Institutional Effectiveness Committee Evaluation Survey

What group best describes your position at the Compton Center?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.00
Administrator	2	40.00	
Classified Staff	1	20.00	
Full-time Faculty	2	40.00	
Part-time Faculty	0	0.00	
Student	0	0.00	

The number of members on this committee is appropriate for effectively carrying out its responsibilities.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.40
Strongly Agree	1	20.00	
Agree	0	0.00	
Neutral	2	40.00	
Disagree	1	20.00	
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	
N/A	1	20.00	

The representation on this committee (i.e., administrative, faculty, staff, and student membership) is appropriate for effectively carrying out its responsibilities.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.40
Strongly Agree	2	40.00	
Agree	2	40.00	
Neutral	0	0.00	
Disagree	0	0.00	
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	
N/A	1	20.00	

This committee is represented by the specific roles and positions at the college that can most effectively carry out its responsibilities.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.60
Strongly Agree	2	40.00	
Agree	1	20.00	
Neutral	1	20.00	
Disagree	0	0.00	
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	
N/A	1	20.00	

Adequate introduction and training has been provided to help me be a productive committee member.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.60
Strongly Agree	1	20.00	
Agree	0	0.00	
Neutral	1	20.00	
Disagree	2	40.00	
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	
N/A	1	20.00	

Adequate information and communication is provided to continually support my participation on this committee.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.00
Strongly Agree	1	20.00	
Agree	1	20.00	
Neutral	2	40.00	
Disagree	0	0.00	
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	
N/A	1	20.00	

My workload required for this committee is appropriate for representing my job classification's constituency (or expectations of hours devoted to collegial governance for faculty members).

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.20
Strongly Agree	0	0.00	
Agree	1	20.00	
Neutral	1	20.00	
Disagree	1	20.00	
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	
N/A	2	40.00	

The workload is equitably distributed with respect to all committee members.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.40
Strongly Agree	0	0.00	
Agree	1	20.00	
Neutral	3	60.00	
Disagree	0	0.00	
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	
N/A	1	20.00	

The workload is equitably distributed with respect to the institutional calendar.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.20
Strongly Agree	0	0.00	
Agree	2	40.00	
Neutral	2	40.00	
Disagree	0	0.00	
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	
N/A	1	20.00	

The tasks and responsibilities assigned to this committee are appropriate for its placement within the governance structure.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.00
Strongly Agree	1	20.00	
Agree	2	40.00	
Neutral	0	0.00	
Disagree	1	20.00	
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	
N/A	1	20.00	

The number and duration of meetings is appropriate for carrying out this committee's responsibilities.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.60
Strongly Agree	0	0.00	
Agree	1	20.00	
Neutral	2	40.00	
Disagree	1	20.00	
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	
N/A	1	20.00	

Leadership of this committee is appropriate and effective.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.20
Strongly Agree	0	0.00	
Agree	3	60.00	
Neutral	0	0.00	
Disagree	1	20.00	
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	
N/A	1	20.00	

The members of this committee work well together in accomplishing tasks and responsibilities as well as holding efficient and effective meetings.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.80
Strongly Agree	1	20.00	
Agree	2	40.00	
Neutral	1	20.00	
Disagree	0	0.00	
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00	
N/A	1	20.00	

Question: Please provide any other comments you would like to share regarding this committee.

Response
More members are needed on IE committee given the amount of work required. This committee needs to meet regularly and frequently. For next year, the administrative co-chair needs to be clearly assigned and that individual must be consistent in attendance and in providing direction.
I have not served on the committee long enough to comment on the above questions. Feedback I have received from members with more experience is that they have felt overwhelmed by the time required to read the reviews, write comments, meet to discuss and then often return the document for further editing and to read again. I understand the process is going to change and have participated in discussions to reduce the number of readings of program reviews which are poorly written. As far as preparation for my role on the committee that has been minimal. I have observed the orientation of faculty at ECC, that have their reviews due the following semester, and think we should provide similar support at the Compton Center. I have brought these ideas forward to Felipe Lopez. The ECC Dean who oversees this process, also new to her role but with a lot of experience at another institution, is very supportive and willing to collaborate.
Training may be helpful at all levels, even with the program review authors. It should also be followed up. What I have learned here, is that "shared governance" does not necessarily mean its shared at all. It could just mean that certain people sit on committee to make things appear or qualify to be "shared governance". Of course we could look up what it means here and it would probably fit, but what is seen and what is done can be different. Anyway, that is my two cents worth nothing on it.