

## **Non-Instructional Department Reviews 2011-2012 Summary**

### **Annual Department Reviews reviewed:**

- Child Care Partners
- Facilities
- Human Resources
- Information Technology Services
- Instructional Services
- President's Office
- Resource Development
- Small Business Development Center
- Student Services
- Business Office, including Bookstore

### **Overall Summary and Highlights:**

The concept of efficiency appeared frequently in nearly every department review. This is positive because CGCC employees are looking for ways to do what they do better, a testament to their quality and dedication. Some examples include SBDC modifying the approach to startup inquiries, IT and Facilities closely examining their workflow, Student Services recommending improvements to the phone system, and the Business Office improving the procurement process.

The reviews also offered low-to-no cost solutions as recommendations when possible. For example, during times of peak demand for the computers in the information commons at the Hood River campus a computer lab could be opened to improve access.

The committee noted that specific topics or recommendations that reviewers had knowledge of were sometimes not included or reflected in the reports. There also appeared to be some confusion regarding the assessment matrix therefore the IAC will work on appropriate modifications to the process.

### **Theme Summary by Core Function Areas**

#### **1. Organizational Management & Leadership Structure**

Generally, departments reported that they have an organizational structure that is functional and sufficient. A combination of organizational charts, evaluations, job descriptions and surveys were used in this determination; however it was noted that some of these documents may need to be updated for some departments. It was also interesting that internal decision structure and supervisory structure may vary within some departments. Finally, staff roles and responsibilities, within and across departments, need to be determined and well articulated.

#### **2. Financial Management & Budget**

While departments reported that their budgets meet the essential needs of the department, there were specific requests for additional budget to fund certain activities or to purchase specific items. Budget comments were mostly limited to either the actual dollar amount or the adequacy of the budget and did not reflect on the process.

### 3. Facilities, Technology, & Other Resources

It is understood that the items listed below would have budget ramifications and could also be addressed in #2 when speaking to adequacy of budget.

**Facilities** are generally reported to meet department needs. It was noted that Hood River campus has limited office space for staff and faculty. While not prioritized, Instruction listed a variety of instructional space needs: including but not limited to a childcare facility for ECE practicum, a kitchen facility HR-ICC for ECE classes, and additional space for art classes. Storage space was mentioned as a need for some departments.

**Technology:** Reports for additional computers or computer upgrades were found in several departments: There are not enough computers available for student use in HR-ICC's Commons area. SBDC laptops need to be upgraded. Additional smart podiums requested for those classrooms without. Phone system improvements were requested to aid in internal and external communication.

**Human resources (staffing):** All departments describe their staff as competent and well qualified, and for the most part able to complete the departmental tasks. However, there was a common theme that staff members are being pulled from department work to serve on committees and take on institutional tasks, making them less available to carry out their regular duties. As a result, departments are understaffed. Staffing the front desk at both campuses appears to be challenge.

### 4. Planning & Evaluation

Departments report that they meet with differing levels of regularity to discuss, plan and evaluate progress toward departmental goals. Some departments prepare documented yearly action plans. Some departments have outside drivers or funding sources that require yearly plans and final reports. Other departments may not have a specific timeline for planning so it happens more on an ongoing basis. Most departments are using the charter system, but at differing levels. Some departments reported that additional training was required in its usage. However, it was noted that the charter system has appropriate uses and inappropriate uses. A college-wide, open discussion of what is the best use of the charter system is sought. Non-instructional department review organized at the institutional level is a new process and looks to bring more structure and consistency to the planning and evaluation processes of departments.

### 5. Professional Development

While professional development is taking place and is valued by staff, several departments have recognized that it would be helpful if information on potential professional development opportunities was researched and made available. Staff would like to take advantage of these opportunities and improve their knowledge and skills, but they often are not aware of what is out there.

### 6. Communication & Coordination

Communication is working well in general, but there are gaps. The majority of departments describe their ongoing efforts to improve communication within their department, with other departments, between campuses, and with outside entities. There were many improvements put into action or suggested, including no- or low-cost options. Instructional Services would like Groupwise training focused on calendar use to make coordinating smoother. Couriering between Hood River and The Dalles could be improved, as well as technology to facilitate meetings via telecommunication between the two. After learning that a third of their calls were unrelated to their department, Student Services would like to change their phone message to redirect phone traffic to the correct place. It appears that there is not a lack of communication, as shown by the use of phone, Skype, email, websites, Twitter, Facebook, meetings, etc. The problem may be more about the kind of communication and individual preference.

#### **7. Timeliness of Service**

Though difficult to capture, some departments were able to provide anecdotal assessment or general impressions of their timeliness of service. Overall, it appears that departments believe that they are providing service to their customers in a timely manner, but they are still looking to improve. Some were able to refer to student or staff/faculty surveys. Others were able to estimate response times and self-evaluate. Improving efficiencies was a trend throughout all departments.

#### **8. Customer Satisfaction**

Some departments did not address customer satisfaction. It seems they are unclear as to who their customers are. Other departments combined this with timeliness of service, because their data sources were the same for both.

### **Thoughts on Assessment Methodology**

In general, many of the non-instructional department reviews appear to have been approached as an exercise that needs to be carried out to satisfy an outside entity – the Institutional Assessment Committee, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. As a result, reports often read as a justification for existence or funding rather than a self-reflection of services provided. The review is an opportunity for departments to come together and evaluate progress toward yearly goals and, based on that progress, establish new goals for the coming year. It is an internal process that is written down and then shared with the institution as a whole. However, first and foremost, it is a function that is supposed to be useful and a benefit to the department itself.

The template is meant to provide a minimum set of standards on which departments should be assessing themselves. While it is not mandatory that departments follow the format of the template, it is expected that all the areas are addressed. The review committee felt that some

department reviews did not do this. At the same time, it was recognized that there is possible repetition or lack of clarity in the template that should be refined for next year.