outcomes, so that, along with the results of the perception surveys, the evaluating group could convey the information in a report to those responsible parties\textsuperscript{9}. For the units, departments, and committees responsible for the particular Strategic Plan outcomes that have not been met to satisfaction, those results could be highlighted. For example,

\textsuperscript{8} Because the assessments will be done annually, it would only be necessary for the evaluating group to offer a few suggestions in each report.

\textsuperscript{9} The fact that the Director of Planning and Program Evaluation also convenes the Strategic Planning Committee could help facilitate this process.
Strategic Outcome 2.5 proclaims a goal of increasing the number of students who reenroll in the Spring semester and persist until Fall (465) by 5% per year (Windward Community College Strategic Plan - Draft, 2008). If after an annual assessment WCC finds an increase of only 1%, and if that 1% falls below the previously set performance indicator, the Strategic Planning Committee would need to indicate the various groups responsible for that Outcome, such as Admissions and Records, Student Services, and The Learning Center, for example, and forward that information to the evaluating group, so that one main group will be the disseminators of the data.

The evaluating group would then couple Outcome information with the survey results, make a few suggestions for improvement, and communicate those recommendations to the specific groups. Placing an Outcome in the context of a low satisfaction survey score may shed light as to possible reasons why the Outcome was not met. It may be possible to determine whether certain Outcomes are not being met in part due to problems in the governance structures and processes of the groups whose job it is to help reach those Outcomes. Here, it may be the case that the roles were not specified in one or more of those groups, where the members were not adequately informed of what, exactly, they were suppose to do in order to achieve this Outcome (IV.A.2). In this way, the roles can be more clearly delineated so that the college can more easily reach this Outcome. Whatever the case, the units/departments/committees responsible for each of the Outcomes need to be made aware of any deficiencies to allow them the opportunity to explore further and make any necessary improvements.
Part III: Implementing Institutional Improvements

A Possible Model of Implementation for WCC

Assessments of the college's leadership and decision-making structures provide opportunities for self-reflection, and ultimately for change. Indeed, conducting surveys and assessing the outcomes of the college's institutional goals is fruitless unless the information is used for the betterment of the school. Grossmont College in California, who was reaffirmed accreditation on the basis of a comprehensive evaluation in 2008, for example, sends the results of its faculty and staff perception surveys back to the committees and councils for implementations. According to their 2007 Self-Study, weaknesses identified by their evaluating committee are directed to the committees and councils, with a specific recommendation for improvement (Grossmont Community College Self-Study Report, 2007). The committee/council is charged with reporting back to the evaluating committee with how the recommendation was implemented. After time for consideration of any suggested ideas, these committees act to realize the improvements. Windward could follow suit. Once the results of the surveys are gathered and shared with the college community, the evaluating group could disseminate the reports to the various departments/units/committees, with a few suggestions for improvements. That particular department, for instance, could then report back to the evaluating group with how the recommendation was implemented. The department could also incorporate a brief discussion of those improvements into their annual report. For example, if the evaluating group's report to the Social Science Department indicates that the department is lacking a formalized procedure for making decisions, the Social Science Department could use that information to improve and ultimately become a stronger department. Here, the
department could respond by simply creating an on-line departmental policy page, which
would include the policies and procedures associated with bringing forth ideas, making
decisions, planning, and implementing, to name a few. The department could then report
back to the evaluating group as to how the department responded to the recommendations
for improvement. The department could also include a brief discussion of these changes in
their annual report. Because the survey will be part of an annual evaluation process, the
department could then be sure that the next assessment would show improvements. In this
way, all departments, units, and committees will have the opportunity to assess their
governance structures and processes, so that there is a continuous strive to be better.

The Strategic Plan’s Action Outcomes could be looked upon the same way. The
groups responsible for the particular Outcomes that show little success would have the
opportunity to reflect upon what was done during the past year, and what could be done
differently in order to meet the Outcome. The responsible groups could include these ideas
in a response to the evaluating group, as well as in their annual report. For example,
Action Outcome 4.2 states the goal of establishing 50 partnerships with employers to create
internships and job placements, and then increase that number by 3% per year (Windward
Community College Strategic Plan - Draft, 2008). When it does its annual update, the
Strategic Planning Committee may find that the number only increased by 1%, lower than
the previously set performance indicator. The evaluating group would be aware of this
deficiency, as the Strategic Planning Committee would have already conveyed this
information to them, so that the evaluating group could inform the Director of ETC, the
Service Learning Program, the Chancellor, and any Departments that have internships in
credit programs, for example, of this deficiency. Once these groups are made aware of the
problem, they could decide what to do to make it better, with possible recommendations from the evaluating group. It is possible that the problem itself lies with the governance structures and processes of some of those groups; in that case, the perception survey may highlight the problem. Whatever the case, those groups need to decide how they are going to respond in order to reach the Outcome, and their responses needs to be formalized, implemented, and communicated back to the evaluating group. In this way, the college can be better equipped to reach its institutional goals.

Assessing Governance Structures and Processes: Final Thoughts

Recommendation 5 has given Windward Community College the opportunity to reexamine how it assesses its governance and decision-making processes in order to improve its institutional effectiveness. In this report, three recommendations are made that will not only satisfy Recommendation 5, but will also promote a culture of self-reflection and evidence that is essential for WCC's continual growth. First, all governance assessments, such as perception surveys and updates to the Strategic Plan Outcomes, must be aligned with Standard IV.A, and these assessments need to measure all parts of the governance structure. Second, the college needs to designate an evaluation group that establishes performance indicators and then monitors and communicates the assessment results, providing suggestions to the various governance structures for improvement. Finally, these governance bodies need to reflect upon the suggestions and then implement any necessary changes to improve the governance structure's effectiveness. In this way, all of the committees, units, and departments will continually develop and improve, and the college will more easily achieve its institutional goals. This rigor, consistency, and commitment is precisely what we expect from the assessments of our students and our
faculty, and we must approach the assessment of our governance structures and processes with this same dedication.
Appendix A

Standard IV.A

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

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.

2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

   a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

   b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.
3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.
# Appendix B

## Standard IV.A Themes Aligned with Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMES</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>Fryer Text</th>
<th>SURVEY QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **I. ENCOURAGE INITIATIVES** | 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. IV.A.1. | “openness”, “fairness”, “personal commitment” | **FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**  
  - I am encouraged to bring forth ideas to this department/unit/committee.  
  - I have opportunities to bring forth ideas in this department/unit/committee.  
  - My ideas are being heard in this department/unit/committee.  
  - My ideas are valued in this department/unit/committee.  
  - My needs are being heard in this department/unit/committee.  
  - My needs are valued in this department/unit/committee.  
  - I have opportunities to participate in decision-making in this department/unit/committee.  
  - I am encouraged by the leader of this department/unit/committee to take the initiative to improve this department/unit/committee.  

| **II. SYSTEMATIC PARTICIPATIVE PROCESSES** | When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation. IV.A.1. |                                                   | **FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**  
  - There is a procedure used for making decisions in this department/unit/committee.  
  - If there is a procedure used for making decisions, the procedure is used to assure effective discussions in this department/unit/committee.  
  - If there is a procedure used for making decisions, the procedure is used to assure effective planning in this department/unit/committee.  
  - If there is a procedure used for making decisions, the procedure is used to assure effective implementation of ideas in this department/unit/committee.  
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| 1. WRITTEN POLICIES | 2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. IV.A.2. | "clarity" | FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:  
- The College has established a written policy regarding participation in decision-making processes in this department/unit/committee.  
- The College has implemented a written policy regarding participation in decision-making processes in this department/unit/committee.  
- "clarity", "caring", "hard work", "good times"  
  Ch 3: Planning  
| a. PROCESSES | The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies. IV.A.2 | FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:  
- If there is a policy for participation and decision-making, it specifies how to bring forth ideas in this department/unit/committee.  
- If there is a policy for participation and decision-making, it specifies how to work together on planning in this department/unit/committee.  
- I understand the procedures associated with bringing forth ideas in this department/unit/committee.  
- I understand the procedures associated with working together on planning in this department/unit/committee.  
| b. ROLES | a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions. IV.A.2.a | FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:  
- The leadership roles are clearly defined in this department/unit/committee.  
- Faculty play an important role in the governance of this department/unit/committee.  
- Administrators play an important role in the governance of this department/unit/committee.  
- Faculty exercise a substantial voice in the planning of this department/unit/committee.  
- Administrators exercise a substantial voice in the planning of this department/unit/committee.  
- Faculty exercise a substantial voice in the budget of this department/unit/committee.  
- Administrators exercise a substantial voice in the budget of this department/unit/committee. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>3. COMMUNICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services. IV.A.2.b.</td>
<td>Ch 4: Deciding</td>
<td>“trust” Ch 7: Communication (Redundancy, Multiple channels, clarity, credibility)</td>
<td>FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- For recommendations about student learning programs and services, the college relies upon this department/unit/committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- For recommendations about student learning programs and services, recommendations are offered by this department/unit/committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There are established mechanisms for students to provide input into the decisions of this department/unit/committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Meetings occur on a regular basis for this department/unit/committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There are established mechanisms for staff to provide input into the decisions of this department/unit/committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- The agendas for the meetings are distributed prior to the meetings in this department/unit/committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Minutes are circulated after the meetings in this department/unit/committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I know whom to talk with about new ideas or issues that I may have in this department/unit/committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I am free to communicate my ideas to the advisor of this particular department/unit/committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I am free to communicate my ideas in this department/unit/committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I receive information in a timely manner from the supervisor/designated person of this department/unit/committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- This department/unit/committee works together for the good of the institution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| III. ASSESSMENT / EVALUATION | The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. IV.A.5. | “competence” “stability,” Ch 5: Acting | FOR NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS:  
• I know whom to talk with about new ideas or issues that I may have in this committee.  
• I am free to communicate my ideas to the advisor of this committee.  
• I am free to communicate my ideas in this committee.  
FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:  
• There is a regular evaluation to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of this department/unit/committee.  
• There is a regular evaluation to ensure integrity and effectiveness of the supervisor of this department/unit/committee.  

| 1. COMMUNICATION OF RESULTS | The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations. IV.A.5. | Ch 7: Communication | FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:  
• The results are widely communicated to the college community if/when there is an evaluation of this department/unit/committee.  
• The results are widely communicated to the college community if/when there is an evaluation of the supervisor of this department/unit/committee.  
FOR NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS:  
• The results are widely communicated to the college community if/when there is an evaluation of this committee.  
• The results are widely communicated to the college community if/when there is an evaluation of the supervisor of this committee.  

| IV. IMPROVEMENT | ...and uses them as the basis for improvement. IV.A.5. | FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:  
• The results of the evaluation are used as a basis for institutional improvement if/when there is an evaluation of this department/unit/committee.  
• The results of the evaluation are used as a basis for institutional improvement if/when there is an evaluation of the supervisor of this department/unit/committee.  
FOR NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS:  
• The results of the evaluation are used as a basis for institutional improvement if/when there is an evaluation of this committee.  
• The results of the evaluation are used as a basis for institutional improvement if/when there is an evaluation of the supervisor of this committee. |
Appendix C

2008 Faculty/Staff Pilot Survey

2008 Faculty and Staff Pilot Survey of Governance Structures and Processes

Below is the general format and questions for the faculty and staff pilot survey. All departments, units, and committees will complete the same survey, since the same Standard applies to all governance structures and processes in the college, no matter who they are. The “Survey Code” will be used to indicate which particular survey the employee is submitting (since all surveys look the same), so that all surveys for the Budget Committee will have the same number, and then surveys for the Math/Business Department will have a different number, etc. The “I.D. Code” is a non-identifiable number that each person will be assigned, a number that they will use for each of the surveys they complete.

In terms of committee surveys, there will be a second survey version for non-committee members, because the Standard needs to measure their responses, too. Therefore, there will be two versions of the survey: 1) for all departments, units, and committees, and 2) for all non-committee members. In addition, the survey will include demographic questions that are not included here.
Survey Code ____________
I.D. Code ________________

Please indicate the extent of your agreement on each of the following statements. You may mark "Not Applicable" for those items that do not apply to you or to the particular situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Encourage Initiatives

1. I am encouraged to bring forth ideas to this department/unit/committee.

2. I have opportunities to bring forth ideas in this department/unit/committee.

3. My ideas are being heard in this department/unit/committee.

4. My ideas are valued in this department/unit/committee.

5. My needs are being heard in this department/unit/committee.

6. My needs are valued in this department/unit/committee.

7. I have opportunities to participate in decision-making in this department/unit/committee.
8. I am encouraged by the leader of this department/unit/committee to take the initiative to improve this department/unit/committee.

9. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

**Systematic Participative Processes**

10. There is a procedure used for making decisions in this department/unit/committee.

11. If there is a procedure used for making decisions, the procedure is used to assure effective discussions in this department/unit/committee.

12. If there is a procedure used for making decisions, the procedure is used to assure effective planning in this department/unit/committee.

13. If there is a procedure used for making decisions, the procedure is used to assure effective implementation of ideas in this department/unit/committee.

14. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

**Written Policies**

15. The College has established a written policy regarding participation in decision-making processes in this department/unit/committee.

16. The College has implemented a written policy regarding participation in decision-making processes in this department/unit/committee.

17. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.
Process

18. If there is a policy for participation and decision-making, it specifies how to bring forth ideas in this department/unit/committee.

19. If there is a policy for participation and decision-making, it specifies how to work together on planning in this department/unit/committee.

20. I understand the procedures associated with bringing forth ideas in this department/unit/committee.

21. I understand the procedures associated with working together on planning in this department/unit/committee.

22. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

Roles

23. The leadership roles are clearly defined in this department/unit/committee.

24. Faculty play an important role in the governance of this department/unit/committee.

25. Administrators play an important role in the governance of this department/unit/committee.

26. Faculty exercise a substantial voice in the planning of this department/unit/committee.

27. Administrators exercise a substantial voice in the planning of this department/unit/committee.
28. Faculty exercise a substantial voice in the budget of this department/unit/committee.

29. Administrators exercise a substantial voice in the budget of this department/unit/committee.

30. There are established mechanisms for students to provide input into the decisions of this department/unit/committee.

31. There are established mechanisms for staff to provide input into the decisions of this department/unit/committee.

32. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

**Recommendations**

33. For recommendations about student learning programs and services, the college relies upon this department/unit/committee.

34. For recommendations about student learning programs and services, recommendations are offered by this department/unit/committee.

35. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

**Communication**

36. Meetings occur on a regular basis for this department/unit/committee.

37. The agendas for the meetings are distributed prior to the meetings in this department/unit/committee.
38. Minutes are circulated after the meetings in this department/unit/committee.

39. I know whom to talk with about new ideas or issues that I may have in this department/unit/committee.

40. I am free to communicate my ideas to the advisor of this department/unit/committee.

41. I am free to communicate my ideas in this department/unit/committee.

42. I receive information in a timely manner from the supervisor/designated person of this department/unit/committee.

43. This department/unit/committee works together for the good of the institution.

44. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

**Assessment / Evaluation**

45. There is a regular evaluation to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of this department/unit/committee.

46. There is a regular evaluation to ensure integrity and effectiveness of the supervisor of this department/unit/committee.

47. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.
Communication of Results

48. The results are widely communicated to the college community if/when there is an evaluation of this department/unit/committee.

49. The results are widely communicated to the college community if/when there is an evaluation of the supervisor of this department/unit/committee.

50. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

Improvement

51. The results of the evaluation are used as a basis for institutional improvement if/when there is an evaluation of this department/unit/committee.

52. The results of the evaluation are used as a basis for institutional improvement if/when there is an evaluation of the supervisor of this department/unit/committee.

53. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY
Survey Code ______________
I.D. Code ______________

Please indicate the extent of your agreement on each of the following statements. You may mark "Not Applicable" for those items that do not apply to you or to the particular situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Encourage Initiatives**

1. I am encouraged to bring forth ideas to this committee.

2. I have opportunities to bring forth ideas in this committee.

3. My ideas are being heard in this committee.

4. My ideas are valued in this committee.

5. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

**Process**

6. I understand the procedures associated with bringing forth ideas in this committee.
7. I understand the procedures associated with working together on planning in this committee.

8. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

**Roles**

9. There are established mechanisms for students to provide input into the decisions of this committee.

10. There are established mechanisms for staff to provide input into the decisions of this committee.

11. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

**Communication**

12. I know whom to talk with about new ideas or issues that I may have in this committee.

13. I am free to communicate my ideas to the advisor of this committee.

14. I am free to communicate my ideas in this committee.

15. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.
Assessment / Evaluation

16. There is a regular evaluation to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of this committee.

17. There is a regular evaluation to ensure integrity and effectiveness of the supervisor of this committee.

18. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

Communication of Results

19. The results are widely communicated to the college community if/when there is an evaluation of this committee.

20. The results are widely communicated to the college community if/when there is an evaluation of the supervisor of this committee.

21. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

Improvement

22. The results of the evaluation are used as a basis for institutional improvement if/when there is an evaluation of this committee.

23. The results of the evaluation are used as a basis for institutional improvement if/when there is an evaluation of the supervisor of this committee.

24. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the section above, please do so in the box below.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY
Appendix D

Timeline for 2008 Faculty/Staff Pilot Survey

September
• A draft of the survey will be available on the college website for comments.

October
• The survey will be finalized and then open on-line for two or three weeks for employees to complete.

November-December
• The data will be summarized and made available on the college website.
• The college could also comment on the deficiencies and offer suggestions to the various units/departments/committees; then the evaluating group could just step in at the end, take the suggestions, and make their reports to the units/departments/committees. These reports should be limited to just a few suggestions, as this assessment will be done annually.

January
• Units/departments/committees will meet to discuss the surveys and comments, considering potential changes to budget, strategic plan requests, etc.

April-May
• Units/departments/committees will discuss any changes they implemented as a response to the data and comments.
• The monitoring group will consider any changes to the survey instrument for next time.
• Units/departments/committees will include a brief discussion of the changes they implemented in their annual reports.
References
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**Member Survey Questions about the Leader of Administrative Services**
(to be answered by members of Administrative Services and its units only)

Administrative Services includes the Business Office, Human Resources, Institutional Computing and Data Processing, and Operations and Maintenance.

Director Clifford Togo is the leader of Administrative Services.

The leader of this office ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 (strongly disagree)</th>
<th>2 (somewhat disagree)</th>
<th>3 (neutral)</th>
<th>4 (somewhat agree)</th>
<th>5 (strongly agree)</th>
<th>(don't know)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>encourages me to bring forth ideas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides opportunities for me to bring forth ideas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is receptive to my ideas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values my ideas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspires confidence in others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspires others to achieve excellence.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is willing to pursue new and innovative directions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports faculty, staff, and students to work effectively as a team to accomplish the mission, goals and projects of the College.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishes effective working relationships with relevant committees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintains effective working relationships with relevant committees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports staff development for faculty and staff to improve and become more successful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responds to my questions in timely manner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disseminates information in a timely manner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
takes initiative to prepare the College for future success.

1 2 3 4 5

monitors progress toward planned mission, goals, and objectives.

1 2 3 4 5

recognizes when a decision is required and acts effectively and expeditiously.

1 2 3 4 5

2 If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the leader of Administrative Services, please do so in the box below.

Member Survey Questions about the Office of Administrative Services
(to be answered by members of Administrative Services and its units only)

The Office of Administrative Services includes the Business Office, Human Resources, Institutional Computing and Data Processing, and Operations and Maintenance.

As a whole, Administrative Services and its units ...

encourages me to bring forth ideas.

1 2 3 4 5

provides me opportunities to bring forth ideas.

1 2 3 4 5

makes known whom to approach with new ideas.

1 2 3 4 5

has a policy for participation and decision-making that specifies how to bring forth ideas.

1 2 3 4 5

hears my needs.

1 2 3 4 5

values my needs.

1 2 3 4 5

provides opportunities to participate in office decision-making.

1 2 3 4 5

provides a decision-making procedure.

1 2 3 4 5

has a decision-making procedure that encourages effective discussions.

1 2 3 4 5

has a decision-making procedure that results in effective planning.

1 2 3 4 5

has a policy for participation and decision-making that specifies how to work together on planning.

1 2 3 4 5
has a policy for participation and decision-making that specifies roles and procedures.

makes known staff members roles in the planning process.

makes known the procedures associated with working together on planning.

defines leadership roles clearly.

allows staff to play an important role in office governance.

allows staff to exercise a substantial voice in office planning.

allows staff to exercise a substantial voice in office budgeting.

establishes a mechanism for students to provide input into the office's decisions.

establishes a mechanism for office staff to provide input into the office's decisions.

conducts meetings on a regular basis.

distributes agendas for meetings prior to the meetings.

circulates minutes for the meetings after the meetings.

distributes office information in a timely manner.

works collectively and collegially for the good of the institution.

regularly conducts a evaluation of the office leader to ensure office integrity and effectiveness.

the results of office evaluations are widely communicated to the college community.

the results of evaluation of the office's leader are widely communicates to the college community.

the College relies upon this office for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

the College uses the results of the office's evaluation as a basis for institutional improvement.

the College uses evaluation results of the office's leader as a basis for
If you would like to make any additional comments regarding Administrative Services, please do so in the box below.
**Leaders and Governance Structure Perception**
**Survey of the Office of Administrative Services**

**General Information**

1. Indicate your department

2. Indicate your status

3. **Non-Member Survey Questions about the Leader of Administrative Services**

   Administrative Services includes the Business Office, Human Resources, Institutional Computing and Data Processing, and Operations and Maintenance.

   Director Clifford Togo is the leader of Administrative Services.

   The leader of this office...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 (strongly disagree)</th>
<th>2 (somewhat disagree)</th>
<th>3 (neutral)</th>
<th>4 (somewhat agree)</th>
<th>5 (strongly agree)</th>
<th>(don't know)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>encourages me to bring forth ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides opportunities for me to bring forth ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is receptive to my ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values my ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspires confidence in others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspires others to achieve excellence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is willing to pursue new and innovative directions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports faculty, staff, and students to work effectively as a team to accomplish the mission, goals and projects of the College.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishes effective working relationships with relevant committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maintains effective working relationships with relevant committees.

supports staff development.

responds to my questions in timely manner.

disseminates information in a timely manner.

takes initiative to prepare the College for future success.

monitors progress toward planned mission, goals, and objectives.

recognizes when a decision is required and acts effectively and expeditiously.

4

If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the leader of Administrative Services, please do so in the box below.


5 Non-Member Survey Questions about Administrative Services

This survey is for non-members of a governance structure (e.g., a committee, council, department, or office) who want to submit their perceptions of the governance structure.

Administrative Services includes the Business Office, Human Resources, Institutional Computing and Data Processing, and Operations and Maintenance.

As a whole, Administrative Services and its units ...

1 (strongly disagree) 2 (somewhat disagree) 3 (neutral) 4 (somewhat agree) 5 (strongly agree) (don't know)

encourages me to bring forth ideas.

provides opportunities to bring forth ideas.

makes known the procedures associated with bringing forth ideas.

is receptive to my ideas.

values my ideas.

inspires confidence in others to achieve excellence.
1. makes known the procedures associated with working with this office.
2. provides effective mechanisms for students to provide input into the decisions of the office.
3. provides effective mechanisms for faculty to provide input into the decisions of the office.
4. provides effective mechanisms for staff to provide input into the decisions of the office.
5. responds to my questions in a timely manner.
6. disseminates information in a timely manner.
7. regularly conducts assessment to ensure the office's integrity and effectiveness.
8. regularly conducts assessment to ensure the leader's integrity and effectiveness.
9. includes assessment results in Annual Assessment and/or Program Review Reports.
10. uses the results of assessment as a basis for improvement of the office.

6 If you would like to make any additional comments regarding Administrative Services, please do so in the box below.

Submit
Leader and Governance Structures

leader or structure perform activities during evaluation period

survey of leader or structure is administered

results of survey and other information is summarized and presented to leader or structure for self-evaluation

self-evaluation is reviewed and outcomes and expectations for the next period are jointly established

Improvement by leader or structure occurs

results of the process are widely-communicated

process continues in next period
Table 1. Governance Structures.

This table presents a sequence for evaluating governance structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Period</th>
<th>October to December</th>
<th>January to February</th>
<th>March to April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yearly</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>CCAAC - Instruction</td>
<td>Academic Department Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair 1</td>
<td>CAAC - ETC</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair 2</td>
<td>Deans Advisory Council</td>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair 3</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Administrative Services</td>
<td>Master Planning Committee/Space Utilization</td>
<td>Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of the Chancellor</td>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>Business and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Instruction</td>
<td>Technology Vision Committee</td>
<td>Budget Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Dean 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>ETC Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Dean 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Effective Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational and Community Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>once in three years</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Ke Kumu Pali</th>
<th>Accreditation Steering Committee (when active)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Common Book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Leaders and Governance Structures Perception
#### Survey for the ..... Member Surveys

1. **Member Survey Questions about the ..... (to be answered by members of the ..... Office only) The ..... Office includes the ..... The leader is .....**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.</th>
<th>(strongly disagree)</th>
<th>(somewhat disagree)</th>
<th>(neutral)</th>
<th>(somewhat agree)</th>
<th>(strongly agree)</th>
<th>(don't know)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>encourages me to bring forth ideas.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides opportunities for me to bring forth ideas.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is receptive to my ideas.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values my ideas.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspires confidence in others.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspires others to achieve excellence.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is willing to pursue new and innovative directions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports faculty, staff, and students to work effectively as a team to accomplish the mission, goals and projects of the College.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishes effective working relationships with relevant committees.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintains effective working relationships with relevant committees.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports staff development for faculty and staff to improve and become more successful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responds to my questions in a timely manner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disseminates information in a timely manner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takes initiative to prepare the College for future success.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitors progress toward planned mission, goals, and objectives.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognizes when a decision is required and acts effectively and expeditiously.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the ..... please do so in the box below.**

6 Responses
Leaders and Governance Structure Perception Survey of the Office of .......: Non-Member Survey Questions about the Leader of .... This unit includes .... .... is the leader ...

Non-Member Survey Questions about the Leader of .... This unit includes .... .... is the leader of .... The leader of this office is...

- (strongly disagree)
- (neutral)
- (somewhat agree)
- (strongly agree)
- (don't know)

100%
80%
60%
40%
20%
0%

encourages me to bring forth ideas.
inspires others to achieve excellence.
supports staff development.
recognizes when a decision is required and acts effectively and expeditiously.
Leaders and Governance Structure Perceptions Survey of the Office of .......: Non-Member Survey Questions about the Leader of .... This unit includes ..... .... is the leader ...

Non-Member Survey Questions about the Leader of .... This unit includes ..... .... is the leader of ..... The leader of this office is ...

- (strongly disagree)
- (neutral)
- (somewhat agree)
- (strongly agree)
- (don't know)

encourages me to bring forth ideas.
inspires others to achieve excellence.
supports staff development.
recognizes when a decision is required and acts effectively...
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**Member Survey Questions about the ..... (to be answered by members of the ..... Office only) The ..... Office includes the ..... The leader is .....**

- (strongly disagree)
- (neutral)
- (somewhat agree)
- (strongly agree)
- (don't know)

Encourages me to bring forth ideas.

Inspires others to achieve excellence.

Supports staff development for faculty and staff to improve and become more successful.

Recognizes when a decision is required and acts effectively and expeditiously.
### Leaders and Governance Structure Perception

#### Survey of the Office of ......

#### General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Administrative Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chancellor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Services</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational and Community Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Indicate your status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative, Professional and Technical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service (CS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive/Management (EM)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (F)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Non-Member Survey Questions about the Leader of .... This unit includes ...... .... is the leader of ......The leader of this office is ....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>(strongly disagree)</th>
<th>(somewhat disagree)</th>
<th>(neutral)</th>
<th>(somewhat agree)</th>
<th>(strongly agree)</th>
<th>(don't know)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>encourages me to bring forth ideas.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides opportunities for me to bring forth ideas.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is receptive to my ideas.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values my ideas.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspires confidence in others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspires others to achieve excellence.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is willing to pursue new and innovative directions.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports faculty, staff, and students to work effectively as a team to accomplish the mission, goals and projects of the College.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.</td>
<td>(strongly disagree)</td>
<td>(somewhat disagree)</td>
<td>(neutral)</td>
<td>(somewhat agree)</td>
<td>(strongly agree)</td>
<td>(don't know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishes effective working relationships with relevant committees.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintains effective working relationships with relevant committees.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports staff development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responds to my questions in timely manner.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disseminates information in a timely manner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takes initiative to prepare the College for future success.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitors progress toward planned mission, goals, and objectives.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognizes when a decision is required and acts effectively and expeditiously.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding the leader of ...., please do so in the box below.

7 Responses

5. Non-Member Survey Questions about .... This survey is for non-members of a governance structure (e.g., a committee, council, department, or office) who want to submit their perceptions of the governance structure. This unit includes .... As a whole, .... and its units ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.</th>
<th>(strongly disagree)</th>
<th>(somewhat disagree)</th>
<th>(neutral)</th>
<th>(somewhat agree)</th>
<th>(strongly agree)</th>
<th>(don't know)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>encourages me to bring forth ideas.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides opportunities to bring forth ideas.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makes known the procedures associated with bringing forth ideas.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is receptive to my ideas.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values my ideas.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspires confidence in others to achieve excellence.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makes known the procedures associated with working with this office.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(strongly disagree)</td>
<td>(somewhat disagree)</td>
<td>(neutral)</td>
<td>(somewhat agree)</td>
<td>(strongly agree)</td>
<td>(don't know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides effective mechanisms for students to provide input into the decisions of the office.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responds to my questions in a timely manner.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disseminates information in a timely manner.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regularly conducts assessment to ensure the office's integrity and effectiveness.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>includes assessment results in Annual Assessment and/or Program Review Reports.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses the results of assessment as a basis for improvement of the office.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. If you would like to make any additional comments regarding ......, please do so in the box below.

9 Responses
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