Justification

The [American Association of University Professors] 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities makes it clear that the faculty has a collective expertise that gives it “primary responsibility” in such areas of academic governance as “curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.” It is accordingly appropriate that the faculty role in the evaluation of administrators be especially focused on faculty interaction with administrators directly charged with the oversight of the educational program, of students, and of such personnel matters as salaries, promotion, and tenure. If the faculty exercises its role responsibly, such administrators will more likely see the faculty as a resource to be drawn upon, not an enemy to be combated.


In an effort to facilitate a greater understanding and appreciation of the work that administrators do in the service of the college’s mission, we propose that the Evaluation of Administrators be modified in ways that are outlined on the subsequent pages of this document. This proposal results from the desire to promote transparency and alignment between administrators’ and faculty initiatives.

Moreover, incorporating such a practice into our evaluating processes addresses the results of Kapi’olani Community College’s 2006 ACCJC Self Study, in which the accrediting body indicates that the College only partially met the Standard because, “While the majority of leadership levels, institutional governance, and decision making structures are evaluated, the results are not consistently communicated to the faculty and staff at large or used in any meaningful way to make improvements” (Standard Four: Leadership and Governance: Self Evaluation 434).

Faculty involvement in the review process of administrators would facilitate understanding of the work that administrators do, the ways in which their efforts align with faculty efforts, and the ways in which the work of both parties fulfills independent yet overlapping needs of the college. Such a process would also enable increased understanding of ways faculty efforts can best be implemented so as to further administrator initiatives and visa versa, as well as how administrator efforts might be more effectively implemented.

Both faculty and administrators play a significant role in the success of the college.
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Currently, during the contract renewal and tenure and promotion process, faculty enumerate all their efforts in comprehensive documents. These extensive documents do more than facilitate the evaluation of the faculty member, which in and of itself is instrumental. These documents provide an overview for administrators of how teachers are interacting with students, current pedagogical trends, as well as the kinds of initiatives faculty see as promising in terms of student support. Involving faculty in the evaluation of administrators would provide the same benefits. Such documents would give faculty an idea of the scope of administrators’ work, what their work entails, how administrative work align with faculty efforts, and areas that faculty may not so readily recognize as instrumental to the running of the college.

As noted in the quotation above, universities and colleges across the country have begun to implement administration evaluation processes that involve faculty. We believe that such an effort on our campus would yield positive results in terms of creating a more efficient work environment with the added benefits of promoting collegiality and equality between faculty and administrators, improving transparency, and facilitating greater understanding and appreciation of the ways in which both faculty and administrators contribute to the success of the college.

Modification of the current process to include faculty also provide an opportunity for administration to model ongoing professional development, participate in the culture of evidence, demonstrate adjustment and constructive use of the assessment, and, finally, to lead the way in the use of ePortfolios so as to begin the institutionalization of the culture of ePortfolios.
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Proposal Overview

Participants

- Faculty Senate
- Chancellor
- Vice Chancellors
- Deans
- Department Chairs / Unit Heads (annual evaluation survey and annual share-out only)
- For possible future inclusion: Staff Council and Staff Council Chair, CAAC and CAAC Chair, any other decision-making bodies—composition of Leadership Review Committee will have to change

Basic Processes

- Annual evaluation survey (evaluation of the above individuals/governing bodies)
  - Applies to all of the above every year
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- Electronic
- All members of the Kapi’olani CC community may participate (faculty, staff, admin., student government)
- Results tabulated by OFIE
- Results reported to individual or body evaluated
- Results not made public at this time
- EXCEPT for DCs/Unit Heads, individual or body evaluated must post results and an informal but substantive reflection on results in ongoing ePortfolio by specific due date (see below for due dates) LRC chair has access to this ePortfolio

- 5-year portfolio review
  - Applies to
    - Faculty Senate
    - Chancellor
    - Vice Chancellors
    - Deans
  - Department Chairs / Unit Heads do NOT participate in portfolio (they have promotion dossiers or 5-year reviews to do)
  - Faculty Senate Chair (or Vice Chair?) responsible for updating Faculty Senate portfolio during his/her term as chair
  - Self-evaluation, similar to promotion dossier
  - Presented in ePortfolio
  - Maintained continuously, reviewed every 5 years
  - Staggered reviews for benefit of busy campus and Leadership Review Committee
  - See attached guidelines for more specific information

- Annual share-out
  - Applies to all
  - Public (campus) presentation
  - See attached guidelines for more specific information

Roll out

- Staggered beginning, to avoid portfolio reviews all happening in same year
  1. Year 1: AY 2011-2012
    - Policies and procedures finalized
    - Evaluation surveys for all
    - Survey week consistently first week of March
    - Special push on first Friday of March (PD day)
    - Results reported to evaluatee
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- Results and reflection on results posted by all (except for DCs/UHs) to ePortfolio
- Reflections reviewed (short reviews) by Leadership Review Committee

2. Year 2: AY 2012 – 2013
   - 5-yr. portfolio due for Chancellor & Faculty Senate
   - Annual share-out for all
   - Evaluation surveys for all, see above

3. Year 3: AY 2013-2014
   - 5-yr. portfolios due for Vice Chancellors
   - Annual share-out for all
   - Evaluation surveys for all, see above

   - 5-year portfolios due for one half of Deans
   - Annual share-out for all
   - Evaluation surveys for all, see above

5. Year 5: AY 2015-2016
   - 5-year portfolio due for other half of Deans
   - Annual share-out for all
   - Evaluation surveys for all, see above

   - Program Review and Adjustment year
   - Annual share-out for all
   - Evaluation surveys for all, see above

7. Year 7: AY 2017-2018
   - 5-year portfolios due for Chancellor and Faculty Senate
   - Annual share-out for all
   - Evaluation surveys for all, see above

8. Continues in cycle

Leadership Review Committee

- 5 members
  1. 3 C-5 faculty members from campus at large
     - 3-year terms, staggered
     - Rotation list, randomly generated
     - As faculty become C5, their names go on the rotation list at the bottom
     - Chair’s name goes to bottom of rotation list
  2. 1 E/M employee not currently up for review
     - Nominated, appointed, elected, or rotated from admin. team
     - 1-year term
3. 1 chair
   - Elected from and by Faculty Senate Evaluations Committee
   - C-5 level
   - 1 year term, 3 year commitment
   - Service can extend beyond membership on Faculty Senate Evaluations Committee, but chair should continue to attend FS Eval. Committee meetings to keep committee apprised of the LRC work and processes
   - 3 cr. TE per semester of 1-yr. active term
   - 1 year of shadowing current chair prior to term
   - 1 year of supporting succeeding chair after term completed
   - Responsible for working with OFIE to ensure evaluation processes every year
     - Wide distribution of link to surveys
     - Reminders
     - Drafting/revising language to accompany above
     - Ensuring that results get to evaluates in timely manner
   - Responsible for convening leadership review committee
   - Responsible for ensuring that results reflection responses get written and submitted in timely manner
   - Responsible for writing 5-year portfolio reviews
   - Responsible for receiving portfolios and ensuring confidentiality
   - Responsible for scheduling and facilitating annual share-out
   - Responsible for creating/updating and monitoring spreadsheet of decision-making bodies/individuals up for 5-year portfolio in any given year
   - Responsible, with Faculty Senate Evaluation Committee Chair, for maintaining LRC membership rotation list
   - Responsible for liaising with admin. regarding the admin. member of the LRC

Due Dates

- Evaluation surveys go out first week in March, push on first Friday in March (OFIE, chair of LRC)
- Results reported to leader by April 30 (OFIE, chair of LRC)
- Results posted to ePortfolio, along with reflection, by May 31 (Leaders or E/M employees)
- Reflections checked by LRC chair, reminders sent out as necessary
- 5-year portfolios due October (same due date as T/P dossiers) (Leaders)
- Reviews of 5-year portfolios due December 31 (LRC, LRC Chair, other reviewers)
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- Annual share-outs scheduled for the Friday before Valentine’s Day in February (LRC Chair, Leaders)
- Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Feb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>evaluation surveys go out first week in March, big push for evals first Friday in March (applies to whole campus, evaluating FS, Chancellor, VCs, Deans, DCs, UHs)</td>
<td>survey results reported to evaluatee by April 30 (applies to LRC and OFIE)</td>
<td>results posted by evaluatee to ePortfolio, along with reflection, by May 31 (applies to FS, Chancellor, VCs, Deans)</td>
<td>reflections checked LRC Chair, reminders sent out as necessary by September 15 (applies to LRC Chair)</td>
<td>5-year portfolios due early October (same day as T/P Dossiers) (applies to FS, Chancellor, VCs, Deans)</td>
<td>reviews of 5-year ePortfolios finished by December 31 (applies to LRC and other reviewing bodies, as appropriate)</td>
<td>annual share out during the Friday on or before Valentine’s Day (applies to FS, Chancellor, VCs, Deans, DCs, UHs and whole campus may attend)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested Procedure for Creation and Implementation

- Small subcommittees of FS Evaluation Committee to work on the following during Spring 2011 & into Fall 2011 & Spring 2012 as necessary:
  - Drafting/revising evaluation survey tools
  - Drafting/revising guidelines for 5-year portfolio & drafting/revising 5-year portfolio review procedures
  - Drafting/revising structure and guidelines for annual share-out
  - Drafting/revising guidelines for response (to annual evaluation survey results) reflection
  - Drafting/revising LRC Guidelines (like DPC Guidelines—should be approved by Union?)
  - Establishment of C-5 LRC rotation list
  - Election of LRC Chair
Proposal, Guidelines for Leadership ePortfolio

This document describes the Kapi‘olani Community College Leadership ePortfolio review process. It is a guide for both the Executive/Managerial employee or decision-making body to be reviewed and for the reviewers.

Purpose of Review

The creation of the ePortfolio and its review serve multiple purposes, including the following:

1. To facilitate greater understanding and appreciation of the work that Executive/Managerial (E/M) employees and decision-making bodies do in the service of the college’s mission.
2. To provide E/M employees and decision-making bodies with feedback upon which to base some of their plans for self-improvement and efforts in service of the college.
3. To provide additional information (the ePortfolio itself) and evaluation of that information (the Leadership Review Committee review) to the supervisors who are ultimately responsible for the E/M employees’ performance review.

Participants

This process applies to:

- Kapi‘olani CC Faculty Senate (FS Chair is ultimately responsible for maintaining ePortfolio)
- Kapi‘olani CC Chancellor
- Kapi‘olani CC Vice Chancellors
- Kapi‘olani CC Deans

General Information for Executive/Managerial Employees and Decision-Making Bodies

Maintenance of the Leadership ePortfolio should be continuous and ongoing. It will be formally reviewed once every 5 years, but the Chair of the Leadership Review Committee (LRC) has constant access to the ePortfolio.

The Leadership ePortfolio is very important. The information posted will form the basis upon which the LRC reviews your work. In addition, its maintenance and review provide valuable opportunities for you to review, reflect upon, and shape your work.
Criteria for Review

Please include a formal job description in your ePortfolio. If your work has deviated from this description for some reason, please explain. In general, your work will be reviewed in the following areas, and evidence is expected:

1. Leadership philosophy.
2. Leadership effectiveness, including clear discussion of how work directly supports student engagement, learning, and achievement and directly supports faculty’s work to promote student engagement, learning, and achievement.
3. Communication and interpersonal skills.
4. Use of feedback (in various forms, but to include the survey administered by the LRC) to improve work.
5. Professional development endeavors.
6. Community connection / public relations endeavors.
7. Satisfactory resolution of recommendations made by reviewing bodies during previous formal review (as applicable).
8. Performance in the following areas, as defined by the attached University of Hawaii Executive/Managerial Performance Evaluation (with some modifications, indicated by italics):
   a. Quality: The result of carrying out an activity which approaches an ideal outcome of fulfilling the purpose of the activity. Completion of identified projects, programs, goals, objectives, etc., and discussion and evidence of the impact of this completion, in a matter which is judged relative to success, creativity, innovation, leadership, organizational abilities, judgment, planning, etc.
   b. Quantity: The amount produced, expressed in terms of activities completed, impact on the institution (and evidence of this impact), units completed, etc.
   c. Timeliness: Completion of activities or results produced, as the earliest possible time, on-time, or maximizing the time available for other activities. Prompt response to inquiries or requests of those served (aka constituencies or subordinates).
   d. Cost-Effectiveness: The use of the organization’s resource, e.g., technological, human, material, etc., in an effective, way to maximize results in obtaining the highest gain or reduction in loss or improved use of resources available, with consideration to the impact on other units, offices, etc.
   e. Interpersonal Impact: Promotes collegiality, cooperation, consideration and goodwill amongst coworkers, peers, those served (subordinates), and critical constituencies. Understands and fosters effective working relationships with internal and external constituencies. Supports, mentors, and develops...faculty
and staff served. This includes efforts to ensure that those faculty and staff served understand the value of their work and their expertise to the institution.

f. Decision-Making: Ability to recognize when a decision is required and the impact of the decision; makes appropriate decisions; acts effectively and expeditiously.

g. Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action: Contributes and is committed to the University’s goals of diversity, equity, equal opportunity, and affirmative action.

**Review cycle**

Individual Leadership ePortfolios will be reviewed every 5 years. Review will take place in a staggered cycle as follows:

1. Year 1: Chancellor & Faculty Senate
2. Year 2: Vice Chancellors
3. Year 3: Dean of Hospitality, Business, & Legal Education; Dean of Health Programs
4. Year 4: Dean of Arts & Sciences, Dean of Community and Continuing Education, Dean of Kahikoluamea (if such a position exists at the time of review)
5. Year 5: No ePortfolio reviews; instead procedures and documents reviewed and adjusted
6. Year 6: Chancellor & Faculty Senate
   etc.

**Review schedule**

The various leaders are reviewed by appropriate bodies, as listed below:

1. Faculty Senate:
   a. Leadership Review Committee
2. Chancellor:
   a. Leadership Review Committee
   b. Submitted, with LRC reviews, to Vice President of Community Colleges
3. Vice Chancellors:
   a. Leadership Review Committee
   b. Submitted, with LRC reviews, to Chancellor
4. Deans:
   a. Supervising Vice Chancellor
   b. Leadership Review Committee
   c. Submitted, with LRC reviews, to Chancellor
Review timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Event</th>
<th>Mid-October, same date as T/P dossiers</th>
<th>November 15</th>
<th>December 31</th>
<th>January 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ePortfolio due to LRC chair; leader's access to ePortfolio temporarily blocked</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor reviews due to LRC (as applicable)</td>
<td>LRC reviews due to Chancellor or VPCC (as applicable)</td>
<td>Chancellor or VPCC review due (if VPCC chooses to write review); leader’s access to ePortfolio restored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership Review Committee (LRC) Procedures

Campus: Kapi`olani Community College

Leadership Review Committee (LRC)

Leadership Review Committee (LRC) Procedures

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide basic guidelines and procedures governing the LRC review of Leadership Portfolios. The document also provides guidelines regarding the composition and governance of the LRC.

Effective Date

This document has been approved by the Faculty Senate Evaluations Committee, and is effective when final approval is given by the Faculty Senate and the Chancellor.

Guidelines

1. These procedures and any subsequent changes to these procedures must be approved by a majority vote of the total votes received from the Faculty Senate and the Executive/Managerial (E/M) employees.

2. The procedures may be amended at any time during the year, provided that all of the Executive/Managerial (E/M) employees and the Faculty Senate have been informed in writing of the proposed changes and have been given the opportunity to vote on the proposed changes.

3. The LRC Chair will be responsible for managing processes necessary to the implementation of changes to this document.

4. When procedures are amended during the year, leaders submitting portfolios in that year shall be allowed to utilize either amended LRC procedures or the previous year's LRC procedures.
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5. To avoid conflicts of interest, LRC members who are themselves submitting a leadership portfolio in any given year shall not sit on the LRC for the entirety of that academic year. The recused member will be replaced according to procedures outlined below.

LRC Membership

1. The LRC shall be comprised of three rank-C5 faculty members, one rank-C5 Chairperson selected as outlined below, and one E/M employee.

2. The three non-chair faculty members will serve 3-year terms, staggered.

3. The one E/M employee will serve for 1 year.

4. The commitment of the chair of the LRC extends for 3 years, with only one year of active service. The first year of commitment will involve “shadowing” the current chair. The second year of commitment is the year of active service. The third year of commitment involves mentoring and advising the replacement chair. The year of active service will include the support of the previous chair in the form of advice and/or mentoring, and it will also include allowing the future chair to shadow all activities related to the duties of the LRC.

5. The chair of the LRC shall receive 3 credits of TEs in each semester of his/her active year of service, for a total of 6 credits.

Selection of LRC Members

1. The three rank-C5 faculty members will be selected as follows:
   
a. A list of all rank-C5 faculty members at the Kapiʻolani CC campus will be complied. List will be ordered according to seniority, with the most senior C5 faculty members at the top of the list.

b. This list will serve as a rotation list for service, beginning with the most senior C5 faculty members at the top of the list. When each member completes his/her service, his/her name is moved to the bottom of the rotation list.

c. As faculty members are promoted to the rank of C5, their names will be added to the bottom of the list.

d. As C5 faculty members retire, their names will be removed from the list.
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e. If any C5 faculty member called for LRC service refuses to serve, his/her name will be moved to the bottom of the list and the next person on the list will be contacted for service.

f. The Faculty Senate Evaluation Committee Chair is responsible for maintaining the rotation list and for contacting potential LRC members as their names come to the top of the list for service.

2. The three rank-C5 faculty members will serve for a period of 3 years. To ensure that the terms are staggered, the initial call to serve will invite the first C5 faculty member on the rotation list to serve for one year, the second C5 faculty member on the rotation list to serve for two years, and the third C5 faculty member on the rotation list to serve for 3 years. After that, all members will be invited to serve for 3 years. As necessary (due to retirements, recusals, etc.), terms of service may be adjusted to re-establish the staggering. Such adjustments will be made by the LRC chair in consultation with the Faculty Senate Evaluations Committee.

3. If one (or more) of the three C5 faculty members is unable to fulfill his/her term, the LRC chair will call into service the next C5 faculty member on the rotation list, adjusting terms as necessary (see above) to ensure staggering.

4. The one E/M employee member of the LRC will be selected in any way the Chancellor and other E/M employees deem appropriate (appointment, rotation, election, etc.)

5. LRC members assume responsibilities on September 1 of each year and will be notified by the LRC Chair. The previous LRC will complete any unfinished business.

Selection of LRC Chair

1. The Chair of the LRC must be a C5-rank faculty member.

2. As C5 faculty members near the top of the rotation list (described above), the FS Evaluation Committee chair will contact those faculty members’ Department Chairs to recommend that they be nominated to serve on the FS Evaluation Committee.

3. The Chair of the LRC will be selected by a majority vote of the FS Evaluations Committee.

4. Unless special circumstances prevent it, the Chair of the LRC will be elected from the FS Evaluation Committee membership.

5. If circumstances prevent #4 above, the next 5 names on the rotation list (see above) will be ranked by the FS Evaluation Committee; the FS Evaluation Committee Chair will
then contact the faculty members on the ranked list, in order, to invite each of them to serve as chair in turn.

6. The Chair of the LRC must attend FS Evaluation Committee meetings to keep committee apprised of the LRC work and processes.

Leadership Portfolio Review Procedures

1. The Leadership Portfolio Guidelines will be provided to all E/M employees and/or the FS Chair under review in that year by the LRC Chair on or before August 1.

2. The maintenance of Leadership Portfolios should be ongoing, with some finalizing before review.

3. The LRC Chair will have constant access to all Leadership Portfolios.

4. No earlier than the due date for Tenure/Promotion Dossiers in any given year, the LRC Chair will coordinate review of the Leadership Portfolios up for review in that year. This includes arranging meetings of the committee and ensuring that all paperwork is completed and deadlines adhered to. It also includes ensuring that all pertinent guidelines are followed during the review processes.

5. The LRC Chair will prepare a written report on the Leader’s strengths and areas in need of improvement. This report will be based on the discussions of the LRC about the Leader and must be approved by all committee members. Minority opinions should be incorporated into the report, and indicated as minority opinions.

6. All deliberations of the LRC shall be confidential and shall not be discussed with non-LRC members. No attempts should be made to contact the Leader to inform him or her of the LRC’s assessment. Procedural questions and concerns are negotiated by the LRC Chair, who may consult with the previous LRC Chair and the FS Evaluation Committee as s/he decides upon a course of action.

7. Upon completion of the review of the Leadership Portfolio, the LRC Chair shall upload the assessment report to the portfolio and report to the Leader’s supervisor and to the Leader him/herself that the assessment report is available for review.
Items for Annual Evaluation Survey

Items will be rated on a Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Survey applies to all of the following:

Faculty Senate
Department Chairs and Unit Heads
Deans
Vice Chancellors
Chancellor

Leadership

1. Creates an environment that encourages innovation and participation by faculty
3. Recognizes the value of faculty constructive criticism in decision-making.
4. Takes risks and embarks on new directions to improve the college.
5. Effectively plans for and complies with accreditation standards.
6. Applies fairness and objectivity when making decisions that affect faculty.

Administration and Management

1. Manages and allocates funds fairly and efficiently.
2. Makes optimal use of human, financial, and physical resources to support teaching and service goals of the College.
3. Allows for a reasonable amount of time when deadlines are mandated.
4. Supports training and development needs for faculty.
5. Is effective at resolving conflicts.
6. Accepts and implements recommendations of departments, faculty governance bodies and committees.

Communication

1. Consults with faculty adequately before making important changes to current practices.
2. Promotes open communication and is accessible to faculty.

3. Is diligent in representing the concerns of faculty throughout the administrative hierarchy.

4. Provides openness and transparency in decision making that affects faculty.

**Student Learning**

1. Fosters a supportive learning environment for students

2. Provides a safe, well-maintained, well-equipped physical environment for learning.

3. Encourages, supports, and rewards excellence in teaching.

4. Keeps pace with the changing educational landscape, especially regarding technology.

**Overall**

1. Overall rating of administrator

**Open-Ended**

1. Please feel free to add comments below:
Annual Share-Out Parameters

Applies to all of the following
• Faculty Senate (represented by Chair)
• Department Chairs and Unit Heads
• Deans
• Vice Chancellors
• Chancellor

Roll-Out Parameters

• To be held on the Friday of or before Valentine’s Day in February.
• All presenters provide a visual prop to be left in the presentation area (similar to C4ward posters).
• While the Visual Representations are available for viewing, different evaluates will “present” (similar to how a conference is scheduled).
• Presentations will be scheduled between 9:00 am and 3:00 pm and, depending on the number of presenters, some may be scheduled concurrently.

Presentation Criteria

• 20-30 minute presentation with 15-20 minutes for Q&A.
• Brief overview of job in terms of responsibilities and umbrella of duties.
• Overview of “repetitive” tasks—daily duties.
• Work done since last evaluation.
• Highlight 2-3 particular projects
  o Projects Completed
  o Projects in Progress
  o Projects on the Horizon
• Situate projects within Strategic and Tactical Plans
• Very generalized share-out of annual evaluation results, including plans to continue excellence and/or improve.