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 assess the effectiveness of leaders and decision-making which leads to institutional improvements. (Standard 3.D.1d; Standard IV.A.1, A.2, A.3, and A.5)

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. The French Report stressed that the remaining work on the Recommendation had three equally important parts. First, WCC 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 summarized what other colleges did in order to satisfy the Standard IV.A.5 requirement: Most conducted some form of perception survey (pg. 4) with questions aligned to Standard IV.A. Some even measured leadership and governance at the level of individual offices, departments, and committees. Additionally, survey results were used to help them make changes in their governance structures and processes.

The French Report recommended WCC develop a valid survey with questions aligned 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).

The survey developed allowed 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 he or she belongs—same questions, different context. Moreover, in measuring constituent satisfaction of governance structures and processes, all people’s views are important. Therefore, it was 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 needed 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 4 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 Follow-up Report Visit 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 included in the French Report and made
modifications to them. Simultaneously, a Proposal on Recommendation 5 with a flow
chart showing the process and timeline of when each governance structure and the leader
of that structure would be evaluated was presented to the Faculty Senate, the
Administration, 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 and the Faculty Senate organization were assessed,
and in the case of Instructional Services, the Vice Chancellor for Instruction, the Dean of
Division 1 and Dean of Division 2, and the Vice Chancellor’s office were assessed.
In March and April, the surveys for the first group were also used to assess the committees deemed by Windward’s Administrators, Faculty Senate Chairs, and IEC as being instrumental in the governance of the College. Then in April and May, those same surveys were used to assess the Department Chairs, the ETC Coordinators, and the Budget, Strategic Planning, Enrollment Management, and Institutional Effectiveness Committees.

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 established during the 2008-2009 Academic Year, to administer, analyze, and present information from the “Leaders and Governance Structures Surveys” to facilitate institutional governance improvement. The GSIEC will continue to be 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 surveys of leaders and governance structures have been presented to the leaders and governance groups for their self-assessment, and those self-assessments and governance improvement statements have been returned to the GSIEC. The self-assessments and governance improvement statements will 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.

ANALYSIS

As the descriptive summary illustrates, the College has created and implemented a process for effectively evaluating its governance with the following being accomplished in 2008-2009 academic year.

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.
- 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.

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.

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

March-May 2009
• The process was repeated for the third group of governance entities.

The following will be accomplished in 2009-2010 academic year.

August 2009
• The GSIEC and IEC will assess the governance evaluation process and revise the process as needed.

September – October 2009
• Modifications to procedure and surveys will be made, if necessary.

November – December 2009
• The member and non-member surveys for the first group of governance entities will be administered.
• The data will be summarized and provided to the governance entity for their self-assessment. Self-assessments with outcome statements will be returned to the GSIEC.

January– March 2010
• The process for the second group of governance entities will be conducted.

March-May 2010
• The process will be repeated for the third group of governance entities.
UHCC SYSTEM OFFICE RESPONSE TO
STANDARD IV
SELF-STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS
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.

IV.B. Board and Administrative Organization

In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

IV.B.1. The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.

IV.B.1.a. The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

Planning Agenda

• The College and the OVPCC will work with the BOR to make every effort to post agendas of special meetings well in advance, at least a week, to allow for the logistical challenges faced by the neighbor islands and instructional faculty schedules.

The Vice President for Community Colleges (VPCC) and staff met with the Executive Administrator and Secretary of the Board. The Secretary confirmed that the Board complies with Hawaii law requiring notice six (6) calendar days in advance of any meetings. The Board’s regularly scheduled meetings, Next Meeting Agenda, and archived Meeting Minutes and Agenda are posted on the BOR website.

When the BOR posts agendas and meeting notices, they also notify the UH President’s Office which notifies the UH Vice Presidents, Chancellors, and their secretaries that the notice has been posted. The Board also maintains a list of those who
have requested paper copies of the agenda and distributes to that list within the six calendar days. Additionally, the Board sends notice of meetings to the Office of the Governor, State of Hawaii. Notices are posted to the statewide calendar Hawaii Calendar of Events.

**IV.B.1.b. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.**

Planning Agenda

No action required

**IV.B.1.c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.**

Planning Agenda

No action required

**IV.B.1.d. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedure.**

Planning Agenda

No action required.

**IV.B.1.e. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.**

Planning Agenda

- The College and the OVPCC will work with the BOR to establish regular review of BOR policies and procedures.

The Vice President for Community Colleges is working with the Vice President for Academic Planning and Policy and the BOR to develop and establish regular review of BOR policies and procedures.
IV.B.1.f. The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

Planning Agenda

- The BOR and the OVPCC, with faculty from each college, will develop an appropriate program for BOR development and new member orientation.

The BOR has developed an orientation process for new Board of Regent members. The most recent orientation took place on June 29, 2009 and included information about the community colleges, the accreditation process, and the Board’s role in accreditation. The Vice President for Community Colleges is engaged in new Board member orientation.

IV.B.1.g. The governing board’s self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

Planning Agenda

- The College and the OVPCC will work with the BOR to develop and implement a clearly defined process for evaluation and assessment of BOR performance.

The Board has begun development of a process for evaluation and assessment of BOR performance. The results of a question sent to each Regent in May 2008 to evaluate the Board’s effectiveness was discussed at the August 22, 2008 Board meeting. BOR Minutes Aug 22 2008.

IV.B.1.h. The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

Planning Agenda

No action required.

IV.B.1.i. The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.
Planning Agenda

- The College and the OVPCC will work with the BOR to assist the BOR in becoming more involved and informed with the accreditation process.

The BOR has developed an orientation program for new Board member which includes information about the accreditation process and the Board’s role in accreditation.

IV.B.1.j. The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.

In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

Planning Agenda

No action required

IV.B.2. The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

The Chancellor is the Chief Executive Officer of the College and the Office of the Chancellor is responsible for the orderly and proper functioning of Windward Community College, and that that College is adhering to its mission.

The Chancellor has dual reporting lines: to the Vice President for Community Colleges and to the President of the University of Hawaii, and provides the overall leadership and coordination for planning, overseeing, and evaluating the administrative structure and personnel needs of the campus.

The Chancellor delegates authority to campus administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities. However due to the expansion of the Chancellor’s role in external affairs of the College, the deans and directors have been given additional internal responsibilities. These external responsibilities include developing and enhancing
relationships and connections to community organizations, specific client groups served by the College, and significant leaders in the community. Because of these new external responsibilities, since the last Self Study, there have been discussions on campus concerning reorganization of the administrative structure of the College (see discussion below), but no changes have been made.

The former Chancellor guided institutional improvement of teaching and learning by supporting assessment efforts, encouraging innovation, seeking opportunities for external resources to fund faculty projects and travel, and creating a mechanism, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, to improve institutional effectiveness. The Budget and the Strategic Planning Committees were enlarged to include both stakeholders and administrators, and the Academic Development Plan was dissected into a Strategic Plan, an Operational Plan, and a Technology Vision Plan (see Recommendation 1 above).

These plans were then integrated into a Program Review and Budget Cycle (http://windward.hawaii.edu/Assessment/Planning_Cycle.pdf) in May 2006, which may need revision (see discussion below). As a result of these actions, the College now has a systematic process of assessment, program review, strategic planning, and budget creation that integrates academic activities with planning and the allocation of resources as discussed in Recommendation 2 above. The present Chancellor is reviewing all policies and procedures established as well as reviewing the need, if any, for campus reorganization.

IV.B.3: In multi-college districts or systems the district/system provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. It establishes clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board.

IVB.3.a. The district/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the college and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.

Planning Agenda

- The College and the OVPCC will continue to refine the functional responsibilities of the system and make public the information.

The UHCC functional Map was reviewed and updated by the community colleges Chancellors at their 2009 planning retreat.
IV.B.3.b. The district/system provides effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions.

Planning Agenda

- The College will work with the OVPCC to develop methods for evaluating the UHCC System

Since the self studies were completed in 2006, Hawaii’s community colleges have joined Achieving the Dream: Community Colleges Count. UHCC sought participation in this major national initiative because of its focus on issues that are directly related to the institutional expectations expressed in the ACCJC Standards for Accreditation. In addition to the core Achieving the Dream initiatives, Hawaii participates in the State Policy component of the initiative which provides access to tools and “best practices”. The Community College Inventory: Focus on Student Persistence, Learning, and Attainment, distributed as part of the Achieving the Dream orientation materials provides descriptions of characteristics of colleges that are strongly focused on student success. Related to each characteristic is a set of indicators that more fully describe observable institutional practices. The UHCC system views these indicators as so significant that several have been incorporated into the UHCC System Strategic Outcomes and Performance Measures and will be regularly evaluated.

IV.B.3.c. The district/system provides fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the colleges.

Planning Agenda

- The Office of the VPCC, working with the Community Colleges Council of Chancellors, will develop a documented process for allocating specified resources based upon program review at the UHCC system level.

In response to Hawai‘i’s economic slowdown and decline in State revenues, in fall 2008, the governor requested that all departments identify budget reductions for FY 2010 and FY 2011. The Vice President for Community Colleges, working with the Chancellors and Associate Vice Presidents, identified budget priorities and developed written policies to manage the reductions. The priorities identified Native Hawaiian student success, remedial/developmental education, and workforce shortage areas (including Science Technology Engineering and Math). The agreed upon priorities specifically precluded reductions in areas identified as important strategic outcomes in the UHCC Strategic Plan.
IV.B.3.d. The district/system effectively controls its expenditures.

Planning Agenda

No action required.

IV.B.3.e. The chancellor gives full responsibility and authority to the presidents of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without the chancellor’s interference and holds them accountable for the operation of the colleges.

Planning Agenda

The work group is in agreement that each college’s planning agenda make reference to positions descriptions reflecting current organization.

No action taken

IV.B.3.f. The district/system acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board. The district/system and the colleges use effective methods of communication, and they exchange information in a timely manner.

Planning Agenda

- The College will work with the OVPCC and UH system to review and revise written policies and procedures to reflect the 2005 Reorganization.

  OVPCC is working with the UH system (including the Board) to review and revise written policies and procedures to reflect the 2005 Reorganization. Review includes not only title changes but functional changes as well.

IV.B.3.g. The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role-delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

Planning Agenda

- The College and the OVPCC will continue to develop, make public, and regularly review structures, policies, and procedures for improvement.

  The University of Hawai‘i System has invested in IBM Cognos Business Intelligence software that will be used to develop enterprise-wide management applications. The first Cognos report at UH, released in spring 2009, is a table on selected characteristics of credit students found in the UH System Management and Planning Support (MAPS) Enrollment Report. Scheduled for release later in 2009 is the University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Outcomes & Performance Measures
Dashboard. This application provides an “at a glance” summary of 10 critical measures which are based on the University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan. The dashboard, together with drill throughs to detail graphs, provides a dynamic assessment of the University’s progress toward its goal.

OVPCC technical staff, working with the IR Cadre, are developing reports for UHCC specific initiatives and projects to include, but not limited to the UHCC Strategic Plan, Program Review, and Achieving the Dream (AtD). The reports will be web-based and open to the public.