To: Jeff Arbuckle, OFIE

From: Susan Jaworowski

Co-chair, Self-Evaluation Standard IV

cc: Guy Kellogg

Co-chair, Self-Evaluation Standard IV

Joy Oehlers

Standard IV A 1 convenor

Re: Self-Evaluation Standard IV data requests

Date: November 22, 2010

Jeff, attached are the data questions from Standard IV. At this point, we only have data requests from the subcommittee working in Standard IV A 1. The other subcommittees are choosing other methods of information gathering that do not involve your office.

There are three questions and five charts. The charts are taken directly from the 2006 report, and the subcommittee would like to replicate the questions and the scale. I would suggest putting off the Quill survey as late as possible as the campus is in the process of hiring a webmaster whose duties include an overhaul of Quill, so we should not survey that until the overhaul is completed (of course, if is not done in a timely fashion, we will have to survey on the old Quill, but as there is a possibility of a timely update, we should see if it's possible to wait for that).

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any general questions about the data request. If you have specific questions, you may find it more useful to contact the IVA1 convenor, Joy Oehlers, directly.

- 1. How do KCC students, staff, administration, and faculty receive communication about institutional policies and processes?
- 2. How do KCC students, staff, administration, and faculty dissemminate communication about institutional policies and processes?
- 3. What process(es) do KCC students, staff, administration and faculty use to set and achieve goals?

Table 2. Faculty and Staff Reasons for Accessing Quill Fall 2005

Faculty	Staff	Question: Have you ever accessed information from "Quill" (the inte information system for Kapi'olani CC administration, faculty. and st					
n=49	n=20	Yes, for Administration purposes (i.e., memoranda, committee meeting min-					
13.88%	12.66%	utes)					
n = 83	n =37	Yes, for Forms and Procedures (for Administrative Services, Auxiliary Ser-					
23.51%	23.42%	vices, Business Office, Human Resources, Information Media Technology					
		Services, Library and Professional Development)					
n = 39	n = 19	No. for Eale (4- IIII Contain on I Took along Documen)					
11.0%	12.03%	Yes, for links (to UH System and Technology Resources)					
n = 22	n = 13						
6.23%	8.23%	Yes, for news (i.e., news feeds, events listings, news stories and headlines)					
n = 54	n = 18						
15.29%	11.39%	Yes, for planning (i.e., strategic plan s and tactical plans)					
n = 28	n = 9	Was to seed On'll (interest seed)					
7.93%	5.7%	Yes, to search Quill (intranet search)					
n = 7	n = 12	V f (411) (1					
1.98%	7.59%	Yes, for "411" (key services and resources available at the College)					

Table 3.
Faculty and Staff Reasons for Not Using Quill
Fall 2005

		Question: Have you ever accessed information from "Quill" (the internal information system for Kapi'olani CC administration, faculty. and staff)?
n=47	n=17	No, I was not aware of Quill's existence.
13.31%	0.76%	100, 1 was not aware of Quin 5 existence.
n = 18	n=11	No, I had no use for the Quill information.
5.09%	6.96%	100, I had no use for the Quin information.
n = 6	n = 2	
1.69%	1.27%	No, Other.

Table 4.
Faculty Evaluation of Leadership
Fall 2005

1 111 2000						
LEADERSHIP BY	RATINGS					
	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Excellent	Don't Know	
Board of Regents	n = 13	n = 36	n = 30	n = 5	n = 71	
Doard of Regents	8.39%	23.23%	19.35%	3.23%	45.81%	
Former Chancellor	n=7	n =23	n=59	n=33	n = 36	
Former Chancehor	4.43%	14.56%	37.34%	20.89%	22.78%	
Administration	n = 9	n = 24	n = 64	n = 35	n = 24	
(Deans and Directors)	5.77%	15.38%	41.03%	22.44%	15.38%	
Department Chairs	n = 3	n = 11	n = 66	n = 61	n = 16	
Department Chan's	1.91%	7.01%	42.03%	38.85%	10.19%	
Faculty Canata	n = 0	n = 15	n = 71	n = 18	n = 53	
Faculty Senate		9.55%	45.22%	11.46%	33.76%	

Table 5. Student Evaluation of Leadership Fall 2005

1 111 2000						
LEADERSHIP	RATINGS					
	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Excellent	Don't Know	
Doord of Dogonto	n = 44	n = 50	n = 189	n = 35	n = 691	
Board of Regents	4.36%	4.96%	18.73%	3.47%	68.48%	
Former Chancellor	n = 24	n = 30	n= 220	n = 35	n = 648	
Former Chancenor	2.50%	3.13%	22.98%	3.66%	67.71%	
Administration	n = 22	n = 31	n = 264	n = 121	n = 578	
(Deans and Directors)	2.17%	3.05%	25.98%	11.91%	56.89%	
Description of Chairm	n = 21	n = 30	n = 272	n = 118	n = 569	
Department Chairs	2.08%	2.97%	26.93%	11.68%	56.34%	
Student Conguess	n = 124	n = 36	n = 274	n = 99	n = 572	
Student Congress	11.22%	3.26%	24.79%	8.96%	51.76%	

Table 6. Staff Evaluation of Leadership Fall 2005

LEADERSHIP	RATINGS					
	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Excellent	Don't Know	
Doord of Dogonts	n = 9	n = 9	n= 13	n = 2	n = 27	
Board of Regents	15.0%	15.0%	21.67%	3.33%	45.00%	
Former Chancellor	n = 5	n=15	n=19	n=11	n=10	
Former Chancenor	8.33%	25.0%	31.67%	18.33%	16.67%	
Administration	n = 5	n = 20	n = 22	n = 6	n = 6	
(Deans and Directors)	8.47%	33.9%	37.29%	10.17%	10.17%	
Staff Council	n = 4	n = 10	n = 24	n = 7	n = 15	
Staff Council	6.67%	16.67%	40.00%	11.67%	25.00%	