Prepared by Michelle Riggs



Educational Master Planning Committee Self Evaluation Spring 2011

Background: According to Goal 6.1 of the Crafton Hills College (CHC) Educational Master Plan (EMP), the college will "implement and integrate planning processes and decision-making that are collaborative, transparent, evidence-based, effective and efficient." At Crafton, committee structures comprise a major component of both planning and decision-making, so an important step in pursuing this goal is to ask committee members for their own observations about how well their committee's processes, interactions, and outcomes during the 2010-11 academic year reflect these characteristics. In addition, the purpose of collecting this information is to improve the functioning of committees through professional development and other strategies.

Methodology: The Crafton Council in collaboration with the Office of Research and Planning developed a scannable paper survey for committee self-evaluation. The surveys were distributed to the chairs and conveners of every campus committee and completed by the committee members during committee meetings. Evaluation results for each committee will be shared with the committee and the Crafton Council. In addition, an analysis of results aggregated across all committees will provide a baseline measure of institutional committee effectiveness, and will be distributed to the entire campus community.

Overview: In spring 2011, committee members were asked to objectively provide their opinions of the internal processes, external interactions, and outcomes of each committee on which they served. This self-evaluation process will be an annual reflection of committee member's perspectives used to evaluate the performance and effectiveness of CHC committees. The results of these evaluations will be used to identify strengths, areas that need improvement, and to plan further action as appropriate to enhance the effectiveness of campus committees. In total ninety-nine evaluations from fifteen committees were received.

Findings: The **Educational Master Planning Committee** evaluation data is included with no analysis or summarization. Evaluation results for individual committees will not be provided, however the aggregated results from all committees has been analyzed and the results are available on the Office of Research and Planning website.

Below you will find the number of the question in order of its position on the survey. As an example, "q1" represents question one, and was the first question on the survey. The question number is followed directly by the question itself. The "N" represents the number of responses received, and the "%" is the "N" divided by the number of total responses to the question. A brief explanation is provided before each bank of questions.

In q1 - 6, respondents were asked to provide their role on the committee, the number of years they have served on the committee they are evaluating, if they plan to serve on the committee again next year, the number of other CHC committees on which they serve, and their position at the college.

q1 Name of committee	Ν	%
Educational Master Planning	10	100.0
q2 Did you serve as chair or convener of this committee this year	Ν	%
Yes	1	10.0
No	9	90.0
Total	10	100.0

q3 How long have you served continuously on this committee	Ν	%
New member this year	4	40.0
2 Years	6	60.0
Total	10	100.0
q4 Do you expect to serve on this committee again next year	Ν	%
Yes	9	90.0
I don't know	1	10.0
Total	10	100.0
q5 On how many other Crafton committees did you serve this year	Ν	%
0	1	10.0
1	1	10.0
4	2	20.0
5 or more	6	60.0
Total	10	100.0
q6 What is your primary function now at CHC	Ν	%
FT Faculty	4	40.0
Classified	2	20.0
Manager	4	40.0
Total	10	100.0

In q7a -q7e, respondents were asked to indicate how often the committee's processes, interactions, and outcomes during 2010-11 reflected each of the following characteristics. Choices on the Likert-scale were Almost Always, Often, Sometimes, Seldom, Almost Never, and No Opinion.

q7a Collaborative: Sharing, inclusive, open to input, respectful of diverse		
opinions, characterized by meaningful dialogue	Ν	%
Almost Always	10	100.0
Total	10	100.0
q7b Transparent: Open, easy to understand, clearly defined, characterized by		
effective and meaningful communication with the College community	Ν	%
Almost Always	9	90.0
Often	1	10.0
Total	10	100.0
q7c Evidence-Based: Reliant upon relevant, accurate, complete, timely		
qualitative and/or quantitative information; not based solely on assertion,		
speculation, or anecdote	Ν	%
Almost Always	9	90.0
Often	1	10.0
Total	10	100.0
q7d Effective: Working properly and productively toward the committee's	Ν	%
intended results		
Almost Always	9	90.0
Often	1	10.0
Total	10	100.0

q7e Efficient: Performing well with the least waste of time and effort; characterized by serving the committee's specified purposes in the best		
possible manner	Ν	%
Almost Always	8	80.0
Often	2	20.0
Total	10	100.0

In q8 and q9, respondents were asked to provide their opinion of the committee's most significant accomplishment this year, and the committee's most needed improvement in an open-ended format.

q8 Please enter this committee's most significant accomplishment this year

- Reaffirmation and revision of the EMP
- Revise and update the EMP. Decide on protocol to develop new programs
- Revised Ed Master Plan
- Revising and updating whole plan
- Revising, editing the CHC EMP
- Revision of the Educational Master Plan.
- Update of Ed Master Plan

Updating Educational Master Plan

q9 Please enter the improvement most needed by this committee

- Communication with campus and input from campus
- None, really. We just need to remain diligent about moving forward with each goal.

In q10a -q10c, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with statements related to their service on the committee overall. Choices on the Likert-scale were; Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

q10a I feel comfortable contributing ideas	N	%
Strongly Agree	6	60.0
Agree	3	30.0
Total	9	90.0
q10b My ideas are treated with respect, whether or not others agree with them	Ν	%
Strongly Agree	7	70.0
Agree	2	20.0
Total	9	90.0
q10c I have had sufficient opportunities to provide input into committee		
recommendations	Ν	%
Strongly Agree	7	70.0
Agree	2	20.0
Total	9	90.0

In q11a -q11k, respondents were asked to rate aspects of the committee's work overall this year using a 6-point Likert-scale with choices of Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor, Very Poor, and No Opinion.

q11a Clarity of the committee's charge	N	%
Very Good	6	60.0
Good	3	30.0
Total	9	90.0

Total99q11c Quality of information flow from the committee to constituency groupsNVery Good2Good7Total90q11d Quality of information flow from constituency groups to the committeeNVery Good2Good3Fair2Poor1Total9q11e Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a wholeNVery Good4Good4Fair1Total9Q11e Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a wholeNVery Good4Good4Fair1Total9Q11f Access to data needed for deliberationsN	90.0 90.0 20.0 70.0 90.0 90.0 20.0 30.0 20.0 10.0 10.0 90.0 90.0 40.0 40.0 10.0
q11c Quality of information flow from the committee to constituency groupsNVery Good2Good7Total90q11d Quality of information flow from constituency groups to the committeeNVery Good2Good3Fair2Poor1Total9q11e Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a wholeNVery Good4Good4Fair1Total9q11e Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a wholeNVery Good4Good4Fair1Total9Good4Fair1Total9q11f Access to data needed for deliberationsN	% 20.0 70.0 90.0 % 20.0 30.0 20.0 10.0 10.0 90.0 % 40.0 40.0
Very Good2Good7Total90q11d Quality of information flow from constituency groups to the committeeNVery Good2Good3Fair2Poor1No Opinion1Total9q11e Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a wholeNVery Good4Good4Fair1Total9q11e Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a wholeNVery Good4Good4Fair1Total9Good4Fair1Total9q11f Access to data needed for deliberationsN	20.0 70.0 90.0 20.0 30.0 20.0 10.0 10.0 90.0 % 40.0 40.0
Good77Total9090q11d Quality of information flow from constituency groups to the committeeNVery Good22Good33Fair22Poor11No Opinion11Total99q11e Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a wholeNVery Good44Good44Fair11Total99Good44Good44Fair11Total99q11f Access to data needed for deliberationsN	70.0 90.0 90.0 20.0 20.0 10.0 10.0 90.0 % 40.0 40.0
Total 90	90.0 % 20.0 30.0 20.0 10.0 10.0 90.0 % 40.0 40.0
q11d Quality of information flow from constituency groups to the committeeNVery Good2Good3Fair2Poor1No Opinion1Total9q11e Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a wholeNVery Good4Good4Fair1Total9Good4Good4Fair1Total9Good4Fair1Total9Good4Fair1Total9Q11f Access to data needed for deliberationsN	% 20.0 30.0 20.0 10.0 90.0 % 40.0 40.0
Very Good 2 2 Good 3 3 Fair 2 2 Poor 1 1 No Opinion 1 1 Total 9 9 q11e Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community N Very Good 4 4 Good 4 4 Fair 1 1 Total 9 9 Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community N Very Good 4 4 Good 4 4 Good 4 4 Good 9 9 q11f Access to data needed for deliberations N	20.0 30.0 20.0 10.0 90.0 % 40.0 40.0
Good 3 3 Fair 2 3 Poor 1 1 No Opinion 1 1 Total 9 9 q11e Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community N Very Good 4 4 Good 4 4 Fair 1 1 Total 9 9 Good 4 4 Fair 1 1 Total 9 9 q11f Access to data needed for deliberations N 1	30.0 20.0 10.0 90.0 % 40.0 40.0
Fair2Poor1No Opinion1Total9q11e Quality of communication by the committee with the campus communityNas a wholeNVery Good4Good4Fair1Total9q11f Access to data needed for deliberationsN	20.0 10.0 90.0 % 40.0 40.0
Fair2Poor1No Opinion1Total9q11e Quality of communication by the committee with the campus communityNas a wholeNVery Good4Good4Fair1Total9q11f Access to data needed for deliberationsN	10.0 10.0 90.0 % 40.0 40.0
No Opinion 1 Total 9 q11e Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community N as a whole N Very Good 4 Good 4 Fair 1 Total 9 q11f Access to data needed for deliberations N	10.0 90.0 % 40.0 40.0
Total 9 <td>90.0 % 40.0 40.0</td>	90.0 % 40.0 40.0
Total 9 <td>% 40.0 40.0</td>	% 40.0 40.0
N Very Good 4 Good 4 Fair 1 Total 9 q11f Access to data needed for deliberations N	40.0 40.0
Very Good4Good4Fair1Total9q11f Access to data needed for deliberationsN	40.0 40.0
Good 4 4 Fair 1 1 Total 9 9 q11f Access to data needed for deliberations N	40.0
Fair 1 1 Total 9 9 q11f Access to data needed for deliberations N	
Total 9 9 q11f Access to data needed for deliberations N	
q11f Access to data needed for deliberations N	90.0
	%
	80.0
	10.0
	90.0
q11g Access to meeting space N	%
	90.0
	90.0
q11h Access to other resources needed for the committee to work effectively N	%
	70.0
	10.0
No Opinion 1	10.0
	100.0
q11i Training or mentoring for you as a committee member N	%
	20.0
Good 2	20.0
Fair 3 C	30.0
	20.0
	90.0
q11j Establishment of expectations or norms for committee members and convener(s)	%
	30.0
	60.0
	90.0
q11k Adherence to expectations or norms for committee members and convener(s)	%
	40.0
	<u>40.0</u> 50.0
	<u>90.0</u>

Finally, in q12 committee members were given the opportunity to leave any additional comments in an open-ended format.

Additi	onal Comments:
•	(Name) is an amazing leader. She makes this boring committee tolerable.
•	Still learning, but enjoyed my experience and hope to share more opinions and ideas
	next year.