Self-assessment for the CCAAC

Part I. General comments regarding the responses to the leaders and governance structures perception Surveys

The Credit Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee (CCAAC) is the principal reviewing and recommending body on all aspects of the educational curricula. As a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate, the committee oversees a comprehensive review of all course proposals and modifications at the College. In order for the CCAAC to serve the College and the community in this way, having clear decision-making policies and procedures within the committee is critical.

The CCAAC Leaders and Governance Structure Perception Survey of 2009 reveals both strengths and weaknesses in the governance structures and processes within the CCAAC. Of the member surveys (N=6), most members gave positive ratings. Here, the responses fell into the ‘strongly agree’ and ‘somewhat agree’ categories for most of the questions. The non-member survey responses (N=22) were a bit more varied, and for many of the questions, more respondents marked ‘neutral’ compared to the member responses. Otherwise, the non-member survey results seemed to be somewhat evenly distributed amongst the ‘somewhat disagree’, ‘neutral’, ‘somewhat agree’, ‘strongly agree’, and ‘don’t know’ categories.

Part II. Strengths revealed by the surveys

The strengths of the CCAAC are most clearly revealed in the member surveys: All of the members of the CCAAC report that the committee provides them opportunities to bring forth ideas (100%); that the committee allows members to play an important role in CCAAC governance (100%); that regular meetings are conducted (100%); that minutes are circulated for the meetings after the meetings (100%); and that the committee works collectively and collegially for the good of the institution (100%). From these results, it is clear that the committee communicates well and often, and that it works diligently to achieve its goals.

Part III. Weaknesses revealed by the surveys

As shown in the surveys, the weaknesses of the CCAAC seem to be most associated with its lack of procedures at the time the survey was conducted; this is the case with both the member and non-member surveys. For example, 67% (4) of the members report that they ‘somewhat agree’ that the committee makes known the procedures associated with working together on planning, and 2 report that they ‘strongly agree’. Although 100% of the respondents fall into both the ‘somewhat agree’ and ‘strongly agree’ categories, the committee could show improvement by ensuring that more than 2 members ‘strongly agree’ that the committee makes known the procedures associated with working together on planning. A similar sentiment regarding the need for procedures can be seen in the results of the non-member surveys. Here, 18% (4) of the respondents ‘somewhat agree’ that the committee makes known the procedures associated with working with the CCAAC, and 23% (5) marked that they ‘don’t know’. From these results, it seems that the committee could do a better job making known the procedures associated with course proposals and modification—for both members of the committee, as well as faculty and staff who may want to propose courses to the committee.

Also, as revealed in the survey results of the non-members, 23% (5) were ‘neutral’ that the committee is receptive to their ideas, and 27% (6) said they ‘didn’t know’. On a related note, 14% (3) of the non-members marked ‘neutral’ when asked whether the committee provides mechanisms for students to provide input into the committee, and 68% (15) said they ‘didn’t know’; the committee members reported similar perceptions regarding how well the committee directly responds to students’ needs. These results may indicate that the committee could do a better job reaching out to faculty and possibly to students, for example, who may have new ideas for courses.

Finally, both the member and non-member surveys revealed the need for a regular assessment of the committee to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of its leaders, as well as the need to use those results as a basis for improvement. Here, responses on both the member and non-member surveys range from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘neutral’ to ‘don’t know’, when asked whether a regular assessment of the committee and its leader is conducted. These responses are expected, as this is the first year that the committee is doing an assessment. However, the committee notes the importance of doing this regular assessment, and of using the results as a basis for improvement. We welcome the feedback that allows us to function more effectively as a committee.

1 From the WCC website: http://windward.hawaii.edu/committees/ccaac
### Part IV. Self-assessment Matrix for the CCAAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Statement or Goal (1)</th>
<th>Measurable Outcome (1)</th>
<th>Changes Made as a Result (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make known the procedures associated with working together on planning to both members and non-members.</td>
<td>Upon final approval the “Windward Community College Curriculum Review Policy: Philosophy and Procedures” will be posted on the CCAAC committee page and distributed to all faculty and staff. <em>(When Curriculum Central is implemented this policy will be amended to reflect the changes.)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do a better job of providing help to faculty who may want to propose a new course or certificate.</td>
<td>Invite Thanh Giang from Curriculum Central to fall convocation to explain the new system for proposing courses. Provide training for Curriculum Central. Post samples of proposals for new certificates of programs on the committee website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the results of the annual self-assessment as a basis for improvement.</td>
<td>Accomplish the measurable outcomes listed above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) complete the first two columns for the 2009 self-assessment.  
(2) to be completed for the 2009 self-assessment period after the second annual survey.