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The issue is measuring effectiveness in creating an environment in which all the responsibilities are met in a manner that all individuals see their contributions as being valuable.  (M. Rota)

INTRODUCTION:

In early Fall of 2009, Chancellor Mike Rota asked David Panisnick to put together a group of faculty to work on a proposal for assessing administrative leadership at HCC. Jennifer Higa-King and Pat Patterson subsequently became part of that committee. By November of that semester, the committee had come up with a fairly detailed "concept" which was shared with Chancellor Rota and VCAA Erika Lacro. Agreement was reached and the committee set itself the task of completing a formal proposal by the end of Spring 2010, after which it would, in consultation with administration, be submitted to appropriate campus bodies for additional recommendations and final approval.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT:

Beginning in the 1990's a paradigm shift took place in the processes for self-assessment, planning and improvement in institutions of higher education. The idea of continuous improvement in educational quality became a core principle of the accreditation process, with continuous improvement driven by changing accreditation standards. Accreditation required assessment of institutional effectiveness, and Program Review became the phrase used to describe the review of the effectiveness of educational programs. Discussions ensued on definitions and effective processes for measuring/assessing student progress, student achievement and institutional effectiveness. By 1996, the Program Review process was expanded to include student services and support services across the nation. Honolulu Community College is following suit. The integration of the Program Review process was seen as essential to institutional planning and budgeting; and the use of data analysis, trends and assessment as critical to inform decision making within the governance processes.
At the instructional level, classroom assessment saw a shift in focus from teaching to learning which resulted in the creation of measurable standards called Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's). Today, SLO's are integral to the accreditation review process. Institutions must identify SLO'S at course, program and degree levels to measure effectiveness, plan and implement new initiatives.

Given the evolution of the Program Review and the increasing importance accorded to SLO's, it is inevitable that the same method of self-assessment should now become the linchpin of the Administration review process.

THE PURPOSE OF THE ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM REVIEW:

The Administration Program Review is a collaborative goal-setting and self-assessment process designed to help and improve college leadership. It is intended to be flexible, collegial, relevant, practical, and should result in a clear sense of direction and accomplishment for the Chancellor and his staff.

The most important extrinsic purpose is for the Administration to receive the resources it needs (e.g. equipment, staff, etc.) and to meet accreditation standards. The intrinsic purpose of the self-assessment process is to help the Administration to clarify and achieve its goals. In addition, the process should aid the Administration in strengthening its bonds with the college units and community and to foster cooperation within and among the units and community itself; in short, to maximize effective leadership.

BROAD OUTLINE: THE CONCEPT

The proposal is a non-quantitative measurement of administrative effectiveness through self-assessment. "Non-quantitative" does not mean that the self-assessment would be devoid of evidence. The intention is to move away from the use of questionnaires and surveys as primary tools of assessment which often generate biased and misinformed responses. In short, what individuals perceive about administrative performance is not always consistent with how administration is actually performing.

The model for the administrative self-assessment is the Program Review. To this end, the administration has agreed to supply its own Mission Statement and Campus Leadership Outcomes (CLOs) which will be the standard against which administrative leadership and performance is measured. Exactly how the Program Review, traditionally an academic unit form of assessment, is translated to accommodate administrative assessment, is the practical issue which has occupied most of the committee's work.

As part of the 2009 Midterm Accreditation report, the administration "indicates specifically which parties are responsible for each performance objective, and which administrator has responsibility for oversight and ensuring implementation. This linkage was created explicitly to tie into meaningful administrative assessment."

Clearly, the Chancellor's staff will have their own individualized self-assessments to complete as part of the process. Evidence in the form of data, anonymous review by peers, subordinates and supervisors, surveys and questionnaires, communication
mechanisms such as Town Hall meetings, newsletters, and campus blogs etc., will all be used for the purpose of self-evaluating strengths and weaknesses, professional development, new initiatives, and addressing areas of concern.

The broader implications of the administration's self-assessment will impact budgetary considerations and the Strategic Plan, and will become part of the campus Accreditation Report.

After completing its self-assessment, the administration will submit it to a Committee of Seven for review:

- Faculty Senate Chair
- Staff Senate Chair
- Planning Council Chair
- Campus Leadership Team Representative
- Accreditation Liaison Officer
- Kupu Ka Wai
- ASUH-HCC President

The committee of seven will read and discuss the administration's self-assessment and compose a written evaluation highlighting strengths and weaknesses with suggestions for correctives and new initiatives (much in the same manner a DPC or TPRC evaluates faculty dossiers for tenure/promotion).

The administration then has the option of writing a response to the Committee of Seven. However, the administration may not in any way alter, delete or adumbrate the committee of seven's evaluation report. The Committee of Seven's report and the administration's response are both to be included as part of the Accreditation Report.

The Administration will be asked to update its self-assessment annually. It is anticipated that the same format will be used and updates should require only minimal editing.

MISSION STATEMENT AND COLLEGE LEADERSHIP OUTCOMES (CLO's):

The Administration will need to compose its own Mission Statement and College Leadership Outcomes (CLO's). The Mission Statement should clearly describe the Administration's purpose and should establish the foundation upon which the CLO's are constructed. The Mission Statement should guide the Administration in its thematic focus and in the types of governance and leadership it exercises. The mission should neither be so broad as to permit the Administration to pursue virtually any type of activity, nor so narrow as to restrict its ability to adapt. The CLO's should be understandable in the context of its mission. Some questions to consider:

1. What is the purpose of the Administration? What functions does the Administration perform to carry out this purpose? How has this changed? What are the current trends in administration services nationwide? How have marketplace forces affected the Administration's operations?
2. What are the Administration's strengths and weaknesses? Have these changed in recent years? How do these areas correspond to where the Administration would like
to be?
3. How does the Administration compare to equivalent administrations in peer institutions? What are the comparative measures used to assess performance?
4. What are the important relationships the Administration has to other units within the University system and the outside community?

OBJECTIVES:

The major objectives of the Administration Program Review are to:
1. State Administration’s goals and align future goals with the college’s mission and strategic plan.
2. Collect and analyze data on key performance indicators, CLO’s, activities and accomplishments.
3. Examine and document the effectiveness of administrative leadership.
4. Develop initiatives and strategies concerning future directions and needs (e.g. budget, staffing, resources).

SERVICES:

The following set of questions might be considered regarding Administration services:
1. Does the Administration have defined performance goals or targets? How does the Administration determine whether it is achieving these? What specific performance measures does the Administration use to assess its performance on an ongoing basis?
2. What improvements have been made in the delivery of services from the Administration to its constituencies?
3. Has the Administration implemented any innovative or state-of-the-art approaches to improve its effectiveness and efficiency?
4. How does the Administration assess its users’ needs on an ongoing basis? How flexible is the Administration in responding to those needs? How does the Administration assess user satisfaction with its performance?
5. Are any new services being planned by the Administration based upon user’s current or anticipated needs? How will these change current Administration operation?
6. Is there overlap or duplication of services within the Administration or with other components of the University system? How could this be reduced, if appropriate?

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE:

The Administration "has created an 'implementation framework' that indicates specifically which parties are responsible for each performance objective, and which administrator has responsibility for oversight and ensuring implementation. This linkage was created explicitly to tie into meaningful administrative assessment.” (From 2009 Midterm Accreditation Report). Currently, all members of the Administration are assessed through an evaluation of their accomplishments as well as an anonymous review of their performance by peers, subordinates and supervisors. This evaluation is
used to create professional development plans for the succeeding year. The Chancellor uses these evaluations to gauge the strengths and weaknesses of the administrative team, and work with individuals to address areas of concern.

In addition to these assessment mechanisms, the Administration should report on any significant staffing or organizational changes which have taken place or which are anticipated. A rationale for these changes is necessary, especially if they result in additional staff.

ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT:

Some questions which might be considered regarding Administration support:

1. How has technology been integrated into the services and functions of the Administration? How successful have these efforts been? How has the Administration developed hardware, software and training support?
2. How has the Administration addressed security and obsolescence issues?
3. How well does the Administration's current space meet its needs? What reallocation or renovation could be implemented to improve administrative services?

ANALYSIS:

Analysis, along with Planning, are very different from the above listed components of the Administration Program Review which involve reporting and data collection. The Analysis section of the Administration Program Review can take various forms. It might be included as a conclusion to append to each of the sections listed above; or, it could take the form of a summary conclusion - or both - at the end of the entire report. In either case, it should be where the Administration makes its case for having demonstrated effective governance, in much the same manner as a faculty member is required to do when applying for tenure/promotion.

Following is a list of some relevant sample questions:

1. Is the Administration's mission aligned with the campus mission?
2. Are the goals and CLO's current, relevant and appropriate to campus and community needs?
3. Has the Administration addressed prior recommendations made by the ACCJC and/or campus advisory committees?
4. What are the Administration's strengths and where does it need improvement?
5. What challenges and opportunities exist for the Administration?

PLANNING:

Together with the Administration’s analysis of its performance, the Planning function should complete the case for demonstrating leadership. The Administration Program Review is intended to be the key driver informing the Administrations strategic planning process. As a self-study document it should be updated annually and serve as a vital component in the planning and budgeting
Some questions to be addressed are:

1. What are the Administration's plans for strengthening itself?
2. What resources are needed (e.g. personnel, facilities, finances)?
3. Is there a sequence for making the changes? What are the timelines?
4. What changes must the Administration make in the short term and in the long term to address this plan?
5. Who will be responsible for carrying out the plan, for carrying out various parts of the plan?
6. What is the short-term budgetary impact of this plan? What is the long-term budgetary impact?

The questions presented in the above sections are only examples of questions the Administration might explore. Fundamental to the process of issues identification is that the Administration itself knows best what challenges confront it. Once the process is underway, the historical context and substantive foundation of previous cycles of review, and with an examination of the changes and external forces which affect the Administration, the subsequent cycles should be designed to identify issues confronting the Administration that, when addressed, should continue to help the Administration move in a trajectory of improvement and quality enhancement of its governance and leadership.

LEADERSHIP: A Non-Quantitative Measurement.

*Efficiency is doing things right, effectiveness is doing the right things.*

(Peter Drucker)

*Leadership without governance is empty, governance without leadership is blind.*

(The Factory)

The committee thinks it is important to differentiate between governance and leadership, a distinction which is commonly ignored. Governance refers to "what" is accomplished, leadership is more a reflection of "how" it is accomplished.

Leadership is an abstract concept. It cannot be precisely defined and it means different things to different people. This is one reason the committee has decided to pursue a non-quantitative approach. Another reason is that because individuals respond to the term intuitively, it is inevitable that a multitude of extraneous factors (e.g. overall approval or disapproval of governance impacting personal interests) will produce biased results.

One way of addressing this problem is to contextualize leadership and define it in specific terms which most individuals would agree constitute necessary, if not sufficient conditions under which leadership is demonstrated.

Following this line of thought, the committee has catalogued a lexicon of leadership terminology in the form of contextual questions to be addressed by the Administration. These questions share the common qualification that they lend themselves to evidential
responses, even if only by way of example. The use of terms like integrity, honesty or commitment do not meet this criterion. In contrast, terms like shared governance, initiative and effectiveness do meet the criterion; they can be tested.

We request that the Administration respond to or devise questions like the ones below. Once the Administration completes its Mission statement and CLO's it might well use those as a basis for creating its own questions, keeping in mind that they must be formulated so as to permit evidential responses.

The Committee of Seven, as part of its evaluation of the Administration's self-study, will respond to the Administration's perspective of its Leadership. The level of agreement between the Administration's self-assessment of its leadership and the Committee of Seven's evaluation of that self-assessment will produce a "leadership quotient" reflecting the similarities and/or differences between the respective perceptions. This need not, indeed should not, be calibrated on a quantitative scale.

Any subsequent reviewing body (e.g. ACCJC) will be able to compare the Administration's self-assessment of its Leadership with the Committee of Seven's response and have a clear snapshot of Leadership at the college. This is how a non-quantitative measurement of Leadership takes place.

Leadership Questions: Examples

1. Provide evidence for encouraging and engaging in collaborative decision-making.
2. Have there been instances in which the Administration has developed innovative strategies, employed policies or procedures, or made decisions which it judges to be unique or even contrary to accepted system culture?
3. Given the difficulty of maintaining high morale during difficult times, how has the Administration promoted a "realistic optimism" in order to inspire confidence in administrative governance?
4. In what area(s) does the Administration think the rest of the college community has under-achieved in its responsibility to move the campus forward? How has this been communicated? Results?
5. What does the Administration see as among the most difficult decisions it has had to make? Why were they difficult? How were they resolved?
6. What does the Chancellor think about transparency in the evaluation of administrative personnel (e.g. 360's)? What is the current approach to this issue? Are changes being discussed?
7. What plans for the future of the college are currently being discussed which the Administration considers to be innovative? Short term? Long term?
8. The header quote describes effectiveness as "doing the right thing." How has the Administration "done the right thing," especially in any instances where it would have been easier to justify not "doing the right thing" in the name of efficiency?
9. Relative to BOR policy, how has the Administration demonstrated autonomy?
10. Are there any plans, accomplishments or even failures which the Administration would characterize as having involved "risk taking?"
11. Are there instances in which the Administration has successfully mediated between campus units with conflicting or competing interests? Results?
12. In what way does the Administration maintain transparency in its decision-making
processes (e.g. budget)?
13. Does the Administration perceive a difference between collaborative
decision-making and shared governance? Explain.