



Introduction

According to Supporting Action 1 of Strategic Direction 2 in the Crafton Hills College (CHC) Educational Master Plan (EMP), the college will “Strengthen communication of shared governance projects and committee work.” Because committees are central to planning and decision-making at CHC, an important step toward achieving this goal is to gather committee members’ perspectives on how well these principles align with their committee’s activities during the 2024–2025 academic year. This feedback is intended to strengthen committee effectiveness through professional development and targeted strategies.

Methodology

The Crafton Council, in partnership with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning, created this survey for distribution to all campus shared-governance committee chairs and members annually at the end of the spring semester. Committee members were asked to share their insights on their committee’s internal processes, external interactions, and outcomes. The survey included 5 demographic questions, 20 questions using Likert scales, 2 questions related to strategic direction and ACCJC standards alignment, and 3 short-response questions. Participation in the survey was entirely voluntary.

Findings

Table 1 summarizes the committees for which the online survey was administered. An important limitation to consider is that there was only a total of 28 responses received, and all questions were voluntary, therefore findings were based on a limited sample. As a result, they should not be taken to be representative of all committee participants’ views.

Table 1: Type of survey format administered by each committee.

Committee	#	%
Budget	2	7.1
Crafton Council	3	10.7
Distance Education	3	10.7
Educational Master Plan	4	14.3
Enrollment Strategies	3	10.7
Institutional Effectiveness, Accreditation, and Outcomes	0	0.0
Planning and Program Review	3	10.7
Professional Development	4	14.3
Safety	4	14.3
Student Equity and Achievement (SEA)	2	7.1
Technology	0	0.0
Total	28	100.0

Table 2 displays the functional demographics of the respondents and total number of other CHC committees on which they serve.

Table 2: Committee member’s function, and number of other committees currently serving on.

What is your primary function now at CHC?	#	%	On how many other Crafton committees did you serve on this year?	#	%
FT Faculty	10	40.0	1	2	8.3
PT Faculty	0	0.0	2	11	45.8
Classified and/or Confidential	6	24.0	3	2	8.3
Manager	8	32.0	4	1	4.2
Student	0	0.0	5 or more	7	29.2
Decline to State	1	4.0	None	1	4.2
Total	25	100.0	Total	24	100.0

Table 3 displays the total number of service years on the current committee, and their plans to serve on the same committee next academic year.

Table 3: Number of service years and plans to serve next year.

How long have you served continuously on this committee?	#	%	Do you expect to serve on this committee again next year?	#	%
New member this year	4	16.0	Yes	22	88.0
2 years	5	20.0	No	1	4.0
3 years	2	8.0	Undecided	2	8.0
4 or more years	14	56.0			
Total	25	100.0	Total	25	100.0

In Table 4 below, the majority of respondents indicated that the committee's processes, interactions, and outcomes almost always reflected the characteristics of collaboration (96%), transparency (93%), and evidence-based decision-making (92.6%). Respondents also reported that the committee was almost always effective (85%) and efficient (89%). In addition, smaller groups noted that these qualities were present about half the time, with responses including transparency (4%), evidence-based decision-making (7%), effectiveness (11%), and efficiency (7%).

A limited number of respondents rated these aspects less positively. One respondent (4%) indicated that collaboration occurred only occasionally, and one respondent (4%) reported that transparency was almost never demonstrated. One respondent (4%) also indicated that effectiveness and efficiency were almost never achieved.

Table 4: Committee member responses to characteristics reflected in the processes, interactions, and outcomes of the committee for 2024-2025.

Please indicate how often the committee's processes, interactions, and outcomes this year reflected each of the following characteristics:	Almost Always		About half the time		Occasionally		Almost Never		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Collaborative: Sharing, inclusive, open to input, respectful of diverse opinions, characterized by meaningful dialogue.	26	96.3	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	27
Transparent: Open, easy to understand, clearly defined, characterized by effective and meaningful communication with the College community.	25	92.6	1	3.7	0	0.0	1	3.7	27
Evidence-Based: Reliant upon relevant, accurate, complete, timely qualitative and/or quantitative information; not based solely on assertion, speculation, or anecdote.	25	92.6	2	7.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	27
Effective: Working properly and productively toward the committee's intended results.	23	85.2	3	11.1	0	0.0	1	3.7	27
Efficient: Performing well with the least waste of time and effort; characterized by serving the committee's specified purposes in the best possible manner.	24	88.9	2	7.4	0	0.0	1	3.7	27

In Table 5, respondents were asked to evaluate their perception of the committee's overall communication practices using a four-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree). The findings showed strong positivity, with most respondents agreeing that they felt comfortable contributing ideas (93%), believed their ideas were treated with respect (97%), and had sufficient opportunities to provide input (93%). Respondents also evaluated how well the committee's charge aligned with the ACCJC standards and CHC's comprehensive master plan goals and objectives. A large majority agreed that the ACCJC standards (93%) and CHC's goals and objectives (93%) informed the committee's actions.

However, a small group of respondents (7%, n=2 each) disagreed that they felt comfortable contributing ideas, had sufficient opportunities to provide input, or that the committee's actions were informed by the ACCJC standards and CHC's goals and objectives. In addition, one respondent (4%, n=1) felt their ideas were not treated with respect.

Table 5: Committee communication practices.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about your service on this committee overall this year:	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
I feel comfortable contributing ideas	22	78.6	4	14.3	0	0.0	2	7.1	28
My ideas are treated with respect, whether or not others agree with them	22	78.6	5	17.9	0	0.0	1	3.6	28
I have had sufficient opportunities to provide input into committee recommendations	21	75.0	5	17.9	0	0.0	2	7.1	28
The ACCJC Standards that align with the charge of this committee helped to inform the committees actions	21	75.0	5	17.9	0	0.0	2	7.1	28
The CHC Comprehensive Master Plan Goals and Objectives that align with the charge of this committee helped to inform the committees actions	21	75.0	5	17.9	0	0.0	2	7.1	28

Table 6 shows that most aspects of committee work were rated positively, with 96–100% of respondents marking clarity of charge, internal communication, information flow to constituencies, campus communication, access to resources, and establishment and adherence to norms as very good or good. Information flow from constituencies and access to data were rated entirely positive (100%). However, ratings for training and mentoring were more mixed, with 77% marking it as good and 23% as poor.

A small number of respondents (4%, n=1 each) selected very poor on several items, though none did so for information flow from constituencies or access to data.

Table 6: Overall work of the committee.

Please rate the following aspects of the committee's work overall this year:	Very Good		Good		Poor		Very Poor		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Clarity of the committee's charge	21	75.0	6	21.4	0	0.0	1	3.6	28
Quality of communication within the committee	19	67.9	8	28.6	0	0.0	1	3.6	28
Quality of information flow from the committee to constituency groups	17	63.0	9	33.3	0	0.0	1	3.7	27
Quality of information flow from constituency groups to the committee	16	57.1	12	42.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	28
Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a whole	16	57.1	11	39.3	0	0.0	1	3.6	28
Access to data needed for deliberations	20	71.4	8	28.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	28
Access to other resources needed for the committee to work effectively	20	71.4	7	25.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	28
Training or mentoring for you as a committee member	15	57.7	5	19.2	5	19.2	1	3.8	26
Establishment of expectations or norms for committee members and convener(s)	20	71.4	7	25.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	28
Adherence to expectations or norms for committee members and convener(s)	20	71.4	7	25.0	0	0.0	1	3.6	28

Table 7 below, committee members share their most notable achievement during the 2024-2025 academic year. The following comments were provided:

Table 7: Open-ended comments on committee accomplishment for 2024-2025. (n=13)

Please enter this committee's most significant accomplishment this year:
Based on review of data identified the following pathways to focus on in outreach efforts: Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics; Society, Behavior, and Culture; and Creative and Fine Arts, Communication, and Design. Reviewed the District Dual Enrollment Plan and provided detailed feedback on the plan to the district. Provided input on Standards I and II for the writing of the ISER.
Began the early review process for accreditation.
Cascade updates on EMP KR's.
Closing transfer equity gaps for Latinx and Black & African American students over two consecutive years.
Developing a comprehensive calendar of events and workshops during Flex and Inservice for both the fall and spring semesters.
Facility Master Plan completion
Feedback on Accreditation Standards
Having more exemplary PPR plans than expected, which shows how great the coaching is working.
Reviewing all the strategic directions.
The priority plan for funding that was submitted to the DSO.
We have worked together on many campus updates and trainings. We have reviewed on campus safety issues and resolved them using a collaborative approach.
We reviewed and provided effective feedback for a large number of 4 yr and 2 yr plans. Continue to work to improve the overall process.
Work on various aspects of RSI, including updating the college's RSI statement, input and evidence to support the development of a Standard 2 narrative for accreditation review, and facilitating student input on RSI effectiveness from faculty.

Table 8-9 directed respondents to select their committee accomplishments that align with CHC Strategic Directions and which ACCJC standard it meets.

Table 8: Committee accomplishments that align with CHC Strategic Directions.

	#	%
Strategic Direction 1 - Increase Student Enrollment	10	35.7
Strategic Direction 2 - Engage in Practices that Prioritize and Promote Inclusivity, Equity, Anti-Racism, and Human Sustainability	16	57.1
Strategic Direction 3 - Increase Student Success & Equity	13	46.4
Strategic Direction 4 - Develop a Campus Culture that Engages Students, Employees, and the Broader Community	15	53.6
Strategic Direction 5 -Foster and Support Inquiry, Accountability, and Campus Sustainability	16	57.1

Table 9: Committee accomplishments that align ACCJC standards.

The committee's accomplishments align with which ACCJC Standards: (select all that apply)					
	#	%		#	%
Standard 1 - Institutional Mission & Effectiveness: The institution has a clear mission that guides planning, evaluation, improvement, and innovation.	18	64.3	Standard 3 - Infrastructure and Resources: The institution provides strong infrastructure, qualified staff, and stable resources to sustain effectiveness and student success.	17	60.7
Standard 2 - Student Success: The institution delivers quality programs and support, evaluates outcomes, and uses data to improve student success.	15	53.6	Standard 4 - Governance and Decision-Making: The institution practices clear governance with defined roles and inclusive decision-making.	18	64.3

Table 10, an open-ended question that directed respondents to provide the improvement most needed by the committee in its processes, interactions, outcomes, or other aspect of its work. The following comment was provided:

Table 10: Open-ended responses on improvement most needed by committee. (n= 8)

Please enter the improvement most needed by this committee in its processes, interactions, outcomes, or other aspect of its work:
A better way to view Prof. Development requests when deciding whether to approve or not approve the request. Maybe an image of the request and what goals the request meet.
Better attendance by members; better follow-up on tasks and document review by members.
For newbies, better intro coaching sessions.
It would be great to have more consistent student engagement, though that's no easy feat.
Member and mentor training would be useful.
More effective use of time by sending out the Cascade updates prior to then capturing changes in the meetings (like we started near the end of the year).
More participation is needed from committee members.
None. This committee works as intended. Stays on task and is not bogged down by off task issues.

Lastly, table 11 an open-ended question provided respondents the opportunity to express any additional comments. The following comment was provided:

Table 11: Additional Comments. (n=3)

If you would like to make any additional comments, please do so in the space below.
[name] does a great job with this committee. It is a pleasure to sit in and contribute.
[name] provides great leadership for this committee. Thank you!
I think the PPR committee introduction of coaching has had a positive impact on not only the writer but for the college.