

Windward CC Institutional Survey 2018 (Demographics and Combined Questions)

Q1. Are you familiar with the Windward CC Mission Statement: "Windward Community College offers innovative programs in the arts and sciences and opportunities to gain knowledge and understanding of Hawaii and its unique heritage. With a special commitment to support the access and educational needs of Native Hawaiians, we provide the Ko'olau region of O'ahu and beyond with liberal arts, career and lifelong learning in a supportive and challenging environment - inspiring students to excellence."

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	97.59%	81
No	2.41%	2

Q2. How well does the Mission Statement describes the mission of Windward CC?

	does not	poor	less than satisfactory	satisfactory	excellent	Unable to judge	Total	Weighted Average						
star	2.41%	2	0.00%	0	2.41%	2	31.33%	26	57.83%	48	6.02%	5	83	4.51

Q3. Employment Status

Answer Choices	Responses	
Faculty	61.45%	51
Staff	38.55%	32

Q4. Unit

Answer Choices	Responses	
Academic and Instructional Support	16.00%	8
Academic Affairs (Departments)	60.00%	30
Office of Career and Community Education (OCCE)	2.00%	1
Student Affairs	22.00%	11
Other (please specify)	0.00%	0

Q5. Faculty Rank

Answer Choices	Responses	
Lecturer	24.00%	12
Instructor or Assistant Professor	44.00%	22
Associate Professor or Professor	32.00%	16

Q6. How many successive semesters have you been at Windward CC? (For Lecturers)

Answer Choices	Responses	
1	8.33%	1
2	8.33%	1
3	0.00%	0
4	0.00%	0
more than 4	83.33%	10

Q23. Working Environment

	excellent	satisfactory	less than satisfactory	poor	unable to judge	N/A	Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted						
A. Windward CC working environment	48.39%	30	45.16%	28	6.45%	4	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	62	4.42	4.42		
B. UH System environment	20.97%	13	48.39%	30	14.52%	9	1.61%	1	14.52%	9	0.00%	0	62	3.6	4.04

Respondents	Comment
1	To much personal politics and favoritism.
2	System appears not to look at 10-campus issues related to redundancy in hiring practices; example: 4 campuses working off of a single civil service recruitment list from DHRD at the same time

Q24. My Leadership Roles at Windward CC

	always	most of the time	sometimes	never	unable to judge	N/A	Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted						
A. The frequency of which I participate actively in college affairs	19.35%	12	45.16%	28	29.03%	18	3.23%	2	1.61%	1	1.61%	1	62	3.79	3.83
B. The frequency of which I provide leadership to the college	24.19%	15	20.97%	13	27.42%	17	17.74%	11	1.61%	1	8.06%	5	62	3.53	3.57
C. The frequency of which I contribute to the improvement of the college	33.87%	21	30.65%	19	30.65%	19	1.61%	1	1.61%	1	1.61%	1	62	3.95	4.00
D. The frequency of which I participate actively on campus committees	19.35%	12	43.55%	27	22.58%	14	6.45%	4	1.61%	1	6.45%	4	62	3.78	3.82

Respondents	Comment
1	As a Blue Collar, I can only contribute by physical labor. I do my best to take care of my building and staff who work there as well as students and guests that come on campus.
2	Lots and lots of opportunities for campus involvement, very appreciated

Windward CC Institutional Survey 2018 (Demographics and Combined Questions)

Q25. Please offer any suggestions that you may have for improving the college	
Respondents	Responses
1	Conduct a systems analysis of the entire employment process to discover impediments to efficient hiring, and work to resolve those issues.
2	We need to have REAL equality on campus. New managerial staff below the Vice chancellor to be completely overhauled! To not be forced and threatened to do work out of our job description. To stop favoritism and nepotism. And most of all, have boundries when it comes to personal information! No revealing to others about a person's private affairs! We need a surprise investigation from a independent source with no ties to the UH system!
3	Doug is awesome; he listens, he acts, sorry to lose him. Pray for just as an effective new chancellor and appreciate that students, staff, faculty and community members are part of the selection process. Aloha
4	As an employee here, I know that there are a lot of things that happen on campus that I am unaware of. Everything from decision making, budget decisions, activities, complaints, tension between departments or individuals, etc. Many of these questions ask about the effectiveness of something or other. It's hard to judge the effectiveness because where I have interactions with many people on campus and consider them to be good working relationships, the specificities of their daily work and the results that come about due to them are not often known to me. Not that I want to know everything about everyone, but I feel some things are out in the open and praised or just shared, while others are kind of left vague or just not referred to. I'm not sure exactly what I'm getting at other than after a few years of working on this campus, I love the people, the environment, the relationships and harmony of this campus, but I also feel like there is so much more to know about WCC. Not in a bad way, but I feel there is a little more communication and collaborating that could happen to make this campus even better. I feel that if I knew more, maybe I would find more ways that I could be a part of helping build our campus.
5	Greater scrutiny on instructional faculty in their teaching practices and ethical standards in the workplace.
6	None
7	There needs to be an increase of student diversity from outside the community. Recruitment for students overseas or out of state should be encouraged. The utility of the building for teaching could be increased. Online instruction is risky with student retention and success, but it should be expanded for students out of state and overseas, with reduced fees to be competitive.
8	Some departments or college functions were not individually evaluated. How do we provide input on HR?

Windward CC Institutional Survey 2018 (Staff Results)

Q16. Staff Involvement in Campus Decision-making															
	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
A. Overall involvement of Staff in campus decision-making	12.00%	3	52.00%	13	16.00%	4	8.00%	2	12.00%	3	0.00%	0	25	3.44	3.77
B. Involvement of Staff in the budgeting process	8.00%	2	36.00%	9	16.00%	4	12.00%	3	20.00%	5	8.00%	2	25	3	3.56
C. Involvement of Staff in setting campus priorities	16.00%	4	44.00%	11	4.00%	1	20.00%	5	12.00%	3	4.00%	1	25	3.33	3.67
D. Involvement of Staff in the campus hiring process	12.00%	3	48.00%	12	8.00%	2	16.00%	4	8.00%	2	8.00%	2	25	3.43	3.67
E. Involvement of Staff in the program review process	24.00%	6	40.00%	10	8.00%	2	4.00%	1	24.00%	6	0.00%	0	25	3.36	4.11
F. Accessibility of decisions to the campus community	20.00%	5	32.00%	8	8.00%	2	16.00%	4	20.00%	5	4.00%	1	25	3.17	3.74
G. Timeliness of Institutional decisions	0.00%	0	52.00%	13	16.00%	4	16.00%	4	16.00%	4	0.00%	0	25	3.04	3.43
H. Opportunities to present suggestions for improvement	20.00%	5	48.00%	12	16.00%	4	12.00%	3	4.00%	1	0.00%	0	25	3.68	3.79
I. The policies and procedures regarding staff participation in decision-making processes	16.00%	4	44.00%	11	0.00%	0	20.00%	5	20.00%	5	0.00%	0	25	3.16	3.70
J. Defined roles of administrators, faculty and staff in Windward CC policy, planning, and decision-making decisions	24.00%	6	48.00%	12	8.00%	2	8.00%	2	12.00%	3	0.00%	0	25	3.64	4.00
K. Procedures for campus-wide discussion, planning and implementation of ideas that have campus wide implications	20.00%	5	44.00%	11	8.00%	2	12.00%	3	16.00%	4	0.00%	0	25	3.4	3.86
L. The use of results of integrity and effectiveness evaluations for improvement	12.00%	3	24.00%	6	0.00%	0	12.00%	3	44.00%	11	8.00%	2	25	2.43	3.75
M. Accessibility of evaluation results that are used for campus improvement	12.00%	3	32.00%	8	4.00%	1	16.00%	4	28.00%	7	8.00%	2	25	2.83	3.63
N. Encouragement of Staff by institutional leaders to take initiative in improving practices, programs and services	24.00%	6	48.00%	12	4.00%	1	12.00%	3	12.00%	3	0.00%	0	25	3.6	3.95
O. Regular evaluations of Leadership roles, decision-making policies and procedures for integrity and effectiveness	8.00%	2	44.00%	11	12.00%	3	16.00%	4	20.00%	5	0.00%	0	25	3.04	3.55
Respondents	Comment														
1	Blue Collar workers are not treated fairly and many times forced to do work outside of job description														

Windward CC Institutional Survey 2018 (Staff Results)

Q17. Leadership															
	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
A. Effectiveness of the UH Board of Regents in governing Windward CC	8.70%	2	21.74%	5	4.35%	1	0.00%	0	65.22%	15	0.00%	0	23	2.09	4.13
B. Effectiveness of the current community college system administrative structure	17.39%	4	52.17%	12	8.70%	2	0.00%	0	21.74%	5	0.00%	0	23	3.43	4.11
C. Effectiveness of the UH system President	26.09%	6	34.78%	8	4.35%	1	0.00%	0	34.78%	8	0.00%	0	23	3.17	4.33
E. Effectiveness of the UH system Vice President of UH Community Colleges	34.78%	8	21.74%	5	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	43.48%	10	0.00%	0	23	3.04	4.62
D. Effectiveness of the Windward CC Chancellor	65.22%	15	26.09%	6	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	8.70%	2	0.00%	0	23	4.39	4.71
E. Accessibility of Windward CC Administrators to Staff	39.13%	9	47.83%	11	0.00%	0	4.35%	1	8.70%	2	0.00%	0	23	4.04	4.33
F. Effectiveness of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs	26.09%	6	30.43%	7	8.70%	2	4.35%	1	30.43%	7	0.00%	0	23	3.17	4.13
G. Effectiveness of the Dean of Academic Affairs, Division I	30.43%	7	26.09%	6	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	43.48%	10	0.00%	0	23	3	4.54
H. Effectiveness of the Dean of Academic Affairs, Division II	34.78%	8	8.70%	2	8.70%	2	0.00%	0	47.83%	11	0.00%	0	23	2.83	4.50
I. Effectiveness of the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs	30.43%	7	39.13%	9	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	30.43%	7	0.00%	0	23	3.39	4.44
J. Effectiveness of the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services	30.43%	7	34.78%	8	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	34.78%	8	0.00%	0	23	3.26	4.47
K. Effectiveness of the Director of Career and Community Education	17.39%	4	52.17%	12	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	30.43%	7	0.00%	0	23	3.26	4.25
L. Effectiveness of the campus administrative structure	17.39%	4	43.48%	10	13.04%	3	4.35%	1	21.74%	5	0.00%	0	23	3.3	3.94
M. Effectiveness of the Windward CC Office of Planning and Program Evaluation	21.74%	5	26.09%	6	4.35%	1	0.00%	0	47.83%	11	0.00%	0	23	2.74	4.33
N. Effectiveness of the Windward CC Office of Institutional Research	21.74%	5	26.09%	6	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	52.17%	12	0.00%	0	23	2.65	4.45
O. Effectiveness of the Windward CC Office of Safety and Security	39.13%	9	52.17%	12	4.35%	1	0.00%	0	4.35%	1	0.00%	0	23	4.22	4.36
P. Attitude of campus administration toward Staff involvement in decision-making	17.39%	4	43.48%	10	21.74%	5	8.70%	2	8.70%	2	0.00%	0	23	3.52	3.76
Q. Effectiveness of communication channels to resolve problems	13.04%	3	47.83%	11	17.39%	4	8.70%	2	13.04%	3	0.00%	0	23	3.39	3.75
R. Effectiveness of Faculty Senate leadership	13.04%	3	26.09%	6	8.70%	2	4.35%	1	47.83%	11	0.00%	0	23	2.52	3.92
S. Effectiveness of Staff Senate leadership	26.09%	6	21.74%	5	13.04%	3	8.70%	2	30.43%	7	0.00%	0	23	3.04	3.94
T. Effectiveness of Planning and Budget Council (PBC)	17.39%	4	26.09%	6	0.00%	0	4.35%	1	52.17%	12	0.00%	0	23	2.52	4.18
U. Effectiveness of Institutional Effectiveness committee (IEC)	17.39%	4	13.04%	3	4.35%	1	4.35%	1	60.87%	14	0.00%	0	23	2.22	4.11
V. Effectiveness of Master Planning and Space Allocations committee (MAPSAC)	4.35%	1	17.39%	4	4.35%	1	4.35%	1	65.22%	15	4.35%	1	23	1.86	3.71
W. Availability of opportunities to evaluate college governance and decision-making process	13.04%	3	4.35%	1	13.04%	3	21.74%	5	47.83%	11	0.00%	0	23	2.13	3.17
X. Opportunities to evaluate college governance and decision-making process	13.04%	3	8.70%	2	8.70%	2	21.74%	5	47.83%	11	0.00%	0	23	2.17	3.25
Respondents	Comments														
1	It's a mixed bag of good and bad admin. In the Blue Collar division, our Vice has shown some good results. It's the people below him that needs the boot. They seem to abuse the power they have. We need a MAJOR														

Windward CC Institutional Survey 2018 (Staff Results)

Q18. Professional Development Climate

	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count			
A. Campus support for innovative ideas	27.27%	6	36.36%	8	9.09%	2	4.55%	1	22.73%	5	0.00%	0	22	3.41	4.12
B. Resources and support for distance education	27.27%	6	45.45%	10	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	27.27%	6	0.00%	0	22	3.45	4.38
C. Administration recognition of Staff excellence	27.27%	6	31.82%	7	18.18%	4	4.55%	1	18.18%	4	0.00%	0	22	3.45	4.00
D. Support to attend professional meetings	50.00%	11	22.73%	5	9.09%	2	4.55%	1	13.64%	3	0.00%	0	22	3.91	4.37
E. Overall support for Staff professional development	59.09%	13	18.18%	4	9.09%	2	0.00%	0	13.64%	3	0.00%	0	22	4.09	4.58
F. Computing and information literacy skills	22.73%	5	50.00%	11	0.00%	0	4.55%	1	22.73%	5	0.00%	0	22	3.45	4.18
G. Professional development in helping to meet students' individual needs	31.82%	7	31.82%	7	4.55%	1	4.55%	1	22.73%	5	4.55%	1	22	3.48	4.25
H. Quality of collegiality among Staff	31.82%	7	50.00%	11	9.09%	2	0.00%	0	9.09%	2	0.00%	0	22	3.95	4.25
I. Quality of collegiality between Staff and administrators	31.82%	7	40.91%	9	13.64%	3	0.00%	0	13.64%	3	0.00%	0	22	3.77	4.21
J. Quality of collegiality between Staff and faculty	31.82%	7	40.91%	9	9.09%	2	0.00%	0	13.64%	3	4.55%	1	22	3.81	4.28
Respondents	Comments														
1	For distance learning, more classes should be given. I work a schedule that makes it hard to attend physical classes 90% of the time. The distance classes are a blessing! As for staff and faculty relations, well there are attitude problems and we Blue Collars seem to be looked down on, and lower class White Collars seem to be treated the same also. How can we be a team if we can't be equals?														

Q19. Support Services to Staff

	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count			
A. Quality of services provided by the Library	59.09%	13	27.27%	6	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	13.64%	3	0.00%	0	22	4.18	4.68
B. Quality of services provided by the Computing Services staff	59.09%	13	27.27%	6	4.55%	1	0.00%	0	9.09%	2	0.00%	0	22	4.27	4.60
C. Response time of the Computing Services staff	59.09%	13	31.82%	7	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	9.09%	2	0.00%	0	22	4.32	4.65
D. Quality of services provided by the Testing Center	40.91%	9	4.55%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	50.00%	11	4.55%	1	22	2.86	4.90
E. Quality of services provided by the Media Center	50.00%	11	31.82%	7	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	18.18%	4	0.00%	0	22	3.95	4.61
F. Quality of graphic design services	45.45%	10	13.64%	3	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	40.91%	9	0.00%	0	22	3.23	4.77
G. Available student help	13.64%	3	31.82%	7	4.55%	1	0.00%	0	45.45%	10	4.55%	1	22	2.67	4.18
H. Secretarial/clerical support	45.45%	10	45.45%	10	0.00%	0	4.55%	1	4.55%	1	0.00%	0	22	4.23	4.38
Respondents	Comment														
1	Student would be excellent if there were more funding for them to be hired.														

Q20. Technology Resources

	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count			
A. Computer equipment provided to Staff	45.45%	10	31.82%	7	9.09%	2	0.00%	0	13.64%	3	0.00%	0	22	3.95	4.42
B. Computer software provided to Staff	50.00%	11	31.82%	7	9.09%	2	0.00%	0	9.09%	2	0.00%	0	22	4.14	4.45
C. Speed and reliability of campus computer networks and access to the Internet	54.55%	12	45.45%	10	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	22	4.55	4.55
D. Campus telephone system	50.00%	11	36.36%	8	4.55%	1	0.00%	0	9.09%	2	0.00%	0	22	4.18	4.50
E. Other communication equipment	36.36%	8	13.64%	3	0.00%	0	9.09%	2	27.27%	6	13.64%	3	22	3.26	4.31
Respondents	Comment														
1	We need less bulky walkie talkies that actually work and can hear clearly.														

Windward CC Institutional Survey 2018 (Staff Results)

Q21. Facilities and Equipment

	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
A. APT/Staff offices	13.64%	3	45.45%	10	18.18%	4	0.00%	0	22.73%	5	0.00%	0	22	3.27	3.94
B. Laboratories and shops	18.18%	4	13.64%	3	4.55%	1	0.00%	0	50.00%	11	13.64%	3	22	2.42	4.38
C. Maintenance of buildings	13.64%	3	54.55%	12	9.09%	2	22.73%	5	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	22	3.59	3.59
D. Maintenance of grounds	40.91%	9	36.36%	8	13.64%	3	9.09%	2	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	22	4.09	4.09
E. Maintenance and replacement of equipment	13.64%	3	45.45%	10	9.09%	2	9.09%	2	22.73%	5	0.00%	0	22	3.18	3.82
F. Timeliness of completion of work orders	4.55%	1	18.18%	4	31.82%	7	27.27%	6	18.18%	4	0.00%	0	22	2.64	3.00
G. Parking	36.36%	8	40.91%	9	18.18%	4	4.55%	1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	22	4.09	4.09
H. Overall quality of campus facilities and equipment	18.18%	4	59.09%	13	13.64%	3	9.09%	2	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	22	3.86	3.86
I. Quality of facilities and equipment for my work	22.73%	5	59.09%	13	4.55%	1	13.64%	3	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	22	3.91	3.91
J. Safety of buildings and equipment	18.18%	4	68.18%	15	0.00%	0	13.64%	3	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	22	3.91	3.91
K. Procedures for responding to on-campus emergencies	31.82%	7	40.91%	9	13.64%	3	9.09%	2	4.55%	1	0.00%	0	22	3.86	4.00
L. Security guard coverage	22.73%	5	59.09%	13	9.09%	2	4.55%	1	4.55%	1	0.00%	0	22	3.91	4.05
M. Lighting for campus security	9.09%	2	45.45%	10	18.18%	4	13.64%	3	13.64%	3	0.00%	0	22	3.23	3.58
N. Campus accessibility and accommodation for persons with disabilities	13.64%	3	36.36%	8	22.73%	5	9.09%	2	18.18%	4	0.00%	0	22	3.18	3.67
Respondents	Comment														
1	First of all I was injured due to defective equipment. Also the job being performed which I sustained my injury was and is not in our job description. Hence the forcing of out of job scope work! We have way to any chemicals for my job and equipment is either out dated or useless and not usable for my work. As for Security, they seem under staffed and over worked. They are excellent in their jobs because they have a good leader. We don't!														
2	No sweeping, mopping or regular cleaning of our building. Only basic trash pickup. Janitors always shorthanded. Need to replace rusty paper towel holders that keep jamming.														

Q22. Human Resources and Personnel Policies

	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
A. Current salary schedule	13.64%	3	40.91%	9	13.64%	3	9.09%	2	13.64%	3	9.09%	2	22	3.35	3.76
B. Information regarding benefits	22.73%	5	45.45%	10	9.09%	2	4.55%	1	13.64%	3	4.55%	1	22	3.62	4.06
C. Workload	13.64%	3	45.45%	10	9.09%	2	4.55%	1	22.73%	5	4.55%	1	22	3.24	3.94
D. Equitable assignment of evening/weekend work assignments	13.64%	3	13.64%	3	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	54.55%	12	18.18%	4	22	2.17	4.50
E. Effectiveness of evaluation of Staff by administrators	18.18%	4	40.91%	9	9.09%	2	4.55%	1	18.18%	4	9.09%	2	22	3.4	4.00
F. Quality of the campus Staff hiring process	9.09%	2	40.91%	9	18.18%	4	13.64%	3	18.18%	4	0.00%	0	22	3.09	3.56
G. Overall process for the evaluation of Staff	13.64%	3	50.00%	11	0.00%	0	13.64%	3	22.73%	5	0.00%	0	22	3.18	3.82
H. Overall process for the evaluation of the executive/managerial staff (Chancellor, Deans and Directors)	31.82%	7	27.27%	6	4.55%	1	4.55%	1	31.82%	7	0.00%	0	22	3.23	4.27
I. Overall effectiveness of the College in upholding ethical standards for all employees.	18.18%	4	45.45%	10	9.09%	2	9.09%	2	18.18%	4	0.00%	0	22	3.36	3.89
J. Planning for staffing needs for new facilities, programs and services.	18.18%	4	18.18%	4	22.73%	5	9.09%	2	31.82%	7	0.00%	0	22	2.82	3.67
K. Number of support staff to provide support services for students.	31.82%	7	18.18%	4	4.55%	1	0.00%	0	45.45%	10	0.00%	0	22	2.91	4.50
L. Number of support staff to provide support services for employees.	18.18%	4	22.73%	5	18.18%	4	4.55%	1	36.36%	8	0.00%	0	22	2.82	3.86
M. Overall manner in which college personnel are shown fairness and respect by the college administration.	31.82%	7	40.91%	9	9.09%	2	0.00%	0	18.18%	4	0.00%	0	22	3.68	4.28
N. College policies concerning equity and diversity issues	31.82%	7	40.91%	9	4.55%	1	9.09%	2	13.64%	3	0.00%	0	22	3.68	4.11
Respondents	Comment														
1	We need a major overhaul.														
2	Administration should also be mindful of existing programs whose scope has increased and justifies more clerical support														
3	The HR process delays have been a difficulty to navigate and complete.														

**Windward CC Institutional Survey 2018
(Faculty Results)**

Q7. Academic Quality															
	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
A. Quality of the education provided to students at Windward CC	58.70%	27	30.43%	14	4.35%	2	2.17%	1	4.35%	2	0.00%	0	46	4.37	4.52
B. Quality of the education in my department/program	56.52%	26	32.61%	15	2.17%	1	0.00%	0	2.17%	1	6.52%	3	46	4.51	4.60
C. Quality of education in my on-campus classes/program	56.52%	26	30.43%	14	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	2.17%	1	10.87%	5	46	4.56	4.65
D. Quality of education in my DE classes/program	39.13%	18	28.26%	13	4.35%	2	0.00%	0	10.87%	5	17.39%	8	46	4.03	4.48
E. Quality of Windward CC graduates	39.13%	18	50.00%	23	6.52%	3	0.00%	0	4.35%	2	0.00%	0	46	4.2	4.34
F. Teaching competency of faculty in on-campus classes/program	52.17%	24	34.78%	16	2.17%	1	2.17%	1	4.35%	2	4.35%	2	46	4.34	4.50
G. Teaching competency of faculty in DE classes/program	34.78%	16	26.09%	12	8.70%	4	2.17%	1	19.57%	9	8.70%	4	46	3.6	4.30
H. Relevance of courses to college requirements	60.87%	28	30.43%	14	2.17%	1	2.17%	1	4.35%	2	0.00%	0	46	4.41	4.57
I. Currency and relevance of the curriculum	52.17%	24	41.30%	19	0.00%	0	2.17%	1	4.35%	2	0.00%	0	46	4.35	4.50
J. Policies and procedures that define faculty and academic administrator's responsibilities for improving curriculum	32.61%	15	39.13%	18	13.04%	6	4.35%	2	8.70%	4	2.17%	1	46	3.84	4.12
K. Policies and procedures that define faculty and academic administrator's responsibilities for improving programs	28.26%	13	43.48%	20	8.70%	4	6.52%	3	10.87%	5	2.17%	1	46	3.73	4.08
L. Policies and procedures that define faculty and academic administrator's responsibilities for improving academic support services	28.26%	13	41.30%	19	15.22%	7	2.17%	1	10.87%	5	2.17%	1	46	3.76	4.10
Respondents	Comment														
1	Curriculum is supposed to be in the hands of the faculty, so why was ENG100X pushed on them from the system admin?														
2	We fail our students everyday!														
3	While I think we have a well-rounded curriculum, one area that is severely lacking in terms of a modern education is financial literacy. When I have polled my students about what they wish they could learn about in college, more than anything, they respond, by overwhelming majority, that they need to know more about how money works (mortgages, loans, credit, investments). I think that if we took a good look at the financial situations of many of our faculty and staff, it would be abundantly clear that higher education across the board has left most of us financially illiterate and thus, ill-prepared to survive in Hawaii. While it's easy to blame the economy, as an academic, I can't help but admit it's also a lack of financial education. As for policies and procedures that define faculty and admin's responsibilities for improvement, I hardly even think they're necessary. The majority of people I work with are constantly working towards making their classes, programs, and services better (more streamlined, more articulated, more engaging and accessible) every day. There are no policies that make this happen; it's often a result of the character of those drawn to education. If anyone thinks we need to write more rules to make this happen, that's fine, but I don't think more rules will make anyone working hard, work harder. And I don't think they'll make anyone who's not working hard, do anything extra. I work with the largest group of (financial illiterate and doomed for the poor-house) people I've ever met. If writing policies that specify our responsibilities for improvement is necessary to satisfy our legislature or accreditation committee, do it. Any policy will likely only reflect what's already happening.														

Windward CC Institutional Survey 2018 (Faculty Results)

Q8. Faculty Involvement in Campus Decision-making															
	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
A. Overall Involvement of faculty in campus decision-making	36.96%	17	41.30%	19	10.87%	5	4.35%	2	4.35%	2	2.17%	1	46	4.04	4.19
B. Involvement of faculty in the budgeting process	36.96%	17	39.13%	18	10.87%	5	2.17%	1	8.70%	4	2.17%	1	46	3.96	4.24
C. Involvement of faculty in setting campus priorities	30.43%	14	45.65%	21	13.04%	6	2.17%	1	6.52%	3	2.17%	1	46	3.93	4.14
D. Involvement of faculty in the campus hiring process	52.17%	24	39.13%	18	2.17%	1	0.00%	0	4.35%	2	2.17%	1	46	4.38	4.53
E. Involvement of faculty in the scheduling of course offerings	45.65%	21	32.61%	15	6.52%	3	2.17%	1	10.87%	5	2.17%	1	46	4.02	4.40
F. Involvement of faculty in the curriculum approval process	65.22%	30	21.74%	10	4.35%	2	2.17%	1	4.35%	2	2.17%	1	46	4.44	4.60
G. Involvement of faculty in the program review process	52.17%	24	32.61%	15	8.70%	4	0.00%	0	4.35%	2	2.17%	1	46	4.31	4.47
H. Transparency in decision making processes	23.91%	11	47.83%	22	10.87%	5	10.87%	5	4.35%	2	2.17%	1	46	3.78	3.91
I. Accessibility of decisions to the campus community	23.91%	11	43.48%	20	8.70%	4	6.52%	3	10.87%	5	6.52%	3	46	3.67	4.03
J. Timeliness of Institutional decisions	19.57%	9	45.65%	21	19.57%	9	6.52%	3	4.35%	2	4.35%	2	46	3.73	3.86
K. Opportunities to present my suggestions for improvement	32.61%	15	47.83%	22	13.04%	6	2.17%	1	4.35%	2	0.00%	0	46	4.02	4.16
L. The Policies and procedures regarding faculty participation in decision-making processes	36.96%	17	36.96%	17	8.70%	4	4.35%	2	8.70%	4	4.35%	2	46	3.93	4.23
M. Defined roles of administrators and faculty in Windward CC policy, planning and budget decisions	34.78%	16	45.65%	21	6.52%	3	6.52%	3	4.35%	2	2.17%	1	46	4.02	4.16
N. Procedures for campus-wide discussion, planning and implementation of ideas that have campus wide implications	34.78%	16	41.30%	19	10.87%	5	8.70%	4	4.35%	2	0.00%	0	46	3.93	4.07
O. The use of results of integrity and effectiveness evaluations for improvement	28.26%	13	43.48%	20	13.04%	6	4.35%	2	8.70%	4	2.17%	1	46	3.8	4.07
P. Accessibility of evaluation results that are used for campus improvement	26.09%	12	45.65%	21	13.04%	6	8.70%	4	4.35%	2	2.17%	1	46	3.82	3.95
Q. Encouragement of faculty by institutional leaders to take initiative in improving practices, programs and services	52.17%	24	34.78%	16	6.52%	3	4.35%	2	2.17%	1	0.00%	0	46	4.3	4.38
R. Regular evaluations of Leadership roles, decision-making policies and procedures for integrity and effectiveness	36.96%	17	39.13%	18	15.22%	7	6.52%	3	2.17%	1	0.00%	0	46	4.02	4.09
Respondents	Comment														
1	A lot of the assessment data on WCC and UHCC websites are scattered, missing, old, undated, or hard to find														
2	Sometimes requests to faculty for opinions on decisions seem like a formality, in that admin usually do whatever they plan.														

Windward CC Institutional Survey 2018 (Faculty Results)

Q9. Leadership															
	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
A. Effectiveness of the UH Board of Regents in governing Windward CC	11.63%	5	37.21%	16	13.95%	6	6.98%	3	27.91%	12	2.33%	1	43	2.98	3.77
B. Effectiveness of the current community college system administrative structure	18.60%	8	48.84%	21	11.63%	5	9.30%	4	9.30%	4	2.33%	1	43	3.6	3.87
C. Effectiveness of articulation agreements/processes within UH system	16.28%	7	46.51%	20	16.28%	7	2.33%	1	16.28%	7	2.33%	1	43	3.45	3.94
D. Effectiveness of the UH system President	23.26%	10	46.51%	20	11.63%	5	2.33%	1	16.28%	7	0.00%	0	43	3.58	4.08
E. Effectiveness of the UH system Vice President of UH Community Colleges	18.60%	8	44.19%	19	18.60%	8	4.65%	2	13.95%	6	0.00%	0	43	3.49	3.89
F. Effectiveness of the Windward CC Chancellor	58.14%	25	32.56%	14	0.00%	0	6.98%	3	2.33%	1	0.00%	0	43	4.37	4.45
G. Accessibility of the Windward CC Chancellor to faculty	65.12%	28	23.26%	10	6.98%	3	0.00%	0	4.65%	2	0.00%	0	43	4.44	4.61
H. Effectiveness of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs	62.79%	27	20.93%	9	6.98%	3	2.33%	1	4.65%	2	2.33%	1	43	4.38	4.55
I. Effectiveness of the Dean of Academic Affairs, Division I	41.86%	18	34.88%	15	4.65%	2	4.65%	2	13.95%	6	0.00%	0	43	3.86	4.32
J. Effectiveness of the Dean of Academic Affairs, Division II	46.51%	20	32.56%	14	6.98%	3	4.65%	2	9.30%	4	0.00%	0	43	4.02	4.33
K. Effectiveness of the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs	48.84%	21	37.21%	16	4.65%	2	4.65%	2	4.65%	2	0.00%	0	43	4.21	4.37
L. Effectiveness of the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services	25.58%	11	44.19%	19	6.98%	3	11.63%	5	11.63%	5	0.00%	0	43	3.6	3.95
M. Effectiveness of the Director of Career and Community Education	41.86%	18	25.58%	11	9.30%	4	0.00%	0	20.93%	9	2.33%	1	43	3.69	4.42
N. Effectiveness of the campus administrative structure	27.91%	12	48.84%	21	11.63%	5	2.33%	1	6.98%	3	2.33%	1	43	3.9	4.13
O. Effectiveness of the Windward CC Office of Planning and Program Evaluation	23.26%	10	34.88%	15	13.95%	6	4.65%	2	20.93%	9	2.33%	1	43	3.36	4.00
P. Effectiveness of the Windward CC Office of Institutional Research	16.28%	7	37.21%	16	9.30%	4	11.63%	5	23.26%	10	2.33%	1	43	3.12	3.78
Q. Effectiveness of the Windward CC Office of Safety and Security	37.21%	16	46.51%	20	11.63%	5	0.00%	0	2.33%	1	2.33%	1	43	4.19	4.27
R. Attitude of campus administration toward faculty involvement in decision-making	34.88%	15	39.53%	17	13.95%	6	0.00%	0	9.30%	4	2.33%	1	43	3.93	4.24
S. Effectiveness of communication channels to resolve problems	30.23%	13	41.86%	18	13.95%	6	2.33%	1	9.30%	4	2.33%	1	43	3.83	4.13
T. Effectiveness of Faculty Senate leadership	30.23%	13	46.51%	20	4.65%	2	4.65%	2	11.63%	5	2.33%	1	43	3.81	4.19
U. Effectiveness of Staff Senate leadership	25.58%	11	23.26%	10	0.00%	0	2.33%	1	39.53%	17	9.30%	4	43	2.92	4.41
V. Effectiveness of Planning and Budget Council (PBC)	27.91%	12	44.19%	19	6.98%	3	6.98%	3	11.63%	5	2.33%	1	43	3.71	4.08
W. Effectiveness of Institutional Effectiveness committee (IEC)	20.93%	9	39.53%	17	6.98%	3	6.98%	3	23.26%	10	2.33%	1	43	3.29	4.00
X. Effectiveness of Master Planning and Space Allocations committee (MAPSAC)	13.95%	6	46.51%	20	9.30%	4	2.33%	1	23.26%	10	4.65%	2	43	3.27	4.00
Y. Effectiveness of Faculty Senate committees (ie. Curriculum, HAP, Foundation, Writing Advisory, Sustainability)	44.19%	19	37.21%	16	6.98%	3	2.33%	1	9.30%	4	0.00%	0	43	4.05	4.36
Z. Opportunities to evaluate college governance and decision-making process	27.91%	12	46.51%	20	13.95%	6	4.65%	2	6.98%	3	0.00%	0	43	3.84	4.05
Respondents	Comment														
2	What's the function of our IR office? We seem to use system data, mostly.														

Windward CC Institutional Survey 2018 (Faculty Results)

Q10. Professional Development Climate															
	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
A. Campus support for educational innovation	50.00%	21	28.57%	12	16.67%	7	2.38%	1	2.38%	1	0.00%	0	42	4.21	4.29
B. Resources and support for distance education	35.71%	15	26.19%	11	9.52%	4	4.76%	2	19.05%	8	4.76%	2	42	3.58	4.22
C. Opportunity and support to pursue scholarship	33.33%	14	42.86%	18	9.52%	4	2.38%	1	11.90%	5	0.00%	0	42	3.83	4.22
D. Administration recognition of faculty excellence	52.38%	22	30.95%	13	4.76%	2	7.14%	3	4.76%	2	0.00%	0	42	4.19	4.35
E. Support to attend professional meetings	52.38%	22	35.71%	15	4.76%	2	2.38%	1	4.76%	2	0.00%	0	42	4.29	4.45
F. Study leave/sabbatical opportunities	33.33%	14	28.57%	12	2.38%	1	4.76%	2	26.19%	11	4.76%	2	42	3.4	4.31
G. Overall support for faculty professional development	52.38%	22	35.71%	15	4.76%	2	2.38%	1	4.76%	2	0.00%	0	42	4.29	4.45
H. Professional development support in developing computing skills, information literacy, and expertise with educational technologies	40.48%	17	38.10%	16	11.90%	5	4.76%	2	4.76%	2	0.00%	0	42	4.05	4.20
I. Professional development in helping to meet students' individual needs	45.24%	19	38.10%	16	11.90%	5	2.38%	1	2.38%	1	0.00%	0	42	4.21	4.29
J. Student evaluation of instructors	26.19%	11	50.00%	21	7.14%	3	7.14%	3	9.52%	4	0.00%	0	42	3.76	4.05
K. Effectiveness of peer evaluation process in improving my primary duties	30.95%	13	45.24%	19	9.52%	4	11.90%	5	2.38%	1	0.00%	0	42	3.9	3.98
L. Quality of collegiality among faculty	47.62%	20	42.86%	18	2.38%	1	4.76%	2	2.38%	1	0.00%	0	42	4.29	4.37
M. Quality of collegiality between faculty and administrators	42.86%	18	40.48%	17	7.14%	3	4.76%	2	4.76%	2	0.00%	0	42	4.12	4.28
N. Degree of academic freedom on campus	47.62%	20	42.86%	18	4.76%	2	2.38%	1	2.38%	1	0.00%	0	42	4.31	4.39

Q11. Support Services to Faculty															
	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
A. Quality of services provided by the Library	63.41%	26	19.51%	8	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	12.20%	5	0.00%	0	41	4.2	4.64
B. Quality of services provided by the Computing Services staff	78.05%	32	14.63%	6	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	41	4.63	4.73
C. Response time of the Computing Services staff	70.73%	29	19.51%	8	2.44%	1	4.88%	2	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	41	4.51	4.60
D. Quality of services provided by the Testing Center	63.41%	26	17.07%	7	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	17.07%	7	2.44%	1	41	4.13	4.79
E. Quality of services provided by the Media Center	63.41%	26	24.39%	10	9.76%	4	0.00%	0	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	41	4.46	4.55
F. Quality of instructional design services	34.15%	14	21.95%	9	4.88%	2	4.88%	2	34.15%	14	0.00%	0	41	3.17	4.30
G. Quality of services provided by Student Affairs	48.78%	20	26.83%	11	7.32%	3	2.44%	1	14.63%	6	0.00%	0	41	3.93	4.43
H. Quality of services provided by the Admission and Records Office	58.54%	24	21.95%	9	0.00%	0	2.44%	1	17.07%	7	0.00%	0	41	4.02	4.65
I. Quality of services provided by the Financial Aid Office	56.10%	23	17.07%	7	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	26.83%	11	0.00%	0	41	3.76	4.77
J. Quality of student help	51.22%	21	36.59%	15	4.88%	2	0.00%	0	7.32%	3	0.00%	0	41	4.24	4.50
K. Quality of Secretarial/clerical support	60.98%	25	34.15%	14	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	41	4.51	4.60
Respondents	Comment														
1	support services are satisfactory														
2	Could use more financial resources for student employees, i.e. peer mentors														
3	If I could, I would rate 11.K. "Quality of Secretarial/clerical support" somewhere between satisfactory and excellent														

Windward CC Institutional Survey 2018 (Faculty Results)

Q12. Facilities and Equipment

	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
A. Faculty offices	31.71%	13	51.22%	21	12.20%	5	0.00%	0	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	41	4.13	4.21
B. Classrooms	36.59%	15	51.22%	21	7.32%	3	0.00%	0	4.88%	2	0.00%	0	41	4.15	4.31
C. Laboratories, shops and studios	19.51%	8	39.02%	16	7.32%	3	0.00%	0	31.71%	13	2.44%	1	41	3.15	4.19
D. Maintenance of buildings	9.76%	4	51.22%	21	21.95%	9	12.20%	5	4.88%	2	0.00%	0	41	3.49	3.62
E. Maintenance of grounds	34.15%	14	48.78%	20	12.20%	5	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	41	4.1	4.18
F. Maintenance and replacement of equipment	19.51%	8	41.46%	17	26.83%	11	7.32%	3	4.88%	2	0.00%	0	41	3.63	3.77
G. Timeliness of completion of work orders	9.76%	4	24.39%	10	26.83%	11	29.27%	12	9.76%	4	0.00%	0	41	2.95	3.16
H. Parking	41.46%	17	46.34%	19	4.88%	2	4.88%	2	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	41	4.2	4.28
I. Overall quality of campus facilities and equipment	29.27%	12	58.54%	24	4.88%	2	4.88%	2	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	41	4.07	4.15
J. Quality of facilities and equipment for my program	36.59%	15	48.78%	20	12.20%	5	0.00%	0	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	41	4.17	4.25
K. Safety of buildings and equipment	34.15%	14	53.66%	22	7.32%	3	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	41	4.15	4.23
L. Procedures for responding to on-campus emergencies	31.71%	13	43.90%	18	9.76%	4	2.44%	1	12.20%	5	0.00%	0	41	3.8	4.19
M. Security guard coverage	39.02%	16	43.90%	18	9.76%	4	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	41	4.18	4.26
N. Lighting for campus security	21.95%	9	48.78%	20	19.51%	8	4.88%	2	4.88%	2	0.00%	0	41	3.78	3.92
O. Campus accessibility and accommodation for persons with disabilities	21.95%	9	46.34%	19	17.07%	7	0.00%	0	14.63%	6	0.00%	0	41	3.61	4.06
Respondents	Comment														
1	NOTHING is being done to address the problem of chicken poop around campus (trio, art gallery, theater box off) around campus. Science and humanities buildings are in dire need of power washing the mildew. Plumbing in Humanities building is so bad the building vibrates none stop														
2	parking is terrible during peak class hours; okay after 2pm or so. Getting around campus on a wheelchair is very difficult.														
3	Exteriors of some buildings look dirty, lots of chicken poop in certain areas like Palanakila, it would be good to have sidewalks all around the campus for accessibility														
4	Cafeteria grill hood doesn't vent properly and needs to be addressed														
6	Limited personnel affects maintenance														
7	Person who cleans Naauao sits on their lanai every day and is just reading the newspaper when I walk past every day -- in the morning and at night. It's weird. Students don't sit there anymore, only that guy. I complained to their faculty.														

Q13. Technology Resources

	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
A. Classroom instructional equipment	29.27%	12	53.66%	22	9.76%	4	0.00%	0	7.32%	3	0.00%	0	41	3.98	4.21
B. Classroom AV equipment	29.27%	12	48.78%	20	14.63%	6	0.00%	0	7.32%	3	0.00%	0	41	3.93	4.16
C. Reliability of classroom AV equipment	29.27%	12	36.59%	15	14.63%	6	4.88%	2	14.63%	6	0.00%	0	41	3.61	4.06
D. Computers and software in classrooms	34.15%	14	48.78%	20	4.88%	2	2.44%	1	9.76%	4	0.00%	0	41	3.95	4.27
E. Computer equipment provided to faculty	48.78%	20	29.27%	12	7.32%	3	0.00%	0	12.20%	5	2.44%	1	41	4.05	4.49
F. Computer software provided to faculty	41.46%	17	34.15%	14	12.20%	5	2.44%	1	9.76%	4	0.00%	0	41	3.95	4.27
G. Speed and reliability of campus computer networks and access to the Internet	60.98%	25	31.71%	13	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	41	4.46	4.55
H. Campus telephone system	48.78%	20	39.02%	16	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	4.88%	2	2.44%	1	41	4.28	4.45
I. Technology in off-campus facilities	19.51%	8	19.51%	8	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	58.54%	24	2.44%	1	41	2.4	4.50
J. Technology support for online instructional services.	26.83%	11	29.27%	12	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	36.59%	15	2.44%	1	41	3.08	4.32
Respondents	Comment														
1	Rumor says temp faculty get old computers and permanent faculty get newer.														
2	Not all of the emergency phones work?														
3															
4	I wish that emergency/alarm messages could be sent through the phone system, in addition to the current loud speakers.														
5	IT Support needed from the publisher. Not Wcc														

Windward CC Institutional Survey 2018 (Faculty Results)

Q14. Student Characteristics															
	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
A. Availability of accurate, up-to-date research on student outcomes	19.51%	8	36.59%	15	21.95%	9	2.44%	1	14.63%	6	4.88%	2	41	3.46	3.91
B. General competence level of the students at the college	17.07%	7	43.90%	18	26.83%	11	7.32%	3	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	41	3.68	3.74
C. General student interest and motivation	12.20%	5	56.10%	23	17.07%	7	12.20%	5	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	41	3.63	3.70
D. College effort to assist under-prepared students	46.34%	19	41.46%	17	7.32%	3	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	41	4.27	4.35
E. Opportunities for faculty to interact with students	48.78%	20	41.46%	17	4.88%	2	2.44%	1	2.44%	1	0.00%	0	41	4.32	4.40
Respondents	Comment (be specific)														
1	Data can be hard to find. Assistance to under-prepared is good for F2F, but not DE students.														
3	Our turn away from remedial Math and English courses, will widen the gap in persistence and graduation rates. Our efforts to address this population of under-prepared students does nothing to help them persist.														
Q15. Human Resources and Personnel Policies															
	excellent		satisfactory		less than satisfactory		poor		unable to judge		N/A		Total	Weighted Average	Adjusted
A. Current salary schedule	15.00%	6	57.50%	23	15.00%	6	5.00%	2	5.00%	2	2.50%	1	40	3.74	3.89
B. Faculty classification policy (rank system)	12.50%	5	62.50%	25	15.00%	6	5.00%	2	5.00%	2	0.00%	0	40	3.73	3.87
C. Information regarding benefits	20.00%	8	60.00%	24	12.50%	5	5.00%	2	2.50%	1	0.00%	0	40	3.9	3.97
D. Teaching workload	15.00%	6	60.00%	24	12.50%	5	2.50%	1	10.00%	4	0.00%	0	40	3.68	3.97
E. Non-teaching workload (i.e., advising, committee work, etc.)	7.50%	3	55.00%	22	25.00%	10	7.50%	3	5.00%	2	0.00%	0	40	3.53	3.66
F. Equitable assignment of evening/weekend teaching duties	20.00%	8	45.00%	18	5.00%	2	2.50%	1	20.00%	8	7.50%	3	40	3.46	4.14
G. Effectiveness of evaluation of faculty by administrators	15.00%	6	57.50%	23	5.00%	2	7.50%	3	15.00%	6	0.00%	0	40	3.5	3.94
H. Effectiveness of tenure/promotion process	15.00%	6	50.00%	20	12.50%	5	10.00%	4	12.50%	5	0.00%	0	40	3.45	3.80
I. Quality of the campus faculty hiring process	22.50%	9	50.00%	20	10.00%	4	10.00%	4	7.50%	3	0.00%	0	40	3.7	3.92
J. Overall process for the evaluation of APTs	10.00%	4	30.00%	12	12.50%	5	2.50%	1	40.00%	16	5.00%	2	40	2.66	3.86
K. Overall process for the evaluation of staff	10.00%	4	37.50%	15	10.00%	4	7.50%	3	30.00%	12	5.00%	2	40	2.89	3.77
L. Overall process for the evaluation of faculty (including Department Chairs)	17.50%	7	60.00%	24	10.00%	4	5.00%	2	7.50%	3	0.00%	0	40	3.75	3.97
M. Overall process for the evaluation of the executive/managerial staff (Chancellor, Deans and Directors)	20.00%	8	55.00%	22	10.00%	4	7.50%	3	5.00%	2	2.50%	1	40	3.79	3.95
N. Overall effectiveness of the College in upholding ethical standards for all employees.	27.50%	11	52.50%	21	7.50%	3	5.00%	2	5.00%	2	2.50%	1	40	3.95	4.11
O. Adequacy of evaluating staffing needs in the planning and development of new facilities, programs and services.	12.50%	5	52.50%	21	12.50%	5	7.50%	3	12.50%	5	2.50%	1	40	3.46	3.82
P. Number of support staff to provide support services for students.	30.00%	12	42.50%	17	17.50%	7	2.50%	1	5.00%	2	2.50%	1	40	3.92	4.08
Q. Number of support staff to provide support services for employees.	22.50%	9	42.50%	17	20.00%	8	5.00%	2	7.50%	3	2.50%	1	40	3.69	3.92
R. Overall manner in which college personnel are shown fairness and respect by the college administration.	37.50%	15	47.50%	19	2.50%	1	5.00%	2	5.00%	2	2.50%	1	40	4.1	4.27
S. Appropriateness of college policies concerning equity and diversity issues	45.00%	18	37.50%	15	5.00%	2	0.00%	0	10.00%	4	2.50%	1	40	4.1	4.46
Respondents	Comment														
1	WCC needs a faculty handbook to organize scattered info. The faculty classification needs a good editor to make T&P applications easier to write and evaluate. The hiring process is dysfunctional.														
2	14E. Committee work can get overwhelming at times. 14P. some offices/depts overstaffed (counselors; more than when I was at Manoa!) while others could use seasonal help (A&R, FinAid)														
3	The contract renewal and tenure/promotion processes are stressful and I'm not sure those are the most effective and efficient methods of evaluating faculty														
4	We could use more peer mentors to support our recruiting, first year program and retention programs														
6	WIN CC does little to serve its mission, especially when trying to address academic disparities of Native Hawaiian students on campus. This campus suffers from unethical behaviors from faculty in many departments on campus.														
7	For letter 'I' ranked POOR, to be clear, this is due to the ineffectiveness of the HR office in hiring full-time faculty and staff. There are extreme delays which are inefficient and not effective.														