



UNIVERSITY of HAWAII*
WINDWARD
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

REPORT

On

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior College's

RECOMMENDATION 5

May 2008

Prepared by
Kathleen M. French
Instructor

Table of Contents

Introduction	
Recommendation 5.....	1
Three Recommendations for Recommendation 5.....	1
Part I: Assessing the Effectiveness of Leadership and Decision-Making Structures	
Understanding Recommendation 5.....	2
Previous Responses from WCC to ACCJC.....	2
What Other Colleges Have Done.....	4
The Importance of Operationalizing Standard IV.A.....	5
The Importance of Measuring All Parts and All Viewpoints in a Survey	6
The Importance of Assessing Institutional Goals.....	7
Part II: The Job of Monitoring and Communicating Results with Suggestions for Improvement	
Potential Campus Monitoring Groups.....	9
Establishing Measurable Performance Indicators for Both Survey Questions and Strategic Plan Action Outcomes.....	11
Communicating Results to the Campus Community	12
Communicating Results and Suggestions to Units/Departments/Committees.....	13
Part III: Implementing Institutional Improvements	
A Possible Model of Implementation for WCC.....	16
Assessing Governance Structures and Processes: Final Thoughts.....	18
Appendixes	
Appendix A: Standard IV.A.....	20
Appendix B: Standard IV.A Themes Aligned with Survey Questions ...	22

Appendix C: 2008 Faculty/Staff Pilot Survey.....	26
Appendix D: Timeline for 2008 Faculty/Staff Pilot Survey.....	36
References.....	37

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.A¹. 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*². 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 goals⁵. 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

⁵ 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 college⁷. 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 groups⁸. 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 *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 parties⁹. 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,

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.

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

THEMES	STANDARD	Fryer Text	SURVEY QUESTIONS
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”	<p>FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>FOR NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am encouraged to bring forth ideas to this committee. • I have opportunities to bring forth ideas in this committee. • My ideas are being heard in this committee. • My ideas are valued in this 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.		<p>FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
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	“civility”, “caring”, “hard work”, “good times” Ch 3: Planning	FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. FOR NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I understand the procedures associated with bringing forth ideas to this committee. • I understand the procedures associated with working with this committee on specific ideas that I may have for the 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

			<p>department/unit/committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are established mechanisms for students to provide input into the decisions of this department/unit/committee. • There are established mechanisms for staff to provide input into the decisions of this department/unit/committee. <p>FOR NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are established mechanisms for students to provide input into the decisions of this committee. • There are established mechanisms for staff to provide input into the decisions of this committee.
2. RECOMMENDATIONS	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.	Ch 4: Deciding	<p>FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For recommendations about student learning programs and services, the college relies upon this department/unit/committee. • For recommendations about student learning programs and services, recommendations are offered by this department/unit/committee.
3. COMMUNICATION	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. IV.A.3.	"trust" Ch 7: Communication (Redundancy, Multiple channels, clarity, credibility)	<p>FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings occur on a regular basis for this department/unit/committee. • The agendas for the meetings are distributed prior to the meetings in this department/unit/committee. • Minutes are circulated after the meetings in this department/unit/committee. • I know whom to talk with about new ideas or issues that I may have in this department/unit/committee. • I am free to communicate my ideas to the advisor of this particular department/unit/committee. • I am free to communicate my ideas in this department/unit/committee. • I receive information in a timely manner from the supervisor/designated person of this department/unit/committee. • This department/unit/committee works together for the good of the institution.

			<p>FOR NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
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	<p>FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<p>FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>FOR NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.		<p>FOR DEPARTMENT/UNIT/COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>FOR NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.



UNIVERSITY of HAWAII
WINDWARD
 COMMUNITY COLLEGE

**University of Hawai'i
 Windward Community College**

2008 Faculty and Staff Pilot Survey of Governance Structures and Processes

Department / Unit / Committee 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.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
----------------------	----------------------	---------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

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.

Strongly Disagree Somewhat Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Strongly Agree Not Applicable

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.

Strongly Disagree Somewhat Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Strongly Agree Not Applicable

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.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
----------------------	----------------------	---------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

- 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.

- | | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neutral | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree | Not Applicable |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|---------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 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.

Strongly Disagree Somewhat Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Strongly Agree Not Applicable

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



UNIVERSITY of HAWAII*
WINDWARD
 COMMUNITY COLLEGE

**University of Hawai'i
 Windward Community College**

2008 Faculty and Staff Pilot Survey of Governance Structures and Processes

Non-Committee Members 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.

Strongly Disagree Somewhat Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Strongly Agree Not Applicable

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.

Strongly Disagree Somewhat Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Strongly Agree Not Applicable

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.

Strongly Disagree Somewhat Disagree Neutral Somewhat Agree Strongly Agree Not Applicable

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

- Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). (2002). *Accreditation Standards*. Retrieved March 1, 2008, from <http://www.accjc.org/standards.htm>
- Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). (2008). *Letter and Report from ACCJC January 21, 2008*. Retrieved March 1, 2008, from http://windward.hawaii.edu/Accreditation/Documents/2008_01_31.Letter_From_ACCJC.pdf
- Amador, S. L., & Perri, G. M. (2007). *Progress visit report: Windward Community College*. Kaneohe, HI: Windward Community College.
- Cabrillo College Accreditation Survey*. (2003). Retrieved April 15, 2008, from http://www.cuyamaca.edu/accreditation/surveys/other_college_surveys/CABRILLO_ACCREDITATION_SURVEY.pdf
- Cuyamaca College Faculty Accreditation Survey*. (2003). Retrieved April 15, 2008, from http://www.cuyamaca.edu/accreditation/surveys/Surveys06/CC_FacultyAccredSurvey.pdf
- Fryer, T. W., & Lovas, J. C. (1991). *Leadership in governance: Creating conditions for successful decision making in the community college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Limited.
- Grossmont College Accreditation Surveys*. (2006). Retrieved April 15, 2008, from <http://www.grossmont.edu/accreditation/surveys/currentSurveys/GC%20ACCRED%20SURVEY%20STDIV.pdf>
- Grossmont Community College Self-Study Report*. (2007). Retrieved April 4, 2008, from http://www.grossmont.edu/accreditation/selfStudy0807/standards/standard_4.pdf
- Sheehan, M. C. (2006). *Evaluation report: Windward Community College*. Kaneohe, HI: Windward Community College.
- Skyline College Employee Voice Survey*. (2006). Retrieved April 8, 2008, from http://www.smccd.net/accounts/skypro/Surveys%20&%20Focus%20Group%20Studies/employee_voice_2006_survey_exec_sum.pdf
- Windward Community College Faculty Institutional Survey*. (2005). Retrieved April 4, 2008, from <http://www.zoomerang.com/Shared/SharedResultsSurveyResultsPage.aspx?ID=L22F362Q3YHU>

Windward Community College Strategic Plan - 2007 Update. (2007). Retrieved April 15, 2008,
from http://windward.hawaii.edu/Planning/Documents/2007_Strategic_Plan_update.pdf

Windward Community College Strategic Plan - Draft. (2008). Retrieved April 15, 2008, from
http://www.wcc.hawaii.edu/feedback/2008/Strategic_Plan/

Windward Community College: Institutional Effectiveness. (2008). Retrieved May 11, 2008,
from <http://windward.hawaii.edu/Committees/Directives.html#effectiveness>

Windward Community College: Institutional Research. (2008). Retrieved May 11, 2008, from
<http://www.windward.hawaii.edu/ir/>