# West Hills College
## IEAC- WHCC Annual Evaluation 2017-2018

---

**1 - 1. As a new committee, quantitative measures have not been established. What are the quantitative data points that the IEAC Committee will report on in the future? These data points should align with you Governance Committee Template Outputs.**

| Response Rate | 4/14 (28.57%) |
|---|---|

• The goals of the committee should reflect the upcoming needs of the college using the master plan and accreditation needs.

• Annual Report on College indicators (contributions to District KPIs?) Annual Report on Governance Committees Campus Initiatives ACCJC Annual Report - if needed ACCJC Sub Change Reports - if needed ISER Contributions (living document)

• I have not seen the Governance Committee Template for this committee - so I am not sure what to align them with.

• Continual quality improvement to enhance student achievement and promote student learning.

---

**2 - 2. Are there process improvements that would assist the committee in producing its outputs?**

| Response Rate | 4/14 (28.57%) |
|---|---|

• This committee is doing everything in it's power to promote student success.

• Development of an annual timeline (and adherence to the timeline) Shared and better understanding of committee's responsibilities/duties

• The committee does a good job of putting processes in place that allow for output accountability

• As we move forward we will be able to determine what improvements need to me made in the process.

---

### 3 - Committee Effectiveness

**Purpose is tied to the College mission and clearly articulated**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.25 |
| Disagree | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Neutral | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Agree | (4) | 3 | 75.00% | | |
| Strongly Agree | (5) | 1 | 25.00% | | |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4/14 (28.57%) | 4.25 | 0.50 | |

---

### 4 - Committee Effectiveness

**Goals are set at the beginning of each academic year**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 3.75 |
| Disagree | (2) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| Neutral | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Agree | (4) | 2 | 50.00% | | |
| Strongly Agree | (5) | 1 | 25.00% | | |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4/14 (28.57%) | 3.75 | 1.26 | |

---

### 5 - Committee Effectiveness

**Purpose is understood**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.00 |
| Disagree | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Neutral | (3) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| Agree | (4) | 2 | 50.00% | | |
| Strongly Agree | (5) | 1 | 25.00% | | |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4/14 (28.57%) | 4.00 | 0.82 | |

### 6 - Committee Effectiveness

**Purpose is followed**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Disagree | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.25 |
| Neutral | (3) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| Agree | (4) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| Strongly Agree | (5) | 2 | 50.00% | | |
| | | | | 0  25  50  75  100 | Course |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4/14 (28.57%) | 4.25 | 0.96 | |

### 7 - Committee Effectiveness

**Size, composition, and structure is conducive to fulfilling the purpose**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Disagree | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.00 |
| Neutral | (3) | 2 | 50.00% | | |
| Agree | (4) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Strongly Agree | (5) | 2 | 50.00% | | |
| | | | | 0  25  50  75  100 | Course |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4/14 (28.57%) | 4.00 | 1.15 | |

### 8 - Committee Effectiveness

**Members are participatory, open, and engaged in robust dialogue**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Disagree | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.25 |
| Neutral | (3) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| Agree | (4) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| Strongly Agree | (5) | 2 | 50.00% | | |
| | | | | 0  25  50  75  100 | Course |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4/14 (28.57%) | 4.25 | 0.96 | |

### 9 - Committee Effectiveness

**Recommendations are the result of inclusive dialogue**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Disagree | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.25 |
| Neutral | (3) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| Agree | (4) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| Strongly Agree | (5) | 2 | 50.00% | | |
| | | | | 0  25  50  75  100 | Course |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4/14 (28.57%) | 4.25 | 0.96 | |

| 10 - Committee Effectiveness | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Self-review and improvement is conducted annually** | | | | | |
| **Response Option** | **Weight** | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Percent Responses** | **Means** |
| Strongly Disagree | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 3.75 |
| Disagree | (2) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| Neutral | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Agree | (4) | 2 | 50.00% | | |
| Strongly Agree | (5) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| | | | | 0  25  50  75  100 | Course |

| **Response Rate** | **Mean** | **STD** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4/14 (28.57%) | 3.75 | 1.26 | |

| 11 - Committee Effectiveness | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Chair/Co-chair shows strong and effective leadership** | | | | | |
| **Response Option** | **Weight** | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Percent Responses** | **Means** |
| Strongly Disagree | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.50 |
| Disagree | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Neutral | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Agree | (4) | 2 | 50.00% | | |
| Strongly Agree | (5) | 2 | 50.00% | | |
| | | | | 0  25  50  75  100 | Course |

| **Response Rate** | **Mean** | **STD** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4/14 (28.57%) | 4.50 | 0.58 | |

| 12 - Committee Effectiveness | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Meeting schedule is appropriate to fulfill Committee purpose** | | | | | |
| **Response Option** | **Weight** | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Percent Responses** | **Means** |
| Strongly Disagree | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.50 |
| Disagree | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Neutral | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Agree | (4) | 2 | 50.00% | | |
| Strongly Agree | (5) | 2 | 50.00% | | |
| | | | | 0  25  50  75  100 | Course |

| **Response Rate** | **Mean** | **STD** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4/14 (28.57%) | 4.50 | 0.58 | |

| 13 - Committee Effectiveness | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Meetings are run efficiently** | | | | | |
| **Response Option** | **Weight** | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Percent Responses** | **Means** |
| Strongly Disagree | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.25 |
| Disagree | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Neutral | (3) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| Agree | (4) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| Strongly Agree | (5) | 2 | 50.00% | | |
| | | | | 0  25  50  75  100 | Course |

| **Response Rate** | **Mean** | **STD** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4/14 (28.57%) | 4.25 | 0.96 | |

### 14 - Committee Effectiveness

**Agendas and minutes are available in a timely manner**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.25 |
| Disagree | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Neutral | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Agree | (4) | 3 | 75.00% | | |
| Strongly Agree | (5) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| | | | | 0  25  50  75  100 | Course |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4/14 (28.57%) | 4.25 | 0.50 | |

### 15 - Committee Effectiveness

**Agendas and minutes are accurate, useful, and reflect meeting content**

| Response Option | Weight | Frequency | Percent | Percent Responses | Means |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | (1) | 0 | 0.00% | | 4.25 |
| Disagree | (2) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Neutral | (3) | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| Agree | (4) | 3 | 75.00% | | |
| Strongly Agree | (5) | 1 | 25.00% | | |
| | | | | 0  25  50  75  100 | Course |

| Response Rate | Mean | STD | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4/14 (28.57%) | 4.25 | 0.50 | |

### 16 - i. This narrative section should focus on the following components: 1. Did the Committee achieve its academic year goals? 2. Did the process appropriately assess and improve student learning? 3. What has been the Committee's contribution to the College over the past year? 4. What is the best thing about the Committee? 5. What would make the Committee better next year?

| Response Rate | 4/14 (28.57%) |
|---|---|

• 1. Work in progress 2. Yes,, to be continued 3. This committee has be working together to help the college get off "Warning" status 4. Watching "the best of the best" of the college work together 5. Continued college-wide dialogue.

• So far the committee is on track for this year. The accomplishment for this year will help student learning. The committee has taken the steps needed to help the college with records and accreditation. The committee works together to achieve the goals it need to achieve. It will be better when we can focus on other needs of the college.

• I think the goals are not well understood by all committee members. Expectations of each member need to be better articulated. I believe assessment of student learning will come with time; we have been too focused on the follow-up report and much of the committee "real" purpose has been secondary. The committee has played an oversight role in establishing ISS, setting up governance committee evaluation, incorporating accreditation into all aspects of the college. I would like to see the committee have monthly open forums/lunch chats to train and develop the campus' understanding of institutional effectiveness.

• 1. I feel that we did - the committee work for the follow up report was completed, work ensuring that our college is continuing to make efforts to improve integration and institutional effectiveness was achieved. 2. Yes 3. See number 1 4. The open and robust dialog surrounding all things related to the institutional standards and integration of this college, and the efforts made to ensure a sustainable future. 5. The ability of the committee to continue the work that they started this year and focus on institutional effectiveness campus wide - a lot of time was put into the follow up report and that deterred a bit from the sustainable efforts for other areas needing improvement.

### 17 - ii. This narrative section should focus on the following components: 1. Did the assessment tool adequately address process issues? 2. Did the assessment tool adequately address committee effectiveness? 3. What is the best thing about the assessment tool? 4. What would make the assessment tool better?

| Response Rate | 4/14 (28.57%) |
|---|---|

• 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. It addresses process issues and committee effectiveness 4. It's fine.

• The assessment tool did address the procedural issues. Because the committee is new future assessments will determine if there are any gaps in the assessment tool.

• Too soon to say - the committee is still in it's infancy.

• 1. No because we do not have a committee page in the Governance Manual to refer to. 2. yes 3. It took about 10 minutes to complete 4. Having some measurable goals to look at from maybe a beginning of the year meeting and then making the determination whether we achieved our goals. Also the committee page to look at outputs.