Self-assessment for the Master Planning and Space Utilization Committee

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

The objectives of the Master Planning and Space Utilization Committee (MPSUC) revolve around making recommendations to the Chancellor concerning short, mid, and long term facilities use, as well as planning for the renovation of existing facilities and construction of new facilities. In order for the MPSUC to serve the College in this way, having clear decision-making policies and procedures is critical.

Overall, the MPSUC Leaders and Governance Structure Perception Survey of 2009 reveals the need for clearer decision-making policies and procedures within the committee; this was reported by both members (N=7) and non-members (N=18). As the committee is a relatively new addition to the governance structures on campus, many of the seemingly negative responses are to be expected. The MPSUC will use these results as a way of creating a committee that best responds to the needs of the College.

Part II. Strengths revealed by the surveys

The strengths of the MPSUC are most clearly revealed in the member surveys: Most of the members (4) reported that agendas for meetings are distributed prior to the meetings, and 43% (3) reported that minutes were circulated after the meetings. In general, many members (43%) felt that the committee works collectively and collegially for the good of the institution.

Part III. Weaknesses revealed by the surveys

1) Although the sharing of information seemed to be a strength in the member surveys, non-members reported that the committee could do a better job disseminating information to them in a timely manner. For example, roughly 60% of the non-members (11) somewhat disagreed or strongly disagreed that the MPSUC shares information with those outside the committee. These results seem to indicate that the committee will need to find ways of more effectively sharing information with the rest of the college.

2) The survey results also seem to indicate the need for regularly scheduled meetings for the committee. For example, some members strongly disagreed that the committee conducts meetings on a regular basis (43%). Possibly related, 43% of the members (3) somewhat disagreed that the committee provides opportunities for them to bring forth ideas, and almost half of the non-members reported the same. Here, it is likely that having regularly scheduled meetings would improve the perceptions and experiences of both members and non-members of the committee.

3) When the committee does meet, members also reported that they were unclear about any decision-making procedures for the committee. For example, 43% (3) of the members disagreed that the committee has a policy for participation and decision-making that specifies how to bring forth ideas; the other member responses were scattered evenly amongst the ‘somewhat agree’, ‘strongly agree’, and ‘don’t know’ categories. Similarly, 50% of the non-member reported that they either ‘somewhat disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree’ that the committee makes known the procedures associated with bringing forth ideas, and 28% said that they simply did not know about these procedures. Almost half of the non-members disagreed that the committee encourages them to bring forth ideas.

Once ideas are brought forth to the committee, the survey results seem to indicate that the committee needs a decision-making procedure that not only specifies roles and procedures, but also results in effective planning. Here, 43% of the members (3) disagreed that the committee has this type of procedure, and more than half of the non-members (10) disagreed that the committee makes known the procedures associated with working with the MPSUC.

4) Finally, both the member and non-member surveys reveal 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 MPSUC 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/Directives.html#planning
## Part IV. Self-assessment Matrix for the Master Planning and Space Utilization Committee

<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>Conduct regularly scheduled meetings</td>
<td>The committee will meet at least one time per month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a policy for participation and decision-making that specifies how to bring forth ideas</td>
<td>Create a policy for decision-making and include the policy as part of the MPSUC information on the web.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find ways of more effectively sharing information with the rest of the college</td>
<td>Create a webpage for the MPSUC that includes both policies and procedures of the committee, as well as information on any committee decisions that are made. This page would also include the minutes from all of the meetings.</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.