



## Chairs Council Committee Self-Evaluation Academic Year 2016-2017

Prepared by Diana Pineda

### **Overview**

According to Strategic Direction 6.0 of the Crafton Hills College (CHC) Educational Master Plan (EMP), CHC “uses decision making processes that are effective, efficient, transparent, and evidenced-based.” At Crafton, committee structures constitute a major component of both planning and decision-making. Therefore, an important step in pursuing this goal is to ask committee members for their own observations regarding how well their committee’s processes, interactions, and outcomes during the 2016-2017 academic year reflect these characteristics. A closely related purpose of collecting this information is to improve the functioning of committees through professional development and additional strategies.

### **Methodology**

The Crafton Council in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning developed a survey, which was distributed to the chairs and conveners of every campus shared-governance committee in paper and online formats during the end of the spring 2017 semester. Committee members were asked to provide their opinions about the internal process, external interactions, and outcomes of each committee on which they served. The survey consisted of 5 demographic questions, 19 questions on three unique Likert scales, and 4 short-response questions; all responses were optional.

### **Findings**

The evaluation data is included with no analysis or summarization. While evaluation results for individual committees are not provided; however, the aggregated results from all committees have been analyzed and the results are available on the Office on Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning website.

Below you will find the number of the question relative to 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, for example “Name of committee” is what was asked for Q1. The “N” represents the number of responses received, and the “%” is the “N” divided by the number of total responses to the question. Answers with no responses have been excluded from the tables. A brief explanation is provided before each set of questions.

Questions 2-5, prompted respondents to indicate 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

Questions & Responses		N	%
Q1: Name of committee	Chairs Council	4	100.0%
Q2: How many years have you served on this committee?	New Member	1	25.0%
	2 years	0	0.0%
	3 years	2	50.0%
	4 or more years	1	25.0%
Q3: Will you serve on this committee next year?	Yes	4	100.0%
	No	0	0.0%
	Unknown	0	0.0%
Q4: On how many other committees do you serve?	0	0	0.0%
	1	2	50.0%
	2	1	25.0%
	3	1	25.0%
	4	0	0.0%
	5 or more	0	0.0%
Q5: What is your function at CHC?	FT Faculty	4	100.0%
	PT Faculty	0	0.0%
	Classified	0	0.0%
	Confidential	0	0.0%
	Manager	0	0.0%
	Student	0	0.0%

Question 6, directed respondents to indicate how often the committee's processes, interactions, and outcomes during the 2016-2017 academic year reflected each of the characteristics provided below. The respondents were provided with a 6-point Likert scale which included the following options: Almost Always, Often, Sometimes, Seldom, Almost Never, and No Opinion.

Question & Responses		N	%
Collaborative: Sharing, inclusive, open to input, respectful of diverse opinions, characterized by meaningful dialogue	Almost Always	1	25.0%
	Often	2	50.0%
	Sometimes	1	25.0%
Transparent: Open, easy to understand, clearly defined, characterized by effective and meaningful communication with the College community	Almost Always	1	25.0%
	Often	2	50.0%
	Sometimes	1	25.0%
Evidence-Based: Reliant upon relevant, accurate, complete, timely qualitative and/or quantitative information; not based solely on assertion, speculation, or anecdote	Almost Always	1	25.0%
	Often	1	25.0%
	Sometimes	1	25.0%
	Seldom	1	25.0%

(Table Continues!)

(Table Continued!)

Effective: Working properly and productively toward the committee's intended results	Almost Always	1	25.0%
	Often	2	50.0%
	Sometimes	1	25.0%
Efficient: Performing well with the least waste of time and effort; characterized by serving the committee's specified purposes in the best possible manner	Often	2	50.0%
	Sometimes	2	50.0%

Question 7, directed respondents to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with statements related to their service on the committee overall. Respondents were provided with a 4-point Likert scale which included the following choices: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

Question & Responses		N	%
I feel comfortable contributing ideas	Strongly Agree	2	50.0%
	Agree	2	50.0%
My ideas are treated with respect, whether or not others agree with them	Strongly Agree	2	50.0%
	Agree	2	50.0%
I have had sufficient opportunities to provide input into committee recommendations	Strongly Agree	2	50.0%
	Agree	2	50.0%

Question 8, prompted respondents to rate aspects of the committee's work overall in the 2016-2017 academic year. Respondents used a 6-point Likert-scale which included the following choices: Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor, Very Poor, and No Opinion.

Question & Responses		N	%
Clarity of the committee's charge	Very Good	1	25.0%
	Good	2	50.0%
	Fair	1	25.0%
Quality of communication within the committee	Very Good	2	50.0%
	Good	2	50.0%
Quality of information flow from the committee to constituency groups	Very Good	1	25.0%
	Good	2	50.0%
	Fair	1	25.0%
Quality of information flow from constituency groups to the committee	Very Good	1	25.0%
	Good	3	75.0%
Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a whole	Very Good	1	25.0%
	Good	2	50.0%
	Fair	1	25.0%
Access to data needed for deliberations	Very Good	1	25.0%
	Good	2	50.0%
	Fair	1	25.0%

(Table Continues!)

(Table Continued!)

Access to meeting space	Very Good	3	75.0%
	Good	1	25.0%
Access to other resources needed for the committee to work effectively	Very Good	2	50.0%
	Good	1	25.0%
	Fair	1	25.0%
Training or mentoring for you as a committee member	Fair	2	50.0%
	Poor	1	25.0%
	No Opinion	1	25.0%
Establishment of expectations or norms for committee members and convener(s)	Very Good	1	25.0%
	Good	2	50.0%
	Fair	1	25.0%
Adherence to expectations or norms for committee members and convener(s)	Very Good	1	25.0%
	Good	2	50.0%
	Fair	1	25.0%

Question 9, was an open ended question that directed respondents to provide their opinion of the committee's most significant accomplishment in the current year. The following comments were provided:

- Discussions of CTA negotiations regarding chair release time and compensation
- [Name] it is my opinion that often chairs are forced to endure presentations that are neither relevant or nor informative from admin, faculty and staff. The [Name] tend to want to dictate to the chairs "other duties" and seem to want to create rather than resolve problems. As with all committees, it is my opinion that take a back seat and let us do our jobs.
- We all survived huge turn over in administration and are anticipating some stability.

Question 10, an open ended question directed respondents to describe how the committee's accomplishments align with the Crafton Hills College Strategic Directions, ILOs, and/or GEOs. The following comments were provided:

- Without us there would be no schedule!

Question 11, also an open ended question directed respondents to enter the improvement most needed by the committee in its processes, interactions, outcomes, or other aspect of its work. The following comments were provided:

- Time management during meetings, another hour and a half that has evolved into a 2 hour meeting/1

Finally, question 12 was an open ended question that provided respondents the opportunity to provide any additional comments. There were no answers provided by any of the respondents in this committee.