



Issue 2016 -09

Revised June 27, 2017

Abstract

Last administered in 2012, the 2016 Closing the Loop Study aimed to elicit a portrait of the overall atmosphere of the Kapi'olani Community College (KapCC) campus for upcoming accreditation purposes. The survey consisted of 47 questions and received 374 responses out of a possible 607 members of faculty and staff (HR 2016), for a response rate of 61.61%. Results suggest that faculty and staff's perceptions of campus performance have remained generally consistent since 2012. Communication between governance organizations and their constituents has increased, as well as approval of the Office for Administrative Services (OAS) and the safety and sufficiency of the institution's facilities. However, in the areas of faculty and staff support/sufficiency, council performance, institutional effectiveness planning, and management of academic affairs, Office for International Affairs (OIA) Center for Excellence in Learning Teaching and Technology (CELTT), and campus parking, approval has slightly declined.

Methods

Participants & Data Collection

The "2016 Closing the Loop Study" was created and administered via Survey Monkey. The survey was an edited version of the 2012 Accreditation Self Study Faculty and Staff Survey. Questions that were no longer relevant to the campus were removed (e.g. questions regarding departments that were either renamed or dissolved). The survey was conducted over a period of 4 weeks, and reminders were sent twice a week via the chancellor's office.

Analysis

The survey consisted of 3 types of questions: 1) Yes/No; 2) Select all that apply; and 3) Likert Scale. Responses to both the 2012 and 2016 surveys were compared item by item in order to detect changes in campus climate over the past 4 years. Please see the Appendix for the complete list of tables containing and comparing item results.

"Yes/No" and "Select all that apply" questions were analyzed by calculating the number and percentage of responses to each answer, as well as the total number of responses. This allowed for easy comparison of changes from 2012 to 2016.

Likert scale questions required a more complex analysis. To facilitate comparison, questions using a Likert scale were assigned weighted values. For example, items containing the options “strongly agree,” “somewhat agree,” “neutral,” “somewhat disagree,” and “strongly disagree” were assigned the following values: 2, 1, 0, -1, -2, respectively. The option “don’t know/NA” was assigned a value of 0, as those responses are equivalent to having no opinion on the topic.

These “assigned values” were then used to calculate the following: calculated assigned value, maximum assigned value possible, and % assigned value. Of these numbers, % assigned value is particularly useful; the higher the % assigned value, the more respondents “strongly agreed” with the given statement. Likewise, the lower the % assigned value, the more respondents “strongly disagreed” with the given statement. For more information on how these values were calculated, please see Appendix B.

Summary of Results

Areas seeing Improvement

Overall, results suggest that the campus has improved in the quality, currency, and variety, etc. of its library collections (Questions 20-22).

Communication between governance organizations and their constituents (see Question 35) has also improved in the last four years. Faculty Senate saw the greatest improvement in communication from 18.66% in 2012 to 38.89% in 2016 ($\Delta +20.23\%$), and also generally improved in its representation of faculty in various academic matters (Question 36).

Finally, performance of the Staff Council has also improved since 2012 (Question 38).

Areas needing substantial attention

One area needing substantial attention is that of personnel satisfaction. For instance, Question 23 includes 15 sub-questions related to the qualifications of new hires, personnel policies, and sufficiency of support for faculty/staff. While the % Assigned Values for most of these questions were already low in 2012, several values declined significantly farther in 2016, indicating growing dissatisfaction among faculty and staff. This issue is reflected in the responses to Question 23-3, which asked participants to note their opinions regarding the following statement: The institution applies its personnel policies consistently and fairly. In 2012, this item received a % Assigned Value of 11.37%, indicating low-moderate agreement/satisfaction. In 2016, this figure dropped to 0.19% ($\Delta -11.18\%$).

The results also suggest dissatisfaction with the adequacy of campus facilities and equipment (see Question 24). For example, Question 24-1 asked participants to rate the following statement: “There are adequate facilities available to sustain our program/department/unit and student needs.” In 2012,

the % Assigned Value of the responses was -14.26%. This number fell to -22.64% in 2016, indicating a significant decline in approval (Δ -8.38%). Likewise, Question 24-2 asked participants to rate the adequacy of classroom equipment. This value also decreased from 1.95% in 2012 to -11.98% in 2016 (Δ -13.93%).

Areas with little change

Results suggest that the majority of the areas covered by this survey saw little change from 2012.

For example, faculty reflection on their teaching practices has remained relatively the same since 2012, with the vast majority (greater than 85%) of respondents reporting that they reflect on the key aspects of courses (Question 11).

Usefulness of support services for teaching (Question 18), access to technical equipment (Question 31), faculty understanding of departmental budget (Question 32), and participation in organizations, councils, committees, etc. (Question 33), have all remained generally consistent since 2012.

The percentage of faculty teaching distance education classes has also remained steady, decreasing by only 0.27% since 2012.

Areas reflecting lack of knowledge

A number of questions received large proportions of “don’t know/NA” responses, suggesting issues with a lack of knowledge about departments and/or resources. For instance, Questions 43-47 ask participants to rate the functioning of various Kapi’olani CC offices, including the Office for Institutional Effectiveness, the Office of Academic Affairs, and the Office for Administrative Services. For both the 2012 and 2016 surveys, the percent of “Don’t know or N/A” responses ranged from approximately 40 to 60%. The percent of don’t know responses for each office changed little from 2012 to 2016, indicating no improvement in familiarity with the activities of these offices among the broader campus community between 2012 and 2016. These results suggest a general lack of knowledge about the purpose and processes of these departments. Further, because of the large proportion of “don’t know/NA” responses, the % assigned value questions may not be a fair assessment for these items.

Question 37, which asked about the responsibilities of Kalāualani, also saw significant numbers of “don’t know/NA” responses, receiving between 65 and 71% of “don’t know/NA” responses for each of its sub questions. While the percentage of “don’t know/NA” responses is slightly lower than in 2012, these results suggest a significant lack of knowledge amongst faculty and staff.

Question 39, which asked participants to weigh in on how effective various campus councils are at achieving their goals, also received high proportions of “don’t know/NA” responses; between 67 and 76% of respondents chose the “don’t know/NA” option in 2016.

Conclusion

Overall there have been not many significant changes in the faculty and staff responses to the 2016 Self-study survey. When looking at individual department questions, it should be noted that they received negative or very low assigned value scores that do not reflect the actual climate of these departments. The majority of the responses from Question 43 onward were in the “don’t know/NA” category.

Items of note are questions 9, 23, 24, 26, and 34, which have significantly more negative responses in 2016 than were reported in 2012. Questions 22, 35, 36, and 38 have shown positive improvements in responses from 2012.

Appendix: A Results

| Question 1: Department/Unit | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Business, Legal Education and Technology | 27 | 16 |
| | 7.67% | 4.38% |
| Culinary Arts | 17 | 17 |
| | 4.83% | 4.66% |
| Emergency Medical Services | 6 | 7 |
| | 1.70% | 1.92% |
| Health Sciences | 23 | 20 |
| | 6.53% | 5.48% |
| Kahikoluamea | 22 | 2 |
| | 6.25% | 0.55% |
| Hospitality and Tourism Education | 9 | 8 |
| | 2.56% | 2.19% |
| Arts and Humanities | 46 | 43 |
| | 13.07% | 11.78% |
| Center for Excellence in Learning, Teaching and Technology | 2 | 12 |
| | 0.57% | 3.29% |
| Language, Linguistics and Literature | 55 | 41 |
| | 15.63% | 11.23% |
| Library & Learning Resources | 17 | 11 |
| | 4.83% | 3.01% |
| Math & Sciences | 34 | 42 |
| | 9.66% | 11.51% |
| Nursing | 10 | 12 |
| | 2.84% | 3.29% |
| Social Sciences | 13 | 12 |
| | 3.69% | 3.29% |
| Student Services | 22 | 43 |
| | 6.25% | 11.78% |
| Community and Continuing Education | 13 | 15 |
| | 3.69% | 4.11% |
| Other Administrative or Support Office | 36 | 64 |
| | 10.23% | 17.53% |
| Total | 352 | 365 |

| Question 2: Are you a full-time or part-time employee at the college? | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Full time | 281 78.49% | 304 82.38% |
| Part Time | 77 21.51% | 65 17.62% |
| Total | 358 | 369 |

| Question 3: You are a(n): | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Faculty--Instructional | 162 44.88% | 139 38.61% |
| Faculty--Non-Instructional | 53 14.68% | 53 14.72% |
| Lecturer | 67 18.56% | 66 18.33% |
| Administrative, Professional, and Technical Staff (APT) | 47 13.02% | 63 17.50% |
| Civil Service Staff | 23 6.37% | 31 8.61% |
| Administrator | 9 2.49% | 8 2.22% |
| Total | 361 | 360 |

| Question 4: Does your work involve students directly in instructional settings? | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 247 68.99% | 240 64.86% |
| No | 111 31.01% | 130 35.14% |
| Total | 358 | 370 |

| Question 5: Do you currently serve as a department chair? | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 16 7.31% | 8 3.83% |
| No | 203 92.69% | 201 96.17% |
| Total | 219 | 209 |

| Question 6: Please rate the following items: (IIA) | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 1) I have actively used the student learning assessment results to address the weak areas of student learning. | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 68 30.36% | 62 30.10% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 81 36.16% | 82 39.81% |
| Neutral (0) | 26 11.61% | 25 12.14% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 9 4.02% | 4 1.94% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 8 3.57% | 15 7.28% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 32 14.29% | 18 8.74% |
| Total | 224 | 206 |
| Assigned Value | 192 | 172 |
| Total Assigned Value | 448 | 412 |
| % Assigned Value | 42.86% | 41.75% |

| 2) Student learning assessment results are a great guide for me to make improvements to my teaching. | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 69 31.36% | 49 24.26% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 77 35.00% | 66 32.67% |
| Neutral (0) | 28 12.73% | 37 18.32% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 8 3.64% | 15 7.43% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 6 2.73% | 13 6.44% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 32 14.55% | 22 10.89% |
| Total | 220 | 202 |
| Assigned Value | 195 | 123 |
| Total Assigned Value | 440 | 404 |
| % Assigned Value | 44.32% | 30.45% |

| 3) I actively engage in student learning outcome assessment. | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 91 41.55% | 86 43.65% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 73 33.33% | 60 30.46% |
| Neutral (0) | 17 7.76% | 8 4.06% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 12 5.48% | 8 4.06% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 5 2.28% | 13 6.60% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 21 9.59% | 22 11.17% |
| Total | 219 | 197 |
| Assigned Value | 233 | 198 |
| Total Assigned Value | 438 | 394 |
| % Assigned Value | 53.20% | 50.25% |

| 4) My student learning competencies/outcomes at the course level are clearly aligned with the program level student learning outcomes. | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 103 46.61% | 92 45.32% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 68 30.77% | 72 35.47% |
| Neutral (0) | 21 9.50% | 14 6.90% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 2 0.90% | 5 2.46% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 1 0.45% | 3 1.48% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 26 11.76% | 17 8.37% |
| Total | 221 | 203 |
| Assigned Value | 270 | 245 |
| Total Assigned Value | 442 | 406 |
| % Assigned Value | 61.09% | 60.34% |

| 5) I participated in the development of program level student learning outcomes. | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 81 43.78% | 72 36.18% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 38 33.33% | 44 33.33% |
| Neutral (0) | 12 6.49% | 25 12.56% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 20 10.81% | 29 14.57% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 1 0.54% | 3 1.51% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 33 17.84% | 26 13.07% |
| Total | 185 | 199 |
| Assigned Value | 178 | 153 |
| Total Assigned Value | 370 | 398 |
| % Assigned Value | 48.11% | 38.44% |

| 6) I am willing to work with my colleagues on student learning outcome assessment. | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 134 54.92% | 107 52.71% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 59 24.18% | 64 31.53% |
| Neutral (0) | 7 2.87% | 17 8.37% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 3 1.23% | 1 0.49% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 8 3.28% | 6 2.96% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 33 13.52% | 8 3.94% |
| Total | 244 | 203 |
| Assigned Value | 308 | 265 |
| Total Assigned Value | 488 | 406 |
| % Assigned Value | 63.11% | 65.27% |

| 7) I will be more willing to do student learning outcome assessment if examples are available for me to adopt. | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 99 45.41% | 81 39.90% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 63 28.90% | 52 25.62% |
| Neutral (0) | 28 12.84% | 32 15.76% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 5 2.29% | 11 5.42% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 8 3.67% | 8 3.94% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 15 6.88% | 19 9.36% |
| Total | 218 | 203 |
| Assigned Value | 240 | 187 |
| Total Assigned Value | 436 | 406 |
| % Assigned Value | 55.05% | 46.06% |

| 8) I know where to find assistance on developing student learning outcome assessment. | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 84 38.18% | 77 37.75% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 68 30.91% | 53 25.98% |
| Neutral (0) | 29 13.18% | 20 9.80% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 10 4.55% | 24 11.76% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 15 6.82% | 16 7.84% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 14 6.36% | 14 6.86% |
| Total | 220 | 204 |
| Assigned Value | 196 | 151 |
| Total Assigned Value | 440 | 408 |
| % Assigned Value | 44.55% | 37.01% |

| 9) I do not see the value in student learning outcome assessment. | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 13 5.94% | 15 7.35% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 12 5.48% | 18 8.82% |
| Neutral (0) | 25 11.42% | 41 20.10% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 46 21.00% | 27 13.24% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 112 51.14% | 95 46.57% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 11 5.02% | 8 3.92% |
| Total | 219 | 204 |
| Assigned Value | -232 | -169 |
| Total Assigned Value | 438 | 408 |
| % Assigned Value | -52.97% | -41.42% |

| Question 7: What teaching methods do you use in your class? Check all that apply. (II.A.) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Lecture | 173 80.47% | 164 82.83% |
| Lecture and Lab | 100 46.51% | 92 46.46% |
| Collaborative Projects | 120 55.81% | 106 53.54% |
| Group Work | 166 77.21% | 145 73.23% |
| Small group discussion | 158 73.49% | 145 73.23% |
| Individual Student presentations | 125 58.14% | 114 57.58% |
| Group presentations | 109 50.70% | 104 52.53% |
| Performance activities | 70 32.56% | 58 29.29% |
| Observation | 82 38.14% | 71 35.86% |
| Practical Application | 111 51.63% | 88 44.44% |
| Demonstration | 120 55.81% | 97 48.99% |
| Multimedia presentation | 123 57.21% | 102 51.52% |
| Team teaching | 41 19.07% | 42 21.21% |
| Workshop/seminar | 43 20.00% | 48 24.24% |
| Service learning | 51 23.72% | 49 24.75% |
| Socratic method | 70 32.56% | 70 35.35% |
| Problem-based learning | 95 44.19% | 92 46.46% |
| In-class projects | 107 49.77% | 100 50.51% |
| Out-of-class projects | 107 49.77% | 94 47.47% |
| Role-play | 62 28.84% | 58 29.29% |

| | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| Supplemental on-line materials and activities | 108 50.23% | 103 52.02% |
| Games | 71 33.02% | 57 28.79% |
| Computer assisted simulations | 37 17.21% | 41 20.71% |
| Clinicals | 25 11.63% | 24 12.12% |
| Practicum | 24 11.16% | 21 10.61% |
| Other (please specify) | 13 6.05% | 22 11.11% |
| Total | 215 | 198 |

| Question 8: What assessment methods do you use in your class? Check all that apply. (II.A.) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Tests | 152 70.70% | 134 68.02% |
| Multiple Choice tests | 132 61.40% | 115 58.38% |
| Fill-in-the-blank tests | 82 38.14% | 73 37.06% |
| True/False tests | 76 35.35% | 68 34.52% |
| Matching tests | 67 31.16% | 49 24.87% |
| Essay tests | 99 46.05% | 87 44.16% |
| Quizzes | 153 71.16% | 130 65.99% |
| Written paper/report | 158 73.49% | 135 68.53% |
| Oral presentations | 130 60.47% | 114 57.87% |
| Oral interview | 37 17.21% | 21 10.66% |
| Multimedia | 47 21.86% | 37 18.78% |
| Written portfolio | 51 23.72% | 27 13.71% |
| E-portfolio | 22 10.23% | 33 16.75% |

| | | |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Demonstrations | 57 26.51% | 53 26.90% |
| Performance | 54 25.12% | 44 22.34% |
| Musical performance | 6 2.79% | 2 1.02% |
| Dance performance | 5 2.33% | 4 2.03% |
| Oral performance | 36 16.74% | 24 12.18% |
| Speeches | 20 9.30% | 11 5.58% |
| Other | 24 11.16% | 30 15.23% |
| Total | 215 | 197 |

| Question 9: How is the process of inputting course proposal(s) through Kualiti Student Curriculum Management? (II.A.) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| I did not submit course proposals through Kualiti. Does not apply (0) | 127 56.95% | 143 72.22% |
| Very easy (+2) | 5 2.24% | 6 3.03% |
| Somewhat easy (+1) | 30 13.45% | 25 12.63% |
| Somewhat difficult (-1) | 42 18.83% | 17 8.59% |
| Very difficult (-2) | 19 8.52% | 7 3.54% |
| Total | 223 | 198 |
| Assigned Value | -40 | 6 |
| Total Assigned Value | 446 | 396 |
| % Assigned Value | -8.97% | 1.52% |

| Question 10: Are you aware that the courses that you teach need to go through a curriculum review process every five years? (II.A.)2 | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 185 84.47% | 170 86.29% |
| No | 34 15.53% | 27 13.71% |
| Total | 219 | 197 |

| Question 11: For the courses that you have taught, have you reflected on the following: (II.A.) | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| 1. The basic skills (reading, writing, and analytical) are needed for success in your course(s)? | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 210 97.67% | 183 96.32% |
| No | 5 2.33% | 7 3.68% |
| Total | 215 | 190 |

| 2. Amount and level of reading, writing or other independent work required in your course(s)? | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 203 94.86% | 180 94.74% |
| No | 11 5.14% | 10 5.26% |
| Total | 214 | 190 |

| 3. Amount and level of quantitative and logical reasoning required in your course(s)? | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 181 85.38% | 159 84.57% |
| No | 31 14.62% | 29 15.43% |
| Total | 212 | 188 |

| 4. Background knowledge in related subject matter expected of students entering the course. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 182 86.67% | 162 85.26% |
| No | 28 13.33% | 28 14.74% |
| Total | 210 | 190 |

| 5. Expectations for student participation (in activities/reading/projects) outside of class to support their learning. | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 202 94.39% | 172 91.01% |
| No | 12 5.61% | 17 8.99% |
| Total | 214 | 189 |

| 6. How your course reflects the course level (e.g., 100 level, 200 level, or lower than 100 level) | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 200 95.69% | 175 92.59% |
| No | 9 4.31% | 14 7.41% |
| Total | 209 | 189 |

| Question 12: Is there a need for tutoring services to fall under a centralized organization (with standardized hiring and quality control policies), regardless of the delivery location? (II.C.) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 116 52.49% | 109 54.77% |
| No | 34 15.38% | 27 13.57% |
| No Opinion | 71 32.13% | 63 31.66% |
| Total | 221 | 199 |

| Question 13: Have you taught a distance delivery class (e.g., completely online, cable TV, off-site) since Fall 2011? (III.B.) | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 75 33.94% | 67 33.67% |
| No | 146 66.06% | 132 66.33% |
| Total | 221 | 199 |

| Question 14: If "Yes" to the question above, rate the support for your equipment needs in the distance delivered classes that you have taught? If "No", please skip. (III.B.) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very Satisfied (+2) | 27 35.53% | 16 23.53% |
| Somewhat Satisfied (+1) | 26 34.21% | 24 35.29% |
| Neither Satisfied or dissatisfied (0) | 12 15.79% | 11 16.18% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied (-1) | 11 14.47% | 11 16.18% |
| Very dissatisfied (-2) | 0 0.00% | 6 8.82% |
| Total | 76 | 68 |
| Assigned Value | 69 | 33 |
| Total Assigned Value | 152 | 136 |
| % Assigned Value | 45.39% | 24.26% |

| Question 15: Are you aware of the college's mission statement? (I.A.) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Completely (+4) | 87 27.36% | 84 28.57% |
| Mostly (+3) | 146 45.91% | 126 42.86% |
| Some (+2) | 54 16.98% | 50 17.01% |
| A little (+1) | 18 5.66% | 18 6.12% |
| Not at all (0) | 13 4.09% | 16 5.44% |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|
| Total | 318 | 294 |
| Assigned Value | 912 | 832 |
| Total Assigned Value | 1,272 | 1,176 |
| % Assigned Value | 71.70% | 70.75% |
| Average Value | 2.87 | 2.83 |

| Question 16: Are you aware of places to find the Kapi`olani CC mission statement document? Check all that apply. (I.A.) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Classrooms | 41 12.97% | 44 15.12% |
| Kapi`olani Community College homepage | 274 86.71% | 226 77.66% |
| Office for Institutional Effectiveness (OFIE) website | 100 31.65% | 104 35.74% |
| `Ohana, the college's intranet | 135 42.72% | 67 23.02% |
| Strategic plan 2008-2015 Booklet | 179 56.65% | 138 47.42% |
| I don't know where to find it | 15 4.75% | 22 7.56% |
| Total | 316 | 291 |

| Question 17: Rate the following items: | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| 1) Our mission statement expresses the college-wide commitment to student learning (I.A.) | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 182 57.96% | 134 45.58% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 89 28.34% | 109 37.07% |
| Neutral (0) | 22 7.01% | 13 4.42% |
| Somewhat disagree (-1) | 3 0.96% | 9 3.06% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 1 0.32% | 7 2.38% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 17 5.41% | 22 7.48% |
| Total | 314 | 294 |
| Assigned Value | 448 | 354 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|
| Total Assigned Value | 628 | 588 |
| % Assigned Value | 71.34% | 60.20% |

| 2) I have discussed the relevance of the mission statement to student learning with peers of administrators (I.A.) | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 55 17.52% | 40 13.61% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 95 30.25% | 78 26.53% |
| Neutral (0) | 67 21.34% | 56 19.05% |
| Somewhat disagree (-1) | 26 8.28% | 26 8.84% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 35 11.15% | 52 17.69% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 36 11.46% | 42 14.29% |
| Total | 314 | 294 |
| Assigned Value | 109 | 28 |
| Total Assigned Value | 628 | 588 |
| % Assigned Value | 17.36% | 4.76% |

| 3) I participated actively in the planning or priority-setting process in my department/unit (I.B.) | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 83 26.52% | 66 22.53% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 79 25.24% | 71 24.23% |
| Neutral (0) | 60 19.17% | 48 16.38% |
| Somewhat disagree (-1) | 24 7.67% | 21 7.17% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 26 8.31% | 38 12.97% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 41 13.10% | 49 16.72% |
| Total | 313 | 293 |
| Assigned Value | 169 | 106 |
| Total Assigned Value | 626 | 586 |
| % Assigned Value | 27.00% | 18.09% |

| 4) I used student data, program review data, or other institutional data to help my department/unit to identify areas of improvement. (I.B). | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 87 27.88% | 82 27.99% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 92 29.49% | 76 25.94% |
| Neutral (0) | 52 16.67% | 41 13.99% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 16 5.13% | 19 6.48% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 23 7.37% | 27 9.22% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 42 13.46% | 48 16.38% |
| Total | 312 | 293 |
| Assigned Value | 204 | 167 |
| Total Assigned Value | 624 | 586 |
| % Assigned Value | 32.69% | 28.50% |
| 5) I am committed to improve the effectiveness of my education/professional practice to improve student learning and success on this campus (I.B.). | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 234 75.00% | 214 72.79% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 50 16.03% | 50 17.01% |
| Neutral (0) | 16 5.13% | 13 4.42% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 1 0.32% | 1 0.34% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 4 1.28% | 1 0.34% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 7 2.24% | 15 5.10% |
| Total | 312 | 294 |
| Assigned Value | 509 | 475 |
| Total Assigned Value | 624 | 588 |
| % Assigned Value | 81.57% | 80.78% |

Question 18: To what degree do the following support services facilitate your work to promote student learning and success? (II.B.)

| Auxillary Services | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Greatly (4) | 102 34.34% | 91 32.50% |
| To some Degree (3) | 97 32.66% | 89 31.79% |
| A little (2) | 50 16.84% | 57 20.36% |
| Not at all (1) | 23 7.74% | 22 7.86% |
| Don't know (0) | 25 8.42% | 21 7.50% |
| Total | 297 | 280 |
| Assigned Value | 822 | 767 |
| Assigned Value Average | 2.77 | 2.74 |
| Total Assigned Value | 1,188 | 1,120 |
| % Assigned Value | 69.19% | 68.48% |

| Bookstore | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Greatly (4) | 83 28.04% | 75 26.60% |
| To some Degree (3) | 115 38.85% | 90 31.91% |
| A little (2) | 53 17.91% | 62 21.99% |
| Not at all (1) | 21 7.09% | 35 12.41% |
| Don't know (0) | 24 8.11% | 20 7.09% |
| Total | 296 | 282 |
| Assigned Value | 804 | 729 |
| Assigned Value Average | 2.72 | 2.59 |
| Total Assigned Value | 1,184 | 1,128 |
| % Assigned Value | 67.91% | 64.63% |

| Business Office | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Greatly (4) | 75 25.77% | 69 24.64% |
| To some Degree (3) | 72 24.74% | 63 22.50% |
| A little (2) | 52 17.87% | 55 19.64% |
| Not at all (1) | 50 17.18% | 50 17.86% |
| Don't know (0) | 42 14.43% | 43 15.36% |
| Total | 291 | 280 |
| Assigned Value | 670 | 625 |
| Assigned Value Average | 2.30 | 2.23 |
| Total Assigned Value | 1,164 | 1,120 |
| % Assigned Value | 57.56% | 55.80% |

| Counseling Services (e.g., Trio, academic advising) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Greatly (4) | 142 48.46% | 151 53.74% |
| To some Degree (3) | 62 21.16% | 72 25.62% |
| A little (2) | 40 13.65% | 22 7.83% |
| Not at all (1) | 16 5.46% | 17 6.05% |
| Don't know (0) | 33 11.26% | 19 6.76% |
| Total | 293 | 281 |
| Assigned Value | 850 | 881 |
| Assigned Value Average | 2.90 | 3.14 |
| Total Assigned Value | 1,172 | 1,124 |
| % Assigned Value | 72.53% | 78.38% |

| New Student Orientation Program (NSO) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Greatly (4) | 114 38.91% | 114 40.43% |
| To some Degree (3) | 64 21.84% | 65 23.05% |
| A little (2) | 34 11.60% | 30 10.64% |
| Not at all (1) | 21 7.17% | 32 11.35% |
| Don't know (0) | 60 20.48% | 41 14.54% |
| Total | 293 | 282 |
| Assigned Value | 737 | 743 |
| Assigned Value Average | 2.52 | 2.63 |
| Total Assigned Value | 1,172 | 1,128 |
| % Assigned Value | 62.88% | 65.87% |

| Kahikoluamea | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Greatly (4) | 91 30.74% | |
| To some Degree (3) | 59 19.93% | |
| A little (2) | 43 14.53% | |
| Not at all (1) | 31 10.47% | |
| Don't know (0) | 72 24.32% | |
| Total | 296 | |
| Assigned Value | 658 | |
| Assigned Value Average | 2.22 | |
| Total Assigned Value | 1,184 | |
| % Assigned Value | 55.57% | |

| Question 19: Have you requested library materials in your subject area, or discussed the collection with a library staff since Fall 2011? (II.C.) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 89 30.27% | 84 30.00% |
| No | 205 69.73% | 196 70.00% |
| Total | 294 | 280 |

| Question 20: If yes, did the library purchase the materials you requested or discussed? (II.C.) | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 67 58.77% | 60 53.10% |
| No | 47 41.23% | 53 46.90% |
| Total | 114 | 113 |

| Question 21: Which of the following library services have you used since Fall 2016. Check all that apply. (II.C.) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Accessed online journals and digital materials | 129 43.88% | 113 40.50% |
| Borrowing books or materials located at the library | 103 35.03% | 82 29.39% |
| Borrowing books or materials through intralibrary or interlibrary loan | 61 20.75% | 52 18.64% |
| Reading books held in the reference collection | 43 14.63% | 42 15.05% |
| Using library instruction sessions | 74 25.17% | 66 23.66% |
| Using computer and printing services | 62 21.09% | 47 16.85% |
| Testing Center | 143 48.64% | 119 42.65% |
| Others | 39 13.27% | 34 12.19% |
| Did not use | 58 19.73% | 78 27.96% |
| Total | 294 | 279 |

| Question 22: How would you rate the library collections in your subject area since Fall 2016. (II.C.) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| Availability of needed online journals/materials | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very Satisfied (2) | 43 15.03% | 56 20.07% |
| Somewhat Satisfied (1) | 74 25.87% | 54 19.35% |
| Neither Satisfied nor dissatisfied (0) | 28 9.79% | 30 10.75% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied (-1) | 18 6.29% | 11 3.94% |
| Very dissatisfied (-2) | 19 6.64% | 8 2.87% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 104 36.36% | 120 43.01% |
| Total | 286 | 279 |
| Assigned Value | 104 | 139 |
| Total Assigned Value | 572 | 558 |
| % Assigned Value | 18.18% | 24.91% |

| Currency, being up-to-date | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very Satisfied (2) | 48 16.96% | 53 19.20% |
| Somewhat Satisfied (1) | 67 23.67% | 54 19.57% |
| Neither Satisfied nor dissatisfied (0) | 30 10.60% | 35 12.68% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied (-1) | 13 4.59% | 6 2.17% |
| Very dissatisfied (-2) | 13 4.59% | 4 1.45% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 112 39.58% | 124 44.93% |
| Total | 283 | 276 |
| Assigned Value | 124 | 146 |
| Total Assigned Value | 566 | 552 |
| % Assigned Value | 21.91% | 26.45% |

| Quantity | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very Satisfied (2) | 31 10.88% | 47 17.15% |
| Somewhat Satisfied (1) | 77 27.02% | 48 17.52% |
| Neither Satisfied nor dissatisfied (0) | 34 11.93% | 40 14.60% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied (-1) | 23 8.07% | 11 4.01% |
| Very dissatisfied (-2) | 11 3.86% | 4 1.46% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 109 38.25% | 124 45.26% |
| Total | 285 | 274 |
| Assigned Value | 94 | 123 |
| Total Assigned Value | 570 | 548 |
| % Assigned Value | 16.49% | 22.45% |

| Quality | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very Satisfied (2) | 46 16.14% | 61 22.18% |
| Somewhat Satisfied (1) | 73 25.61% | 49 17.82% |
| Neither Satisfied nor dissatisfied (0) | 32 11.23% | 35 12.73% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied (-1) | 16 5.61% | 4 1.45% |
| Very dissatisfied (-2) | 10 3.51% | 3 1.09% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 108 37.89% | 123 44.73% |
| Total | 285 | 275 |
| Assigned Value | 129 | 161 |
| Total Assigned Value | 570 | 550 |
| % Assigned Value | 22.63% | 29.27% |

| Variety | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very Satisfied (2) | 34 11.97% | 51 18.41% |
| Somewhat Satisfied (1) | 75 26.41% | 52 18.77% |
| Neither Satisfied nor dissatisfied (0) | 35 12.32% | 37 13.36% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied (-1) | 19 6.69% | 8 2.89% |
| Very dissatisfied (-2) | 12 4.23% | 5 1.81% |
| Don't Know/N/A (0) | 109 38.38% | 124 44.77% |
| Total | 284 | 277 |
| Assigned Value | 100 | 136 |
| Total Assigned Value | 568 | 554 |
| % Assigned Value | 17.61% | 24.55% |

| Question 23: Please rate the following items. (III.A.) | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| 1) The qualifications required of new faculty and staff positions reflect student needs. | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 101 36.20% | 60 22.56% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 110 39.43% | 90 33.83% |
| Neutral (0) | 19 6.81% | 33 12.41% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 14 5.02% | 35 13.16% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 5 1.79% | 15 5.64% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 30 10.75% | 33 12.41% |
| Total | 279 | 266 |
| Assigned Value | 288 | 145 |
| Total Assigned Value | 558 | 532 |
| % Assigned Value | 51.61% | 27.26% |

| 2) The qualifications required of new faculty and staff positions reflect the analysis of the service needs of the program/department | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 91 32.85% | 57 21.43% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 110 39.71% | 80 30.08% |
| Neutral (0) | 22 7.94% | 36 13.53% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 13 4.69% | 34 12.78% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 7 2.53% | 21 7.89% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 34 12.27% | 38 14.29% |
| Total | 277 | 266 |
| Assigned Value | 265 | 118 |
| Total Assigned Value | 554 | 532 |
| % Assigned Value | 47.83% | 22.18% |

| 3) The institution applies its personnel policies consistently and fairly. | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 50 18.05% | 36 13.64% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 80 28.88% | 56 21.21% |
| Neutral (0) | 42 15.16% | 47 17.80% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 49 17.69% | 39 14.77% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 34 12.27% | 44 16.67% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 22 7.94% | 42 15.91% |
| Total | 277 | 264 |
| Assigned Value | 63 | 1 |
| Total Assigned Value | 554 | 528 |
| % Assigned Value | 11.37% | 0.19% |

| 4) There is a sufficient number of teaching faculty to support the services in our program/department/unit. | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 33 11.96% | 18 6.84% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 81 29.35% | 47 17.87% |
| Neutral (0) | 27 9.78% | 34 12.93% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 65 23.55% | 60 22.81% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 38 13.77% | 66 25.10% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 32 11.59% | 38 14.45% |
| Total | 276 | 263 |
| Assigned Value | 6 | -109 |
| Total Assigned Value | 552 | 526 |
| % Assigned Value | 1.09% | -20.72% |

| 5) There is a sufficient number of student service personnel (e.g., academic advisors) to support the services in our program/department/unit | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 30 10.83% | 30 11.36% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 80 28.88% | 57 21.59% |
| Neutral (0) | 34 12.27% | 44 16.67% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 48 17.33% | 47 17.80% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 43 15.52% | 43 16.29% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 42 15.16% | 43 16.29% |
| Total | 277 | 264 |
| Assigned Value | 6 | -16 |
| Total Assigned Value | 554 | 528 |
| % Assigned Value | 1.08% | -3.03% |

| 6) There is a sufficient number of non-teaching faculty other than student service personnel (e.g., in the areas of assessment, curriculum development, professional development, or institutional research) to support the services in our program or department. | | |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 21 7.61% | 23 8.71% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 72 26.09% | 46 17.42% |
| Neutral (0) | 40 14.49% | 49 18.56% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 59 21.38% | 47 17.80% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 42 15.22% | 53 20.08% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 42 15.22% | 46 17.42% |
| Total | 276 | 264 |
| Assigned Value | -29 | -61 |
| Total Assigned Value | 552 | 528 |
| % Assigned Value | -5.25% | -11.55% |

| 7) There is a sufficient number of staff to support services in our program/department/unit. | | |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 24 8.63% | 19 7.14% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 85 30.58% | 70 26.32% |
| Neutral (0) | 31 11.15% | 28 10.53% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 66 23.74% | 53 19.92% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 53 19.06% | 78 29.32% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 19 6.83% | 18 6.77% |
| Total | 278 | 266 |
| Assigned Value | -39 | -101 |
| Total Assigned Value | 556 | 532 |
| % Assigned Value | -7.01% | -18.98% |

| 8) The institution has a sufficient number of administrators | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 115 41.67% | 95 35.71% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 77 27.90% | 68 25.56% |
| Neutral (0) | 34 12.32% | 43 16.17% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 12 4.35% | 19 7.14% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 9 3.26% | 13 4.89% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 29 10.51% | 28 10.53% |
| Total | 276 | 266 |
| Assigned Value | 277 | 213 |
| Total Assigned Value | 552 | 532 |
| % Assigned Value | 50.18% | 40.04% |

| 9) The administrators in the college are qualified for their responsibilities. | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 77 28.10% | 44 16.99% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 96 35.04% | 74 28.57% |
| Neutral (0) | 43 15.69% | 45 17.37% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 22 8.03% | 39 15.06% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 15 5.47% | 27 10.42% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 21 7.66% | 30 11.58% |
| Total | 274 | 259 |
| Assigned Value | 198 | 69 |
| Total Assigned Value | 548 | 518 |
| % Assigned Value | 36.13% | 13.32% |

| 10) Our program/department/unit has a sufficient number of staff to provide administrative support. | | |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 43 15.69% | 26 9.92% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 81 29.56% | 59 22.52% |
| Neutral (0) | 27 9.85% | 35 13.36% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 48 17.52% | 53 20.23% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 60 21.90% | 66 25.19% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 15 5.47% | 23 8.78% |
| Total | 274 | 262 |
| Assigned Value | -1 | -74 |
| Total Assigned Value | 548 | 524 |
| % Assigned Value | -0.18% | -14.12% |

| 11) The institution treats faculty/staff in a professional and equitable manner. | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 72 26.18% | 40 15.21% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 74 26.91% | 76 28.90% |
| Neutral (0) | 46 16.73% | 44 16.73% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 47 17.09% | 40 15.21% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 27 9.82% | 48 18.25% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 9 3.27% | 15 5.70% |
| Total | 275 | 263 |
| Assigned Value | 117 | 20 |
| Total Assigned Value | 550 | 526 |
| % Assigned Value | 21.27% | 3.80% |

| 12) The need to promote student learning, guides professional development activities for faculty. | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 64 23.53% | 32 12.26% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 92 33.82% | 83 31.80% |
| Neutral (0) | 44 16.18% | 56 21.46% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 21 7.72% | 28 10.73% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 11 4.04% | 25 9.58% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 40 14.71% | 37 14.18% |
| Total | 272 | 261 |
| Assigned Value | 177 | 69 |
| Total Assigned Value | 544 | 522 |
| % Assigned Value | 32.54% | 13.22% |

| 13) The needs to promote student learning guides professional development activities for staff. | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 37 13.70% | 20 7.66% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 69 25.56% | 56 21.46% |
| Neutral (0) | 47 17.41% | 47 18.01% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 22 8.15% | 30 11.49% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 15 5.56% | 36 13.79% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 80 29.63% | 72 27.59% |
| Total | 270 | 261 |
| Assigned Value | 91 | -6 |
| Total Assigned Value | 540 | 522 |
| % Assigned Value | 16.85% | -1.15% |

| 14) My department chair or unit head communicates important and necessary information relevant to me. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 168 61.09% | 121 46.01% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 73 26.55% | 80 30.42% |
| Neutral (0) | 15 5.45% | 22 8.37% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 9 3.27% | 11 4.18% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 6 2.18% | 18 6.84% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 4 1.45% | 11 4.18% |
| Total | 275 | 263 |
| Assigned Value | 388 | 275 |
| Total Assigned Value | 550 | 526 |
| % Assigned Value | 70.55% | 52.28% |

| 15) The administration communicates important and necessary information to faculty and staff. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 75 27.17% | 52 19.77% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 97 35.14% | 98 37.26% |
| Neutral (0) | 34 12.32% | 39 14.83% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 36 13.04% | 32 12.17% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 30 10.87% | 31 11.79% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 4 1.45% | 11 4.18% |
| Total | 276 | 263 |
| Assigned Value | 151 | 108 |
| Total Assigned Value | 552 | 526 |
| % Assigned Value | 27.36% | 20.53% |

| Question 24: Please rate the following items. (III.B.) | | |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| 1) There are adequate facilities available to sustain our program/department/unit and student needs. | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 18 6.50% | 17 6.42% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 85 30.69% | 59 22.26% |
| Neutral (0) | 28 10.11% | 34 12.83% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 78 28.16% | 79 29.81% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 61 22.02% | 67 25.28% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 7 2.53% | 9 3.40% |
| Total | 277 | 265 |
| Assigned Value | -79 | -120 |
| Total Assigned Value | 554 | 530 |
| % Assigned Value | -14.26% | -22.64% |

| 2) The classroom equipment meets our program/department/unit and student needs. | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 29 10.28% | 23 8.75% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 98 34.75% | 62 23.57% |
| Neutral (0) | 31 10.99% | 37 14.07% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 69 24.47% | 61 23.19% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 38 13.48% | 55 20.91% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 17 6.03% | 25 9.51% |
| Total | 282 | 263 |
| Assigned Value | 11 | -63 |
| Total Assigned Value | 564 | 526 |

| | | |
|-------------------------|-------|---------|
| % Assigned Value | 1.95% | -11.98% |
|-------------------------|-------|---------|

| 3) The office equipment meets our program/department/unit and student needs. | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 34 12.45% | 35 13.21% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 111 40.66% | 84 31.70% |
| Neutral (0) | 34 12.45% | 45 16.98% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 52 19.05% | 54 20.38% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 37 13.55% | 34 12.83% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 5 1.83% | 13 4.91% |
| Total | 273 | 265 |
| Assigned Value | 53 | 32 |
| Total Assigned Value | 546 | 530 |
| % Assigned Value | 9.71% | 6.04% |

| 4) There is an assessment of the physical resources need in our program/department/unit | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 34 12.36% | 24 9.13% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 70 25.45% | 57 21.67% |
| Neutral (0) | 46 16.73% | 32 12.17% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 27 9.82% | 44 16.73% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 26 9.45% | 46 17.49% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 72 26.18% | 60 22.81% |
| Total | 275 | 263 |
| Assigned Value | 59 | -31 |
| Total Assigned Value | 550 | 526 |
| % Assigned Value | 10.73% | -5.89% |

| 5) My input matters when my program/department/unit makes plans on facilities and equipment maintenance or purchase. | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 69 24.91% | 49 18.49% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 94 33.94% | 85 32.08% |
| Neutral (0) | 39 14.08% | 34 12.83% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 22 7.94% | 36 13.58% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 29 10.47% | 40 15.09% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 24 8.66% | 21 7.92% |
| Total | 277 | 265 |
| Assigned Value | 152 | 67 |
| Total Assigned Value | 554 | 530 |
| % Assigned Value | 27.44% | 12.64% |

| 6) My input matters when my program/department/unit prioritize equipment purchases. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 73 26.64% | 49 18.70% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 85 31.02% | 83 31.68% |
| Neutral (0) | 47 17.15% | 44 16.79% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 20 7.30% | 26 9.92% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 19 6.93% | 37 14.12% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 30 10.95% | 23 8.78% |
| Total | 274 | 262 |
| Assigned Value | 173 | 81 |
| Total Assigned Value | 548 | 524 |
| % Assigned Value | 31.57% | 15.46% |

| 7) I feel the college implements the necessary procedures to ensure the safety of my working environment. | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 64 23.27% | 42 15.97% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 95 34.55% | 74 28.14% |
| Neutral (0) | 44 16.00% | 45 17.11% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 35 12.73% | 41 15.59% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 20 7.27% | 44 16.73% |
| Don't Know/N/A (0) | 17 6.18% | 17 6.46% |
| Total | 275 | 263 |
| Assigned Value | 148 | 29 |
| Total Assigned Value | 550 | 526 |
| % Assigned Value | 26.91% | 5.51% |

| 8) I am familiar with the processes that my program/department/unit uses to make equipment replacement and maintenance decisions. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 56 20.22% | 42 15.91% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 106 38.27% | 86 32.58% |
| Neutral (0) | 26 9.39% | 38 14.39% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 27 9.75% | 38 14.39% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 29 10.47% | 36 13.64% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 33 11.91% | 24 9.09% |
| Total | 277 | 264 |
| Assigned Value | 133 | 60 |
| Total Assigned Value | 554 | 528 |
| % Assigned Value | 24.01% | 11.36% |

| 9) The college determines equipment replacement and maintenance based on program and service needs. | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 31 11.31% | 18 6.87% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 82 29.93% | 54 20.61% |
| Neutral (0) | 37 13.50% | 50 19.08% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 29 10.58% | 35 13.36% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 27 9.85% | 45 17.18% |
| Don't Know/N/A (0) | 68 24.82% | 60 22.90% |
| Total | 274 | 262 |
| Assigned Value | 61 | -35 |
| Total Assigned Value | 548 | 524 |
| % Assigned Value | 11.13% | -6.68% |

| Question 25: To what degree did the recent renovations create learning spaces that promote effective integration of student engagement into the learning process? (III.B.) | | |
|---|---------------|-------------|
| Kokio STEM Center (Phase 1) | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| To a great degree (+4) | 55 20.07% | |
| To some degree (+3) | 44 16.06% | |
| A little (+2) | 8 2.92% | |
| Not at all (+1) | 10 3.65% | |
| Don't know (0) | 157 57.30% | |
| Total | 274 | |
| Assigned Value | 378 | |
| Total Assigned Value | 1,096 | |
| % Assigned Value | 34.49% | |
| Average Score | 1.38 | |

| |
|--------------------------|
| Kokio STEM Center |
|--------------------------|

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|-----------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| To a great degree (+4) | | 54 20.69% |
| To some degree (+3) | | 38 14.56% |
| A little (+2) | | 14 5.36% |
| Not at all (+1) | | 7 2.68% |
| Don't know (0) | | 148 56.70% |
| Total | | 261 |
| Assigned Value | | 365 |
| Total Assigned Value | | 1,044 |
| % Assigned Value | | 34.96% |
| Average Score | | 1.40 |

| Kahikoluamea Center | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| To a great degree (+4) | 80 29.09% | |
| To some degree (+3) | 59 21.45% | |
| A little (+2) | 18 6.55% | |
| Not at all (+1) | 8 2.91% | |
| Don't know (0) | 110 40.00% | |
| Total | 275 | |
| Assigned Value | 541 | |
| Total Assigned Value | 1,100 | |
| % Assigned Value | 49.18% | |
| Average Score | 1.97 | |

| Iliahi Student Engagement Center | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| To a great degree (+4) | 58 21.25% | 35 13.36% |
| To some degree (+3) | 62 22.71% | 48 18.32% |
| A little (+2) | 13 4.76% | 15 5.73% |
| Not at all (+1) | 11 4.03% | 13 4.96% |
| Don't know (0) | 129 47.25% | 151 57.63% |
| Total | 273 | 262 |
| Assigned Value | 455 | 327 |
| Total Assigned Value | 1,092 | 1,048 |
| % Assigned Value | 41.67% | 31.20% |
| Average Score | 1.67 | 1.25 |

| Manele building classrooms and computer lab | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| To a great degree (+4) | 65 23.72% | 38 14.56% |
| To some degree (+3) | 41 14.96% | 33 12.64% |
| A little (+2) | 8 2.92% | 16 6.13% |
| Not at all (+1) | 8 2.92% | 10 3.83% |
| Don't know (0) | 152 55.47% | 164 62.84% |
| Total | 274 | 261 |
| Assigned Value | 407 | 293 |
| Total Assigned Value | 1,096 | 1,044 |
| % Assigned Value | 37.14% | 28.07% |
| Average Score | 1.49 | 1.12 |

| Question 26: Rate the questions regarding campus parking: (III.B.) | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| The amount of available campus parking affects my students' attendance. | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very Positively (2) | 33 12.18% | 22 8.53% |
| Somewhat Positively (1) | 25 9.23% | 29 11.24% |
| Neutral (0) | 37 13.65% | 33 12.79% |
| Somewhat negatively (-1) | 90 33.21% | 86 33.33% |
| Very Negatively (-2) | 37 13.65% | 34 13.18% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 49 18.08% | 54 20.93% |
| Total | 271 | 258 |
| Assigned Value | -73 | -81 |
| Total Assigned Value | 542 | 516 |
| % Assigned Value | -13.47% | -15.70% |

| The amount of available campus parking affects my ability to perform my duties. | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very Positively (2) | 45 16.48% | 34 13.08% |
| Somewhat Positively (1) | 30 10.99% | 45 17.31% |
| Neutral (0) | 97 35.53% | 80 30.77% |
| Somewhat negatively (-1) | 64 23.44% | 49 18.85% |
| Very Negatively (-2) | 17 6.23% | 27 10.38% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 20 7.33% | 25 9.62% |
| Total | 273 | 260 |
| Assigned Value | 22 | 10 |
| Total Assigned Value | 546 | 520 |
| % Assigned Value | 4.03% | 1.92% |

Question 27: Answer the following questions on the safety and sufficiency of the institution's facilities. (III.B.)

1) Do you understand how to file a request for the repair or maintenance of office space, classrooms, or laboratories through your department?

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Yes | 215 77.34% | 201 76.72% |
| No | 37 13.31% | 31 11.83% |
| Don't know/NA | 26 9.35% | 30 11.45% |
| Total | 278 | 262 |

2) Do you feel that the classrooms provided meet acceptable safety standards?

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Yes | 182 66.18% | 137 52.49% |
| No | 52 18.91% | 73 27.97% |
| Don't know/NA | 41 14.91% | 51 19.54% |
| Total | 275 | 261 |

3) Have you been asked within the last two years to evaluate the effectiveness of the facilities and equipment you use in either instructional or campus support activities?

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Yes | 66 23.91% | 36 13.79% |
| No | 177 64.13% | 181 69.35% |
| Don't know/NA | 33 11.96% | 44 16.86% |
| Total | 276 | 261 |

| 4) Have you been asked within the last two years to determine your existing needs and to recommend new equipment or facilities to improve your effectiveness? | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 131 47.64% | 86 32.95% |
| No | 118 42.91% | 146 55.94% |
| Don't know/NA | 26 9.45% | 29 11.11% |
| Total | 275 | 261 |

| 5) Do you feel that your office and work space(s) are secure from break-ins? | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 161 58.33% | 137 52.29% |
| No | 94 34.06% | 94 35.88% |
| Don't know/NA | 21 7.61% | 31 11.83% |
| Total | 276 | 262 |

| Question 28: Please answer the following questions on the safety and sufficiency of the institution's facilities. (III.B.) | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| 1) Do you feel that the office and work space(s) provided for you by the institution meets acceptable standards? | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 188 68.61% | 174 66.16% |
| No | 76 27.74% | 78 29.66% |
| Don't Know/NA | 10 3.65% | 11 4.18% |
| Total | 274 | 263 |

| 2) If applicable, do you feel that the laboratories provided for you meet acceptable safety standards? | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 89 34.23% | 74 29.02% |
| No | 30 11.54% | 26 10.20% |
| Don't Know/NA | 141 54.23% | 155 60.78% |
| Total | 260 | 255 |

| 3) Is the equipment you use for instruction regularly maintained by the institution in regards to safety and maximum benefit? | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 125 46.64% | 105 40.54% |
| No | 58 21.64% | 64 24.71% |
| Don't Know/NA | 85 31.72% | 90 34.75% |
| Total | 268 | 259 |

| 4) If you use special equipment or materials in instructional and/or other professional activities (e.g., laboratory equipment, chemicals, culinary equipment, ect.) are these materials and equipment regularly inspected for safety? | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 65 25.10% | 53 21.20% |
| No | 25 9.65% | 35 14.00% |
| Don't Know/NA | 169 65.25% | 162 64.80% |
| Total | 259 | 250 |

| Question 29: What could Auxiliary Services do to improve the quality of your working environment and experience at Kapi`olani CC? (check your top THREE choices) (III.B.) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Build new facilities | 131 48.70% | 122 47.47% |
| Improve grounds | 57 21.19% | 75 29.18% |
| Improve parking facilities | 162 60.22% | 126 49.03% |
| Improve restrooms near your office | 73 27.14% | 84 32.68% |
| Improve your office and work space(s) | 118 43.87% | 103 40.08% |
| Improve your laboratory | 45 16.73% | 44 17.12% |
| Maintain existing facilities | 205 76.21% | 207 80.54% |
| Total | 269 | 257 |

| Question 30: How much do you need the following equipment in your primary duty to promote student learning/success? (III.B.) | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| 1) Clickers | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 18 6.90% | 25 10.04% |
| Very Much (3) | 22 8.43% | 12 4.82% |
| Somewhat (2) | 39 14.94% | 36 14.46% |
| A little (1) | 29 11.11% | 24 9.64% |
| No need (0) | 153 58.62% | 152 61.04% |
| Total | 261 | 249 |
| Weighted Score | 245 | 232 |
| Weighted Average | 0.94 | 0.93 |

| 2) Copier | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 174 64.93% | 165 64.71% |
| Very Much (3) | 51 19.03% | 35 13.73% |
| Somewhat (2) | 20 7.46% | 23 9.02% |
| A little (1) | 12 4.48% | 11 4.31% |
| No need (0) | 11 4.10% | 21 8.24% |
| Total | 268 | 255 |
| Weighted Score | 901 | 822 |
| Weighted Average | 3.36 | 3.22 |
| 3) Desktop Computer (with DVD playing Capacity) | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 193 71.22% | 181 70.98% |
| Very Much (3) | 33 12.18% | 25 9.80% |
| Somewhat (2) | 17 6.27% | 16 6.27% |
| A little (1) | 4 1.48% | 7 2.75% |
| No need (0) | 24 8.86% | 26 10.20% |
| Total | 271 | 255 |
| Weighted Score | 909 | 838 |
| Weighted Average | 3.35 | 3.29 |

| 4) Document camera (to project non-transparent document or video) | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 39 15.29% | 32 12.75% |
| Very Much (3) | 35 13.73% | 26 10.36% |
| Somewhat (2) | 54 21.18% | 57 22.71% |
| A little (1) | 36 14.12% | 27 10.76% |
| No need (0) | 91 | 109 |

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------|--------|
| | 35.69% | 43.43% |
| Total | 255 | 251 |
| Weighted Score | 405 | 347 |
| Weighted Average | 1.59 | 1.38 |

| 5) DVD player | | |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 81 30.80% | 52 20.23% |
| Very Much (3) | 45 17.11% | 23 8.95% |
| Somewhat (2) | 51 19.39% | 49 19.07% |
| A little (1) | 21 7.98% | 34 13.23% |
| No need (0) | 65 24.71% | 99 38.52% |
| Total | 263 | 257 |
| Weighted Score | 582 | 409 |
| Weighted Average | 2.21 | 1.59 |

| 6) iPad or equivalent | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 40 15.44% | 52 20.63% |
| Very Much (3) | 45 17.37% | 37 14.68% |
| Somewhat (2) | 48 18.53% | 40 15.87% |
| A little (1) | 32 12.36% | 34 13.49% |
| No need (0) | 94 36.29% | 89 35.32% |
| Total | 259 | 252 |
| Weighted Score | 423 | 433 |
| Weighted Average | 1.63 | 1.72 |

| 7) Laptop Computer | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 164 61.19% | 154 59.69% |
| Very Much (3) | 38 14.18% | 44 17.05% |
| Somewhat (2) | 30 11.19% | 28 10.85% |
| A little (1) | 9 3.36% | 8 3.10% |
| No need (0) | 27 10.07% | 24 9.30% |
| Total | 268 | 258 |
| Weighted Score | 839 | 812 |
| Weighted Average | 3.13 | 3.15 |

| 8) Large Screen TV | | |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 63 24.32% | 70 27.13% |
| Very Much (3) | 27 10.42% | 37 14.34% |
| Somewhat (2) | 40 15.44% | 44 17.05% |
| A little (1) | 37 14.29% | 17 6.59% |
| No need (0) | 92 35.52% | 90 34.88% |
| Total | 259 | 258 |
| Weighted Score | 450 | 496 |
| Weighted Average | 1.74 | 1.92 |

| 9) Microphone | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 35 13.51% | 35 13.89% |
| Very Much (3) | 26 10.04% | 25 9.92% |
| Somewhat (2) | 34 13.13% | 36 14.29% |
| A little (1) | 36 13.90% | 24 9.52% |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| No need (0) | 128 49.42% | 132 52.38% |
| Total | 259 | 252 |
| Weighted Score | 322 | 311 |
| Weighted Average | 1.24 | 1.23 |

| 10) Overhead projector | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 97 37.02% | 102 39.84% |
| Very Much (3) | 25 9.54% | 23 8.98% |
| Somewhat (2) | 29 11.07% | 28 10.94% |
| A little (1) | 25 9.54% | 13 5.08% |
| No need (0) | 86 32.82% | 90 35.16% |
| Total | 262 | 256 |
| Weighted Score | 546 | 546 |
| Weighted Average | 2.08 | 2.13 |

| 11) Printer | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 207 76.95% | 213 82.24% |
| Very Much (3) | 33 12.27% | 19 7.34% |
| Somewhat (2) | 13 4.83% | 7 2.70% |
| A little (1) | 7 2.60% | 6 2.32% |
| No need (0) | 9 3.35% | 14 5.41% |
| Total | 269 | 259 |
| Weighted Score | 960 | 929 |
| Weighted Average | 3.57 | 3.59 |

| 12) Printer ink Cartridge | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 207 77.24% | 210 81.08% |
| Very Much (3) | 32 11.94% | 21 8.11% |
| Somewhat (2) | 9 3.36% | 6 2.32% |
| A little (1) | 8 2.99% | 5 1.93% |
| No need (0) | 12 4.48% | 17 6.56% |
| Total | 268 | 259 |
| Weighted Score | 950 | 920 |
| Weighted Average | 3.54 | 3.55 |

| 13) Projector screen | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 166 63.60% | 170 66.15% |
| Very Much (3) | 32 12.26% | 24 9.34% |
| Somewhat (2) | 17 6.51% | 16 6.23% |
| A little (1) | 12 4.60% | 12 4.67% |
| No need (0) | 34 13.03% | 35 13.62% |
| Total | 261 | 257 |
| Weighted Score | 806 | 796 |
| Weighted Average | 3.09 | 3.10 |

| 14) Reliable high speed internet access | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 244 90.04% | 239 93.36% |
| Very Much (3) | 17 6.27% | 11 4.30% |
| Somewhat (2) | 3 1.11% | 2 0.78% |
| A little (1) | 0 0.00% | 0 0.00% |

| | | |
|-------------------------|------------|------------|
| No need (0) | 7 2.58% | 4 1.56% |
| Total | 271 | 256 |
| Weighted Score | 1,033 | 993 |
| Weighted Average | 3.81 | 3.88 |

| 15) Speakers | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 122 46.21% | 129 50.19% |
| Very Much (3) | 38 14.39% | 49 19.07% |
| Somewhat (2) | 36 13.64% | 30 11.67% |
| A little (1) | 16 6.06% | 13 5.06% |
| No need (0) | 52 19.70% | 36 14.01% |
| Total | 264 | 257 |
| Weighted Score | 690 | 736 |
| Weighted Average | 2.61 | 2.86 |

| 16) Webcam | | |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Absolutely (4) | 43 16.93% | 45 17.51% |
| Very Much (3) | 39 15.35% | 35 13.62% |
| Somewhat (2) | 45 17.72% | 55 21.40% |
| A little (1) | 33 12.99% | 24 9.34% |
| No need (0) | 94 37.01% | 98 38.13% |
| Total | 254 | 257 |
| Weighted Score | 412 | 419 |
| Weighted Average | 1.62 | 1.63 |

Question 31: Do you have access to the following equipment/supply when conducting your primary duty? (III.B.)

Clickers

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Yes | 81 31.03% | 66 26.72% |
| No | 180 68.97% | 181 73.28% |
| Total | 261 | 247 |

Copier

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Yes | 266 96.73% | 243 94.92% |
| No | 9 3.27% | 13 5.08% |
| Total | 275 | 256 |

Desktop computer (with DVD playing capacity)

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Yes | 229 84.50% | 214 83.59% |
| No | 42 15.50% | 42 16.41% |
| Total | 271 | 256 |

Document camera (to project non-transparent document or video)

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Yes | 84 32.31% | 73 29.20% |
| No | 176 67.69% | 177 70.80% |
| Total | 260 | 250 |

DVD player

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Yes | 177 66.29% | 152 60.32% |
| No | 90 33.71% | 100 39.68% |
| Total | 267 | 252 |

| iPad or equivalent | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 28 10.73% | 74 29.48% |
| No | 233 89.27% | 177 70.52% |
| Total | 261 | 251 |

| Laptop computer | | |
|------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 195 72.76% | 184 72.16% |
| No | 73 27.24% | 71 27.84% |
| Total | 268 | 255 |

| Large screen TV | | |
|------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 95 36.40% | 91 36.11% |
| No | 166 63.60% | 161 63.89% |
| Total | 261 | 252 |

| Microphone | | |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 65 24.90% | 77 31.05% |
| No | 196 75.10% | 171 68.95% |
| Total | 261 | 248 |

| Overhead projector | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 175 65.79% | 152 60.32% |
| No | 91 34.21% | 100 39.68% |
| Total | 266 | 252 |

| Printer | | |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 251 91.94% | 236 91.47% |
| No | 22 8.06% | 22 8.53% |
| Total | 273 | 258 |

| Printer ink cartridge | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 229 84.19% | 221 85.99% |
| No | 43 15.81% | 36 14.01% |
| Total | 272 | 257 |

| Projector screen | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 214 80.15% | 195 77.08% |
| No | 53 19.85% | 58 22.92% |
| Total | 267 | 253 |

| Reliable high speed internet access | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 227 84.70% | 194 75.49% |
| No | 41 15.30% | 63 24.51% |
| Total | 268 | 257 |

| Speakers | | |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 164 62.12% | 183 72.62% |
| No | 100 37.88% | 69 27.38% |
| Total | 264 | 252 |

| Webcam | | |
|---------------|--|--|
|---------------|--|--|

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Yes | 75 29.18% | 80 32.65% |
| No | 182 70.82% | 165 67.35% |
| Total | 257 | 245 |

Question 32: Choose your answer for the following questions related to financial resources planning. (III.D.)

1) Do you understand your department's budget?

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Yes | 93 33.82% | 112 42.91% |
| No | 182 66.18% | 149 57.09% |
| Total | 275 | 261 |

2) Do you understand how your department's budget was determined?

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Yes | 75 27.17% | 80 30.65% |
| No | 201 72.83% | 181 69.35% |
| Total | 276 | 261 |

3) Do you understand the connection between your department's budget and your division's Tactical Plan?

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Yes | 105 38.18% | 80 30.77% |
| No | 170 61.82% | 180 69.23% |
| Total | 275 | 260 |

| 4) Do you understand the connection between your department's budget and the college's Strategic Plan? | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 99 36.26% | 87 33.46% |
| No | 174 63.74% | 173 66.54% |
| Total | 273 | 260 |

| 5) Do you understand the connection between your department's budget and the college's Long Range Development Plan? | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 86 31.39% | 59 22.69% |
| No | 188 68.61% | 201 77.31% |
| Total | 274 | 260 |

| 6) Were you involved directly with your department's tactical action plan in the Comprehensive Program Review? | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Yes | 99 36.13% | 69 26.54% |
| No | 175 63.87% | 191 73.46% |
| Total | 274 | 260 |

| Question 33: Which of the following authorized governance organizations, advisory councils, or task forces/committees have you participated in since fall 2011? (Check all that apply) | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Kalāualani (Native Hawaiian Council) | 21 11.11% | 33 17.10% |
| Faculty Senate | 66 34.92% | 81 41.97% |
| Staff Council | 9 4.76% | 32 16.58% |
| Chancellor's Policy, Planning, and Assessment Council (PPAC) | 32 | |

| | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 16.93% | |
| Chancellor's Advisory Council (CAC) | | 45 23.32% |
| Administrative Staff Council | 12 6.35% | 12 6.22% |
| Vice Chancellors' Advisory Council (VCAC) | 25 13.23% | 33 17.10% |
| Counseling and Academic Advising Council (CAAC) | 19 10.05% | 31 16.06% |
| Other Committees | 151 79.89% | 135 69.95% |
| Task Forces | 39 20.63% | 57 29.53% |
| Total | 189 | 193 |

| | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|
| Question 34: There are opportunities for you to provide input before the college makes decisions that affect your primary duties | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 43 16.10% | 39 14.89% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 99 37.08% | 88 33.59% |
| Neutral (0) | 62 23.22% | 56 21.37% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 37 13.86% | 37 14.12% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 26 9.74% | 42 16.03% |
| Total | 267 | 262 |
| Assigned Value | 96 | 45 |
| Total Assigned Value | 534 | 524 |
| % Assigned Value | 17.98% | 8.59% |

| | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| Question 35: Rate the communication between the authorized governance organizations and their respective constituents: | | |
| Faculty Senate with Faculty | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | 33 12.31% | 68 26.98% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 83 | 85 |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 30.97% | 33.73% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 32 11.94% | 24 9.52% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 23 8.58% | 7 2.78% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 13 4.85% | 9 3.57% |
| Don't know (0) | 84 31.34% | 59 23.41% |
| Total | 268 | 252 |
| Assigned Value | 100 | 196 |
| Total Assigned Value | 536 | 504 |
| % Assigned Value | 18.66% | 38.89% |

| Student Congress with students | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | 9 3.35% | 14 5.60% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 37 13.75% | 34 13.60% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 19 7.06% | 21 8.40% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 16 5.95% | 15 6.00% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 10 3.72% | 12 4.80% |
| Don't know (0) | 178 66.17% | 154 61.60% |
| Total | 269 | 250 |
| Assigned Value | 19 | 23 |
| Total Assigned Value | 538 | 500 |
| % Assigned Value | 3.53% | 4.60% |
| Kalāualani with students and employees | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | 8 2.99% | 18 7.14% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 26 9.70% | 25 9.92% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 17 6.34% | 30 11.90% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 10 3.73% | 8 3.17% |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Very ineffective (-2) | 10 3.73% | 10 3.97% |
| Don't know (0) | 197 73.51% | 161 63.89% |
| Total | 268 | 252 |
| Assigned Value | 12 | 33 |
| Total Assigned Value | 536 | 504 |
| % Assigned Value | 2.24% | 6.55% |

| Staff Council with staff | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | 12 4.48% | 25 9.96% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 33 12.31% | 38 15.14% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 20 7.46% | 29 11.55% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 12 4.48% | 7 2.79% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 12 4.48% | 4 1.59% |
| Don't know (0) | 179 66.79% | 148 58.96% |
| Total | 268 | 251 |
| Assigned Value | 21 | 73 |
| Total Assigned Value | 536 | 502 |
| % Assigned Value | 3.92% | 14.54% |

| Question 36: Please rate the Faculty Senate in fulfilling the responsibility to speak for faculty in the following academic matters | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| Policy determining the initiation, review, and evaluation of proposed or authorized research, instructional, and academic programs | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective | 29 10.98% | 49 19.84% |
| Somewhat effective | 65 24.62% | 70 28.34% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective | 19 7.20% | 14 5.67% |
| Somewhat ineffective | 7 | 5 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2.65% | 2.02% |
| Very ineffective | 8 3.03% | 8 3.24% |
| Don't Know | 136 51.52% | 101 40.89% |
| Total | 264 | 247 |
| Weighted Value | 100 | 147 |
| Total Weighted Value | 528 | 494 |
| % Weighted Value | 18.94% | 29.76% |

| Budget planning and implementation policy | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective | 16 6.06% | 25 10.12% |
| Somewhat effective | 40 15.15% | 47 19.03% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective | 29 10.98% | 28 11.34% |
| Somewhat ineffective | 19 7.20% | 13 5.26% |
| Very ineffective | 17 6.44% | 14 5.67% |
| Don't Know | 143 54.17% | 120 48.58% |
| Total | 264 | 247 |
| Weighted Value | 19 | 56 |
| Total Weighted Value | 528 | 494 |
| % Weighted Value | 3.60% | 11.34% |

| Student-faculty relations policy | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective | 21 8.02% | 33 13.47% |
| Somewhat effective | 54 20.61% | 65 26.53% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective | 22 8.40% | 21 8.57% |
| Somewhat ineffective | 7 2.67% | 10 4.08% |
| Very ineffective | 9 3.44% | 8 3.27% |
| Don't Know | 149 | 108 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|
| | 56.87% | 44.08% |
| Total | 262 | 245 |
| Weighted Value | 71 | 105 |
| Total Weighted Value | 524 | 490 |
| % Weighted Value | 13.55% | 21.43% |

| Policy for the evaluation of faculty and campus academic administrators | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective | 23 8.68% | 39 15.85% |
| Somewhat effective | 61 23.02% | 58 23.58% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective | 21 7.92% | 28 11.38% |
| Somewhat ineffective | 10 3.77% | 12 4.88% |
| Very ineffective | 16 6.04% | 10 4.07% |
| Don't Know | 134 50.57% | 99 40.24% |
| Total | 265 | 246 |
| Weighted Value | 65 | 104 |
| Total Weighted Value | 530 | 492 |
| % Weighted Value | 12.26% | 21.14% |

| The improvement and establishment of a canon of professional ethics and an effective means of professional maintenance of those ethics, including faculty self-discipline | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective | 22 8.43% | 33 13.52% |
| Somewhat effective | 45 17.24% | 50 20.49% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective | 30 11.49% | 23 9.43% |
| Somewhat ineffective | 7 2.68% | 17 6.97% |
| Very ineffective | 13 4.98% | 14 5.74% |
| Don't Know | 144 | 107 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|
| | 55.17% | 43.85% |
| Total | 261 | 244 |
| Weighted Value | 56 | 71 |
| Total Weighted Value | 522 | 488 |
| % Weighted Value | 10.73% | 14.55% |

Question 37: Please rate Kalaulani in fulfilling its responsibility to native Hawaiian and native Hawaiian-serving employees at the college in the following areas:

a) advise the Chancellor and Administrative Team regularly on the concerns of Hawaiians at the college

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Very effective (+2) | 23 8.71% | 26 9.92% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 23 8.71% | 42 16.03% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 9 3.41% | 10 3.82% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 4 1.52% | 5 1.91% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 2 0.76% | 6 2.29% |
| Don't know (0) | 203 76.89% | 173 66.03% |
| Total | 264 | 262 |
| Assigned Value | 61 | 77 |
| Total Assigned Value | 528 | 524 |
| % Assigned Value | 11.55% | 14.69% |

b) define the college's kuleana to Hawaiians and the āina

| | 2012 | 2016 |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Very effective (+2) | 20 7.58% | 26 10.70% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 25 9.47% | 27 11.11% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 11 4.17% | 12 4.94% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 4 1.52% | 3 1.23% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 5 | 10 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 1.89% | 4.12% |
| Don't know (0) | 199 75.38% | 165 67.90% |
| Total | 264 | 243 |
| Assigned Value | 51 | 56 |
| Total Assigned Value | 528 | 486 |
| % Assigned Value | 9.66% | 11.52% |

| c) guide the college's broader efforts to better serve Native Hawaiians in the areas of teaching, curriculum development, long-range planning, policy development, and implementation | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | 24 9.13% | 25 10.25% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 28 10.65% | 33 13.52% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 11 4.18% | 13 5.33% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 5 1.90% | 4 1.64% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 4 1.52% | 8 3.28% |
| Don't know (0) | 191 72.62% | 161 65.98% |
| Total | 263 | 244 |
| Assigned Value | 63 | 63 |
| Total Assigned Value | 526 | 488 |
| % Assigned Value | 11.98% | 12.91% |

| d) identify Native Hawaiian issues that influence curriculum and instruction | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | 21 7.95% | 20 8.37% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 27 10.23% | 32 13.39% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 14 5.30% | 10 4.18% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 3 1.14% | 8 3.35% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 6 2.27% | 8 3.35% |
| Don't know (0) | 193 | 161 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|
| | 73.11% | 67.36% |
| Total | 264 | 239 |
| Assigned Value | 54 | 48 |
| Total Assigned Value | 528 | 478 |
| % Assigned Value | 10.23% | 10.04% |

| e) provide recommendations for training in culturally appropriate curriculum development and instruction | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | 19 7.22% | 21 8.71% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 26 9.89% | 24 9.96% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 11 4.18% | 16 6.64% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 4 1.52% | 8 3.32% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 7 2.66% | 9 3.73% |
| Don't know (0) | 196 74.52% | 163 67.63% |
| Total | 263 | 241 |
| Assigned Value | 46 | 40 |
| Total Assigned Value | 526 | 482 |
| % Assigned Value | 8.75% | 8.30% |

| f) advocate for fairness and equity in all decisions and resource allocations related to Native Hawaiian programs and services | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | 20 7.63% | 26 10.70% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 29 11.07% | 27 11.11% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 11 4.20% | 13 5.35% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 2 0.76% | 6 2.47% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 4 1.53% | 11 4.53% |
| Don't know (0) | 196 74.81% | 160 65.84% |
| Total | 262 | 243 |

| | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| Assigned Value | 59 | 51 |
| Total Assigned Value | 524 | 486 |
| % Assigned Value | 11.26% | 10.49% |
| g) assist in educating administration, faculty and staff at the College about issues important to Native Hawaiians including self-determination, intellectual and cultural property rights, sanctity of land, proper pronunciation and usage of the Hawaiian language | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | 20 7.60% | 21 8.64% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 31 11.79% | 31 12.76% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 12 4.56% | 14 5.76% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 5 1.90% | 5 2.06% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 6 2.28% | 13 5.35% |
| Don't know (0) | 189 71.86% | 159 65.43% |
| Total | 263 | 243 |
| Assigned Value | 54 | 42 |
| Total Assigned Value | 526 | 486 |
| % Assigned Value | 10.27% | 8.64% |

| | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| Question 38: Please rate the Staff Council in fulfilling its responsibility to: | | |
| Provide a formal voice and organization representing the staff in the administration of the campus | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective | 14 5.28% | 26 10.70% |
| Somewhat effective | 36 13.58% | 44 18.11% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective | 19 7.17% | 19 7.82% |
| Somewhat ineffective | 5 1.89% | 4 1.65% |
| Very ineffective | 11 4.15% | 7 2.88% |
| Don't Know | 180 67.92% | 143 58.85% |
| Total | 265 | 243 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|--------|
| Weighted Value | 37 | 78 |
| Total Weighted Value | 530 | 486 |
| % Weighted Value | 6.98% | 16.05% |

| Offer avenues to enhance the professionalism, skills and competencies of our staff members | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective | 12 4.53% | 22 9.05% |
| Somewhat effective | 31 11.70% | 48 19.75% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective | 20 7.55% | 17 7.00% |
| Somewhat ineffective | 3 1.13% | 3 1.23% |
| Very ineffective | 14 5.28% | 7 2.88% |
| Don't Know | 185 69.81% | 146 60.08% |
| Total | 265 | 243 |
| Weighted Value | 24 | 75 |
| Total Weighted Value | 530 | 486 |
| % Weighted Value | 4.53% | 15.43% |

| Create a working atmosphere of respect, dignity, equality and cooperation for staff members | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective | 13 4.92% | 26 10.70% |
| Somewhat effective | 31 11.74% | 38 15.64% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective | 26 9.85% | 15 6.17% |
| Somewhat ineffective | 6 2.27% | 10 4.12% |
| Very ineffective | 9 3.41% | 8 3.29% |
| Don't Know | 179 67.80% | 146 60.08% |
| Total | 264 | 243 |
| Weighted Value | 33 | 64 |
| Total Weighted Value | 528 | 486 |

| | | |
|-------------------------|-------|--------|
| % Weighted Value | 6.25% | 13.17% |
|-------------------------|-------|--------|

| Question 39: Please rate the following standing councils in achieving their goals as advisory/ recommending bodies. | | |
|--|---------------|-------------|
| a) Chancellor's Policy, Planning, and Assessment Council (PPAC) | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | 17 6.46% | |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 31 11.79% | |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 11 4.18% | |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 14 5.32% | |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 8 3.04% | |
| Don't know (0) | 182 69.20% | |
| Total | 263 | |
| Assigned Value | 35 | |
| Total Assigned Value | 526 | |
| % Assigned Value | 6.65% | |

| b) Chancellor's Advisory Council (CAC) | | |
|---|-------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | | 10 4.12% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | | 26 10.70% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | | 18 7.41% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | | 6 2.47% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | | 18 7.41% |
| Don't know (0) | | 165 67.90% |
| Total | | 243 |
| Assigned Value | | 4 |
| Total Assigned Value | | 486 |
| % Assigned Value | | 0.82% |

| c) Administrative Staff Council to the Chancellor | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | 16 6.08% | 10 4.12% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 19 7.22% | 18 7.41% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 10 3.80% | 16 6.58% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 7 2.66% | 8 3.29% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 6 2.28% | 8 3.29% |
| Don't know (0) | 205 77.95% | 183 75.31% |
| Total | 263 | 243 |
| Assigned Value | 32 | 14 |
| Total Assigned Value | 526 | 486 |
| % Assigned Value | 6.08% | 2.88% |

| d) Vice Chancellors' Advisory Council (VCAC) to the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | 17 6.51% | 13 5.35% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 25 9.58% | 27 11.11% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 10 3.83% | 16 6.58% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 10 3.83% | 7 2.88% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 5 1.92% | 13 5.35% |
| Don't know (0) | 194 74.33% | 167 68.72% |
| Total | 261 | 243 |
| Assigned Value | 39 | 20 |
| Total Assigned Value | 522 | 486 |
| % Assigned Value | 7.47% | 4.12% |

| e) Counseling and Academic Advising Council (CAAC) to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Very effective (+2) | 12 4.58% | 8 3.31% |
| Somewhat effective (+1) | 26 9.92% | 23 9.50% |
| Neither effective nor ineffective (0) | 12 4.58% | 14 5.79% |
| Somewhat ineffective (-1) | 5 1.91% | 12 4.96% |
| Very ineffective (-2) | 8 3.05% | 14 5.79% |
| Don't know (0) | 199 75.95% | 171 70.66% |
| Total | 262 | 242 |
| Assigned Value | 29 | -1 |
| Total Assigned Value | 524 | 484 |
| % Assigned Value | 5.53% | -0.21% |

| Question 40: Please rate the performance of the following current UH/KCC leaders and governance bodies in encouraging faculty, staff, and students to participate in the discussion, planning and implementation of proposals to improve KCC's services and programs. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| 1) University of Hawai`i Board of Regents | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Poor (1) | 39 14.77% | 54 22.04% |
| Fair (2) | 49 18.56% | 42 17.14% |
| Good (3) | 40 15.15% | 32 13.06% |
| Excellent (4) | 6 2.27% | 1 0.41% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 130 49.24% | 116 47.35% |
| Total | 264 | 245 |
| Weighted Value | 281 | 238 |
| Total Weighted Value | 1,056 | 980 |
| Weighted Value Average | 1.06 | 0.97 |

| Kapi`olani Community College Chancellor | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Poor (1) | 37 13.91% | 25 10.20% |
| Fair (2) | 54 20.30% | 34 13.88% |
| Good (3) | 71 26.69% | 73 29.80% |
| Excellent (4) | 50 18.80% | 62 25.31% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 54 20.30% | 51 20.82% |
| Total | 266 | 245 |
| Weighted Value | 558 | 560 |
| Total Weighted Value | 1,064 | 980 |
| Weighted Value Average | 2.10 | 2.29 |

| Kapi`olani Community College Vice Chancellors | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Poor (1) | 23 8.68% | 33 13.52% |
| Fair (2) | 48 18.11% | 48 19.67% |
| Good (3) | 74 27.92% | 76 31.15% |
| Excellent (4) | 61 23.02% | 34 13.93% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 59 22.26% | 53 21.72% |
| Total | 265 | 244 |
| Weighted Value | 585 | 493 |
| Total Weighted Value | 1,060 | 976 |
| Weighted Value Average | 2.21 | 2.02 |

| Kapi`olani Community College Administration (Deans and Directors) | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Poor (1) | 18 6.79% | 22 9.02% |
| Fair (2) | 44 16.60% | 53 21.72% |
| Good (3) | 84 | 69 |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 31.70% | 28.28% |
| Excellent (4) | 69 26.04% | 44 18.03% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 50 18.87% | 56 22.95% |
| Total | 265 | 244 |
| Weighted Value | 634 | 511 |
| Total Weighted Value | 1,060 | 976 |
| Weighted Value Average | 2.39 | 2.09 |

| Kapi`olani Community College Department Chairpersons and Unit Heads | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Poor (1) | 10 3.76% | 18 7.35% |
| Fair (2) | 27 10.15% | 34 13.88% |
| Good (3) | 90 33.83% | 82 33.47% |
| Excellent (4) | 93 34.96% | 62 25.31% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 46 17.29% | 49 20.00% |
| Total | 266 | 245 |
| Weighted Value | 706 | 580 |
| Total Weighted Value | 1,064 | 980 |
| Weighted Value Average | 2.65 | 2.37 |

| Kapi`olani Community College Faculty Senate | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Poor (1) | 16 6.11% | 13 5.33% |
| Fair (2) | 44 16.79% | 28 11.48% |
| Good (3) | 66 25.19% | 72 29.51% |
| Excellent (4) | 29 11.07% | 52 21.31% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 107 40.84% | 79 32.38% |
| Total | 262 | 244 |
| Weighted Value | 418 | 493 |
| Total Weighted Value | 1,048 | 976 |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|------|------|
| Weighted Value Average | 1.60 | 2.02 |
|-------------------------------|------|------|

| Kapi`olani Community College Staff Council | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Poor (1) | 16 6.02% | 7 2.86% |
| Fair (2) | 22 8.27% | 19 7.76% |
| Good (3) | 28 10.53% | 46 18.78% |
| Excellent (4) | 11 4.14% | 25 10.20% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 189 71.05% | 148 60.41% |
| Total | 266 | 245 |
| Weighted Value | 188 | 283 |
| Total Weighted Value | 1,064 | 980 |
| Weighted Value Average | 0.71 | 1.16 |

| Kapi'olani Community College Kalāualani Council | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Poor (1) | 10 3.79% | 15 6.12% |
| Fair (2) | 15 5.68% | 15 6.12% |
| Good (3) | 27 10.23% | 35 14.29% |
| Excellent (4) | 12 4.55% | 21 8.57% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 200 75.76% | 159 64.90% |
| Total | 264 | 245 |
| Weighted Value | 169 | 234 |
| Total Weighted Value | 1,056 | 980 |
| Weighted Value Average | 0.64 | 0.96 |

| Kapi`olani Community College Student Congress | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Poor (1) | 15 5.70% | 15 6.15% |
| Fair (2) | 23 8.75% | 17 6.97% |
| Good (3) | 22 8.37% | 34 13.93% |
| Excellent (4) | 10 3.80% | 19 7.79% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 193 73.38% | 159 65.16% |
| Total | 263 | 244 |
| Weighted Value | 167 | 227 |
| Total Weighted Value | 1,052 | 976 |
| Weighted Value Average | 0.63 | 0.93 |

| Question 41: How do you receive news about Kapi`olani CC? Check all that apply. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Quill (the college's Intranet) | 84 31.11% | |
| Ohana | | 56 22.67% |
| Kapi`olani CC Bulletin | 207 76.67% | 173 70.04% |
| Kapi`olani CC website | 163 60.37% | 109 44.13% |
| Office for Institutional Effectiveness website | 37 13.70% | 23 9.31% |
| Departmental Website | 46 17.04% | 39 15.79% |
| Kapi`o website | 33 12.22% | 17 6.88% |
| Kapio print | 96 35.56% | |
| Email listserves | 168 62.22% | 174 70.45% |
| Laulima | 124 45.93% | 66 26.72% |
| The public address system | 11 4.07% | 23 9.31% |
| Total | 270 | 247 |

| Question 42: What sources do you use to locate Kapi`olani CC policies? | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| I have not needed to locate Kapi`olani CC policies | 26 9.81% | 39 16.18% |
| `Ohana | | 89 36.93% |
| Quill | 162 61.13% | |
| Kapi`olani CC Bulletin | 41 15.47% | 27 11.20% |
| Kapi`olani CC website | 171 64.53% | 141 58.51% |
| Office for Institutional Effectiveness website | 43 16.23% | 39 16.18% |
| Departmental website | 34 12.83% | 28 11.62% |
| Kapi`o website | 7 2.64% | 7 2.90% |
| Kapi`o print | 8 3.02% | |
| Email listserves | 33 12.45% | 42 17.43% |
| Laulima | 68 25.66% | 40 16.60% |
| The public address system | 1 0.38% | 11 4.56% |
| Total | 265 | 241 |

| Question 43: Rate the functioning of the Office for Institutional Effectiveness, or OFIE | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| 1) OFIE facilitated the practice of using data-based and evidence-based decision-making on campus. | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 51 19.10% | 29 11.79% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 59 22.10% | 52 21.14% |
| Neutral (0) | 18 6.74% | 24 9.76% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 7 | 9 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2.62% | 3.66% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 7 2.62% | 10 4.07% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 125 46.82% | 122 49.59% |
| Total | 267 | 246 |
| Assigned Value | 140 | 81 |
| Total Assigned Value | 534 | 492 |
| % Assigned Value | 26.22% | 16.46% |

| 2) OFIE facilitated the development of a tactical and a strategic plan. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 47 17.67% | 39 15.85% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 56 21.05% | 33 13.41% |
| Neutral (0) | 19 7.14% | 20 8.13% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 2 0.75% | 8 3.25% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 5 1.88% | 8 3.25% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 137 51.50% | 138 56.10% |
| Total | 266 | 246 |
| Assigned Value | 138 | 87 |
| Total Assigned Value | 532 | 492 |
| % Assigned Value | 25.94% | 17.68% |

| 3) OFIE facilitated the tracking of the tactical and strategic plans. | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 43 16.10% | 31 12.81% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 54 20.22% | 38 15.70% |
| Neutral (0) | 14 5.24% | 19 7.85% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 4 1.50% | 8 3.31% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 6 2.25% | 10 4.13% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 146 | 136 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|
| | 54.68% | 56.20% |
| Total | 267 | 242 |
| Assigned Value | 124 | 72 |
| Total Assigned Value | 534 | 484 |
| % Assigned Value | 23.22% | 14.88% |

| 4) OFIE increased the institution's capability of conducting research and evaluation of program and projects' effectiveness. | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 54 20.22% | 26 10.57% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 55 20.60% | 47 19.11% |
| Neutral (0) | 15 5.62% | 21 8.54% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 10 3.75% | 13 5.28% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 7 2.62% | 11 4.47% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 126 47.19% | 128 52.03% |
| Total | 267 | 246 |
| Assigned Value | 139 | 64 |
| Total Assigned Value | 534 | 492 |
| % Assigned Value | 26.03% | 13.01% |

| 5) OFIE facilitated the streamlining of the grant application and proposal submission process. | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 41 15.41% | 31 12.65% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 41 15.41% | 37 15.10% |
| Neutral (0) | 17 6.39% | 16 6.53% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 4 1.50% | 4 1.63% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 5 1.88% | 9 3.67% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 158 59.40% | 148 60.41% |
| Total | 266 | 245 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|
| Assigned Value | 109 | 77 |
| Total Assigned Value | 532 | 490 |
| % Assigned Value | 20.49% | 15.71% |

| | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| 6) OFIE increased the college's ability to seek new resources and external funding. | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 61 23.02% | 33 13.58% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 43 16.23% | 46 18.93% |
| Neutral (0) | 13 4.91% | 14 5.76% |
| Somewhat disagree (-1) | 3 1.13% | 3 1.23% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 6 2.26% | 9 3.70% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 139 52.45% | 138 56.79% |
| Total | 265 | 243 |
| Assigned Value | 150 | 91 |
| Total Assigned Value | 530 | 486 |
| % Assigned Value | 28.30% | 18.72% |

| | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| Question 44: Rate the functioning of the Office for International Affairs, or OIA. | | |
| OIA enhanced communication between faculty, staff, and students regarding international education. | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 11 4.15% | 11 4.51% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 40 15.09% | 12 4.92% |
| Neutral (0) | 18 6.79% | 24 9.84% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 11 4.15% | 20 8.20% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 19 7.17% | 32 13.11% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 166 62.64% | 145 59.43% |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|---------|
| Total | 265 | 244 |
| Assigned Value | 13 | -50 |
| Total Assigned Value | 530 | 488 |
| % Assigned Value | 2.45% | -10.25% |

| OIA broadened the opportunity to establish national and international partnerships in international education. | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 24 9.06% | 20 8.16% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 42 15.85% | 35 14.29% |
| Neutral (0) | 12 4.53% | 20 8.16% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 6 2.26% | 5 2.04% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 8 3.02% | 14 5.71% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 173 65.28% | 151 61.63% |
| Total | 265 | 245 |
| Assigned Value | 68 | 42 |
| Total Assigned Value | 530 | 490 |
| % Assigned Value | 12.83% | 8.57% |

| OIA enhanced our students' intercultural understanding and educational experiences. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 22 8.33% | 15 6.15% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 44 16.67% | 29 11.89% |
| Neutral (0) | 22 8.33% | 24 9.84% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 4 1.52% | 10 4.10% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 7 2.65% | 15 6.15% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 165 62.50% | 151 61.89% |
| Total | 264 | 244 |
| Assigned Value | 70 | 19 |
| Total Assigned Value | 528 | 488 |

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------|-------|
| % Assigned Value | 13.26% | 3.89% |
|-------------------------|--------|-------|

| Question 45: Rate the functioning of the Office of Academic Affairs, or OAA. | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| 1) OAA allowed academic administrators and personnel to better focus on improving learning outcomes. | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 17 6.39% | 10 4.10% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 39 14.66% | 35 14.34% |
| Neutral (0) | 24 9.02% | 24 9.84% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 7 2.63% | 9 3.69% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 8 3.01% | 12 4.92% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 171 64.29% | 154 63.11% |
| Total | 266 | 244 |
| Assigned Value | 50 | 22 |
| Total Assigned Value | 532 | 488 |
| % Assigned Value | 9.40% | 4.51% |

| 2) OAA allowed academic administrators and personnel to focus better on improving teaching processes. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 16 6.02% | 11 4.51% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 37 13.91% | 29 11.89% |
| Neutral (0) | 25 9.40% | 24 9.84% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 5 1.88% | 12 4.92% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 9 3.38% | 13 5.33% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 174 65.41% | 155 63.52% |
| Total | 266 | 244 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|
| Assigned Value | 46 | 13 |
| Total Assigned Value | 532 | 488 |
| % Assigned Value | 8.65% | 2.66% |

| 3) OAA allowed more effective and efficient use of resources (e.g., human, physical, technological, and financial) within and between programs. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 16 6.08% | 8 3.28% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 30 11.41% | 24 9.84% |
| Neutral (0) | 30 11.41% | 23 9.43% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 7 2.66% | 11 4.51% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 9 3.42% | 16 6.56% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 171 65.02% | 162 66.39% |
| Total | 263 | 244 |
| Assigned Value | 37 | -3 |
| Total Assigned Value | 526 | 488 |
| % Assigned Value | 7.03% | -0.61% |

| 4) OAA promoted uniformly measurable standards to be applied to all programs. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 15 5.64% | 8 3.29% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 27 10.15% | 23 9.47% |
| Neutral (0) | 29 10.90% | 25 10.29% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 2 0.75% | 8 3.29% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 9 3.38% | 15 6.17% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 184 69.17% | 164 67.49% |
| Total | 266 | 243 |
| Assigned Value | 37 | 1 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|
| Total Assigned Value | 532 | 486 |
| % Assigned Value | 6.95% | 0.21% |

| Question 46: Rate the functioning of the Center for Excellence in Learning, Teaching & Technology, or CELTT. | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|
| CELTT enhanced the campus capacity to offer online and hybrid courses. | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 107 40.38% | 65 26.86% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 77 29.06% | 61 25.21% |
| Neutral (0) | 17 6.42% | 22 9.09% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 4 1.51% | 6 2.48% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 4 1.51% | 8 3.31% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 56 21.13% | 80 33.06% |
| Total | 265 | 242 |
| Assigned Value | 279 | 169 |
| Total Assigned Value | 530 | 484 |
| % Assigned Value | 52.64% | 34.92% |

| CELTT provided more professional development opportunities. | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 102 38.49% | 75 30.99% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 93 35.09% | 79 32.64% |
| Neutral (0) | 19 7.17% | 26 10.74% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 6 2.26% | 10 4.13% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 8 3.02% | 8 3.31% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 37 13.96% | 44 18.18% |
| Total | 265 | 242 |
| Assigned Value | 275 | 203 |
| Total Assigned Value | 530 | 484 |
| % Assigned Value | 51.89% | 41.94% |

| 4) CELTT sufficiently supported technology-enhanced teaching and learning experience. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 112 42.11% | 84 35.00% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 81 30.45% | 71 29.58% |
| Neutral (0) | 17 6.39% | 22 9.17% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 11 4.14% | 4 1.67% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 6 2.26% | 11 4.58% |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 39 14.66% | 48 20.00% |
| Total | 266 | 240 |
| Assigned Value | 282 | 213 |
| Total Assigned Value | 532 | 480 |
| % Assigned Value | 53.01% | 44.38% |

| 5) CELTT provided sufficient technological support for campus operation. | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 115 43.56% | 97 40.08% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 87 32.95% | 74 30.58% |
| Neutral (0) | 14 5.30% | 17 7.02% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 13 4.92% | 9 3.72% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 6 2.27% | 12 4.96% |
| Don't Know/N/A (0) | 29 10.98% | 33 13.64% |
| Total | 264 | 242 |
| Assigned Value | 292 | 235 |
| Total Assigned Value | 528 | 484 |
| % Assigned Value | 55.30% | 48.55% |

| Question 47: Rate the functioning of the Office for Administrative Services, or OAS. | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|
| 1) OAS promoted a safe physical learning and working environment for students, faculty, and staff. | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 28 10.61% | 22 8.98% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 66 25.00% | 61 24.90% |
| Neutral (0) | 32 12.12% | 34 13.88% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 14 5.30% | 21 8.57% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 12 4.55% | 18 7.35% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 112 42.42% | 89 36.33% |
| Total | 264 | 245 |
| Assigned Value | 84 | 48 |
| Total Assigned Value | 528 | 490 |
| % Assigned Value | 15.91% | 9.80% |

| 2) OAS improved efficiency in matters of human resources. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 10 3.76% | 16 6.56% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 38 14.29% | 42 17.21% |
| Neutral (0) | 33 12.41% | 31 12.70% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 27 10.15% | 23 9.43% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 44 16.54% | 26 10.66% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 114 42.86% | 106 43.44% |
| Total | 266 | 244 |
| Assigned Value | -57 | -1 |
| Total Assigned Value | 532 | 488 |
| % Assigned Value | -10.71% | -0.20% |

| 3) OAS improved efficiency in matters of finance through the Business Office. | | |
|--|----------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 5 1.87% | 8 3.27% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 17 6.37% | 36 14.69% |
| Neutral (0) | 30 11.24% | 32 13.06% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 30 11.24% | 25 10.20% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 60 22.47% | 29 11.84% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 125 46.82% | 115 46.94% |
| Total | 267 | 245 |
| Assigned Value | -123 | -31 |
| Total Assigned Value | 534 | 490 |
| % Assigned Value | -23.03% | -6.33% |

| 4) OAS improved efficiency in matters of campus physical operations management. | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 11 4.12% | 9 3.70% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 47 17.60% | 38 15.64% |
| Neutral (0) | 31 11.61% | 38 15.64% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 24 8.99% | 24 9.88% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 23 8.61% | 20 8.23% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 131 49.06% | 114 46.91% |
| Total | 267 | 243 |
| Assigned Value | -1 | -8 |
| Total Assigned Value | 534 | 486 |
| % Assigned Value | -0.19% | -1.65% |

| 5) OAS's information and technology infrastructure (e.g., online request, online training) facilitated administrative service processes. | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 16 6.02% | 18 7.38% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 52 19.55% | 48 19.67% |
| Neutral (0) | 35 13.16% | 29 11.89% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 8 3.01% | 11 4.51% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 12 4.51% | 18 7.38% |
| Don't know/NA (0) | 143 53.76% | 120 49.18% |
| Total | 266 | 244 |
| Assigned Value | 52 | 37 |
| Total Assigned Value | 532 | 488 |
| % Assigned Value | 9.77% | 7.58% |

| Question 48: Rate the functioning of Kahikoluamea | | |
|---|---------------|-------------|
| 1) Kahikoluamea supported first-year college students in their transition to college level coursework. | | |
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 71 26.59% | |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 50 18.73% | |
| Neutral (0) | 19 7.12% | |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 2 0.75% | |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 7 2.62% | |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 118 44.19% | |
| Total | 267 | |
| Assigned Value | 176 | |
| Total Assigned Value | 534 | |
| % Assigned Value | 32.96% | |

| 2) Kahikoluamea promoted Hawaiian values in the learning experience of first-year college students. | | |
|--|---------------|-------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 46 17.23% | |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 51 19.10% | |
| Neutral (0) | 29 10.86% | |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 2 0.75% | |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 4 1.50% | |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 135 50.56% | |
| Total | 267 | |
| Assigned Value | 133 | |
| Total Assigned Value | 534 | |
| % Assigned Value | 24.91% | |

| 3) Kahilokuamea enhanced first-year students' learning experience by guiding them through learning pathways. | | |
|---|---------------|-------------|
| | 2012 | 2016 |
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 47 17.60% | |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 49 18.35% | |
| Neutral (0) | 21 7.87% | |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 6 2.25% | |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 9 3.37% | |
| Don't Know/NA (0) | 135 50.56% | |
| Total | 267 | |
| Assigned Value | 119 | |
| Total Assigned Value | 534 | |
| % Assigned Value | 22.28% | |

Appendix B: Calculating with Assigned Values

To facilitate comparison between the 2012 and 2016 results, questions using a Likert scale were assigned weighted values. For example, items containing the options “strongly agree,” “somewhat agree,” “neutral,” “somewhat disagree,” and “strongly disagree” were assigned the following values: 2, 1, 0, -1, -2, respectively. Questions containing the option “don’t know/NA” were assigned a value of 0. These values, referred to as “assigned values,” were then multiplied by the number of responses each option received. The resulting values (calculated assigned value, total possible assigned value, and % assigned value) provided insight as to how the survey participants as an aggregate responded to each question. Below are examples demonstrating how each of these values were calculated.

Calculated Assigned Value

In 2012, 68 people responded “strongly agree” to Question 6. To determine the assigned value for this category, these 68 responses were multiplied by a factor of 2 to get an assigned value of 136. In the same question, 81 people responded “somewhat agree.” This value of 81 was multiplied by a value of 1 to get the assigned value of 81. 26 people reported “neutral.” This category was assigned a factor of 0, so 26 responses were multiplied by 0 to get a weighted value of 0. 9 responses were collected in the “somewhat disagree” category. These 9 responses were multiplied by a factor of -1 to get an assigned/weighted value of -9. The “strongly disagree” category received 8 responses. These 8 responses were multiplied by a factor of -2 to get an assigned/weighted value of -16. These assigned category values were then summed to produce the calculated assigned value for the item: $136 + 81 + 0 + -9 + -16 = 200$.

Total Possible Assigned Value

Total possible assigned value is equal to the number of responses received for each question multiplied by the maximum assigned value. For instance, using the “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” scale described above, the maximum assigned value is 2 (on a scale of -2 to +2). Thus, if the total number of participants who responded to Question 6 is 300, the total possible assigned value is 600 (300×2).

% Assigned Value

% Assigned value is calculated by dividing the calculated assigned value by the total possible assigned value. Drawing on the examples above, this would result in a value of 67.67% ($200/300$). % Assigned value is useful because it indicates where on the spectrum the respondents fall as an aggregate. For instance, if the majority of respondents chose “strongly agree” the % assigned value will be closer to 100%. In contrast, if the majority of respondents chose “strongly disagree,” which has a negative assigned value, the % assigned value will be negative. In sum, the larger the % assigned value, the more the respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the statement in the given item.

Assigned Value Average

In several cases, Likert scale questions are assigned values on a scale of 0 to +4 rather than -2 to +2. For instance, an item with the options “greatly,” “to some degree,” “a little,” and “not at all,” and “don’t know/NA,” would be assigned the values +4 to 0 respectively. For these Likert questions, an additional value was calculated: assigned value average. Assigned value average equals the calculated assigned value divided by the total number of respondents. This value represents the average response. For example, an assigned value average of 3.5 means that the average response of participants was somewhere between “greatly” and “to some degree.”

In cases where the majority of participants responded either “neutral” or “don’t know/NA,” meaning that the assigned value average would remain close to 0. In these scenarios, the calculated assigned value does not provide a complete picture; if the majority of responses are “don’t know/NA” and there is a small number of “excellent” and “good,” then the average weighted value would result in a lower score. For example, see Equation 1 below, where x = 30 responses of “good” (weighted value of 3), y=32 responses of “excellent” (assigned value of 4) and z=203 responses of “don’t know/NA” (assigned value of 0).

Equation 1: $(\frac{3x+4y+0z}{265})$

Here, the resulting average weighted value is 1.22; because most of the responses had a weighted value of 0, the number was lowered. Thus, large numbers of “don’t know/NA” responses skew the calculation.

Example

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Strongly Agree (+2) | 3 1.04% |
| Somewhat Agree (+1) | 1 0.35% |
| Neutral (0) | 60 20.83% |
| Somewhat Disagree (-1) | 1 0.35% |
| Strongly Disagree (-2) | 1 1.04% |
| Don’t Know/NA (0) | 220 76.39% |
| Total Number of Responses Collected | 288 |
| Calculated Assigned Value | 4 |
| Maximum Assigned Value Possible | 576 |
| % Assigned Value | 0.69% |

This example demonstrates when the number of don’t know/NA/Neutral answers being the majority of responses collected. While the % assigned value is above 0 it is considered negligible (since it is <1%).

Contact Information

Kelsey Inouye,
J.D., M.Sc.
Institutional/Policy Analyst
Ohia 102
808-734-9778
inouyeks@hawaii.edu

or

Shaun Kiyabu,
B.S.
Institutional/Policy Analyst
Ohia 102
808-734-9763
kiyabus@hawaii.edu