



Kapi'olani Community College

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT REPORT

Chancellor's Advisory Council

2018-2019 Academic Year

What successes does your data reflect?

- The respondents feel comfortable participating in CAC. 80% wrote improved atmosphere. Relevant. Transparent. Confident. Equal. Voice heard.
- Responses were more varied about the effectiveness in decision making. The majority felt the CAC was effective but 79% felt that there was room for improvement writing "process of decision making takes too long", "there is not enough representation" and "isn't this more of an advising vs. decision-making body?"
- Respondents believe that CAC is effective in fulfilling its role but 58% feel there is room for improvement saying "role still must be defined more accurately", while 42% felt CAC was relevant, improved, voice heard, efficient, transparent. Organized.
- How can we improve effectiveness? 17% suggested smaller groups, splinter groups.

What goals emerge from the data?

The Chancellor concluded that there will be two improvements based on the survey res

- AGOs will share only information that is relevant to the entire campus at the CAC meetings. This was already discussed with the AGOs.
- Smaller work groups: The groups can do background work on issues and bring the ideas to the CAC. What are issues that you would like the groups to work on. (The members texted ideas. The list of ideas is in Appendix A.)

Appendix A

What should our CAC work groups focus on?

- Student engagement
- Student retention
- Faculty engaged in retention efforts
- Seeking opportunities to recruit working adults
- How to engage students and empower them.
- Enrollment data – current and relevant
- Enrollment data that will support efficient scheduling of classes
- Enrollment data that can explain student persistence and why students leave mid-semester
- Enrollment of students
- Ways to improve specific performance-based funding measures.
- Data Calendar – making sure that effective data is sent out monthly to inform CAC where we are in terms of performance-based funding and other goals we need to meet.
- Campus governance and the role of CAC
- CAC should be chaired by someone outside of administration. All administrators should be non-voting. The body should be tasked with creating its own agenda and admin serve as resource/answers/advisement to Chancellor.
- Accessibility
- ADA accessibility: documents, flyers, website support
- Issues that require campus wide input, and cannot be handled through any other means.
- Identify focus groups as issues come up in CAC that need more discussion
- Focus groups as topics come up in CAC meetings
- Addressing problems
- Campus wide issues, including reps from all AGOs
- When something needs discussion/approval that impacts campus as a whole. Business!
- Short term goals. Long term goals are important but we need to practice achieving and measuring short term documented goals. Big goals are great, but small goals need to be practices, measured, and tracked first, even if we fall short of the goal.
- Professional development priorities
- Fundraising for professional development
- Student Centric Approach to decision making
- Faculty-centered approach to decision making
- Bridging Student Affairs and Academic Affairs
- Improving curriculum approval process
- Priorities of each department

- Priorities and vacancies
 - Planning and priority setting advisement to the Chancellor. This is what the body should be doing. Because of the body's composition, too many of these people are thinking day to day and getting too involved in operations of campus.
 - Budget/financial data and reports
 - Alternative ways to address funding needs and priorities
 - Reorganization of the campus
-
- Campus culture
 - Values of campus
 - Getting along
 - Civility and respect
 - How to improve interdepartmental relations
-
- Accountability
 - Accountability (2nd time)
 - Holding people accountable to do their jobs
-
- Group to help streamline processes
 - Translating practice into documented policy
 - Standardizing processes on campus
 - Optimizing workflows
 - HR hiring processes/policies
 - Improving HR and Business Office
-
- Create an advisory process
 - Administrative evaluations
 - Improving food options.
 - I'm looking around and people are not engaged.
 - Moving to a quarter system.
 - Entrepreneurial work as a campus




Chancellor's Advisory Council Survey

preliminary results

Feedback for Chancellor's Advisory Council (CAC) | February 12, 2019 | bit.ly/cac19

data



decisions

discussion

Respondents feel comfortable participating in the CAC.

Very Comfortable



Comfortable



Uncomfortable



Q1: How comfortable do you feel participating in the CAC? N = 33 | 7 Selected “Very Comfortable”(21%) | 24 “Comfortable” (73%) | 2 “Uncomfortable” (6%)
Average: 3.2 on 4-point scale where 1=very uncomfortable and 4=very comfortable

80%

**improved atmosphere.
relevant.
transparent.
confident.
equal.
voice heard.**

20% room for improvement

Why do members feel comfortable?

“CAC meetings provide an open environment for myself and other members to discuss topics.”

Q2: What factors contributed to your rating in Q1 regarding participation?
40/50 comments coded positive (80%) | 10/50 comments (20%) coded needs improvement

Responses were
more **varied** about
the effectiveness of
decision making.

Very Effective



Effective



Ineffective



Totally Ineffective



Q3: How effective is the CAC in decision making? N = 32 | 2 “Very Effective” (6%) | 20 “Effective” (63%) | 9 “Ineffective” (28%) | 1 “Totally Ineffective” (3%)
Average: 2.7 on 4-point scale where 1=totally ineffective and 4=very effective

18% improved & proactive



79%
room for
improvement

What do members think about the decision-making process?

“Process of decision making is too long.”

“Not enough is brought to the full body for a vote.”

“Isn’t this more of an advising vs decision-making body?”

Q4: What factors contributed to your rating in Q3 regarding decision making?

30/38 comments were coded as improvement needed (79%) | 7/38 comments (18%) were coded as positive | 1/38 coded (3%) was coded as neutral

Respondents believe
the CAC is **effective**
in **fulfilling its role**.

Very Effective



Effective



Ineffective



Q5: How effective is the CAC in fulfilling its role? | N = 33 | 4 Selected "Very Effective" (12%) | 21 "Effective" (64%) | 8 "Ineffective" (24%)

Average: 2.9 on 4-point scale where 1=totally ineffective and 4=very effective

58%
room for
improvement

42%
relevant.
improved.
voice heard.
efficient.
transparent.
organized.

What do members think about the role of CAC?

“Voting in the CAC suggests that is not an advisory council.”

“Role still must be defined more accurately.”

“Issues, concerns, and ideas are raised at the meetings from folks in the best position to do so.”

Q6: What factors contributed to your rating in Q5 regarding fulfillment of roles? Open-ended comments were coded by theme.
22 out of 38 comments (58%) were coded as improvement needed | 16 out of 38 comments were coded as positive (42%)

Members suggest **splinter groups** to improve effectiveness.



“Offer the group an opportunity to continue these discussions in splinter-meetings to assure that issues are thoroughly discussed, and **those who need to be heard are heard.**”

Q7: What changes would you suggest to improve the effectiveness of the CAC?

Open-ended comments were coded by theme | 6 out of 35 comments (17%) addressed issues with group size

“The CAC has improved over the years. There is greater opportunity for discussion and input. Fantastic job. Please keep it up!!!”

“Keep moving forward.”



Q8: Other Comments

Open-ended comments were coded by theme | 3 out of 12 comments (25%) were coded as “improved process”

Mahalo!

Questions about the data? Want more details?

Contact karapw@hawaii.edu for answers.


Image Sources & Links

Fist bump photo by [rawpixel](#) on [Unsplash](#) | <https://unsplash.com/photos/yN4O7XwWoyY?>

All icons courtesy of Noun Project | <https://thenounproject.com> | No attribution needed for pro members.

A special thank you to OFIE student employee Cory Mitchell for data entry.

Appendix





Why a survey now?

The campus needs to regularly evaluate its institutional plans, governance, and decision-making policies, procedures, and processes to ensure effectiveness as part of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges [ACCJC] Recommendation 1.

This survey was created by the campus administrative assistant to the chancellor and the Office for Institutional Effectiveness. The feedback provided by the members of the Chancellor's Advisory Council will be used as the basis to make improvements to the CAC.

The following questions were asked to gauge kūpono, effectiveness in decision making, and effectiveness in role fulfillment within the CAC, using open-ended responses to identify emerging themes for future measurement.

1. How comfortable do you feel participating in the CAC?
1. What factors contributed to your rating in Q1 regarding participation?
1. How effective is the CAC in decision making?
1. What factors contributed to your rating in Q3 regarding decision making?
1. How effective is the CAC in fulfilling its role?
1. What factors contributed to your rating in Q5 regarding fulfillment of roles?
1. What changes would you suggest to improve the effectiveness of the CAC?

N Values for Coded Themes

Feeling Comfortable

Q2: What factors contributed to your rating in Q1 regarding participation?

Open-ended comments were coded by theme.

40 out of 50 comments (80%) were coded as positive feedback

10 out of 50 coded (20%) were coded as room for improvement

50 Total Comments

Voice Heard	34%	17
Relevant Topics	14%	7
Transparent	12%	6
Improved Atmosphere	8%	4
Group Size Too Large	6%	3
Time Mismanagement	6%	3
Familiarity	6%	3
Confident	4%	2
Intimidated	2%	1
Frustrated	2%	1
Not Efficient	2%	1
Inaction	2%	1
Equality	2%	1

N Values for Coded Themes

Decision Making Process

Q4: What factors contributed to your rating in Q3 regarding decision making?

Open-ended comments were coded by theme.

30/38 comments were coded as improvement needed (79%)

7/38 comments (18%) were coded as positive

1/38 coded (3%) was coded as neutral

38 Total Comments

Ineffective Design	26%	10
Lengthy Decision Making Process	16%	6
Process has Improved	13%	5
Lack of Change or Improvement	11%	4
Lack of Representation	11%	4
Proactive	5%	2
Irrelevant Topics	5%	2
Lack of Time for Constituent Feedback	5%	2
Lack of Clearly Defined Roles	3%	1
Apathetic Attitudes	3%	1
Between effective and ineffective	3%	1

N Values for Coded Themes

Fulfillment of Roles

Q6: What factors contributed to your rating in Q5 regarding fulfillment of roles?

Open-ended comments were coded by theme.

22 out of 38 comments (58%) were coded as improvement needed

16 out of 38 comments were coded as positive (42%)

38 Total Comments

Unclear Definition of Role	16%	6
Relevant Topics	13%	5
No Action	11%	4
Lack of Representation	8%	3
Ongoing Improvement Needed	8%	3
Poor Time Management	8%	3
Voice Heard	8%	3
Process has Improved	8%	3
Efficient	5%	2
Lengthy Decision Making Process	5%	2
Transparent	5%	2
Irrelevant Topics	3%	1
Organized	3%	1

N Values for Coded Themes

Improving Effectiveness

Q7: What changes would you suggest to improve the effectiveness of the CAC?

Open-ended comments were coded by theme

38 Total Comments

Ineffective Design	19%	7
Unclear Definition of Roles	19%	7
Time Mismanagement	11%	4
Splinter Meetings	11%	4
Ineffective Outreach	8%	3
Lack of Representation	8%	3
Group Size Too Large	6%	2
Improved Process	3%	1
Inefficiency	3%	1
Irrelevant Topics	3%	1
Lack of Transparency	3%	1
Not Proactive	3%	1
Poor Participation	3%	1

Q4: What factors contributed to your rating in Q3 regarding decision making?

“Not always clear how discussion leads to chancellor decisions at CAC.”

“Not all are participating in decision making or show interests”

“Lack of representation”

“Not all staff/faculty has a say or participates.”

“Process of decision making is too long.”

Open-ended comments were coded by theme.

30 out of 38 comments were coded as negative (79%) | 7 out of 38 comments (18%) were coded as positive | 1 out of 38 coded (3%) was coded as neutral

Q6: What factors contributed to your rating in Q5 regarding fulfillment of roles?

“Role still must be defined more accurately.”

“Voting in the CAC suggests that is not an advisory council.”

“Not clear.”

“CAC can be more effective in fulfilling its role by making more decisions.”

“Time in meetings needs to be better utilized.”

Open-ended comments were coded by theme.

6 out of 38 comments (16%) were coded as “unclear definition of role” | 5 out of 38 coded (13%) were coded as “relevant topics”

Q7: What changes would you suggest to improve the effectiveness of the CAC?

“Working subcommittees - Doing the work so when things are proposed at CAC - Decisions can be made clear”

“Have target/specific committees to work through issues & then present ideas to greater groups”

“Smaller subgroups composed of subject matter ‘experts’ on areas”

“Offer the group an opportunity to continue these discussions in splinter-meetings to assure that issues are thoroughly discussed, and those who need to be heard are heard.”