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Shared Governance And Internal Communication Audit
Purpose

In the spring of 2011, Monroe County Community College received the final results of its comprehensive accreditation visit by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and was granted maximum accredited status with the timing for the next comprehensive visit to be in 2019-20. However, a focused visit will be conducted in 2012-13 to address two areas of improvement:

1. communication and shared governance and
2. evaluating and improving institutional effectiveness.

Evidence provided in the Self-Study, institutional survey data, and team meetings with faculty, staff, and administration suggested to the HLC team that the College has not yet developed a successful structure or process for promoting effective communication and shared governance. The College’s Self-Study observed that “the College must work to improve and maintain effective lines of communication.” The Institutional Governance Committee agreed to review the shared governance structure and processes and make recommendations regarding opportunities for improving overall function and operations. Thus, Monroe County Community College sought the services of a consultant to lead the College through an employee communication/ shared governance audit. The consultant was expected to analyze the College’s communication/ shared governance practices to reveal their effectiveness throughout the entire organization and provide detailed recommendations for improvement.

CLARUS Corporation was chosen as the consultant to assist Monroe County Community College in the shared governance/ communication audit. In the following sections, methodology and major findings for each component of the audit will be detailed.

Scope Of Project

In the Request For Proposal: Employee Communication/ Shared Governance Audit issued November 23, 2010, the College outlined a fairly comprehensive approach to the audit which would include: (1) planning the audit with the College’s Institutional Governance Committee, (2) conducting primary internal research through focus groups and interviews about the attitudes and perceptions of shared governance and communication, (3) reviewing the internal and external communication materials, and ultimately (4) presenting a report on the findings and providing recommendations on how the College can improve internal communications and shared governance.

The Request For Proposal from Monroe County Community College called for the Consultant to “collect and analyze communication vehicles and programs within the scope of the audit” and listed myriad internal communication examples and external communication examples. It was recommended that the audit focus on the internal communication for this project and not only review the physical communications materials but focus on the communication channels – formal and informal. At the most basic level, good internal communication helps employees do their jobs – and do them well. Effective internal communication is one of the key drivers of employee engagement. Internal communication is also a critical factor in changing or transforming a college. Conditions constantly change and when a college must adapt, sometimes drastically, to a change in the environmental conditions, internal communication is the key to changing.

As Monroe County Community College moves forward in adapting to fiscal and environmental changes, good communication is a must. The focus on the purpose of the internal communications audit was three-fold:
• Examine the current formal communication channels currently being used by the College to share information with respect to their content and frequency of use. These formal communication channels include:

1. Electronic: Communications that are delivered and/or accessed electronically, either by computer, telephone, television, or other devices. Examples include e-mail, intranet, video and webcasts, electronic newsletters, podcasts, blogs, Wikis, voicemail, conference calls, SMS text messaging, screensaver messaging, desktop alert messages, desktop news feeds, and internal social media tools (e.g.: internal Twitter-style sites).

2. Print: Paper-based communications. Examples include magazines, newsletters, brochures, postcards and other desk drops, posters, memos, etc.

3. Face-to-face: One-to-one and one-to-many forums where people are physically present. Examples include team meetings or briefings, conferences, site visits, ‘back to the floor’, consultation forums, ‘brown bag’ lunches, round-table discussions, ‘town meetings’, etc.

4. Workspace: The working environment. Examples include notice boards, plasma and LCD screens, accessories (e.g.: mouse pads), window decals, etc.

• Meet with internal constituents at the College to assess the informal internal communications that are in use.

1. The informal communication channels are often termed as the rumor-mill, water-cooler conversations, social networking, and graffiti. In addition, the internal constituents will also provide feedback on their current use or nonuse of the formal communications channels – electronic, print, face-to-face, and workspace.

• Develop recommendations for improving internal communications, if needed, through development of clear internal communication strategies

The committee structure at Monroe County Community College was also noted as a major concern. As noted in the RFP, “the standing committee structure has been labeled by some as ineffective and overtaxing on human resources. Additionally, concern has been expressed regarding occurrences of decision-making outside the committee structure, even though there is recognition that there are cases where decision-making outside the committee structure is appropriate and in accordance with institutional policy. In some cases, criticism stems from the advisory nature of standing-committee recommendations. Finally, standing committee recommendations and actions overturning recommendations have, occasionally, been criticized for not being founded in data and/or evidence-based analysis. The standing committee structure was identified as an opportunity for improvement in the HLC Vital Focus Conversation Day Report.”

Based on the issues found with the current committee structure, it was suggested that a model of shared governance which uses councils and committees be examined for Monroe County Community College during the audit. A “council” is a recommending body that makes recommendations directly to the President. Typically, councils are developed in the areas of: Administrative Services, Student Services, and Academic. A “committee” is a recommending body that makes recommendations to a council and its areas of responsibility fall within that of the council to which it makes its recommendations. Committees can be either “standing” or “ad hoc” depending on the topic and their function. Every committee is assigned to an appropriate council to ensure that recommendations are reviewed appropriately and forwarded ultimately to the President and Board.

The final expectation in working with the College was to make recommendations on how the College can improve internal communications and shared governance. However, the actual outcomes expected by the College as a result of this project were not clearly defined. It is anticipated that the information gathered in the focus sessions and survey will assist the Institutional Governance Committee in developing a model
of shared governance for Monroe County Community College. This model should have the following attributes, achieved through collaborative conversations:

A. Development of a Board Policy to define shared governance at the College and its ties to institutional mission, vision, and values.

B. Development of an Administrative Rule to implement the Board Policy that would include: values, desired outcomes of shared governance, and implementation to include recommending bodies, councils and committees, and monitoring shared governance.

C. Development of a document outlining shared governance at Monroe County Community College. This project should be an exercise in developing a plan for an effective shared governance structure and a plan to improve internal communication. This will require the College to step back from the current conditions and create a vision of what is desirable for the future. This may require re-examining the current College Constitution and examining different models of shared governance that may better fit the College. This will be an opportunity to envision the “ideal” future conditions with regard to:

   a. Fundamental principles of shared governance
   b. Fundamental structures of shared governance—councils and committees
   c. Access to information
   d. Functions and purposes of councils and committees
   e. Creation, modification, and dissolution of committees
   f. Representation on councils and committees
   g. Responsibilities of chairs/ co-chairs

The results from this project are to be summarized and recommendations made for improvements in communication as well as a proposed model of shared governance. A planning session would be conducted at the end of the project with the Institutional Governance Committee to present recommendations and assist them in working toward a consensus on the development of the documents described above. Models will be provided for the Committee to review.

**Defining Shared Governance**

A multitude of definitions of shared governance exist in academic literature, but the issue for any community college is to develop a working definition that fits the College’s unique characteristics and distinctive identity. In a Chronicle of Higher Education article entitled “What is Shared Governance?” Gary Olson noted the complexity of shared governance:

"Shared governance is not a simple matter of committee consensus, or the faculty's engaging administrators to take on the dirty work, or any number of other common misconceptions. Shared governance is much more complex; it is a delicate balance between faculty and staff participation in planning and decision-making processes, on the one hand, and administrative accountability on the other."

Maintaining that delicate balance between constituent groups at the College is the key to successfully implementing shared governance. And without trust among the constituent groups, regardless of the
model of shared governance chosen, it will fail. It will take a good faith effort among all constituent groups, letting go of the perceived grievances of the past, to ensure that the College will move forward and be successful in the shared governance model developed. Ultimately, shared governance is the blueprint for how the College will ensure that all constituent groups’ voices will be heard in major issues impacting the College, and how those voices will be heard in the issues and decisions at the College in which they should have input and knowledge. Shared governance does not ensure that every individual at a college will participate in every decision nor provide input into every issue. A working definition of shared governance as defined in Governance and Decision-making in Colleges and Universities - Shared Governance, Governance Structure, External Influences, Trends in Governance is:

“Shared governance refers to structures and processes through which faculty, professional staff, administration, governing boards and, sometimes, students and staff participate in the development of policies and in decision-making that affect the institution.”

The challenge for Monroe County Community College is to assess the current impediments in their system and then develop new processes and procedures that will ensure all constituent groups have methods to participate in the process.

**Internal Communication**

The cornerstone to genuine shared governance is broad and unending communication. And it must be remembered that communication is a circular process – not one directional. As seen in the graphic below, a sender creates a message and delivers it to a receiver, who then provides feedback to the sender regarding the message.

While this process appears simple, it is one of the most complex processes in which man participates. The communication process can break down at many levels. The message created by the sender may not be clearly defined and the receiver misinterprets the message. Through the feedback loop to the sender, the sender can clarify the message to the receiver if the communication was misinterpreted. Noise can impact the communication cycle as it passes from the sender to the receiver – the receiver can interpret the message through his or her filters and the message may be misconstrued from the original communication. But, as the sender gets feedback from the receiver, through dialog and conversations, the message can be clarified.

The major issue with communication in many community colleges today is the lack of a feedback loop. Personnel at many community colleges emphasize “we communicate all the time – we send a ton of things out.” Sending things out – or top down communication – does not provide for a feedback loop. Without the presence of a feedback loop, the senders, in this example the administrators at a college never know whether the communication was received and interpreted correctly. The feedback does not
have to be strictly in person; electronic polling and other methods can ensure that the feedback loop is working.

The bottom line for internal communication is that constituent groups at a college are kept in the loop and understand what developments are occurring at the College, especially in the areas that will have a major impact on the College as a whole, like a budget deficit, or areas that will operationally impact their jobs, like a tuition hike. The key to effective internal communication is not 200 e-mails sent out daily informing constituents of the latest “news” but where the constituents are invited to participate as true partners in discussions that will have impact on the College and their spheres of influence, typically their areas of responsibility. If all constituents are kept in the loop, provided opportunities for dialog and discussion (feedback), then the institution prospers and is truly operating under a shared governance model.

**Obstacles To Shared Governance**

An excellent review of the state of shared governance in today’s rapidly changing educational environments is provided by William D. Leach (2008) in the paper: *Shared Governance in Higher Education: Structural and Cultural Responses to a Changing National Climate* (Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University, Sacramento). In this discussion paper, Leach provides an overview of the obstacles and opportunities for effective shared governance. Although he focuses on the research relevant to four-year public universities, there are numerous commonalities found for the shared governance issues facing community colleges today.

It is important to point out prior to an audit of shared governance and communication the potential obstacles inherent in the educational system that can lead to ineffective shared governance at a college. These obstacles include:

- **Strained Working Relationships.** If trust between constituent groups erodes at a college, it is extremely difficult to find a shared governance model that will work. Only if employees feel valued and respected will they participate. The natural inclination for individuals who do not believe they are valued and respected, regardless of which constituent group to which they belong, is to become apathetic and disengaged. Disengagement is a major detriment to shared governance – if individuals believe they are not respected and their opinions and knowledge not valued, they will not participate. Conversely, when individuals believe they are valued and their opinions needed and respected, they will engage and participate.

- **Faculty Salaries, Workload, And Satisfaction.** The more satisfaction faculty has with their work environment, the more likely they are to participate in shared governance. But if faculty believe they are overworked, underpaid, or are generally dissatisfied with their work environment, they are less likely to participate in shared governance. If the faculty believe they are not valued, they are likely to not participate in shared governance because they have no confidence that the administration will really value their input. And individuals who already feel overworked are less likely to participate in committees and shared governance if they believe their input is not really valued.

- **Faculty And Administrative Culture.** Inherently, the strength of academia may also be one of the major obstacles to shared governance. Successful faculty is very specialized in their unique areas of study – they are passionate and completely immersed in their areas of expertise. Successful faculty is more likely to be entrepreneurial and individualistic, valuing academic freedom and independence. But faculty may be disconnected from the broader goals of the College. On the other hand, the administration of the College has to be connected to broader goals and have the ability to see the “larger picture” – management at the College has to focus on responsibility and accountability. Many times, faculty and administration find themselves at odds with each other trying to balance the needs of the discipline areas with the needs of the
organization as a whole. These differences may lead to conflicts and may hinder the effectiveness of shared governance.

- **External Demands On Faculty And Administrators.** For many colleges today, external forces are having an even larger impact on what used to be internal administrative decisions. With educational budgets shrinking and fewer dollars coming from shrinking tax bases, community colleges have to rely more on external funding sources, or find ways to reduce already stretched budgets. The major issue driving many internal decisions today is the dollars available to fund the institution. Community college presidents are being asked to pay even more attention to external constituents to raise funds and strengthen community relationships, and with these partnerships, some of the control over decision-making is shifting to external sources.

**Institutional Climate Indicators**

In the last year, Monroe County Community College has conducted two surveys of employees to better define the climate of the College. The Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) survey was administered to employees in November of 2010 and the goal of the survey was to obtain the perceptions of personnel concerning the college climate and to provide data to assist MCCC in promoting more open and constructive communication among faculty, staff, and administrators. In addition, an employee survey was conducted at the College in the Winter of 2010 to assess how employees view their role in the organization and their expectation of communication at the College. The results of these two surveys were reviewed to provide background for the Shared Governance and Internal Communication Audit as they related to governance and communication. A summary of the results pertinent to this audit are reviewed below.

**PACE.** In November 2010, the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) survey was administered to 166 employees at Monroe County Community College (MCCC). Of those 166 employees, 113 (68.1%) completed and returned the instrument for analysis. The purpose of the survey was to obtain the perceptions of personnel concerning the college climate and to provide data to assist MCCC in promoting more open and constructive communication among faculty, staff, and administrators. Researchers at the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) and representatives from the Human Resources office of MCCC collaborated to administer a survey that would capture the opinions of personnel throughout the College. Based on a solid body of literature about institutional effectiveness, NILIE has synthesized from the literature four leadership or organizational systems ranging from coercive to collaborative (see in the graphic below).
The four systems range from Coercive, the least desirable system, to Competitive to Consultative to Collaborative, the most desirable system but the most difficult to achieve. Descriptions of the four systems were provided by NILIE:

- **Coercive:** Leaders are seen as having no confidence or trust in employees and seldom involve them in any aspect of the decision-making process. Decisions are made at the top and issued downward. Lower levels in the organization oppose the goals established by the upper levels. Influence primarily takes place through fear and punishment.

- **Competitive:** Leaders are seen as having condescending confidence and trust in employees. Employees are occasionally involved in some aspects of the decision-making process. Some decision-making processes take place in the lower levels, but control is at the top. Lower levels in the organization cooperate in accomplishing selected goals of the organization. Some influence is experienced through the rewards process and some through fear and punishment.

- **Consultative:** Leaders are seen as having substantial but not complete confidence and trust in employees. Employees are significantly involved in the decision-making process. More decisions are made at the lower levels, and leaders consult with followers regarding decisions. Lower levels in the organization begin to deal more with morale and exercise cooperation toward accomplishment of goals. Influence is through the rewards process. Occasional punishment and some collaboration occur.

- **Collaborative:** Leaders are seen as having demonstrated confidence and trust in employees. Employees are involved in appropriate aspects of the decision-making process. Decision making is widely dispersed throughout the organization and is well integrated across levels. Collaboration is employed throughout the organization. Employees are influenced through participation and involvement in developing economic rewards, setting goals, improving methods, and appraising progress toward goals.

Examining the scores for Monroe County Community College, the overall results from the PACE instrument indicate a healthy campus climate, yielding an overall 3.61 mean score (out of a possible 5 points) or high Consultative system. The Student Focus category received the highest mean score (4.07), whereas the Institutional Structure category received the lowest mean score (3.07). When respondents were classified according to Personnel Classification at MCCC, the composite ratings were as follows: Support Staff/Maintenance (3.83), Faculty (3.27), and Administrator (3.81). Of the 46 standard PACE questions, the bottom ten mean scores have been identified as areas in need of improvement at Monroe County Community College. Those areas included the extent to which:

- There is a positive relationship between faculty/ staff/ administration (2.25)
- Open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution (2.68)
- I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution (2.74)
- I am encouraged to participate in resource allocation decision-making at the college (2.74)
- Decisions are made at the appropriate levels at this institution (2.84)
- Information is shared with this institution (2.85)
- A spirit of cooperation exists at this institution (2.88)
- I am encouraged to participate in decisions other than resource allocation at the college (2.88)
- Institutional teams use problem-solving techniques (2.95)
- The institution is appropriately organized (2.98)
The major areas for improvement noted in the PACE survey were the currently relationship between constituent groups at the College, participation in decision-making, and the communication at the College.

**Employee Winter Survey 2010.** Employees at Monroe County Community College were also asked to participate in a survey to assess the employees' perceptions of their role at the College and their expectation of communication at the College. The employee survey has been administered three times – 2007, 2008, and 2010 – which allows the College to develop trend information on how the institutional climate is changing. In the Winter 2010 survey, 137 employees participated – faculty (29 percent), staff (45 percent), maintenance (10 percent), and administration (16 percent). Employees were asked to rate a series of statements using a five point scale, “5 = Strongly Agree,” “4 = Agree,” “3 = Neutral,” “2 = Disagree,” and “1 = Strongly Disagree.” Ratings for the statements were averaged and compared to the results of the 2007 and 2008 Employee Surveys.

The results of the Employee Survey help provide an understanding as to whether the current institutional climate has been one that has developed over time or whether it has been a recent occurrence. The key statements regarding the communication at the College were examined and the employees’ ratings of those indicators for the past four years include the following:

- **Efforts are made on a regular basis to obtain opinions and suggestions of employees.** In the 2010 Winter survey, 14 percent of the employees strongly disagreed with this statement, 22 percent disagreed, and 25 percent were neutral. Overall, more than one-third of the employees noted that their opinions and suggestions were not solicited on a regular basis. As a longitudinal indicator, disagreement with the statement has been increasing since 2007. In 2007, the overall rating was 3.2, in 2008 it dropped to 3.1 and by 2010; it received a rating of 3.0.

- **I am informed regarding the activities, programs, and operations of the college.** There has not been a shift in the overall ratings of this statement in the last four years – employees rated the statement between agree and strongly agree, or a 3.6 in 2007, 2008, and 2009. Only five percent strongly disagreed in 2010 and 12 percent disagreed.

- **There are opportunities available to me to express my opinions or suggestions to upper management.** One of the areas in which concern was noted by more than one-third of the employees in 2010 was the opportunities available to employees to express their opinions or suggestions to the administration. Nineteen percent strongly disagreed, 15 percent disagreed, and 25 percent rated it neutrally – neither agreeing nor disagreeing. Overall, the statement received an overall rating of 3.0 – or neutral. This statement was not included in the 2007 and 2008 surveys so no trend data is available.

- **Opinions and suggestions from employees are stymied due to fear and retaliation.** Fear and retaliation are very strong, negative words in an organizational setting, and can lead to a very negative working environment. In the 2010 Employee Survey, almost half of the employees surveyed agreed that “opinions and suggestions from employees are stymied due to fear and retaliation” and 28 percent rated the statement as neutral – they neither agreed nor disagreed. Overall, this statement received a 3.4 on a five point agreement scale and should indicate a major institutional climate problem for Monroe County Community College. This statement was not included on the 2007 and 2008 surveys so no longitudinal data was not available.

- **Information Received.** The employees in the 2010 Winter survey were also asked to rate their believability of the information they receive from the College. Fortunately, 12 percent of the employees noted they always believe it and 46 percent stated they usually believe it. Unfortunately, only 29 percent of the employees stated they only believe the information they receive half of the time, five percent cannot believe it, and seven percent never believe. These ratings indicate that there is skepticism of the information received from the College by more than one-third of the employees.
Beginning The Shared Governance Conversation

Shared governance, improved institutional climate, successful communication, and effective decision-making all rely on two things – trust and respect. Constituent groups at Monroe County Community College have to trust leadership, and all groups have to know they are respected for the jobs they are doing. But, it appears that trust and respect have eroded at the College, replaced instead by mistrust. One employee sums up the current institutional climate in a survey comment:

“The problem is that this climate of mistrust has built up over such a long period of time that it will take a corresponding period of time to build it up, if everyone is interested in doing that. I do not think that everyone is. Even now, I have the feeling that this effort of yours (CLARUS) was paid for by the school merely to maintain accreditation. If accreditation were not an issue, this would not have happened.”

So to begin the conversations about how to best implement a shared governance structure that will work and to improve internal communications, the Institutional Governance Committee, comprised of representatives from all constituent groups, needs to develop a common language for shared governance and really define the parameters of shared governance for Monroe County Community College. Richard Alfred, in a policy paper entitled Shared Governance In Community Colleges (1998), notes the importance of developing a clear definition of shared governance and how it fits into the College’s mission. He recommends that for shared governance to be implemented, the College must outline specific areas of action so that each constituent group is aware of the scope of its responsibility and authority. The questions Alfred developed for beginning the conversation about shared governance include:

1. What is shared governance? Is it shared responsibility? Shared authority? Shared power? Total involvement in decisions? A place for all groups at the bargaining table?
2. What is the difference between concepts such as “responsibility,” “authority,” “power,” “accountability,” and “involvement in decision-making” in shared governance?
3. What groups and individuals are responsible and accountable for what decisions in shared governance?
4. What roles do different groups – the board of trustees, faculty, administration, classified staff, and students – play in shared governance?
5. Who really needs to be involved in decisions? Why?
6. What qualifies an individual to participate in decision-making?
7. What instructional issues should and should not be addressed through shared governance?
8. What kinds of organizational structures, leadership, and management are necessary in community colleges to effectively implement shared governance?
9. What new channels, modes, and styles of communication are needed to maintain a sense of involvement in shared governance?
10. What approaches to decision-making make sense for a community college in an increasingly decentralized, collaborative, technological environment?
11. Are the results of decisions made under shared governance better? Do colleges perform better? Do student outcomes improve?

12. Are the costs of decisions made under shared governance justifiable?

To begin the development of a shared governance model for Monroe County Community College, the Institutional Governance Committee should come to a written consensus on the questions asked above to lay the foundational underpinnings for development of the shared governance model.
Planning The Audit

The first task in the Shared Governance and Internal Communication Audit was to meet with the College’s Institutional Governance Committee to develop a work plan and timeline for the project. A half-day planning session was held with the executive membership of the College’s Institutional Governance Committee on March 28, 2011 at Monroe County Community College. The agenda for the meeting follows:

I. Overview Of Project

   a. Dr. Swanson reviewed the project outline with the Committee.

      Key issues discussed in the project outline were the development and administration of the institutional climate survey, the scheduling of the focus sessions with the College community, and the presentation of results to the Institutional Governance Committee and the College community.

   b. The committee members expressed their expected outcomes from the project and any background information relevant.

      Committee members provided information on the previous research on institutional climate – PACE and the Employee Survey – as well as the results of the HLC accreditation visit and focused review. The timeline for the response for the HLC was also discussed. Committee members also noted the importance of transparency for this project.

   c. Discussion of any perceived obstacles to the project outcomes

      The Committee wanted to ensure that there was complete participation in the process by all employees, and that employees felt free to be as open and honest as possible in both the focus sessions and the online survey. The Committee also wanted to develop a schedule of focus sessions to enable all employee groups to participate – for example late evening sessions would be needed to meet with evening maintenance workers. In addition, thoughtful consideration was given to schedule employee groups so that no supervisors would be present in the focus sessions so that employees would feel free to discuss issues.

   d. Scheduling of focus sessions

      The goal for the focus sessions was to determine the attitudes and perceptions of the constituent groups about shared governance and internal communication at Monroe County Community College. The focus sessions were scheduled for May 4 and 5, 2011. Employees were divided into common groups to interview based on job classification for the focus sessions. It was important to make sure that the focus sessions were conducted prior to the end of the Spring semester to assure maximum participation.

II. Review Of Proposed Online Survey

   a. A draft of an institutional climate survey, based on the instrument developed by Ramo, was presented for review and discussion by the Institutional Governance Committee. After reviewing the initial instrument, the decision was made to utilize an agreement scale to measure the College’s agreement or disagreement with the institutional climate indicators. A draft of the online survey would be delivered to the Institutional Governance Committee prior to administration for review.

   b. Survey administration issues and concerns
i. Communication about the survey and participation
   E-mail was determined to be the most effective method of communicating the availability of the online survey. CLARUS Corporation provided a draft of an e-mail for the College to utilize in explaining the scope of the survey.

ii. Methodology for conducting survey
   The survey developed would be available online for completion. The survey would be open for two weeks, from May 2 to May 16, 2011. A link in the e-mail invitation would allow access to the online survey. The survey was housed at CLARUS Corporation and the identity of the individuals completing the survey would be protected. No individual e-mails nor URL information would be collected for the responses and confidentially of respondents would be assured.

iii. Communicating the results of the survey
   After the analysis of the online survey and summary of the focus sessions, CLARUS Corporation will develop a PowerPoint presentation to present the results of the information gathering and recommendations to the Institutional Governance Committee. After the presentation, a written report will be developed to the Committee expanding on the issues in the presentation. After the institutional Governance Committee has an opportunity to digest the information and develop a plan for shared governance, a college-wide presentation will be done reporting on the findings and the resulting Committee recommendations for implementation of shared governance at the College.

III. Next Steps
   a. Timeline for Project
      The tentative timeline created for the audit was:
      March 29 to April 15, 2011   Development and review of the online survey
      April 15 to April 30, 2011   Programming for the online survey and testing
                                    Scheduling of the focus sessions
      May 2 to 16, 2011           Online survey open
      May 4 to 5, 2011            Focus Sessions
      July 2011                   Presentation of findings (delayed to August given summer vacation schedule)
      August 2011                 Delivery of written report
      October 2011                Presentation to all-campus
Institutional Climate Assessment
Assessment Components

A key component of the Shared Governance and Communication Audit was data gathering – principally to allow constituents at the College the ability to offer opinions and information in a non-threatening environment. A blind online institutional climate survey and mandatory-attendance focus sessions for employees with the Consultant were the two primary ways of gathering information from College constituents about the current state of shared governance and internal communication at the College. The purpose of the focus sessions was to allow constituent groups to explain their perceptions of shared governance and internal communication at the College and to provide recommendations and suggestions for improvements. The results of the focus sessions provide the “perceptions” of the issues that must be addressed in the recommendations. The purpose of the institutional climate survey was to quantify the current satisfaction with shared governance between constituent groups and to determine if there were significant differences noted between constituent groups in their assessment of climate and communication. The survey of institutional climate provides the baseline for measuring over the next few years to assess whether there have been improvements based on the actions taken by the College.

In the following sections, the key results of the focus sessions will be summarized by constituent group. Next, the tabular results from the institutional climate survey will be presented and key comments regarding each area examined in the survey will be provided. Where relevant, the results of the focus sessions will be combined with the results of the institutional climate survey to pinpoint areas of concern. While it was extremely important to interview constituent groups at the College to identify communication and shared governance strengths and weaknesses, it was also extremely important for those interviews and focus groups to focus on how to improve the communication and the governance structure. Recommendations for structural changes and issues that need to be addressed will be discussed in each section of the institutional climate survey.
Focus Sessions

Although the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) did grant Monroe County Community College the maximum accredited status for the next 10 years, the College is subject to a focus visit in 2012-2013 and communication and shared governance are at the heart of that visit. The HLC expects from Monroe County Community College a plan that will address ways to improve communication and shared governance at the College. Given the importance of this focus visit in 2012-2013, mandatory participation was required of the employees at the College in the focus sessions. In an effort to make it possible for all constituent groups to attend, groups were held from 7am to 11pm over two days. Multiple sessions were held for groups like faculty who may have had varied schedules due to classroom commitments. Groups were even held late into the evening with maintenance staff that does not typically arrive at work until after 10pm. Every effort was made to provide an opportunity for constituent groups to meet with the Consultant and provide input. In developing the groups, it was important not to allow employees to participate in groups with direct supervisory personnel, so many of the groups were developed by employment status. For example, directors were included in the same group with other directors, but their direct reports would not participate in the same group.

Administration

The Consultant met with 21 groups ranging in size from two people to more than 50 people, interacting with a total of 167 employees of the College, as well as members of the Board of Trustees. The focus sessions were conducted on campus at Monroe County Community College on May 4 and 5, 2011. A copy of the posted schedule is presented in Appendix A.

A focus session guide was developed to assist the Consultant in guiding the conversation and discussion in each group (see Appendix B). First, the Consultant introduced the purpose of the focus sessions. The Consultant noted that her task was to conduct an audit of internal and external communication for the College and to understand what is working in communication and the potential improvements needed, if any. However, the Consultant did acknowledge to each group her role was limited in actual implementation of improved communication and her commitment to the College was:

- **Do no harm!** When dealing with internal communications, it is extremely important to objectively listen to the issues and perceptions of the various constituent groups and not to take sides with any one group, and to not discuss one group with another.

- **I cannot fix anyone or change anyone!** Jokingly, the Consultant shared that she had not been able to change her spouse in 27 years of marriage, and she seriously doubted that she could change anyone at Monroe County Community College, nor could she remove anyone from the organization. She could, however, try to make structural recommendations that may foster change.

- **I can provide recommendations – I cannot make the organization change!** The Consultant reminded each of the groups that she cannot make the organization change – only the organization itself can follow through and in a collaborative effort begin to do things differently. All groups from the Board of Trustees to the part-time staff have to work together to see significant improvement in communication.

After introducing the project to each group, the Consultant provided a definition of internal communication for the groups to be used for the discussion. The definition provided was:

*Internal communication is a generic expression for all communication (formal and informal) that a college undertakes with its stakeholders – those people with whom it has a relationship that requires support, principally employees and students. The main purpose of internal*
communication is to inform employees and/or members of the direction and performance of the College (or team) to which they belong.

The Consultant went on to describe three types of information a College has to deal with: mission critical information, job critical information, and organizational information. The definitions provided for those three classes of information are as follows:

**Mission Critical Information:** Defined as strategic, mission altering items which need to be communicated – example: budget reduction of 20 percent for the next budget year, a new legislative law impacting enrollment, etc.

**Job Critical Information:** Defined as time-sensitive information that is imperative to an employee performing their job at the College – example: full-time faculty position not being replaced and need for adding adjuncts to cover promised class schedule

**Organizational Information:** Defined as information that is good to know but not needed – example: Wellness class being offered for three weeks on campus and employees invited to attend, an ESL open house, or an event in the theatre.

Using these three types of information, the Consultant then asked the constituent groups to provide recent examples (in the last year) of good or excellent communication at Monroe County Community College for mission critical information, job critical information, and organizational information. After these areas were exhausted, the constituent groups were asked to provide poor examples of communication at the College for mission critical information, job critical information, and organizational information. Next, the formal and informal channels of communication were discussed and the constituent groups were asked to evaluate from which of these channels they get mission critical information, job specific information, and organizational information. As the participants discussed what channels were being used, they were also asked to evaluate whether the channel was an effective communication channel for the three types of information (mission critical, job specific, and organizational), and if not, what formal channels would be more efficient for obtaining the three types of information. Finally, the constituent groups were asked if there were any other issues regarding internal communication that would be beneficial for the Consultant to understand about Monroe County Community College for the audit.

**Summary Of Results**

The following is a summary of the issues discussed in the focus sessions with key groups at Monroe County Community College. These results will be referenced in the assessment of the online survey results and in the recommendations as well.

**Faculty (Full-Time)**

When faculty were asked to share an example of good communication of mission critical information, the fact that a shared governance audit was being conducted and the Consultant was on-site was viewed as excellent communication of mission critical information. However, no other examples were provided by faculty of mission critical information that was communicated well.

Faculty voiced concerns that their input is not being taken seriously. Hiring committees were given as an example. They noted their input on the committees is not taken seriously. And they are concerned that the rules for hiring are being selectively enforced. Faculty noted that for the most mundane positions, for example for a part-time registration clerk, all hoops have to be jumped through, and they have to provide justification, and after recommending a candidate, the person may or not be hired. After
the recommendation is made, the committee members receive no feedback as to what happened. But when a VP is needed, the position is filled over the weekend – no committee, no posting, etc.

Faculty also noted that a feedback loop is needed for committees. Committees work and make recommendations – the recommendations are pushed up to the dean or administration but then nothing is ever heard back on the issue or the recommendations. For example, a committee worked diligently on changing the class schedule from five minutes between classes to 10 minutes and after the recommendation, nothing happened. Again, no timely feedback was provided – or basically no feedback. Another example provided was the new classroom building. There are major impacts on who will staff it, but the campus development committee has not even been involved, not even to determine whether to build a new building or not. Another example is when the Board of Trustees raised tuition $5 at a board meeting after students had paid and registered and there was not any communication to campus prior to the Board decision.

There is an impression that if the issue is really important, then the administration really does not want input from faculty. Many times information is simply shared and no real discussion occurs about any issues at the College. Because there has not been any systematic way of collecting input and providing feedback at the College, the faculty has lost the willingness to discuss and participate. Misrepresentation of items discussed leads to people not discussing anything.

Faculty does not believe that there are any real ways to communicate at the College – their only venues for discussion and input are a faculty union and a staff union. Faculty does not have a real academic forum like an Academic Senate, an Academic Council, or a Faculty Association. Even though the Academic Vice-President does have a forum four times a year with academic members, they really do not get a chance for discussion and input.

When asked about the use of e-mail for receiving information, the faculty noted they get a ton of e-mails (after the fact) which they do not even open anymore. At this point, nothing from Joe is really paid attention to – it is perceived as college propaganda. Some of the employees do not like all of Joe’s e-mails, but others read them and they read the committee minutes as well. The College tends to rely heavily on e-mail to communicate, but about half of the group noted they do not even open their e-mails.

The faculty agrees that the committee structure is not working – it has eroded. Several things can result from a committee: (1) if the answer from the committee is ok and what administration wants, then the committee did it, (2) decisions that have already been made tend to go back to the committees for “input” (read rubber stamp), (3) real decisions and real discussion occur and the committee puts forth recommendations and there is no feedback, or (4) no agenda is posted and no one knows what is coming up. All agreed that the committee structure and decision-making needs to be a priority in developing effective communication. The good news is that all minutes from the committees are posted to the I drive and are accessible by the college community. But since all committees report to the VP’s, there is not another mechanism for review.

There is a perception that the effectiveness of the committee is based on the chair. It was recommended that the chairs could use training in how to run a meeting and bring a group to consensus. The minutes are not put out immediately and people rely on the minutes to get information. To speak at a committee meeting, employees have to sign in as a guest. And when someone speaks out they are attributed as being confrontational. The College has to understand that disagreement in a collegial environment is healthy and not confrontational. Faculty noted that support staff does not want to go to the meetings – if they bring in ideas they are shut down and not listened to.

Overall, faculty feel cut off and isolated from other staff at the College and faculty wants respect from the administration and the Board of Trustees for what they contribute to the organization. Faculty are
concerned that bullying is in effect from the administration and the Board, and there has become a “them” versus “us” attitude at the College. The majority of the faculty agreed that Monroe County Community College was really a good school: it used to focus on teaching, now the attitude is that it does not care about students and outcomes – only $, no concern about faculty, and trust has eroded between faculty and the administration and the Board.

**Faculty Union**

New faculty leadership would like to be proactive and solve faculty issues prior to grievances but wonder how much information is being held back because it may be a negotiation issue. The faculty leadership understands the budget issues but when the administration says “we are poor” and then faculty sees expenditures that are not explained, it causes problems. Simply saying “we don’t have any money” leaves doubts. When employees see the administration and the Board willing to spend money to maintain the physical plant but not to support the human capital, there is a concern about the value of people in the organization. That is exacerbated when faculty hear the Board say faculty is underworked and overpaid – this causes distrust and lack of respect. The new faculty leadership believes that TRUST HAS TO BE BUILT ON BOTH SIDES.

The Faculty Union leadership wants to establish trust with the administration so they know when issues come up that they will be heard and have input. The leadership is concerned that every issue has been a negotiation – a fight – and they have no avenue for discussion other than negotiation. One recommendation for improving the communication about academic issues is to develop a Faculty Senate or an Academic Council. There is a fear that the recommendations from the Shared Governance Audit will be sanitized and changed by the administration.

**Administrative**

When asked for good examples of when mission critical information has been shared well at the College, administrators pointed to the HLC results – the President and VP’s provided information about results and employees were able to ask questions. The strategic planning process was also mentioned as a good example of sharing mission critical information – there was a lot of openness but now that it is done, it is dead and on the shelf.

Administrators, especially those who attend the Administrative Council believe they are being given mission critical information. But with respect to job critical information, maybe we are told, maybe we are not told, and maybe we have to go find the information. For example, the College decided to cut the number of catalogs that were to be printed but no one in student services was told. Managers noted that support staff may get information at the monthly meeting that managers are not even aware of – support staff may know things before managers and managers cannot respond to it since the information has not been shared with them yet.

When asked about how well mission critical information is shared at the College, administrators noted that the frustration everyone shares on campus is not getting mission critical information. The administrators noted that historically people were asked to share their thoughts and have discussions and the impression is now that is not the case – they felt like they used to have participation and buy in to decisions. A major concern is that in Administrative Council there is not real discussion. With 24 people giving reports, there is not really any input or discussion on topics. The Administrative Council may simply be too large to function as anything other than a reporting body. Administrative Council is not really a true open dialog but more of an information session. At the manager level, it is easy to talk and make decisions and get things done (the job critical) but not at the Administrative Council. Big things – like Middle College – are not discussed – someone decides and then it happens with no reasons given for what we are doing. But for little things – like badges – it is discussed to death and spends forever in committee.
Administrators believed that mission critical information, information really important, should be shared at Administrative Council but they noted that sometimes you just magically find out about something, badges for example. Administrative Council was described as an “oral kiosk” – a place to announce the new stuff at the College. Concern was expressed that no one in Administrative Council will question anything being reported. There appears to be a misunderstanding of negative versus critical – asking questions and gaining other opinions is not negative, but it is critical to gaining information and examining all options.

Administrative personnel also agreed that there is a need for agendas to be posted prior to meetings – no one knows what is to be discussed or if they should be there for the discussion. And there is an issue of the timeliness of information – minutes may not be posted in a timely manner for a committee meeting. Everyone learns a lot from the minutes.

Unfortunately, the water cooler is major communication tool at the College – people hear things from other people at the College – correct or incorrect. For example, the support staff went to a meeting and information about a new building was shared and the managers did not know anything about it. People should only share information when it is correct and factual.

**Support Staff**

Support staff was asked if they could share a good or poor example when the College shared mission critical information, and the wage freeze was immediately mentioned as a poor example of sharing mission critical information. Prior to any official communication about a wage freeze, rumors about a wage freeze had already started to be discussed with peers and bosses. All support staff were brought together with the President and VP’s and support staff were told they had a voice – they could vote yes or no. Blank sheets of paper were handed out for a yes or no vote. Staff felt it was very intimidating – they were told it was a one-time shot to vote and if staff were not present they did not have a voice. Staff felt that there was no true “communication” about pay freezes and they were used as leverage against faculty.

Although there is a monthly meeting with the President and staff, the staff believes there is not an opportunity for questions or dialog in those meetings. They just receive information, rather than discuss things and ask questions.

The Support Staff Leadership Group used to meet at least twice a year – they are trying to bring the group back to life now. There used to be no real goal for the support staff organization – just a pot luck and a Christmas dinner. The last two years were difficult – it got really dark when the leader of the support staff tried to support unionizing. The group turned into a place for conflict and complaining sessions. Monthly meetings are allowed for support staff group and an agenda is required – they have to have a planned meeting schedule. Overall, the support staff wants the groups to stop doing a “bitch session” in the support staff meeting and be positive.

When the Support Staff were asked how they identified mission critical and job critical information, they tend to look to see who sends it to them and that is how they decide the importance. Examining the effectiveness of the communication at the College, the open forums were noted as the best information source they have. But all agreed that the multiple communications – e-mail overload – are too much and generally not useful or important. Really important information, like the Board and Administration decision to change tuition, caused a major implementation issue. An implementation team was needed and the College really did not have an implementation plan and staff got dumped on to get it done – this happens a lot at the College. There is the appearance of shared governance at the College but support staff have no real input into anything. And when they ask why, they are told “because I said so – don’t worry about it.”
Staff does not have a union. In the recent budget issues, staff has been reminded at every meeting they have not had layoffs …but staff believe that scare tactics are being used by the administration. Support staff is constantly being told “how lucky you are to have a job and how fortunate you are employed.” People are glad they have a job – but are tired of having it shoved in their faces – everyone knows it is bad. Morale is low among staff and some noted they are afraid of retaliation. Some support staff are scared of their supervisors – if they voice opinions they get “shot down” or “yelled at.” So they simply stay quiet. In addition, support staff feels used and do not believe they have the respect of the organization. Staff notes it is very difficult to move up the ladder in the organization. Support staff also noted that there is a need for more training for supervisors.

Staff is questioning the issue that the budget is a major problem. All excuses provided by administration for no raises stem from the budget. Staff are asking administration how they can continue to tell staff there is no money for raises and but the College continues to spend money. During the budget process, support staff were called into their bosses’ offices and asked what can we do to support the system and how do we do it. Staff tried to find ways to help the financial situation of the College. The support staff came up with ideas and went to the VP’s with ideas to save money and all they got was no. Support staff wants to bring unity and be supportive of the College – but how can they when they see things like trees being planted. They are asking how can the College afford new trees, and it was not communicated that someone else paid for the trees - someone told someone else and the rumors fly.

**Adjunct Faculty**

Adjunct faculty noted that the majority of communication is e-mail, there is almost no communication in person with adjunct faculty, and they do not get good information from the College. Adjuncts report they do not have a mailbox in the division building – and it can be weeks before they see a central mailing. A main source of information for the adjunct faculty is the department secretary and other adjuncts. When adjuncts are included in events timing may be off – an e-mail is sent out at 9:50am on the same day as the 11am event at the College to which they were invited. A list of who to contact at the College is needed for the adjuncts. The faculty handbook is not printed and adjuncts do not have access to the I drive – they are told to go to the I drive and download the handbook but they cannot get to the I drive – just post it as a pdf.

Adjuncts are never invited to faculty or division meetings and there is no orientation or training for adjuncts. The perception among the adjuncts is that it takes a long time to make decisions – they hear things are being talked about and then hear nothing. Adjuncts may not get policy or procedure updates. Issues are not being discussed with adjuncts – they need to know what is up on campus.

Adjuncts feel that the Administration may not really know or understand what faculty is dealing with in the off hours. For example, a student is causing trouble in class and the teacher is afraid of the student and does not know the procedures for handling the student. One adjunct suggested bringing all adjuncts in on a Saturday prior to class start in Fall and telling them everything they need to know and pay them.

**Maintenance**

Maintenance personnel are the happiest at the College. They note that their boss has open conversations and gives reasons when disagreeing with them – he admits he may not know everything and his folks are the experts. In the maintenance department, when the boss asks for a better answer, he really wants input from personnel. In addition, the maintenance personnel believe their boss does a good job of keeping them informed of the things they need to know. When the boss sits down with his personnel, he lets it be known what is expected of them, they feel valued, and they think the boss understands their concerns and issues. The maintenance boss has really happy people – he is open to conversations, gives feedback and reasons why. The maintenance personnel are getting good info – and there is mutual
respect between the supervisor and the employees. The maintenance personnel are happy to be at the College.

Conversely, the maintenance staff believes that when the College asks for input, it is seen as just lip service – the College does not really want any input from the maintenance personnel. The maintenance personnel view the College as a communication black hole – they are told nothing about the reasons why some things happen. There is no feedback from the College about issues happening at the College. The maintenance staff does not believe things are out in the open – the College says the budget is $1 million short and they want to know why. The e-mail sent by the College is really vague – they just give them enough information to say they tell you it but not a lot of information.

Maintenance is most likely to read their direct supervisor’s e-mails – but will not read all the College e-mail. They try to look at the e-mail from home since they do not have access to a computer easily during their shift but there is simply too much e-mail to sort through.

Things have gotten a lot better since their new manager has been there. The old manager in maintenance constantly kept people afraid of losing their jobs and talked down to them. They were leery about bringing something forward because if someone screwed up, they could be fired or assigned a job that was unpleasant. Staff noted, “Shame on the administration for keeping the other manager for so long.” With the old manager it was my way or the highway and people did not seek or take input.

Now when their new manager talks to them – asks their opinions – and says he does not know it all. He talks to them but listens as well and takes input. Their current manager is smart enough to know he does not know everything. He realizes that people have different skills and he uses people to their advantage. He tells them they are doing well and shows them thanks for a job well done. Workers want respect from peers and supervisors and maintenance employees get that – even the ones who work late at night.
Institutional Climate Survey

Methodology

**Questionnaire Design.** The first step in measuring institutional climate was to conduct a survey of employees about shared governance at Monroe County Community College. The survey instrument developed was based on the instrument developed by Ramo, which identified seven key indicators of the state of shared governance at institutions of higher education:

- Climate for Governance
- Institutional Communication
- Board’s Role
- President’s Role
- Faculty’s Role
- Joint Decision-making
- Assessing Structural Arrangements for Governance

Constituents were asked to rate their agreement with a series of statements for each of the seven key indicators of shared governance noted above using an online survey. The statements were expanded for each area to not only focus on faculty, but staff and administration as well. A paper copy of the survey is presented in Appendix C.

It was the responsibility of CLARUS Corporation to write and sequence the questions in such a way that any respondent bias was minimized and the questions were technically correct. The final survey was pretested to ensure that question wording and sequencing were structured as needed. The questionnaire consisted of a few open-ended questions and agreement scaling. The order of the statements appearing in the rating scales was randomized in the survey to reduce order bias.

**Administration.** Online surveys were the primary method of data collection for the shared governance survey. E-mail invitations were sent by Monroe County Community College to all employees, providing them with the goal of the survey and a link for survey completion. (For a copy of the e-mail invitation, see Appendix D.) E-mail invitations were sent to 570 employees of Monroe County Community College – 176 full-time employees (31 percent), 38 part-time support staff (seven percent), and 356 adjunct faculty (62 percent) – on May 2, 2011. The e-mail introduced the purpose of the survey, encouraged them to participate, and noted the survey would remain open from May 2 to May 16, 2011.

The majority of the surveys were completed within the first 48 hours the survey was open. A total of 178 employees completed the survey during the two weeks, for an overall response rate of 31 percent. But examining the self-reported employee classifications, it appears there were a majority of full-time and part-time employees who responded and few adjuncts. Eighty-one percent of the survey respondents self-reported an employee classification: administration (12 percent), faculty – adjunct (eight percent), faculty – full-time (20 percent), and staff/ maintenance (41 percent). Nineteen percent did not self-report an employee classification. Given the low percentage of the adjunct faculty that responded to the survey, the true participation rated equaled 83 percent (178 respondents out of 214 full-time and part-time employees) as seen in Exhibit 1.
Exhibit 1. Employment Status And Length Of Employment At Monroe County Community College By MCCC Constituents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
<th>No Classification Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of response</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length Of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 years</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years or more</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to protect the confidentiality of the individuals responding to the survey, only two demographic questions were asked – the respondents were asked to self-report their primary employment classification and to indicate whether they had been at the College less than 15 years or 15 years or longer. The number of respondents by employment status and the number of years employed for those groups are presented in Exhibit 1.

Examining the length of employment for the constituent groups at Monroe County Community College, seventy-one percent of the administration have been at the College for less than 15 years, and 29 percent have been employed for 15 years or more. Adjunct faculty have been at the College the least amount of time. Eighty-six percent of the adjunct faculty have been at the College less than 15 years and only 14 percent have taught at the College for 15 years or more. Conversely, the full-time faculty at Monroe County Community College have the longest tenure at the College – 42 percent have taught at the College for less than 15 years but 56 percent of the full-time faculty have taught there for 15 years or more (three percent did not respond). Slightly more than one-third (37 percent) of the staff at Monroe Community College have worked at the College for 15 years or more, but 63 percent have worked at the College less than 15 years. For the employees who did not self-report an employee classification, they were also unlikely to reveal their length of service at the College. Nine percent of the non-classified employees noted they have been employed at the College for 15 years or more.

Data Analysis. After the surveys were completed and the online shared governance survey closed, verification of the data began. The data were examined to ensure that procedures were followed in data collection and checked for internal validity by cross-matching answers per respondent. The data were then coded for processing and analysis. SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was used to analyze the data and the data disks will be made available to Monroe County Community College for additional subset analyses.

Analysis of variance was used to test the mean ratings between the constituent groups on each statement in the survey of institutional climate. If p<.05, then a statistically significant difference existed between the responses of the constituent groups and is noted in the responses.
**Report Generation.** A complete set of tabular results by frequency and percentage for the shared governance survey results are provided in Appendix E. The tabular results should serve as reference materials and should be consulted before important conclusions are made. The results of the data are organized into a graphic and narrative report as well as detailed tabular results. This report focuses on the most meaningful findings of the research. The format used has the results summarized in a chart or graphic and pertinent comments below. Key issues noted in the focus sessions are also summarized for each indicator of institutional climate. Finally, a copy of the PowerPoint presentation which summarizes the content of this report is provided in Appendix F.

**Institutional Climate Survey Results**

The first indicator of shared governance is the assessment of Monroe County Community College's institutional climate, specifically whether there is collegiality, respect, tolerance, and civility practiced by all constituent groups at the College, and whether negotiations and communication are carried out in a good faith and an atmosphere of trust. For each statement, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement on a five point scale, with 5 = “Strongly Agree,” 4 = “Agree,” 3 = “Neither Agree Nor Disagree,” 2 = “Disagree,” and 1 = “Strongly Disagree.” The ratings were then averaged for each constituent group and analysis of variance was used to test for significant differences between the groups. In addition, for each set of statements, respondents were allowed to provide additional comments about the topic being rated. The specific comments are presented in Appendix E but are utilized as examples illustrating the issues being expressed by various groups in each set of statements that follow.

**Assessment Of Institutional Climate**

**Chart 1. Agreement With Assessment Of Institutional Climate For Shared Governance By Constituents At Monroe County Community College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
<th>P&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The trustees, the administration, the staff, and the faculty model</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collegiality, respect, tolerance, and civility towards other members of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the campus community and each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations and communications among college</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constituents are open and carried out in good faith and in an atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of trust.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

**Assessment Of Institutional Climate.** As seen in Chart 1, significant differences were noted between the constituent groups with respect to their rating of the institutional climate statements. For the statement “The trustees, the administration, the staff, and the faculty model collegiality, respect, tolerance, and civility towards other members of the campus community and each other,” adjunct faculty were most likely to agree (3.57), but the overall ratings for staff/maintenance (3.38) and administration (3.00) leaned toward a neutral rating of “Neither Agree Nor Disagree,” with full-time faculty in disagreement (2.26). The bottom line is that with the budget issues facing the campus over the last couple of years, there has not been “collegiality, respect, tolerance, and civility towards other members of the campus community and each other.”

A major division is also seen between the administration and the faculty and staff/maintenance with respect to negotiations and communications. When the constituent groups were asked to rate the statement, “Negotiations and communications among college constituents are open and carried out in good faith and in an atmosphere of trust,” full-time faculty (1.72) disagreed with the statement.
administration (2.74) and staff/maintenance (2.88) were more likely to agree that negotiations and communication are open and carried out in good faith, but even their disagreement only placed them in a neither agree nor disagree scale range.

Overall, trust, or a lack thereof, is a major issue at the campus. The various groups at the College have isolated themselves to a point that they believe everyone is against them. Every group in the focus sessions talked about “they” and “them” – basically anyone who was not in their group was “they” or “them.” When interviewing members of the Board of Trustees, the trustees expressed almost a siege mentality. From their perspective, the Board has tried very hard to uphold the tenants of their office – to make good long-term decisions for the College and maintain their fiscal responsibility to the taxpayers who elected them while trying to maintain jobs at the College. Not an easy task in today’s economic climate. But the Board members feel they have been villianized because of their decisions, which they truly believe have been in the best interest of the College and the community. However, the campus constituents, especially faculty, do not believe the Board of Trustees values the employees at the College because of some of the public statements about faculty made at board meetings, specifically being underworked and overpaid. As one respondent noted, “I believe that certain members of the Board of Trustees consider the people who work here (I include faculty, certain administrators, and support staff) as debits, not assets.” And constituent groups do not believe the Board has enough information and interaction with employee groups, other than the administration (which they do not trust either).

The best way to describe the situation the current administration at Monroe County Community College finds themselves in is the old “damned if they do and damned if they don’t” scenario. Administration understands that they are ultimately responsible for all decisions that have to be made but question whether other constituent groups understand that even in a “model” shared governance institution ultimate decision-making lies with the administration. Administration is frustrated by what they believe is a sincere effort to communicate, but then as one respondent noted “there are certain members of the faculty at this college who purport to want to communicate in an atmosphere of trust but fail to actively participate in open communication when presented with opportunities to do so.” Examples were provided of the same people at the College participating in committees and task forces, with employees who were most concerned about issues never working together to try and solve the problems facing the College – simply “expressing strong opinions and criticisms based on little or no information.” But one member of administration did note “I used to think communication was fairly decent on campus, but sadly I don’t feel that way anymore. My opinion has changed dramatically in just one year’s time. I have never paid much attention to the gossip train, but - again sadly - that’s where I’m learning more about decisions being made behind the scenes and how it will affect me. It’s about who you know that’s connected to those at the top that has an impact on decisions.” In the focus sessions, examples were provided by staff and faculty that they had learned about decisions being made at the College that ultimately will impact them and their work environment only after the community at large was informed.

Faculty believes they are not valued for the important job they perform at the College – educating students – and they are not valued for their opinions. One respondent noted, “There have been a few on the Board who have been overheard saying that they do not like the faculty – this does not inspire confidence.” And faculty are concerned that they are not being allowed to share in the governance process as one respondent noted, “The College administration needs to engage in dialog with the faculty, support staff, and maintenance groups. Presently communications are strictly ‘top down.’ The administration makes the major decisions and issues directives.” However, faculty also need to recognize that even in a shared governance model, administration is ultimately responsible for decisions that have to be made at the College, as well as the Board of Trustees.

When examining the results of the staff and maintenance employees at the College, the maintenance and staff have slightly differing opinions on respect and communication. During the employee focus sessions, the maintenance personnel believe that with their new leadership, their opinions and input is
being listened to in major decision-making and they are being respected. But as the maintenance members noted, this has been a recent occurrence with their new leadership who practices open communication, solicits their opinions and ideas, and follows up and shares when decisions are made. This is the one exception to mistrust among employee groups at the College. The maintenance staff believes that their leadership is firmly behind them and will do the best to represent the employees' concerns.

However, the remainder of the staff expressed opinions that are exactly opposite from those of the maintenance employees. One respondent noted “the employees are afraid to speak up for fear of being terminated” and another noted “the Cabinet tries to make the staff believe communication is open but in all reality if you speak your mind against something you can be blacklisted.” Staff believes they are not valued, not listened to, and marginalized by administration and the Trustees. As one respondent noted, “I feel the trustees believe we are overpaid and look down on us without knowing anything about us. They don’t want to hear anything is wrong. If you have a complaint about the president there is nobody to listen to you.” Even when there are attempts to provide information to staff and solicit their opinions, staff feel they are being marginalized from the start. One respondent gave this example. “One of the last meetings I attended had the manager saying to us that we didn’t understand that they see a broader vision from where they are positioned. I thought to myself if you already know we don’t understand why not share that vision and process to get there instead of sitting on high with your own agenda? That makes it hard for me to get on board because they don’t know how to share their vision.”

As one survey respondent noted, “The problem is that this climate of mistrust has built up over such a long period of time that it will take a corresponding period of time to build it up, if everyone is interested in doing that – I do not think that everyone is. Even now, I have the feeling that this effort of yours (CLARUS) was paid for by the school merely to maintain accreditation. If accreditation were not an issue, this would not have happened.” If this is truly the cynicism evident in the majority of the constituents at the College, it will take a very long time for trust and respect to return. But there is a bright spot. One lone staff member did report a positive spin on the institutional climate – “I believe the administration has students’ best interest in mind when making executive decisions. No system is perfect, there is always room for improvement with logistics, but good faith is at the forefront in my perspective. There will always be those whose personal agendas are not being satisfied, but that is not the premise of decisions being made for the good of the whole.” This is the attitude that all groups at the College have to move toward espousing.

Assessment Of Institutional Climate – Issues To Address

The major issue facing Monroe County Community College for both communication and shared governance is TRUST, or the lack thereof, at the organization. In every group discussion, constituent groups used the terminology “them” and “they” and “us.” Over the last few years, especially since economic conditions have been difficult, every constituent group at the College believes that they are neither respected nor valued. The Board of Trustees does not believe that the faculty respects either their position or them as individuals. The faculty believes the Board of Trustees do not respect and give credence to the jobs they do at the College. Staff notes they are constantly “talked down to” and not respected for their knowledge and opinions. The maintenance staff is actually the happiest at the College – they believe their voice is being heard because they trust their manager to carry forth their opinions and provide information relevant to them.

So how do we repair trust in the organization? The major issue is that it takes a very short time to erode trust and a very long time to build trust back into the organization. Dave Bowman, Human Resource Expert at TTG Consultants (http://www.ttgconsultants.com/articles/trustworkforce.html, proposes there are five ways for leaders to lose trust and four ways to rebuild trust. The fastest ways to lose trust will first be examined in relation to the perceptions of the constituent groups at Monroe County
Community College, and then the ways to rebuild trust will be examined with recommendations for actions.

The five ways to lose trust in an organization include: (1) to act and speak inconsistently, (2) seek personal rather than shared gain, (3) withhold information, (4) lie or tell half-truths, and (5) be close-minded. Inconsistency in perceived communication and action has been one of the major drivers of the loss of trust at the College. In the focus sessions, the staff consistently asked how the College could afford to build a new building but not pay any raises. The main message to the constituent groups has been that the College is facing major budget crises and to maintain employees’ jobs, cuts had to be made. But the constituent groups see the College spending money, large sums, and question why. From the perception of the constituent groups, the College is acting inconsistently.

Another driver for the loss of trust was the perception of withholding information from the constituent groups. Constituent groups believe that they are only told information after the fact, after decisions are made. When the communication channels shut down – both top-down and bottom-up – rumors start and real misinformation is communicated. When trust starts to break down, one of two things happen – either there is less communication or too much communication. When managers are challenged and trust starts to erode, one tendency for managers is to share less information to assure that they are providing correct information and not misinformation but this can backfire when employees believe all information is not forthcoming. The other reaction to eroding trust is for managers to share everything, whether important or not, to achieve transparency, but too much information has the same effect of too little – the perception is that key information is not really being shared, only the superfluous information.

Being close-minded and unwilling to consider others ideas and points of view will shatter communication and trust. At Monroe County Community College, there is a perception among staff that they simply cannot disagree with administration. They believe that there is an attitude that it is “my way or the highway” and while staff openly acknowledges no one has been fired, they are concerned that they will be denigrated in their positions and not treated well if they do disagree. In their perception, the environment will not allow for healthy disagreement.

So how can Monroe County Community College re-build the trust between constituent groups? Bowman suggests four ways for leaders to build trust in their organizations: (1) establish and maintain integrity, (2) communicate vision and values, (3) consider all employees as equal partners, and (4) focus on shared rather than personal goals. Each of these will be addressed in context of the issues facing Monroe County Community College with recommendations for action.

- **Establish And Maintain Integrity**

  Integrity begins at the top of the College – the Board of Trustees and the Administration – and moves down the organization. But all constituent groups at the College have to commit to rebuilding trust. The Administration has to commit publicly to open and honest communication and employees have to commit to stop utilizing the rumor mill for their preferred information sources.

  **Recommendation:** Establish trust work teams at the College comprised of members from all constituent groups to develop a trust pledge for all college employees to commit. The work teams will define trust at Monroe County Community College, they will develop tenets of trust for which all employees are responsible, and even develop a series of trust-building activities for the upcoming year for all employees.
• **Communicate Vision And Values**

Good communication in an organization is the way information and truth is disseminated. By clear communication of the College’s vision, the administration defines the path for the College and allows employees to understand how they can contribute to moving the College along that path. With the current economic challenges to the fiscal health of the College, and the major impacts that funding deficits will have on the College, it is recommended that to re-build trust the first attempts at very open communications be with the budget.

**Recommendation:** Every major initiative undertaken at the College should be carefully explained in the context of the mission and the strategic objectives of the College. And if the College cannot tie an initiative to mission and strategic objectives, it should not be undertaken. A quarterly written update should be developed on the status of the major College initiatives and sent to all college employees in an e-mail newsletter. In this newsletter, the mission and strategic objectives of the College should be revisited with employees.

**Recommendation:** Since the budget has become a major concern for all employees, it is recommended that quarterly budget reviews be provided to all college employees by the Vice-President of Administration – or a state of the College address with respect to the budget. In addition, when developing the budget, the College should institute open budget planning sessions in which any members of the College community can attend, ask questions, and make recommendations or suggestions. These sessions can be developed by departmental area at the College.

• **Consider All Employees As Equal Partners**

Trust is established when even the newest, lowest paid employee feels like they are a valued member of a team. It was of concern when new hires commented in the institutional climate survey that they were reconsidering whether they would stay at the College. A key to making employees feel as valued partners at the College is for them to interact with the management team. In addition, it is very important for the supervisors at the College to seek the opinions and ideas of the employees – especially for areas that employees have intimate knowledge and daily involvement. And the bottom line is that all constituent groups from members of the Board, to administration, to faculty, to staff/maintenance have to treat each other with genuine respect – all have an important job in ensuring the success of the College and each group needs to recognize those roles in the success.

**Recommendation:** Find ways for employees and managers to interact more informally and provide opportunities for employees in different departments to trade jobs or to shadow an employee in another part of the College. Create a formal program for job shadowing at the College. Job shadowing should occur between employees horizontally at the College as well as vertically. For example, a maintenance employee may shadow a staff member in financial aid and they would then reverse the job shadowing for another day. In addition, an administrator should shadow an employee in another department to understand various levels of the organization. When job shadowing, the primary focus for the shadowing should be for the employee to understand how another person’s job impacts “the students” at the College.

**Recommendation:** Using random selection, choose 10 employees each week to have lunch on a specific day of the week with a senior administrator until all employees have lunched with all the administrators at the College. The goal of the luncheon would be to allow the administrator to explain to the employees their areas of responsibility at the College and allow for questions about any current issues under their area of responsibility.
Focus On Shared, Rather Than Personal Goals

The heart and focus of the College should be on providing the best educational experience possible for students – a shared goal and the reason for the existence of the College. However, it was clear in the focus sessions that the focus has not been on the shared goal (the students) but rather the individuals at the College. Trust is re-built in an organization when everyone is pulling together to accomplish a shared vision and it appears the College has almost lost sight of that vision. And the essence of teamwork is the fact that the team members trust one another.

Recommendation: Supervisors in all functional areas should hold a focus session monthly to allow for employees in the area to suggest changes and improvements in the processes and operations of that area that would provide a positive impact on students. This is not a “complaint” session, but an honest review of what improvements could be made in the functional area to improve service or outcomes for students – for academic and non-academic areas. For improvements suggested that can be implemented within the department, a simple rule change, the change should be made immediately. For policy and procedure changes suggested that may have cross-functional impact, these recommendations should be sent to the appropriate working committees at the College for evaluation, and feedback should be given to the groups who forward the ideas. The resulting ideas which lead to implementation should be featured in a quarterly all-college communication.

Recommendation: The College should adopt a community project to support with time and energy each year – this may be a local food bank, supporting a community organization that works with the homeless, etc. Regardless of what organization is chosen as the project, employees from all constituent groups working side-by-side on a worthwhile project will foster teamwork and allow for employees across the organizational levels to have positive interaction.
Institutional Communication

Chart 2. Agreement With Assessment Of Institutional Communication In Shared Governance By Constituents At Monroe County Community College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
<th>P&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation by the administration with faculty leadership allows time and a mechanism for leadership to consult with their constituents before offering recommendations.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation by the administration with staff leadership allows time and a mechanism for leadership to consult with their constituents before offering recommendations.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty as a whole, as well as faculty representatives, has timely access to information necessary for faculty members to give input into governance processes.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff as a whole, as well as staff representatives, has timely access to information necessary for staff members to give input into governance processes.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

Institutional Communication. As seen in Chart 2, there are significant differences between the ratings of the constituent groups with respect to communication at Monroe County Community College. Full-time faculty disagree “Consultation by the administration with faculty leadership allows time and a mechanism for leadership to consult with their constituents before offering recommendations” by rating it a 2.22 on the 5 point agreement scale. Administration (3.41), adjunct faculty (3.38), and staff/maintenance (3.22) are slightly more likely to agree with the statement. Full-time faculty was also more likely to disagree with the statement, “The faculty as a whole, as well as faculty representatives, has timely access to information necessary for faculty members to give input into governance processes.” Full-time faculty only rated the statement a 2.17 and adjunct faculty rated the statement 2.91 on the five point agreement scale. Staff/maintenance were the most likely to agree that faculty had access to timely information (3.47), as did the administration (3.44).

Overall, full-time faculty was more likely to believe that communication with staff was worse than staff/maintenance rated. Full-time faculty rated the statement “Consultation by the administration with staff leadership allows time and a mechanism for leadership to consult with their constituents before offering recommendations” as a 2.22, but staff/maintenance neither agreed nor disagreed (3.04), as did adjunct faculty (3.00), and the administration (3.28) were the most likely to agree. With respect to the access to timely information, again full-time faculty was more likely to disagree than staff/maintenance with the statement “The staff as a whole, as well as staff representatives, has timely access to information necessary for staff members to give input into governance processes.” Full-time faculty disagreed (2.26), staff/maintenance were neutral (3.08), and the administration (3.20) and adjunct faculty were slightly more likely to agree (3.33).

Overall, the administration is slightly more likely to believe that they provide time and a mechanism for faculty and staff leadership to consult with their constituents and the faculty and staff, as a whole, has timely access to information necessary to give input into the governance process. Conversely, faculty does not agree they have the time or mechanism to consult with constituents nor access to timely information. Staff is slightly more likely to agree they have access to information and time for input. But the major issue when examining the ratings is that all of the scores are below “4” which denotes “agree.”
Putting this information into the scale content, the administration and staff/maintenance “neither agree nor disagree,” with their scores in the 3’s, and faculty “disagree.”

Good communication is essential for shared governance to function, not only well, but at all, and open and transparent communication helps build trust and provides the necessary information for the College to make good decisions. But when constituent groups believe that decisions are being made behind closed doors or in isolation, it causes distrust and cements the “us versus them” – “them” being any constituent group other than “us.” In the additional comments on institutional communication, one faculty made a fairly tongue in cheek comment that really does sum up the problem with communication at Monroe County Community College – “maybe we can be shown how that decision-making wheel works one more time – maybe not, the wheel is broken.” For those not familiar with the decision wheel concept, the graphic shown below illustrates this concept. First, the situation or problem is defined. Then alternatives or options are identified but to do this step, good information is needed to develop alternatives and options. Next, the risks and consequences are evaluated of the decision, or in other words, how the alternatives will impact the organization. After this analysis, an alternative is selected after is has been fully vetted at the College by multiple constituents. Finally a decision is implemented and the decision is evaluated after implementation.

But for the decision wheel to work well in an organization communication flow has to work well and the formal channels of communication must be trusted in the organization. There are several areas that Monroe County Community College must address in their communication processes in order to help build trust and provide the necessary information for the College to make good decisions.

The areas of concern in communication discussed in the focus sessions and in the other comments on institutional communication are summarized in the following:

- **Quantity versus quality of communication**
  
  An overwhelming majority of the constituent groups at the College expressed frustration with the quantity of communication received and concern about the quality of the communications. One respondent noted, “We receive a multitude of communication, but never receive any information until after the fact for important decisions that impact the College and its entire staff. I do think an effort has been made to improve communication, which is appreciated, but I
wish the information was more relevant than press releases and after-the-fact meeting minutes. I would really like to know what is happening. How can we be a part of enriching lives when half the time we don’t know what is happening until after the decisions are made? I like to be in the know of what is happening around campus and the College interaction within the community, but it seems as though all I receive is information about the next concert, when ticket sales are beginning, who the next who is, etc.” In the focus sessions this sentiment was echoed, with many of the constituent groups noting that while they did receive a large quantity of information, the information did not really address the important institutional issues. And many noted that to find out real information, they sought the committee minutes and read them – not the many e-mail notifications from the marketing director.

- **Decisions are already made and the information communicated is after the fact**

Across all the constituent groups, there was a consistent belief that decisions are made without any real discussion with constituent groups, and then when information is communicated to the groups, administration simply wants a “rubber stamp” of the decision. For example, one respondent noted “As discussed in a session with Dr. Swanson, the problem is that even if we have time to discuss something, many of us feel that the decision has already been made. The discussions are for making us feel like we have a part, when in reality we do not.” Another constituent commented “The committee structure has been marginalized by central administration. The only time they use committee recommendations is when they want a rubber stamp for what they already decided. Communication about instructional issues is just about non-existent and any suggestions to improve quality of instruction over quantity of student numbers are ignored.” In all of the constituent groups, there is a belief that information is provided after the fact and that true consultation about decision is not occurring. Another employee noted “Information is shared after the fact....and sometimes not at all. There is no input allowed by staff the majority of the time.” And yet another comment echoed the same concerns, “Things are agreed upon and we are told what has happened.”

In the focus sessions, the administration countered the employee claims that consultation was not occurring. The administration focuses on having the right people provide input into the decisions that will most impact them. But as one administrator noted, if everyone at the College is involved in every decision, whether it impacts them or not, nothing would ever get decided. The balance at Monroe County Community College is making sure the right people are involved in the right decisions, fully utilizing the committee structure, and then communicating the decision and rationale to the campus as a whole.

- **Consulting with appropriate individuals and constituent groups across the campus on decisions**

Constituent groups believe that key institutional priorities do not receive relevant input from key employees that will be directly impacted by a decision or who will have to implement the resulting decision. “Decisions are made about the direction of programs and the College as a whole with little input from relevant staff. Consultation with appropriate MCCC groups is often after the fact or is for show – meaning that formal processes are in place to satisfy these kinds of examinations or outside consultants, but it’s essentially a sham.” Another respondent noted, “The administration does not consult with other groups, they merely consult with each other.” In the focus sessions, the key example provided of this was a change in the tuition after students had registered and paid. One respondent noted, “Tuition was raised long after the schedule books were out for fall and many students had registered. If support staff had been asked what a good timeline for raising tuition would be, we would have said earlier. The ripple effect from decisions like this and the new class requirements is overwhelming to the offices that deal with students on a day-to-day basis.”
By not working with the personnel who will be directly impacted in a major decision or change, personnel feel that they have not done the best job possible for them to provide a smooth implementation of a decision. For example, one employee noted “Timelines for recommendations and implementation may be a bit short – attention to all departments and employees and students need consideration. In other words, if a policy is implemented, who will be affected and is there ample time to carry it out most efficiently? Also, is each department and employee aware of their role in the implementation of a policy/procedure?” Good communication enhances the implementation of the decision – poor communication hampers it.

- **Access to information and timeliness of information**

Access to information was also an area of concern among the constituent groups. Employees noted that information is not readily shared with the key people that may need the information. One employee noted, “Information is made available on a need to know basis. In nearly all instances it is declared that anyone other than the cabinet doesn’t need to know. Sometimes, even the cabinet is kept in the dark.” In the focus sessions, administration noted that in many cases the information in question is readily accessible in multiple formats, the constituent groups are simply not availing themselves of the information. The groups may have to go access the information on a shared College drive and they are not doing it – but rather they are saying the information is not being shared. Administration believes that every individual in the institution must take personal responsibility for seeking out the available information that is relevant to them.

With respect to the timeliness of information, it appears that timeliness is not the issue; it is the result of the recommendations that are made by the constituents at the campus. The constituents' belief is summed up by one of the respondents – “I feel that I think there is enough time, just not sure that some of the administration cares what the recommendations are that come out of these groups” – and another respondent noted “appropriate time and access to information is afforded in only some cases.”

- **Constituent groups need to make the effort to stay informed**

Across the board, the constituent groups believed that everyone at the College has to take personal responsibility for being informed. As one employee noted, “I think the VP of Instruction and the Deans have done a nice job in improving faculty consultation over the last few years regarding curriculum. I think we need to improve this with the staff, but this may be more of a function of direct staff supervision. As far as the faculty go, many of them seem to ignore meetings, e-mails, info on the web site and then say they were not informed.” Two issues have to be addressed when informing the constituent groups – having relevant information accessible and employees taking the initiative to keep informed.

- **Closure on decision-making needed – the feedback loop**

One of the major issues noted by the constituent groups was the lack of feedback on decisions that were made and the rationale for the decision. In the focus sessions, many of the employees had served on committees, worked very hard to arrive at solutions to problems, and forwarded thoughtful recommendations to administration. For many, no feedback was given on the recommendation and no feedback was given on the final decision. Several committee members noted that their committees worked very hard on a decision, only to have the recommendation turned down by the Administrative team. No feedback was provided to the committee as to why the recommendation they forwarded was overturned. After several times, the committee members disengage and adopt the attitude that their work and input does not matter, is not valuable, and they (the administration) will do what they want. By not having an appropriate feedback loop to those who are involved in problem-solving, the entire process breaks down. As one employee noted, “I will say I have noticed an effort by everyone towards better
communication. I do feel there are things we are not being told. I know not all information needs to be shared, but when large decisions are made, it would be nice to know more about the rationale and also how they came to their conclusion.”

Institutional Communication – Issues To Address

Monroe County Community College utilizes many formal communication methods but relies on e-mail communication. The key mission critical information will be reviewed and recommendations made for improvements.

- **E-Kiosk:** The E-Kiosk provides an update on people at Monroe County Community College. The update is employee-focused and provides information about the activities and positive happenings to employees at the College. The document is essentially an internal document that formalizes the “word-of-mouth” communication that occurs when one employee says to another, “Did you hear about X employee’s award?” This is a valuable communication in the organization.

- **Quarterly Update:** The quarterly update is from the office of the President to inform employees at the College of the mission critical information they need to know. The update started as an attempt to improve communications with College personnel about key issues facing the College. The documents provided to the Consultant were difficult to follow and hard to read so much text because they did not have visual clues to assist the reader in seeing what was included in the document. Apparently this document has been reformatted to improve the readability. This document is extremely important and a better format will assist the reader in finding the mission critical information.

- **All MCCC E-Mail User List:** The College has relied on the all MCCC E-mail User list to communicate with the College and in the pursuit of transparency, the College may have fallen into communication overload. In the focus sessions and survey comments, several employees across the College noted that if “an e-mail was from Joe” they generally just deleted it since so many all-college e-mails are sent by the public relations office. First, the College needs to determine what information needs to be sent to the all MCCC E-mail User list and what does not. The key question about sending all-college e-mails is whether the information is important enough to be sent out or whether it is information that should be posted and available. Mission critical information is that information about strategic college initiatives, budget, and information that will impact the College and its employees. A bake sale being held in the quad is generally not mission critical. Job critical information, that information employees need to perform their jobs, is generally communicated from supervisors and managers, and unless it is an all employee change, for example in their health care benefits, then the information would not be sent to all employees. The organizational information, the bake sales, theater performances, etc., is generally not sent as all-college e-mails but posted on shared College drives and updated daily. Some institutions provide scrolling banners on employees’ computers with activities for the week rather than sending all-college e-mails.

  Second, the College needs to determine how to identify to employees the all-college e-mails that contain mission critical information. Currently the employees do not know, even by the sender, whether it is mission critical information about the College. At some colleges, a subject line is communicated, possibly “Mission Critical,” which identifies the information as extremely important for the employee. In other organizations, if the sender is the College President, then the employees know that the information is critical. However, if the assistant to the President sends out information about bake sales under the President’s name, then the system breaks down. The College needs to identify a way to designate for employees mission critical information.
Third, the College needs to determine what employees can send all-college e-mails and what content can be sent using the all-college e-mail. Rather than send every e-mail to every employee, list-serves can be developed which will communicate the information needed to the employees without sending all information to every employee. If everything, important and trivial, is sent to everyone, information overload occurs and actually hampers communication. For example, the College sends copies of every press release to every employee using the all-college e-mail. This is resulting in information overload for the employees and the natural inclination for many is to simply hit delete when they see the e-mail in their inbox. The problem is that because of the volume of the information, something they may actually need to know may be deleted.

Finally, the College should develop rules for what information is to be pushed out (sent out) and what information is to be posted. Using the press releases as an example, it would be more sensible for releases to be posted to a page on the College’s web site that is easily accessible for employees and the public alike, rather than sending every release to every employee.

- **Campus Connections**: The Campus Connections celebrates the employees at the College and provides the dates to remember and events that are happening on campus. This is an excellent publication, but again it is not a mission critical publication.

- **External Communications**: The external marketing and communications materials for Monroe County Community College were reviewed by the Consultant. The materials reviewed are excellent and provide a solid visual brand and are consistent. The material are very well done, are mission centric, and maintain high visual consistency and are brand consistent. The College’s logo is used consistently which makes the materials highly recognizable. Overall, the College agreed that their external communications is much more successful than their internal communications.

- **Recommendation**: Develop a written document outlining a summary of the key issues discussed at the Administrative Council meetings for distribution to all-college employees. Employees were most concerned about receiving information about issues before decisions are made – and not receiving a press release about an issue as a fait accompli. A summary document should be prepared immediately after an Administrative Council meeting outlining the topics discussed or presented for information. This document should be utilized in all staff meetings and if employees have questions, they should be encouraged to ask for clarification or information about items at the staff meetings.

- **Recommendation**: The President should create a summary document outlining key issues discussed and actions taken at each Board of Trustees meeting, commenting on the impact of the issues under discussion and impact on the College, and send to all employees after the Board meetings. Reading minutes can be done, but having the President put the information in the context of the mission and strategic objectives for the College provides a level of information not currently available at the College.
The Board’s Role

Chart 3. Assessment Of The Board’s Role In Shared Governance By Constituents At Monroe County Community College

The Board’s Role. One of the most obvious conflicts between constituent groups at Monroe County Community College is between the Board of Trustees and the full-time faculty. Neither group believes they are receiving the respect and recognition deserved for the jobs they are doing. And it is evidenced in Chart 3 which presents the constituent groups’ agreement with the Board’s role in shared governance at Monroe County Community College. The first statement, “Members of the governing board have appropriate individual qualifications with regard to education and experience,” is one with which full-time faculty disagree. Full-time faculty provided a rating of 1.88 on the qualifications of the members of the governing board. Conversely, the administration (3.42) and the staff/maintenance (3.36) are more likely to agree that the Board members have the qualifications needed, as do adjunct faculty.

With respect to the qualifications of Board members, it should be noted that “lay boards” have been in the United States since 1642, when Harvard College’s Board of Overseers was installed. Throughout their history, governing boards have had volunteers called “lay” members who provide oversight of the institution’s activities, primarily composed of community members—members of the constituent groups the colleges are serving. In this case the board members are elected by their constituents and as members have oversight for setting strategic goals (long-range planning, budgeting and mission setting), supervising and evaluating the college president, reviewing the educational programs of the institution, ensuring management excellence by making sound financial decisions and sound physical plant decision-making, setting human resource goals, relating to campus and community members, and representing the institution to the public at large. Board members need to be advocates for the college and its constituents but are ultimately held responsible by the voting public. In recent history, since the 1950’s, board composition has moved to include more individuals with business acumen given the heightened concerns of managing the fiscal resources of colleges.

While full-time faculty did not agree that the Board members are qualified, the rating actually appears to be indicative of working relationships between the Board and the constituent groups. Overall, full-time faculty (3.83), staff/maintenance (3.68), and even administration (3.50) were likely to agree that “The Board is inappropriately involved in the day-to-day operations of the institution.” Only adjunct faculty was in disagreement with the statement (2.50). Across some members of the constituent groups, there is
concern that the Board members are too concerned with day-to-day operations which should be handled by management. One respondent to the survey noted, “Does inappropriately mean micromanaging?” Another survey respondent noted, “The Board should only be a policy making body, instead, they meddle in day-to-day operations. The President, unfortunately, allows this to happen.” And other individuals noted “some of the Board members are heavily involved in day-to-day operations at the College” and “The board is there to set policy, not to run the College. They decide what we do, not how to do it.” One employee did note that “additional Board participation with ACCT would help.”

Overall, the majority of the constituents agreed at some level, other than full-time faculty, that “The Board members inform themselves on governance issues by keeping up with the literature and participating in training opportunities and meetings of the ACCT (Association of Community College Trustees).” While full-time faculty were less likely to agree (2.78), administration (3.53), adjunct faculty (3.18), and staff/maintenance (3.25) are likely to agree that the Board members keep themselves professionally up-to-date.

Another area of major disagreement about the Board was “The Board respects and supports the faculty’s traditional role in institutional governance.” As expected and seen in many other ratings, the full-time faculty disagreed with this statement (1.79). Conversely, the administration (3.33), adjunct faculty (3.08), and staff/maintenance (2.97) were more likely to remain neutral or agree. Unfortunately, a faculty member summed up their perception of the relationship between the Board of Trustees and the constituent groups as “BOT = Faculty Bad, BOT = President Good, BOT = All other administrators tolerated, BOT = All employees are an expense – not assets.” With this perception of the negative view the Board has of the employees, it is not surprising that there are major conflicts in communication between the constituent groups at the College. An adjunct faculty member who is new to the College also has seen the divisive relationship between the faculty and the Board, and noted “I am newer to the College. I came because of the enthusiasm and respect for the senior faculty members. My enthusiasm has been dampened as I have seen my senior colleagues attacked with the flimsiest of evidence. Because I am new I am now concerned – no, frightened – of my job. There is little support for faculty in confronting difficult situations.” Another employee noted “The Board has never consulted the faculty on anything that I am aware of. Dialog between the Board and faculty might prove to be an interesting exercise.”

While on the one hand, the Board is accused of micromanaging the College and meddling in the day-to-day operations, then on the other hand the Board is accused of not informing themselves of the issues. Overall, full-time faculty (2.44) slightly disagreed with the statement, “The Board members inform themselves of faculty and staff budgeting issues in which the faculty and staff have an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.” But the administration (3.30), adjunct faculty (3.08), and staff/maintenance (3.01) were most likely to rate the statement as a neutral (neither agree nor disagree). Examining the comments made in the focus sessions and the other comments about the Board’s role in governance, there are constituents at the College that feel that the Board is not engaged enough in the operation of the College. One respondent noted, “The Board is clueless. They think they know what is going on but are informed only by the top administration. There is little input from faculty and the Board does not respect what faculty offers.” Another respondent noted, “I have no idea if the Board is aware of the true day-to-day operations that go on here or whether or not they keep up with the literature and training opportunities. I just know that in all the years I’ve worked here, I’ve never felt more like I’m being lied to. The Board of Trustees seems completely out of touch and the only time we see them is at special functions where they get to stand up and wave.” And yet another respondent noted “In budget matters, I feel the trustees’ rubber stamp whatever they are given without giving it full consideration.”

However, one respondent to the survey does believe that the Board of Trustees does have the best interests of the College in their actions. The respondent noted, “There is no doubt that the Board of Trustees has only the best interest of the College and its students in mind when making decisions about
the College. They strike an appropriate balance in their role by being informed and up-to-date on the operations of the College and their decisions are based on that knowledge. There is no inappropriate decision-making on the part of the Board. Their decisions are primarily based on recommendations of the College administration.”

A key to improving the relationship between the Board and the constituent groups is to make sure that all individuals know and understand the role of the other groups in governance and management and to foster positive dialog between the constituent groups. Many community colleges have staff members – faculty and staff – as ex officio members of the Board of Trustees. Other Boards include reports directly from staff and faculty at Board meetings to keep the issues of concern to staff and faculty in front of the Board.

The Board’s Role – Issues To Address

Most board members at community colleges today have business backgrounds and their experience with higher education comes from having been a student, often decades ago, potentially at the College they are now serving. The issue is that while the board members may be very astute in finance and business and even in specialty areas resulting from their own educational backgrounds, they may not be as astute in assessing curriculum, educational quality, faculty assessment, etc. It is extremely important for the College to provide educational opportunities to the Board to understand the educational constructs.

- **Recommendation:** Include an educational component quarterly at each Board meeting to enhance the continuing educational development for the entire Board. These educational components can be discussions led by the president or a faculty member about a topic of interest nationally. For example, the issue of retention is a major concern given funding models today. The President may share a few articles outlining the national retention agenda, followed by a discussion of the impact on the College, and then a faculty member discusses the specific issues facing the faculty in improving retention.

The Board of Trustees of Monroe County Community College does not feel respected by College employees, especially the faculty, nor does the faculty feel respected by the Trustees. It is extremely important to improve the dialog between the Board and the faculty as entities – without meaningful dialog, trust cannot be established.

- **Recommendation:** To improve dialog between the members of the Board of Trustees and faculty, each group needs to interact in their own environment. It is recommended that the members of the Board of Trustees shadow a faculty member for a day in each of the major divisions. This will provide the Trustees an opportunity to see what an average day is like for a faculty member and for the faculty members to personally interact with the Trustees on a professional level. In addition, given their areas of expertise, the Trustees should also guest lecture for a faculty member.

- **Recommendation:** Greater interaction needs to occur between the employees and the members of the Board of Trustees. It is recommended that members from the Faculty Association, the Staff Association, and the Student Governing Association, present a short five minute report to the Board of Trustees at each meeting, providing an overview of the key issues and activities the Associations are discussing. These will not be representatives of the bargaining units, but of the associations.
The President’s Role

Chart 4. Assessment Of The President’s Role In Shared Governance By Constituents At Monroe County Community College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
<th>P&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The president has adequate academic as well as administrative credentials to serve as the chief officer of the institution.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The president, on more than rare occasions, overturns faculty decisions and recommendations in areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility (e.g., curriculum, tenure, and promotion decisions).</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The president, on more than rare occasions, overturns staff decisions and recommendations in areas in which the staff has primary responsibility (e.g., hiring decisions).</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The president seeks meaningful input from faculty on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the faculty has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The president seeks meaningful input from staff on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the staff has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The president effectively advocates the principles of shared governance to the governing board.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

The President’s Role. Chart 4 provides the College’s assessment of the president’s role in shared governance and in two areas, all the constituent groups agree. First, the constituent groups, even the full-time faculty, agree that “The president has adequate academic as well as administrative credentials to serve as the chief officer of the institution.” There is not a question among the groups that the President does have the credentials to be the chief executive officer of the College.

The constituent groups also agree that “The president, on more than rare occasions, overturns staff decisions and recommendations in areas in which the staff has primary responsibility (e.g., hiring decisions);” full-time faculty are the most likely to agree (3.54), as do staff/ maintenance (3.30), and adjunct faculty (3.10). The administration is most likely to remain neutral (2.95), neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statement. And it should be noted that the authority of the presidency does allow for the President to overturn staff decisions which the President does not feel is in the best interest of the College. As one staff member noted “The President is in a unique position of balancing operations and education. Sometimes his decisions are not popular but again, interest in the College as a whole is the basis for decisions. Individual agendas may be affected by that.” However, there is less agreement among the constituent groups other than full-time faculty that “The president, on more than rare occasions, overturns faculty decisions and recommendations in areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility (e.g., curriculum, tenure, and promotion decisions).” While full-time faculty are likely to agree with this statement, staff/ maintenance (3.15), adjunct faculty (2.90), and administration (2.53) are less likely to agree that the President overturns decisions in which faculty have primary decision-making.

The two areas in which faculty and staff are showing concerns about the President’s role in shared governance is with respect to the President seeking meaningful input from faculty and staff. Full-time
faculty (1.71) and staff/maintenance (2.90) were more likely to disagree that “The president seeks meaningful input from faculty on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the faculty has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility,” than the administration (3.00) and adjunct faculty (3.33). Full-time faculty (1.83) and staff/maintenance (2.60) were also more likely to agree that “The president seeks meaningful input from staff on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the staff has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.” Administration (3.16) and adjunct faculty (3.27) were more likely to agree that the President seeks meaningful input from staff.

The question as to whether the President truly seeks meaningful input into decision-making and issues of concern for the College was the major issue discussed in the other comments shared in this section. One employee noted, “The President needs to hold real meetings with all employee groups, and then show that he puts their suggestions into practice. Everybody was asked how to save money in meetings held two years ago and very few of these ideas were implemented, even though several of them would have led to real cost savings.” In the focus sessions, the staff especially noted that they felt they were constantly being talked at, not really being able to participate in meaningful discussions and dialog. One staff member reports “With little exception, the few meetings we have are meetings to be told, not to discuss or debate. If you disagree with the President, you are set aside.” Another staff member provided an example of a decision they think was made without any input from the constituent groups, “Prior to our Christmas luncheon, the Board of Trustees held a meeting that very morning to change MCCC’s mission. Previous to that meeting, PowerPoint suggestions were gathered from the staff and community, however, there were never any meetings to then discuss any suggestions to change MCCC’s mission. Then, at the luncheon there it was – a PowerPoint slide show dumped on us and staff were absolutely stunned. This is a perfect example of lack of communication at this institution.” Another example was provided by another staff member, “Support staff were told we could vote on a wage freeze a few years ago. I voted NO as did many staff members, but it was told to others that it was a unanimous vote to freeze our wages. We did not have a REAL vote, it was decided ahead of time.”

The final statement examining the President’s role in shared governance was an assessment as to whether the President actually advocates the principles of shared governance to the governing board. As seen earlier, full-time faculty was least in agreement (1.91) with the statement, “The president effectively advocates the principles of shared governance to the governing board.” The administration (3.25), adjunct faculty (3.18), and staff/maintenance (3.12) were more likely to be neutral (neither agree nor disagree) with the statement. Although the staff/maintenance were neutral, it was found in the focus sessions that the staff has more concern about the issue of shared governance than the maintenance staff. The following comments by a staff member summarized the concern, “There is a facade of shared governance, but there is NO shared governance. The President has monthly mandated and required “meetings” with the staff to foster communication where the staff is required to sit and listen to things that have nothing to do with our college. The meetings are an hour in duration and the President will also frequently check the clock and keep talking about anything for that one hour or at times present something that was already given to us. TRUE communication does not happen. All of the staff resent this meeting and get nothing from it but frustration as we sit there while the work in our offices isn’t getting done. We are required to be there all in the name of the facade of communication. We are treated like children and spoon fed only what he wants us to know. For instance, we just received an e-mail about our tuition increasing on the same day or the day before it went out in the newspaper and we were not informed of that at all. In fact, someone asked that specific question in a prior “required communication meeting” and the President side-stepped the question and never specifically answered it. He just said they didn’t know what was going to happen with that and they may have to look at it. That was one week or so before the e-mail. Obviously that had already been decided but it was a secret like most everything is.”

There was major concern expressed by staff that the required meeting is not a useful venue for communication. It is viewed as an update and not a dialog where there is a give and take of information.
and questions are answered. In visiting with staff in the focus sessions, no real opportunities appear to exist for a dialog.

However, overall, the campus does agree that the President does an excellent job of communicating externally. A staff member noted “The current president is ‘out and about’ in the community. He is really a PR specialist and promotes, promotes, promotes – a real spin master.” Another staff member noted “My opinion is that the College is now more worried about keeping up appearances than it is worried about what is happening inside its own doors. There needs to be much more cohesiveness between all branches of employment at this institution, and this needs to be fostered by our leader.”

**The President’s Role – Issues To Address**

It is recognized by the entire College that the President is the major avenue for communication at Monroe County Community College. The problem has been that for much of the communication at the College, the communications with the President take place in large structured forums which are not conducive to discussion. In large forums, information is disseminated and discussion is difficult. As one faculty member noted in the focus sessions, “it is almost impossible to have a discussion to reach consensus with 50 people.”

- **Recommendation:** Stop the monthly all staff meeting and replace them with the previously suggested written reports outlining issues discussed at the Administrative Council and the Board Summary.

- **Recommendation:** Develop mechanisms at the College to allow for small group conversations with the President to provide discussion and employee input rather than simply information dissemination. The President should regularly conduct “Town Hall” meetings with employees at the College. The “Town Hall” meetings should be listening sessions, open forums in which no topic is off the table, with no set agenda other than the issues brought by the employees attending. The meetings should be held with small groups, no more than 12 employees in a group. To facilitate participation the meetings should be held at a regularly scheduled time each month or bi-monthly, and reservations should be made for the “Town Hall” meetings, with no employee attending more than once in a two month period. The “Town Hall” meeting concept could also be expanded to include the public, legislators, businesses, etc. After the “Town Hall” meetings, a regular e-mail should be sent to all employees summarizing the key issues brought forth at the meetings and follow-up on the issues if needed. For example, if an employee questions expenditure at the College like money spent on an ad campaign, which actually had been paid for by a community coalition, the issue is most likely of interest to others. By correcting the misinformation immediately, the “rumor” does not get out of hand.

- **Recommendation:** Create President’s “Think Tank” groups to address issues and provide recommendations on issues that are brought forth in the “Town Hall” meetings. Monroe County Community College, like all colleges across the country, has a very bad habit of discussing issues to death before making a decision. The current discussion about badges at the College is an example. The “Think Tank” groups would be convened to discuss a specific issue at the College – the task force would be formed to flesh out an idea or clarify a problem, recommend a solution, identify a timeline, develop an implementation plan, and present a final report to the President. The group would have a 29 day limit to work – in other words, in 29 days the task force would present the final report. Fifteen to 20 individuals would be chosen to serve on the “Think Tank” and they would be chosen by their area of expertise – they have to have direct knowledge of the issue being brought forth – and are generally line employees (neither VPs nor top administrators). Upon completion of the report, or in 29 days, whichever comes first, the task group is disbanded and they may never serve with the same group of employees twice. This would allow for direct feedback into issues of concern by the employees who are impacted.
The Administration’s Role

Chart 5. Assessment Of The Administration’s Role In Shared Governance By Constituents At Monroe County Community College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
<th>P&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The top administrators have adequate academic as well as administrative credentials to serve as the key academic and administrative officers of the institution.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top administrators, on more than rare occasions, overturn faculty decisions and recommendations in areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility (e.g., curriculum, tenure, and promotion decisions).</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top administrators, on more than rare occasions, overturn staff decisions and recommendations in areas in which the staff has primary responsibility (e.g., hiring decisions).</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top administrators seek meaningful input from faculty on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the faculty has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top administrators seek meaningful input from staff on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the staff has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

The Administration’s Role. The constituent groups were asked to evaluate the administration’s role in shared governance and more agreement was seen among the groups with respect to administration than any topic previously discussed. The majority of the constituent groups actually were close to agreement that “The top administrators have adequate academic as well as administrative credentials to serve as the key academic and administrative officers of the institution” – the administration (3.50), adjunct faculty (3.57) and staff/maintenance (3.74) expressed the highest levels of agreement seen and even faculty were neutral (2.71). There some of the administrators who feel that the administration is not as qualified as they should be. It was noted by respondents that “All 20 something administrators have faculty status yet only about 5 are qualified to teach at this institution,” “Only one of the top administrators has the appropriate academic credentials but not experience to go with it. The others are under credentialed,” and one respondent posed the question, “Several key vice presidents do not have an advanced degree. How can they serve in their positions?”

Faculty and staff are more likely to agree that top administrators overturn decisions and recommendations made by faculty and staff, and this is an area of primary concern that continues to be a major issue impacting shared governance and effective communication. Full-time faculty (3.71) and staff/maintenance (3.06) were more likely to agree that “Top administrators, on more than rare occasions, overturn faculty decisions and recommendations in areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility (e.g., curriculum, tenure, and promotion decisions)” and full-time faculty (3.71) and staff (3.21) also agreed “Top administrators, on more than rare occasions, overturn staff decisions and recommendations in areas in which the staff has primary responsibility (e.g., hiring decisions).” administration was less likely to agree about faculty decisions (2.58) being overturned than they were staff decisions (2.65), and adjunct faculty mirrored the administration’s rating (2.42 for faculty decisions and 2.80 for staff decisions). One staff member suggested the reason for overturning decisions – “The
current administration seem fearful for their jobs and as such, do not take any concerns forward that might seem controversial.”

Overturning decisions and recommendations of faculty and staff is a major area of concern. In the focus sessions, the hiring committees were noted as an example of having staff decisions overturned. Staff is asked to sit on a hiring committee, evaluate with due diligence potential employees, and then make a recommendation. After the recommendation is moved forward, staff report never hearing anything or having their recommendation overturned with no explanation. But as one employee notes, “Since when do the faculty have decisions about who gets promoted? Tenure? Since when does the staff decide who gets hired? It’s not their job – it’s the administrator’s job. They get input on budgeting but don’t tell anyone the results until May, when they suddenly have to spend the money by June 30.” If the process is such that the committees are being asked to provide time and energy to develop the best recommendation, then although they are not ultimately responsible for the hire, feedback should be given to the committee as to the rationale for the final outcome.

As noted earlier, good decision-making relies on meaningful input and full-time faculty and staff (more so than maintenance) do not believe that the top administration really seeks meaningful input. Full-time faculty disagreed with the statement “Top administrators seek meaningful input from faculty on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the faculty has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility,” but the administration (3.58), adjunct faculty (3.27) and staff/ maintenance (3.23) were more likely to agree input is solicited. Full-time faculty (2.88) and staff/ maintenance (3.07) more likely than administration (3.35) and adjunct faculty (3.20) that “Top administrators seek meaningful input from staff on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the staff has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.” A faculty member noted “I have been in a meeting with the VP of Instruction when she openly stated that she needed to do something to overturn a committee decision because she disagreed with it. The college needs to implement the committee method of decision-making in a genuine fashion.”

Since the budget was provided as an example of an area that faculty and staff should have meaningful input, it was a topic of focus for the other comments provided by the respondents. Overall, there are concerns about the budget process being adequately tied to institutional priorities. One employee noted “The budget process is a joke. Top administrators do what they want to when it comes to creating positions, firing people, and spending for favorite programs and people. The only advice they listen to is from the yes-men on campus. Significant complaints about inept administrators are ignored.” Another employee noted that they are asked for input but they never see their priorities in the resulting budget, specifically “We are asked to discuss the budget in division meetings, but faculty and STUDENT priorities are not administrative priorities. Money goes toward marketing and community endeavors more than student functions and activities or instructional needs.” And finally, an employee noted “Regarding the budget, the Board and top administrators seem to feel support staff are overpaid and are just lucky to have jobs. Support staff does not feel valued at MCCC these days.” One lone staff member did note that “Top administrators are deeply concerned with the best interest of students and the college as a whole.” Unfortunately this is not the consensus of the organization.

The Administration’s Role – Issues To Address

The general consensus among faculty and staff at Monroe County Community College is that the administration does not seek meaningful input into decision-making and that administration overturns decisions or recommendations made by groups at the College. The major exception to this is the maintenance employees at the College. The maintenance personnel trust their administrator and praise him for seeking their input into decisions, providing them timely information about college decisions, and respecting their knowledge. This manager embodies the principles of effective supervision. This relationship between supervisor and employees needs to be replicated in all departments at the College.
- **Recommendation:** Provide supervisory management training for the managers at Monroe County Community College. Educational institutions, like many private sector businesses, hire employees for their expertise in a certain area and they may never have had any supervisory experience or training. To successfully manage employees, managers must develop effective management skills, such as performance management, motivation, team development, interpersonal and communication skills, and time management skills. By supporting the managers at the College, and assisting them in developing their communication and management skills, it will ensure the long-term success of the College.

- **Recommendation:** The current structure at the College does not lend itself to provide effective feedback, especially to committees. Currently, employees are asked to serve on committees, such as hiring committees, perform due diligence and made a recommendation, and then the recommendation is forwarded. Typically the committee does not receive any formal feedback on whether their recommendation for hiring was or was not taken, until someone is hired, and then the rumors fly. This is not only an issue with hiring committees, but the majority of the employees who have served on committees noted that not getting formal feedback was a major issue. After enough committee recommendations have been overturned, employees believe their opinion is not valued and they disengage and simply will not serve on committees. A formal feedback loop needs to be established for every committee recommendation. It is recommended that regardless of whether the recommendation was acted upon or not, a formal written report is given back to the committee within 30 days after the recommendation is forwarded at a formal meeting of the committee and read into the minutes. If the recommendation was not acted upon, an explanation for the decision that was made should be included.

- **Recommendation:** Post the agendas for all committee meetings on the shared college drive in a specific location at least a week ahead of the committee meeting. Employees read many of the minutes from the committee meetings at the College to stay abreast of the issues facing the College – in fact the committee minutes are a major information source. However, for employees to have input on issues, they have to know when issues will be discussed. Since the agendas are not posted, college personnel find out about items of interest after the discussion. Posting agendas would allow for interested personnel to provide input at the appropriate time and in a correct forum.
### The Faculty’s Role

Chart 6. Assessment Of The Faculty's Role In Shared Governance By Constituents At Monroe County Community College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
<th>P&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The faculty is afforded an appropriate degree of autonomy with regard to its areas of responsibility by the administration and governing board.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty appropriately exercises its capacity for both adverse and positive decisions in faculty personnel matters.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for faculty development, reward structures, and workloads support the development of faculty expertise in areas of faculty primacy.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

The Faculty’s Role. Chart 6 presents the constituent groups’ ratings of the faculty role in shared governance and there was overall agreement among the constituent groups about the faculty’s role in shared governance. There was overall agreement that “The faculty is afforded an appropriate degree of autonomy with regard to its areas of responsibility by the administration and governing board,” by administration (3.95), adjunct faculty (3.50), full-time faculty (3.39), and staff/maintenance (3.22). The constituent groups also lean toward agreement with the statement “The faculty appropriately exercises its capacity for both adverse and positive decisions in faculty personnel matters,” with the ratings of administration (3.35), adjunct faculty (3.27), full-time faculty (3.21), and staff/maintenance (3.06).

While employees agree that faculty is afforded an appropriate degree of autonomy with regard to its areas of responsibility by the administration and the governing board, why is there the conflict between faculty and the administration and the Board as noted in previous sections? One faculty member noted “Faculty share in all the hiring faculty decisions. Faculty hiring committee process is used in every faculty search.” But other faculty members noted “Faculty decisions in one division are routinely ignored” and “Faculty expertise is not fully utilized in the budget process.” Unfortunately, faculty believes, as one faculty member noted, that “Faculty is an inconvenient truth at this academic enterprise. The BOT and administration would be perfectly happy to run it without them.” Until this attitude is dissipated and reversed, shared governance and effective communication will continue to elude Monroe County Community College.

Generally, there are two approaches at a community college to decision-making – collective bargaining and shared governance. One is adversarial and the other is collegial. The collective bargaining process by its very nature is adversarial. Monroe County Community College has been trying to operate shared governance under a collective bargaining process. Without the presence of a faculty association, the College’s bargaining unit has been acting as the face of shared governance at the College. The adversarial implication of the collective bargaining approach should be left at the bargaining table and the grievance hearing process should not enter into the collegial decision-making process. Shared governance relies on an open and honest discussion between faculty and administrators which should lead to consensus, and if consensus is not possible, then compromise, with the best interest of the College at the basis of the consensus or compromise. After examining the previous system at Monroe County Community College, utilizing the bargaining units in decision-making may have led to much of the animosity and siege mentality evident in the organization toady.

Faculty – adjunct (2.29) and full-time (2.36) – are likely to disagree that “Resources for faculty development, reward structures, and workloads support the development of faculty expertise in areas of
faculty primacy,” while administration (3.25) and staff/ maintenance (3.24) are more likely to agree. Faculty believes that professional development is extremely important to keeping the College updated and competitive. One employee noted “For an institution of higher learning, there is an abhorrent lack of support for professional development or increased educational degrees/expertise.” Other faculty members noted the same concerns about professional development:

- “Gutting professional development and conference budgets was a stupid decision. There is no institutional capacity for significant professional development – either by provision of in-house funding or for meaningful financial incentives for those who pay for their own development.”
- “If any resources are set aside for faculty development, it is inadequate. I would like to see the college pick up some of the costs of membership in professional organizations, continuing education coursework, and continue to allow faculty to decide what the focus of the in-service day should be. With regards to the in-service day, I do not believe it is consistent with higher education. It feels like a K-12 function.”
- “Neither our workload nor the budget allow for attendance at conferences or time to read and research.”
- “The College needs to provide faculty with ADEQUATE release time for special projects. The College also needs to fund professional development for faculty. In addition, the College needs to offer some form of tuition reimbursement for graduate credit to faculty members.”

The Faculty’s Role – Issues To Address

Faculty’s role in a community college is to provide significant input into all areas that affect the academic functions of the College. The form for that input through a shared governance model at many educational institutions is a faculty association or a faculty senate and these entities are not the collective bargaining units for the faculty at the respective colleges – they are collegial organizations that work with the leadership of the College to enhance the academic experience at the College and support the overall mission of the College. For example, the mission statement for the Faculty Association at Johnston Community College in North Carolina states:

“The purpose of the Johnston Community College Faculty Association is to promote professionalism through the pursuit of excellence and competency in teaching, to serve as the voice of the faculty in decision making, to provide an open forum for the free discussion of academic and professional issues, and to support the overall mission of Johnston Community College.”

A Faculty Senate is in operation at Pima Community College in Arizona and its mission statement reads as follows:

“Faculty Senate is the representative body of all faculties (full-time and adjunct) that participates in the governance processes of Pima Community College. Our objectives include strengthening the concept of the faculty as a college entity; promoting the gathering, exchanging, and disseminating of faculty views and concerns regarding college matters; promoting mutual accountability between the college faculty and the faculty representative to any college committee; advising the Chancellor and other administrators of faculty views on college matters; bringing the concerns of the Chancellor and other administrators on college matters to the faculty; promoting the involvement of all faculty members in the establishing, staffing, and functioning of college committees, task forces, or other initiatives; and participating in the policy review process of the college.”

The major issue for Monroe County Community College is the fact that neither a Faculty Association nor a Faculty Senate is in operation. The faculty is represented by a Faculty Union, the collective bargaining
unit for faculty, and the Faculty Union has become the major voice for the faculty at the College. However, by the very nature of collective bargaining in the best of circumstances, it is a contentious relationship – not a collegial one. The Faculty Union at Monroe County Community College has assumed the role of both Faculty Association and Faculty Union, causing disruptive dialogs between the Board of Trustees, administration, and faculty.

- **Recommendation:** Create a Faculty Association to provide a forum for faculty to discuss academic issues not in the context of the bargaining contract. A Faculty Association should be developed, a mission statement written, representation established, and a charter or constitution written and approved. An example of a Faculty Senate Charter is presented in Appendix G and an example of a Faculty Association Constitution is presented in Appendix H. The Faculty Association is needed to provide a collegial response to the academic business of the College and not merge the collective bargaining unit into the discussions.

- **Recommendation:** Even with the current budget constraints of the College, a faculty development program should be established to encourage innovation in teaching and learning. For faculty who want to innovate the learning experience for the student and improve outcomes, the College should establish a competitive “Learning Innovation” fund. Faculty can apply for funding to increase knowledge in new teaching methods, request funding for new equipment, etc. Each year several grants will be provided from the “Learning Innovation” fund to support academic innovation in the classroom or to improve student outcomes. It is suggested that a faculty committee be utilized to create the standards for the awards and the application process.

- **Recommendation:** As noted earlier, effective communication is not unidirectional. Faculty has essentially disengaged from the conversations at the College and they have an obligation to re-engage in communication. The development of a Faculty Association will provide faculty a voice that has been missing at the College.
The Staff’s Role

Chart 7. Assessment Of The Staff’s Role In Shared Governance By Constituents At Monroe County Community College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
<th>P&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The staff is afforded an appropriate degree of autonomy with regard to its areas of responsibility by the administration and governing board.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff appropriately exercises its capacity for both adverse and positive decisions in staff personnel matters.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for staff development, reward structures, and workloads support the development of staff expertise in their areas of primary responsibility.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

The Staff’s Role. Full-time faculty is even more likely to disagree than staff/ maintenance with respect to the autonomy of staff in decision-making, as seen in Chart 7. While full-time faculty (2.46) disagrees with the statement, “The staff is afforded an appropriate degree of autonomy with regard to its areas of responsibility by the administration and governing board,” the administration (3.45), adjunct faculty (3.20), and staff/ maintenance (3.14) are more likely to agree with the statement. The staff/ maintenance employees, the adjunct faculty, and the administration are basically neutral on their ratings of the statement, “The staff appropriately exercises its capacity for both adverse and positive decisions in staff personnel matters,” with all the groups rating the statement as slightly over 3, or a “Neither Agree Nor Disagree.” Only the full-time faculty disagrees with the statement (2.29).

In the other comments about staff exercising its autonomy, administrators noted that “Decisions are shared by way of the institutional governance process” and “Support staff believes they have more autonomy than is appropriate.” However, staff disagrees with the assessment and note “Many personnel are hesitant to speak up about a myriad of issues. They do their work and go home.” Other staff members note “Staff is viewed as the bottom of the totem pole and is the first to be disregarded and ignored” and “The staff meetings are generally quiet. Staff members are afraid to speak up regarding issues that matter in fear of retaliation. Not necessarily a fear for their job, but that someone might get yelled at as a result of their question.” Faculty also notes that “Support staff is treated badly on this campus. They were forced into a “vote” to take a pay freeze. This was nothing more than a publicity stunt by the administration. The college needs to provide small raises and step increases for the support staff. The rage over no pay increase has caused many support staff members to act out on their jobs and has adversely affected their work.” Overall staff notes that “We keep being asked to do more with less. We understand that there are budget issues, but it never seems to show that on the balance sheet. To constantly be lectured about how lucky we are to have jobs does not help morale.”

None of the constituent groups – the administration (2.80), the adjunct faculty (3.00), the full-time faculty (2.25), and the staff/ maintenance (2.83) – believes there are enough resources allocated for staff development as seen in the ratings for the following statement: Resources for staff development, reward structures, and workloads support the development of staff expertise in their areas of primary responsibility. One administrator noted “Staff are paid lip service but treated poorly. If staff works overtime on weeks that include a paid holiday, they lose part or all of their holiday pay and are paid straight time for the additional daily hours worked.” Another administrator noted: “There are virtually no funds for staff development, unless it is to learn how to get more grants.” Faculty comments are similar: “There is so little training and professional development money available that it’s a sad joke. We
are a college, but we don’t allow for training of our own staff. The tuition waiver works for some people, but staff aren’t allowed to take coursework on college time and credit coursework may not be appropriate. There is no support for mentoring or in-house training, since staffing is so thin in some departments that it’s not possible for people to take time out of their jobs to do it. We know about people’s leaving well ahead of time, but replacements aren’t in place. Take a look at the registrar’s position that sat empty (with the VP of student services “acting” as the registrar) and the empty dean’s position in humanities/social sciences." A staff member summed up the issue regarding staff development as “At this point there is no reward for increasing educational level/expertise.”

The Staff’s Role – Issues To Address

The staff at Monroe County Community College (excluding maintenance employees) feels undervalued and unappreciated and describes an environment in which they are scared of supervisors and people get “shot down” when they ask questions or make suggestions. Staff needs to once again feel valued and appreciated for the job they are doing – they did note they truly understand they are fortunate to have a secure job at the College, but they are tired of constantly being reminded of the fact they have a job. Staff has felt they have less voice than any other group at the College and are very hopeful that the new Staff Association will provide an avenue for staff concerns to be heard by the administration.

- **Recommendation:** The College community should support the new Staff Association and encourage all staff at the College to become involved. The Staff Association will provide a forum to discuss staff issues and a way to present those to management. The Staff Association should have a representative that provides a monthly report to the Board of Trustees about the issues being discussed in the Staff Association meetings.

- **Recommendation:** Continue the current employee recognition program at Monroe County Community College aimed at recognizing the valuable contribution of staff at the College and enhance the program. Some suggested components of the recognition program may include:

  1. Print blank Monroe County Community College thank you notes and encourage managers to give staff written thank you notes for a job well done on a special project or event.

  2. Create an “MCCC Star” staff award to reward employees for providing exemplary customer service. Individual recipients are presented with a Star pin at the annual staff recognition dinner. Staff members can be nominated for this award by anyone on campus. Recipients are given up to eight hours of paid leave that can be used for up to one year from notification.

  3. Create a “Star Performer” award to present to an outstanding staff member based on the staff members’ job performance and outstanding contributions helping the College accomplish its strategic goals while demonstrating its core values. Staff members can be nominated for this award by anyone on campus. Recipients are given up to eight hours of paid leave that can be used for up to one year from notification.

  4. Create a TIPS (Top Ideas for Productivity and Savings) or “Great Idea” program in which staff members can share their ideas for improved operations and are recognized monetarily for their contributions. Staff shares their ideas for cutting costs, increasing productivity or service, and improving methods or procedures. Suggestions are evaluated three to four times a year by a quality improvement committee appointed by the administration. Monetary awards are made to staff with winning suggestions based on cost-savings, productivity, and other criteria to be determined. Winners are presented staff awards at the annual staff recognition dinner.
5. Create an MCCC Family Day in which faculty and staff are invited to bring family and friends to the annual Monroe County Community College Family Day celebration to be held one day during the early Fall semester for a day of food, fun, and lots of festivities.

- **Recommendation:** Work with staff to develop individualized learning plans. Some staff development exists at the College, but by developing staff learning plans, staff development programs can be customized for staff. Also, allow greater participation by staff in planning the staff development days at the College.
## Joint Decision-Making

### Chart 8. Assessment Of Joint Decision-Making In Shared Governance By Constituents At Monroe County Community College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
<th>P&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in the area of long-range planning.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making regarding existing or prospective physical resources.</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in the area of budgeting.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in the selection of administrative leadership.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in staff selection and promotion and the granting of tenure.</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The structures and processes that allow for faculty collaboration are clearly defined in the governance documents.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The structures and processes that allow for staff collaboration are clearly defined in the governance documents.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The structures and processes for joint decision-making are functioning in an effective manner.</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

**Assessment Of Joint Decision-Making.** As seen in Chart 8, the constituent groups were asked to rate their agreement with joint decision-making at Monroe County Community College. As seen in earlier research, full-time faculty is the most likely to provide the lowest agreement (substantially lower) that the institution recognizes responsibility for joint decision-making in any area – long-range planning, physical resources, budgeting, selecting administrative leadership, staff selection, and promotion and tenure – than the other constituent groups. While the full-time faculty (1.97) do not agree that “The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in the area of long-range planning,” the administration (3.25), adjunct faculty (3.46), and staff/maintenance (3.06) are more likely to agree that the institution does recognize joint responsibility in long-range planning. A staff member noted “Although the organization realizes the need for strategic planning, it has not adequately supported it with resources (time, money or personnel)” and another staff member commented, “In the past, decisions were made based on the mission and vision of the College but this is not always the case anymore.”

Other than adjunct faculty (3.25), the constituent groups were less likely to agree that “The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making regarding existing or prospective physical resources,” as evidenced by the agreement scores of the administration (2.95), the full-time faculty (1.91), and the staff/maintenance (2.79). Many of the employees in the focus sessions commented on how the College could build a new building during such a downturn economically with no explanation to the College community. One staff member noted “I have still never heard a clear explanation of how it is feasible to build a new building at this point in time. If we have no money and we are cutting budgets to extremes, we have had our pay frozen, and the College is looking at all ways to save money, but yet, we have liquid assets to build a building.”
Full-time faculty (1.86) and staff/maintenance (2.67) are less likely to agree “The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in the area of budgeting,” than the administration (3.20) and adjunct faculty (3.17). But faculty and staff are concerned that there is not joint responsibility for decision-making in budgeting. The frustration is expressed by a staff member, “The staff has been preached to over and over and over again about how bad the economy is and how tight the budget is. Our jobs are regularly threatened at our 'required' president and staff meetings. Every single meeting we hear ‘and we have been able to do all of this SO FAR without any staff layoffs’. We haven’t received raises in three years but somehow we seem to have millions of dollars to contribute to a new technology building. None of the staff approve of it with the current conditions, but the admin and Board forge forward...at all costs. So which is it? Do we have no money? Or do we have millions? Or...do we have money to be spent only as the President wishes without regard to long-term effects and costs and the staff required to manage it all?”

While the administration (3.45) believes “The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in the selection of administrative leadership,” adjunct faculty (2.92), full-time faculty (1.94), and staff/maintenance (2.85) are more likely to disagree. One example of the reasons that the constituent groups do not agree with this statement revolves around the hiring of the Administrative VP, cited by many of the constituent groups in the focus session. Specifically an employee notes “A new VP position was created and staffed over a weekend with not so much as consultation with the other cabinet level administrators. The established process for creating a new position was ignored and a search committee was not considered.” “Staff is asked to sit on hiring committees, but most of the time a decision has been made before interviews are conducted” was a concern noted by one of the staff members in the comments.

Whether due to the hiring committees or not, constituent groups are more likely to agree that “The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in staff selection and promotion and the granting of tenure.” This is evidenced by the ratings provided by the administration (3.55) and adjunct faculty (3.09), and even though the agreement is less for the full-time faculty (2.39) and the staff/maintenance (2.87), there is higher agreement than seen in the other areas of recognition for joint-decision making.

Unlike the majority of the shared governance statements evaluated in this report, the constituent groups all agreed, with no significant differences (even among full-time faculty) with the following two statements:

- The structures and processes that allow for faculty collaboration are clearly defined in the governance documents.
- The structures and processes that allow for staff collaboration are clearly defined in the governance documents.

But all of the employees did not agree that the shared governance process is clearly defined. One employee noted “There are no structures or processes for joint decisions at any level. It becomes frustrating when decisions are made in one department that affects another department but the decisions are not communicated across the departments. Many times these decisions are learned by affected departments through e-mail announcements or reading minutes!” Another employee noted “Just because there is a document or a procedure does not mean it is followed. It is what is needed to make HLC happy and anyone who looks at it will go they have a procedure so it is followed.”

All constituent groups tend to agree with the statement regarding the joint decision-making, “The structures and processes for joint decision-making are functioning in an effective manner.” While the adjunct faculty rated the statement as a neutral (3.25), administration did not agree (2.65), nor did full-time faculty (1.91) or staff/maintenance (2.73). However, one administrator noted “If someone misses out on ‘sharing’ a decision, it is because they chose to opt out of all the ‘shared decision’ opportunities”
and another administrator noted “The structures and processes for joint decision-making work when all parties participate in a constructive and informed manner.” The implication is that all personnel at the College have to take responsibility for participating in shared governance constructively. But from the perspective of faculty, it is not working. One faculty member noted “Bad faith is the best way to describe the structures and processes for joint responsibility for planning, physical resources, and budgeting. The structures may be in place, but they are ignored or hauled out for show when circumstances call for it.

Just read the administrative council minutes about using Skype for communication. Effectiveness? The best way Skype would be effective for this place is because it’s not subject to FOIA requests, according to the president. Even more processes can go on behind the wall of secrecy while ignoring genuine shared decision-making.”

**Joint Decision-Making – Issues To Address**

A major tenant of shared governance is joint decision-making, and joint decision-making actually equals participative leadership. In a review of the materials developed by Monroe County Community College, a very detailed decision-making process has been developed by the College community – but as one employee noted, the joint decision-making is not being used. Committees are called to work on issues that have already been decided and the administration simply wants the committee to “rubber stamp” the decision to provide the illusion of shared decision-making, or worse, the committee diligently works to provide a recommendation and it is ignored by the administration.

Benefits of joint decision-making are numerous. When employees are involved in joint decision-making, it improves the understanding of the issues involved by those who must carry out the decisions and employees are more committed to actions where they have been involved in the relevant decision-making. When people make decisions together, they are more collaborative and their social commitment to one another is greater and thus increases their commitment to the decision.

Generally, joint decision-making is the culmination of the full delegation of a decision to a team or a recognized committee. At Monroe County Community College, joint decision-making may be made through a committee, but unlike other community colleges, the committee structure simply reports to a VP and the recommendations from the committee is not vetted by other organizations or groups at the College. A graphic example of the current committee structure at Monroe County Community College is presented below.

![Committee Structure Diagram]
The College has dropped the number of standing committees to 12. After a committee discusses an issue and comes to consensus on a recommendation, the recommendation is forwarded to the appropriate Vice-President. At that point, the recommendation may be ignored, be overridden, or taken to the President’s Cabinet for discussion. Many times, the committee that works on the recommendation does not receive feedback into the status of the recommendation. In addition, the responsibility for determining the impacts of a recommendation on other areas of the College rests on the shoulders of the Vice-Presidents.

In this very linear structure for input, the majority of the College, other than the few on a committee, never really gets to provide input or insight into a decision. There is no opportunity for any other groups at the College to provide input or to vet the committee’s decision. The bottom line is that the committee structure is not working and will not work with such limited input.

- **Recommendation:** The College needs to develop a Council Model for joint decision-making that will appropriately vet the recommendations across the organization. The committee structure at Monroe County Community College is ineffective and overtaxing on human resources. With the linear nature of the current process, many of the actual decisions at the College occur outside of a committee structure without proper vetting of the decisions’ impacts on the College and other functional areas. Employees feel decisions are being made by limited numbers of individuals and they do not have an opportunity to participate in the decision-making process, especially for mission critical issues. The long-standing committees tend to be advisory in nature and so do not act as decision-making bodies. Finally, the standing committees’ recommendations are routinely overturned and criticized for not being data-based.

Examining the current communication structure at Monroe County Community College as seen in the graphic below, it is not surprising that many of the employees in the constituent groups do not feel they have an adequate opportunity for input into the decision-making process. At Monroe County Community College, committee recommendations go to the Vice-Presidents. The administrative Council is an informative body – information is shared but the current Administrative Council is not a recommending body. The faculty union leadership and the staff association leadership have no formal mechanism for providing input into decisions or vetting recommendations unless they go directly to the President or the Vice Presidents – and that is generally after the fact when decisions have already been made. The current communication structure lends itself to frustrate even the most well-meaning employees at the College.

**Communication Structure**

![Communication Structure Diagram]
An example of a Council Model for joint decision-making is presented in the graphic below. The council model relies on an ad hoc committees, event teams, and standing committees.

In the Council Model, a committee is a recommending body that makes recommendations to a Council. A “standing committee” is a committee established to meet an ongoing need of the College, like diversity or academic practice. An “ad hoc” committee is one which meets its function within a limited time and after which it will be disbanded. An “event team” is a group that works for a limited time each year planning a specific event for the College. To ensure that the committees’ recommendations are examined with respect to the total operation of the College, and to ensure that all constituent groups at the College can provide input into decision-making, all committees are assigned to an appropriate Council. The Council ensures that the recommendations are reviewed appropriately and ultimately forwarded to the President’s cabinet for final review. But a Council can send a recommendation back to a committee for further review and more information or refinement. Finally, the recommendation is sent to the President from the Council, but the President has the ultimate authority and can veto the recommendation.

The College can develop as many types of Council as needed for the organization. Some colleges have as few as three Councils (administrative, student services, and academic) while others may have five or more. An example of a Council Model for Austin Community College is presented in Appendix I. The members of the Councils include representatives of job functions at the College, for example directors, ex officio members (deans or vice presidents), and representatives from the College’s constituent groups – the Faculty Association, Adjunct Faculty Association, Professional-Technical Employees Association, Classified Employees Association, and the Student Government Association.

The Council Model provides not only for joint-decision making by having the correct decision makers involved in the development of the recommendations, but the Council Model ensures that the constituent groups are informed and have a mechanism for formal input by their representation on the Councils. Currently at Monroe County Community College, there are no mechanisms for formal input from the constituent groups.
**Structural Arrangements**

Chart 9. Assessment Of Structural Arrangements In Shared Governance By Constituents At Monroe County Community College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
<th>P&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a faculty union or other institution-wide governance body that meets on a regular basis.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty determines how its own representatives are selected for faculty union.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For joint committees on which the faculty is represented, the representation appropriately reflects the degree of the faculty’s stake in the issue or area the committee is charged with addressing.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty as a whole has an opportunity to meet and comment on ‘short-listed’ academic administrative candidates before hiring decisions are made.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a staff governance body that meets on a regular basis.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff determines how its own representatives are selected.</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For joint committees on which the staff is represented, the representation appropriately reflects the degree of the staff’s stake in the issue or area the committee is charged with addressing.</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

**Assessment Of Structural Arrangements.** For shared governance to work at a College there has to be a structure that allows governance to work and to communicate effectively. The statements rated by the constituent groups assessing the structural arrangements of shared governance at Monroe County Community College are presented in Chart 9. The administration (4.20) and the full-time faculty (4.31) agree that “There is a faculty union or other institution-wide governance body that meets on a regular basis,” as do the adjunct faculty (3.40) and staff/ maintenance (3.57). And full-time faculty (4.40) and the administration (4.20) also agree that “Faculty determines how its own representatives are selected for faculty union,” as do adjunct faculty (3.50) and staff/ maintenance (3.60). But as the faculty is quick to point out – faculty have a bargaining unit but not a faculty association:

- “The faculty union should not be confused with an institution-wide governance body. The support staff group has no governance authority of any kind. These questions don’t reflect the organization of the College.”
- “Our faculty union is NOT a ‘faculty senate’.”
- “We have a faculty union but no faculty senate. Prescribed membership for Curriculum Committee includes seven administrators and five teaching faculty. Only teaching faculty should vote on curriculum issues.”
- “Instructional issues (unless dealing with wages, benefits, and working conditions) are not handled by this group.”
- “The faculty union is not an institution-wide governing body at MCCC. Also, not all areas of instruction are represented on the curriculum committee.”
However, adjunct faculty (2.70) and full-time faculty (2.56) are less likely to agree “For joint committees on which the faculty is represented, the representation appropriately reflects the degree of the faculty’s stake in the issue or area the committee is charged with addressing,” than the administration (3.30) and the staff/maintenance (3.22). There were concerns expressed about the availability and participation of faculty on committees at the College. An administrator noted “I think faculty is far under-represented and do not serve on enough committees. They want to have all kinds of input but it is difficult to get them involved.” Another respondent commented that “Many faculty members choose committees based on what will be less burdensome to their workload. Volunteering for a committee does not always ensure a balanced membership depending on the stakes.” But faculty countered these issues with concerns of their own; specifically committee representation should match the issues and the need for the College to provide time for the committees to meet. A faculty member said “Important committees have too much representation from administration” and another noted “Curriculum issues and graduation requirements should be decided by instructional faculty. Curriculum Committee composition should reflect this.” Faculty strongly believes “The College needs to select days and times when NO classes meet and designate these times for meetings. It is almost impossible for groups and committees to meet because of schedule conflicts.”

But it is important to note that members of the College community expressed in the focus sessions appreciation for the work that has been done by the Institutional Governance Committee in the last year. One employee commented, “The work that has been done over the last year by the Institutional Governance Committee regarding the committee structure and membership on these committees has been very productive. It is addressing the assignment of key individuals on the committees that they have the most knowledge of and interest in.”

There is a major discrepancy in perception of full-time faculty and the other constituent groups with respect to “The faculty as a whole has an opportunity to meet and comment on 'short-listed' academic administrative candidates before hiring decisions are made.” Full-time faculty (2.43) was less likely to agree with the statement than the administration (3.42), adjunct faculty (3.09), and staff/maintenance (3.02).

Overall, the majority of the constituent groups agreed – administration (3.94), adjunct faculty (3.63), full-time faculty (3.22), and staff/maintenance (3.71) – that “There is a staff governance body that meets on a regular basis.” And the majority of the constituent groups agree that “Staff determines how its own representatives are selected,” – staff/maintenance (3.61), the administration (3.74), adjunct faculty (3.13), and even the full-time faculty (3.09). The majority of the constituent groups – administration (3.68, adjunct faculty (3.00), and staff maintenance (3.32) – agreed “For joint committees on which the staff is represented, the representation appropriately reflects the degree of the staff’s stake in the issue or area the committee is charged with addressing,” but full-time faculty (2.63) is less likely to agree. Staff is hopeful for the new structure as evidenced by the comment “I hope that the new structure for staff will allow us to gain a greater voice and stake in governance.” But negative perceptions regarding the role of staff at the College can be summed up by the comment “Staff = sit there and keep your mouth shut.”

**Structural Arrangements – Issues To Address**

For this audit, the working definition of shared governance is: “Shared governance is a delicate balance between faculty and staff participation in planning and decision-making processes, on the one hand, and administrative accountability on the other.” For shared governance to even hope to function at a college, the structure of the college has to at least provide a framework for communication and decision-making. Specifically, a formal structure has to exist that will provide for appropriate constituent group input into the areas where those groups should exercise authority and decision-making. Currently at Monroe County Community College, the structure is hampering the achievement of shared governance and the structure has assisted in causing some – not all – of the mistrust in the organization. While a
new structure will not solve the TRUST issue at the College, it will assist the constituents at the College in having a formal voice in the governance process.

- **Recommendation:** As noted in the previous section on joint decision-making, Monroe County Community College needs to adopt a Council model of shared governance and decision-making. Two models have been presented for the College to review in its development of a new model – both based on Councils.

**Council Model – Example**

In the Council Model presented above, three Councils are developed to which the standing committees, the ad hoc committees, and the event teams report. After the correct Council reviews a decision, it is forwarded to the College Council with college-wide representation for review, and then finally to the College President. This model allows for an issue to be vetted across various groups at the College on which it may have impact as well as all of the constituent groups. While the model may slow down decisions, the resulting recommendations have been fully reviewed and examined for organizational impact, and the constituent groups have all been consulted in the process.
Another example of the Council Model of shared governance is presented in the graphic below. At this College, campus issues are brought to the decision making process from two avenues – through the advisory and governance groups and through the College Deans and administrators. Regardless of the path that the issue comes forward, it is then reviewed and taken to the College Alliance (a Council with all constituent groups represented) for review. If the issue came through the College Deans, the College Alliance may recommend that it be sent to the appropriate advisory or governance group for review, and then back to the College Alliance. Finally, the issue is forwarded to the College Cabinet for review. At this time, the Cabinet can then send it back to a group for review, for example the Deans. The issues are vetted across all groups until consensus is reached.

**Council Model – Example**

- **Recommendation:** The Shared Governance Committee should develop a Council Model for governance at Monroe County Community College. A sample of a Shared Governance Council Model for Austin Community College is presented in Appendix I. After reviewing multiple models at community colleges, the Committee should develop a document which addresses at a minimum the following parameters of a Council Model for Shared Governance:
  1. Define the fundamental principles under which shared governance will operate at Monroe County Community College – or the rationale for shared governance
  2. Define the structures that will be used to operate shared governance at Monroe County Community College; specifically define Councils and committees that will support the shared governance model at the College
  3. Outline the access to information under the shared governance system; how committees and Councils will keep and share information
  4. Specify the functions and purposes of the Councils and committees developed for Monroe County Community College’s shared governance model
5. Provide for the creation, modification, and dissolution of committees

6. Define the representation on the Councils and committees; specify how members will be chosen from the constituent groups

7. Outline the responsibilities of the chairs and co-chairs for the Councils and the committees
**Communication Preferences**

In an effort to understand how the constituent groups at Monroe County Community College communicate, the groups were asked to share their Internet usage, their use of College e-mail, and their cell phone usage. The communication preferences for the constituent groups are presented in the following charts.

**Chart 10. Frequency Of Internet Usage By MCCC Constituents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Internet Usage</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use the Internet daily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the Internet occasionally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never use the Internet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frequency Of Internet Usage.** The majority of all the constituent groups are daily users of the Internet, as seen in Chart 10. More than 80 percent of the staff/maintenance group (82 percent) use the Internet daily, as do 90 percent of the administration, all of the adjunct faculty, and 97 percent of the full-time faculty. In the focus sessions, the maintenance staff noted more difficulty in utilizing the Internet daily since they have to access a computer in a fixed location and the majority of their work day (or night) has them moving all around the campus and not in a fixed location.

**Chart 11. Internet Usage By MCCC Constituents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instant Messaging</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't use</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency Of Use Of Instant Messaging</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Faculty - Adjunct</td>
<td>Faculty - Full-time</td>
<td>Staff/ Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checking College E-Mail/ Work Related</th>
<th>Don't use</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Checking College E-Mail/ Work Related</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Making Phone Calls (Skype)</th>
<th>Don't use</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Use Of Skype</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Of Facebook</th>
<th>Don't use</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Use Of Facebook</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Of Linkedin</th>
<th>Don't use</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Use Of Linkedin</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Of Internet To Communicate With Colleagues, Committee Members</th>
<th>Don't use</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Use Of Internet To Communicate With Colleagues, Committee Members</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downloading Music</th>
<th>Don't use</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Downloading Music</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Internet Usage

The constituent groups were asked to share how they used the Internet, where they were likely to use it to perform tasks, and how frequently those tasks were performed and the results are presented in Chart 11. Unlike the majority of the students at Monroe County Community College, the constituent groups are not heavy users of instant messaging. Almost three-fourths of the constituent groups do not use instant messaging on the Internet. For those who do use the Internet for instant messaging, 60 percent of the administration uses it at home and 40 percent use it at both home and the campus. Two-thirds of the adjunct faculty who use instant messaging use it at home and one-third uses it both at home and at the campus. The full-time faculty are the most likely to use instant messaging on the Internet at both home and the campus (57 percent) and 43 percent use it at home only. Staff/maintenance that use instant messaging are most likely to use it at home (82 percent), but 18 percent use it both at home and at the campus. The constituent groups who use instant messaging are most likely to be daily users.

All of the constituent groups check their college e-mail but where they check it varies. Sixty percent of the administration check college e-mail at the campus and at home, while 40 percent only check their college e-mail when they are on the campus – but either way 80 percent of the administration checks it daily. The adjunct faculty is most likely to check their college e-mail from both home and campus (90 percent), and 10 percent only check it when they are on campus, but all of the adjuncts check their college e-mail daily. The entire full-time faculty also checks their college e-mail daily, with 71 percent checking it from both home and the campus, and 29 percent only checking it from home. Ninety-four

### Frequency Of Reading/ Writing Blogs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t use</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency Of Sending E-mails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency Of Surfing For Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency Of Watching Videos On YouTube

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percent of the staff/maintenance personnel check their college e-mail from both home and the campus, and 93 percent check it daily.

The majority of the constituents at the College do not use Skype to make phone calls – only 30 percent of the administration, 17 percent of the adjunct faculty, and 15 percent of the staff/maintenance use Skype – but 41 percent of the full-time faculty does use Skype. The majority of the Skype users primarily use it at home – 83 percent of the administration, half of the adjunct faculty, 75 percent of the full-time faculty, and 78 percent of the staff/maintenance. The adjunct faculty is most likely to use Skype at both home and the campus. The Skype users are most likely to use it monthly – 67 percent of the administration and 42 percent of the full-time faculty – but the adjunct faculty (100 percent) and the staff/maintenance (56 percent) are more likely to Skype daily.

Half of the constituent groups are Facebook users, and the majority use it at home – 67 percent of the administration, 83 percent of the adjunct faculty, 60 percent of the full-time faculty, and 66 percent of the staff/maintenance. The remainder of the Facebook users also connects at both home and the campus. The administrators who have Facebook accounts use them daily (64 percent), as do the adjunct faculty (67 percent). The full-time faculty on Facebook is more likely to use it weekly (57 percent) and the staff/maintenance are as likely to use it daily as they are weekly (48 percent respectively).

The administration is most likely to use LinkedIn – 45 percent have a LinkedIn account compared to only 17 percent of adjunct faculty, 23 percent of full-time faculty, and 16 percent of staff/maintenance. The administration with a LinkedIn account are likely to use it at home (44 percent), at the campus (22 percent), and both at home and at the campus (33 percent), and they are as likely to use it weekly (44 percent) as monthly (56 percent). The adjunct faculty with a LinkedIn account uses it at home (50 percent) or at home and at the campus – and usage is split – half use it daily and half use it monthly. Full-time faculty with LinkedIn accounts are most likely to use it at home and at the campus (57 percent), but usage is split – 40 percent use it daily and 40 percent use it monthly. For the staff/maintenance with a LinkedIn account, 80 percent use it at home and use it monthly.

All of the constituent groups use the Internet to send e-mails. More than 95 percent of the administration and the full-time faculty send e-mails from both their home and the College, as do 71 percent of the adjunct faculty.
and staff/maintenance. But the overwhelming majority of the constituent groups use the Internet daily. The staff/maintenance group is the least likely to send e-mails daily – 17 percent send e-mails weekly and five percent only send them monthly.

Other than eight percent of the staff/maintenance group, all of the constituents use the Internet to surf for information. The administration and the full-time faculty are most likely to surf for information at both home and the College and the majority of these groups surf daily. Sixty-two percent of the adjunct faculty surf the Internet for information from both home and the campus and 38 percent surf from home, but only 57 percent of the adjunct faculty surf daily, and 36 percent weekly. Three-fourths of the staff/maintenance surf for information from both home and the campus, and 17 percent surf from the campus, but two-thirds of the group surf for information daily and 24 percent surf weekly.

Finally, the constituents were asked if they watched videos on YouTube, and three-fourths of the administration, the part-time faculty, and the full-time faculty do, but only 41 percent of the staff/maintenance watch videos on YouTube. Sixty percent of the administration, who watches YouTube, watches it from home, as do 50 percent of the adjunct faculty, and 73 percent of the staff/maintenance. But 76 percent of the full-time faculty who watch videos on YouTube watches them from both the campus and home. The constituent groups are not daily consumers of YouTube videos – half watch monthly and the majority of the balance watch the videos weekly.

**Chart 12. College E-mail Usage By MCCC Constituents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Checking College E-mail</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Several times a day</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location For Checking College E-mail</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use a computer at home</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a computer at my college office</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a laptop or a netbook with a wireless connection</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a Smartphone with a wireless connection</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College E-mail.** Administration, full-time faculty, and staff/maintenance are frequent users of their College e-mail accounts (see Chart 12). Ninety-five percent of the administration check their college e-mail several times a day, as do 86 percent of the full-time faculty, and 72 percent of the staff/maintenance, and the balance of these groups are likely to check their e-mail daily except for the staff/maintenance where four percent check it several times a week, six percent check it weekly, and one percent check it monthly.

The majority of the administration checks their college e-mail in their college office – 90 percent – and 10 percent use a Smartphone with a wireless Internet connection. Ninety-three percent of the adjunct faculty uses a computer at their home to check their college e-mail and seven percent use the computer in their office at the College. Faculty are much more varied in where they check their College e-mail – one-fourth use their computer at home to check their College e-mail, 58 percent check it in their office at the College, 11 percent use a laptop or a netbook with a wireless connection, and six percent use a Smartphone. The staff/maintenance are most likely to check their College e-mail in their office at the College, four percent use their computer at home, and one percent uses a laptop or a netbook.
Chart 13. College Mailbox Usage By MCCC Constituents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Checking College Mailbox For Information</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Several times a day</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College Mailbox. Personnel at the College still check their physical mailbox at the College on a regular basis, as seen in Chart 13. Forty-eight percent of the administration checks their physical college mailbox several times a day, 43 percent check it daily, and only five percent check it weekly or monthly. The staff/maintenance also check their physical college mailbox regularly – 48 percent check it several times a day, 34 percent check it daily, seven percent check it several times a week or monthly, and two percent never check it. The full-time faculty are less likely to check their physical college mailbox frequently – only 28 percent check it several times a day, 19 percent check it daily, 31 percent only check it weekly, 19 percent monthly, and three percent never check their mailbox. Adjunct faculty are even less likely to check their physical mailbox at the College on a regular basis – only seven percent of the adjunct faculty check it several times a day, 21 percent check it daily, 14 percent several times a week, 43 percent monthly, and 14 percent never check it.

Based on the results of the frequency with which faculty – both adjunct and full-time – do not check their physical mailboxes at the College, the College should reconsider whether important information should be placed in mailboxes and most likely should be sent via e-mail.

Chart 14. Cell Phone Usage By MCCC Constituents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Own A Cell Phone With Internet Capabilities</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Usage Of Text Messaging

| Don't use                                            | 7.7%           | 11.1%             | 9.1%                |                   |
| Home                                                | 25.0%          | 60.0%             | 50.0%               | 70.0%             |
| Both                                                | 75.0%          | 40.0%             | 50.0%               | 30.0%             |

Frequency Of Text Messaging

| Daily                                                | 69.2%          | 75.0%             | 41.2%               | 61.9%             |
| Weekly                                              | 7.7%           | 25.0%             | 23.5%               | 23.8%             |
| Monthly                                             | 15.4%          | 23.5%             | 4.8%                |                   |

Usage Of Camera

| Don't use                                            | 23.1%          | 80.0%             | 80.0%               | 90.9%             |
| Home                                                | 60.0%          | 80.0%             | 80.0%               |                   |
| Campus                                              | 10.0%          | 20.0%             | 20.0%               |                   |
| Both                                                | 30.0%          | 20.0%             | 20.0%               | 9.1%              |

Frequency Of Camera Usage

| Daily                                                | 15.4%          | 5.9%              | 12.5%               |                   |
| Weekly                                              | 23.1%          | 23.5%             | 37.5%               |                   |
| Monthly                                             | 38.5%          | 25.0%             | 37.5%               |                   |

Usage Of Video

<p>| Don't use                                            | 69.2%          | 60.0%             | 68.8%               | 63.6%             |
| Home                                                | 75.0%          | 100.0%            | 60.0%               | 87.5%             |
| Both                                                | 25.0%          | 40.0%             | 12.5%               |                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Video Usage</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty - Adjunct</th>
<th>Faculty - Full-time</th>
<th>Staff/ Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage Of Music or mp3</th>
<th>Don't use</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Usage Of Music or mp3</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't use</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage Of Calendar</th>
<th>Don't use</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Usage Of Calendar</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't use</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Making Phone Calls</th>
<th>Don't use</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Making Phone Calls</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't use</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage Of Internet Access</th>
<th>Don't use</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Of Internet Access</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't use</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other feature used</th>
<th>Android Apps</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>News Applications</th>
<th>GPS</th>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Organizer</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
<th>Internet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note: many cell phones do not work on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cell Phone Usage.** The administration and the full-time faculty are likely to have a cell phone with Internet capabilities but the adjunct faculty and the staff/maintenance are less likely to have a cell phone with Internet as seen in Chart 14. Sixty-two percent of the administration has a cell phone with Internet as do 53 percent of the full-time faculty, but only 36 percent of the adjunct faculty and 34 percent of the staff/maintenance have a cell phone with Internet access. The entire adjunct faculty uses the text messaging function on their phone, as do 92 percent of the administration, 89 percent of the full-time faculty and 91 percent of the staff/maintenance. The administration are likely to text from both home and the College (75 percent), while the adjunct faculty are likely to text from home (60 percent) as are the staff/maintenance (70 percent), but faculty are as likely to text from home (50 percent) as they are from home and the College (50 percent). Overall, the majority of the constituent
groups text daily, except for the faculty who are also likely to text daily (41 percent), weekly (24 percent), and monthly (24 percent).

The entire adjunct faculty uses the camera feature on their phone, as do 92 percent of the staff/maintenance, 83 percent of full-time faculty, and 77 percent of the administration. The majority of the employees use their cameras at home, and most are also likely to use them weekly or monthly.

The majority of the constituent groups do not use the video function on their cell phones – only 40 percent of the respondents use their video cameras, and the majority use their video cameras at home – 75 percent of the administration, all of the adjunct faculty, 60 percent of the full-time faculty, and 88 percent of the staff/maintenance. The majority of the constituents who use the video function on their camera use it only monthly – half of the administration, 60 percent of the full-time faculty, and 62 percent of the staff/maintenance. The entire adjunct faculty uses their video cameras on their phones weekly.

Less than 40 percent of the constituents use their cell phones for music or as an mp3 player, and for those who do, more than two-thirds use them for music at home. The constituents who use their phones for music are likely to listen to them daily – half of the administration and half of the adjunct faculty – but half of the full-time faculty and half of the staff/maintenance listen to music weekly on their phones.

Eighty-five percent of the administration uses their cell phones as a calendar, as do 60 percent of the adjunct faculty, 61 percent of the full-time faculty, and 79 percent of the staff/maintenance. Overall, more than two-thirds of the employees use the calendars both at home and at the campus and the administration and faculty are likely to use the calendars daily, but the staff/maintenance only use their calendars on their phones weekly (28 percent) or monthly (half).

All of the employees surveyed, except for four percent of staff/maintenance, use their phones for making phone calls and the groups use them both at home and at the campus – 85 percent of the administration, 60 percent of the adjunct faculty, 78 percent of the full-time faculty, but the staff/maintenance are more likely to only use them at home (56 percent). More than 88 percent of the employees use their cell phones daily to make phone calls.

Eighty-five percent of the administration use their phones to access the Internet, 91 percent access the Internet both at home and at the College, and 73 percent use the phones daily to connect. All of the adjunct faculty members use their phones to connect to the Internet and 60 percent use them at the College and at home and they are likely to access the Internet daily on their phones. While 79 percent of the full-time faculty use their phones to access the Internet, half use them at home and 53 percent use them both at home and at the campus, but they do not use them daily – only 57 percent access the Internet daily and 43 percent weekly. Finally, the staff/maintenance are the least likely to use their phones to connect to the Internet – only 58 percent of the staff/maintenance use their phone to access the Internet, and the majority use it at home (86 percent), but they are likely to access it daily (62 percent).

Communication – Issues To Address

After reviewing the technology usage and communication preferences of the employees at the College, the following recommendations are offered for improving communications:

- **Recommendation**: The College needs to develop a system for disseminating the mission critical information. The mission critical information should always be shared with employees in the same form and using the same subject line or another identifier and be from key administrative staff – for example the President or the Vice Presidents and not the administrative assistants. Using consistent descriptors or clues in the subject line and key
individuals as the source of the messages will provide visual clues to the employees to pay attention to the information. The job critical information should also have a specific subject line that is used every time information is sent and should be sent from the supervisors.

- **Recommendation:** For the organizations at the College that are not presenting mission critical or job critical information needed by all employees, develop e-mail opt-in lists that will send the information electronically. The recipient at the College can then continue to receive the information if they are interested or they can opt-out of the e-mail lists if it is not something they want to receive. A couple of times a year, the group can send an all-user e-mail to update their lists.

- **Recommendation:** A location on the College’s web site should be designated as the official depository for the “official College information,” and another location on the College web site should be designed for the events and activities. The events and activities should be organized by subject so that the employees can quickly navigate the information and find the key events and activities of interest to them. This information would be posted and not pushed out to the employees. Finally, information sessions should be held to explain the types of information that will be pushed out with the coding system, and the location of the organizational information. A “cheat sheet” should be developed that will allow old and new employees alike a quick reference for the location of information that is posted, and who to contact to include information.

- **Recommendation:** Guidelines should be developed for creating subject lines for e-mails for all employees that will provide an immediate indication of the source of the information as well as the critical nature of the information to employees.

- **Recommendation:** For the organizational information that people would like to know, create a Facebook page for employees to ask questions, make comments, and post information. This would allow employees to follow happenings at the College, much like the old “water cooler” conversations, as well as “like” events, and provide input on things they deem relevant. But the official college communications – mission and job critical – would not be posted on the page.

- **Recommendation:** Utilize electronic voting to build consensus on issues. When sending e-mails about key issues at the College, obtain the opinion of the employees by adding a like/dislike feature or an agree/disagree feature to the e-mail. Employees can respond and their electronic votes can be quickly collected to see how they may feel about an issue. This would be similar to using the Like feature on Facebook pages.
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INTRODUCTION

- Kathi Swanson, Consultant, CLARUS Corporation – provided background on Consultant and Company
  1. Consultant’s Commitment
     - Do No Harm!
     - I Cannot Fix Anyone Or Change Anyone!
     - I Can Provide Recommendations – I Cannot Make The Organization Change!

- Purpose: Conducting an audit of internal and external communication for the College and want to understand what is working in communication and potential improvements

- Scope: To examine the current effectiveness of communication and to make recommendations for improving efficiency and effectiveness in communication – internally and externally

- Review Of Materials: Have already examined a large number of samples of printed and electronic pieces of internal and external communications

FOCUS GUIDE

Defining Internal Communication

Internal communication is a generic expression for all communication (formal and informal) that a college undertakes with its stakeholders – those people with whom it has a relationship that requires support, principally employees and students. The main purpose of internal communication is to inform employees and/or members of the direction and performance of the College (or team) to which they belong.

Let’s use that definition “to inform” as the basis of our discussion.

But, “informing” can mean many things to many people. I would like to provide a framework for categorizing inform into three types of information colleges have to deal with:

A. Mission Critical Information
   Defined as strategic, mission altering items which need to be communicated – example: budget reduction of 20 percent for the next budget year, a new legislative law impacting enrollment, etc.

B. Job Critical Information
   Defined as time-sensitive information that is imperative to an employee performing their job at the College – example: full-time faculty position not being replaced and need for adding adjuncts to cover promised class schedule
C. Organizational Information
Defined as information that is good to know but not needed – example: Wellness class being offered for three weeks on campus and employees invited to attend, or ESL open house;

1. Assessment Of Current Internal Communication

A. Mission Critical
   a. Please provide me with an example of a recent communication you believe illustrates an excellent example of good internal communication for a mission critical issue
   b. Please provide me with an example of a recent internal communication you believe illustrates an example of a poor internal communication for a mission critical issue

B. Job Critical
   a. Please provide me with an example of a recent communication you believe illustrates an excellent example of good internal communication for a job critical issue
   b. Please provide me with an example of a recent internal communication you believe illustrates an example of a poor internal communication for a job critical issue

C. Organizational
   a. Please provide me with an example of a recent communication you believe illustrates an excellent example of good internal communication for an organizational issue
   b. Please provide me with an example of a recent internal communication you believe illustrates an example of a poor internal communication for an organizational issue

2. Evaluating Communication Channels
Explain the types of information channels

Formal Channels

- Electronic: Communications that are delivered and/ or accessed electronically, either by computer, telephone, television, or other devices. Examples include e-mail, intranet, video and webcasts, electronic newsletters, podcasts, blogs, Wikis, voicemail, conference calls, SMS text messaging, screensaver messaging, desktop alert messages, desktop news feeds, and internal social media tools (e.g.: internal Twitter-style sites.)

- Print: Paper-based communication. Examples include magazines, newsletters, brochures, postcards and other desk drops, posters, memos, etc.

- Face-to-face: One-to-one and one-to-many forums where people are physically present. Examples include team meetings or briefings, conferences, site visits, ‘back to the floor’, consultation forums, ‘brown bag’ lunches, round-table discussions, ‘town meetings’, etc.

- Workspace: The working environment. Examples include notice boards, plasma and LCD screens, accessories (e.g.: mouse pads), window decals, etc.
Informal Channels

- Internal communication channels are often termed as the rumor-mill, water-cooler conversations, social networking, and graffiti

I would like to provide a framework for categorizing inform into three types of information colleges have to deal with:

A. Mission Critical
   a. From which of these channels do you currently get mission critical information?
   b. Is this an effective communication channel?
   c. What formal channels would be more efficient for you to get mission critical information?

B. Job Critical
   a. From which of these channels do you currently get job critical information?
   b. Is this an effective communication channel?
   c. What formal channels would be more efficient for you to get job critical information?

C. Organizational
   a. From which of these channels do you currently get organizational information?
   b. Is this an effective communication channel?
   c. What formal channels would be more efficient for you to get organizational information?

D. Other Issues
   a. Any other issues regarding internal communication that would be beneficial for me to understand at the College as we conduct our audit?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP – HAVE A GOOD DAY (EVENING)!
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PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

FACULTY SENATE CHARTER

[Approved March 2, 2007]

I. PURPOSE

A. The Faculty Senate is the representative body of all faculty (full-time and adjunct) that participates in the governance processes of Pima Community College.

B. The Faculty Senate is an integral part of the Pima Community College structure and operates under the policies and procedures of the College.

C. The Faculty Senate, through its President or other authorized representatives, will make appropriate recommendations to the Board of Governors, the Chancellor, the Presidents, and other Administrators of the College.

II. OBJECTIVES

The Faculty Senate shall:

A. Strengthen the concept of the faculty as a College entity.

B. Promote the gathering, exchanging, and disseminating of faculty views and concerns.

C. Advise the Board of Governors, the Chancellor, and other administrators of faculty views and concerns.

D. Promote mutual accountability and reporting between the College faculty and the faculty representatives to any College committee.

E. Bring the concerns of the Board of Governors, the Chancellor, and other administrators to the faculty.


G. Advise the Board of Governors, the Chancellor, and other administrators regarding all Board Policies and those Regulations and Standard Practice Guides that pertain to faculty, students, and Academics.

H. Promote the involvement of all faculty members in the establishing, staffing, and functioning of College committees, task forces, or other initiatives.

III. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. The College faculty will participate in the work of the Faculty Senate through election to the Senate, communication with individual members, and open meetings.
B. Senators are expected to solicit input from their constituents, represent them at Senate meetings, and report back to them.

C. Senators are expected to attend Senate meetings on a regular basis and, whenever possible, to have a proxy attend those meetings which they are unable to attend.

IV. MEMBERSHIP AND ELECTIONS

A. One representative is to be elected by secret ballot from among the full-time faculty members of each of the Academic Departments (or Divisions, depending on the configuration of the campus) of the district. In the event that no full-time faculty member is nominated, an adjunct faculty member may be nominated and elected at the discretion of the department (or division) faculty. In addition, one full-time faculty member shall be elected to represent the district librarians and one shall be elected to represent counselors. The elections for representatives at the Community, Northwest and West Campuses shall take place in even-numbered years. The elections for representatives at Desert Vista, Downtown and East Campuses, as well as for representatives for the district librarians and the counselors, shall take place in odd-numbered years.

B. One adjunct shall be elected from each of the campuses at the College in an election conducted by the person in charge of the campus Faculty Resource Center working in conjunction with the Senate Vice President.

C. One non-voting, ex-officio representative shall be appointed by the President of the Faculty Representative Group (currently PCCEA).

D. In order to insure overall continuity of the Senate, full-time faculty will not have less than 51% of the total Senate representation. If, as the result of any election, adjunct faculty should exceed 49% of the electees, then a sufficient number of full-time faculty Senate positions from the College (“at large” representatives) will be established and opened for election.

E. Each Senator shall serve for a two-year term with no restrictions on the number of terms. Any full-time faculty who is elected as the President-elect of the Faculty Senate will automatically have his/her term extended from the time they become President-elect. This allows for the President-elect to serve as President-elect and the next year as the Faculty Senate President.

F. The regular election for full-time and adjunct faculty members for the Faculty Senate shall be held in October with the understanding that newly elected members will take office in January.

G. In the event of a departmental reorganization, College-wide or on a campus, new Senators will be elected from newly created departments, during the first month of the Fall semester immediately following the change.

H. Special Circumstances of Membership:

1. In the event of a member going on leave, the member shall have the option of continuing to participate in Senate business, or requesting the vacancy be filled by election.

2. In the event of a member’s transfer to a different administrative unit of the College, a new person will be elected to fill the position.
3. If a Senator is unable to attend Senate Meetings for a given semester due to a class conflict an “interim Senator” can be determined in a documented, informal departmental election. The Interim Senator will serve as Senator in the department for one semester only. Informal election results must be forwarded to the Senate President so that the Senate records reflect the change in representation.

4. If necessary, the Senate terms of Officers and BOG Representatives shall be extended by one year upon their election. If this occurs, the Department will complete the election cycle by holding an off-year election for a one-year term so that the normal election cycle (see IV/A above) remains intact.

V. OFFICERS:

A. PRESIDENT

1. The President (or his/her designee) will be responsible for chairing Senate meetings and any open meetings of the faculty called by the Senate leadership. The President, working with officers and chairpersons of any committees which may be established by the Senate, will develop the agenda and work with members of the Senate to reach established goals.

2. The Senate President has the authority to appoint temporary replacements for short-term vacancies.

B. PRESIDENT-ELECT

1. A President-elect will be elected annually by the Senate at the first meeting of the calendar year; this person will assist and learn from the sitting President as President-elect and serve as Senate President in the following year.

2. A sitting President may put his/her name forward as a candidate in an election for President-elect.

C. PAST PRESIDENT

The President will serve as Past-President for one year after the completion of his/her term and will assist the current President as requested.

D. VICE PRESIDENT

1. A Vice-President will be elected annually by the Senate at the first meeting of the calendar year.

2. The Vice President is responsible for supervising elections (with clerical support from the Secretary) and will join the President and President-elect at the Faculty Senate Agenda review meetings. He/she will also contact Senators who are not attending on a regular basis and, if necessary, refer the matter to Chair of the Department that the Senator represents or, if the Department Chair is the Senator, to the other full-time faculty in the Department.

E. SECRETARY

1. A Secretary will be elected annually by the Senate at the first meeting of the calendar year.

2. The Secretary will supervise clerical support for the Senate, including creating accurate summary notes of major points and discussions. This position should only be held by a Faculty Senator.
F. BOARD OF GOVERNORS REPRESENTATIVE

1. Two faculty representatives from the full-time faculty shall be elected from the membership of the Faculty Senate to serve as non-voting representatives to the Board of Governors. Board of Governors Representatives shall serve staggered two-year terms. One Board of Governors representative shall be elected during the first Senate meeting of each calendar year.

2. The BOG Representative represents the Faculty Senate at all meetings of the Board of Governors of Pima Community College. Additionally, the BOG Representatives are also members of the Board Agenda Review (BAR) Committee and are expected to attend both BAR and BOG meetings.

VI. COMMITTEES

A. The Senate may, by successful motion, establish any standing or ad hoc committees it deems appropriate, and shall determine the respective charges of such committees. Any such committee shall be responsible for electing its own chairs and determining its meeting schedule. Upon request of the Senate President, the chair of any Senate committee shall report to the Senate about its progress or its findings.

B. At the request of two or more Senators who are adjuncts, a Standing Adjunct Committee shall be established. The Standing Adjunct Committee will determine its charge, subject to approval by the Senate. The Committee shall be responsible for electing its own chairs and determining its meeting schedule. Upon request of the Senate President, the chair of any Senate committee shall report to the Senate about its progress or its findings.

VII. MEETINGS

A. The Senate will meet monthly during the academic year.

B. The Senate meetings are open, and the meeting schedule will be posted on the Faculty Senate website.

C. For the purpose of conducting Senate business, a quorum shall consist of a majority of elected Senators.

D. Decisions of the Faculty Senate will require a majority vote of members in attendance.

E. Faculty Senate meetings are divided into three portions: The Report Session, the Business Session and the Open Forum.

F. Participation in the Report and Business Sessions is limited to elected members and invited guests. Participation in the Open Forum is afforded to all faculty.

G. Senators may, by successful motion, request an Executive Session to be held directly after adjournment of the Faculty Senate meeting or at a time and place of the Senate’s choosing. Participation during the Executive Session is limited to Senators.
VIII. DECISION MAKING PROCESS FOR SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

A. The Senate may, by formal motion, identify certain agenda items as “significant issues.” A significant issue is one that has either College-wide impact or affects a majority of faculty or its presentation at a meeting would be potentially divisive or highly controversial.

B. A significant issue will be addressed by an ad hoc committee (which includes at least one Senate member) as appropriate, through any or all of the following:
   1. By conducting research on the past history of the issue at PCC.
   2. By conducting research on how the issue has surfaced and been handled elsewhere.
   3. By holding public hearings outside Faculty Senate meetings to collect data on the issue.
   4. By working with institutional research to design and conduct any surveys or questionnaires which might be required.
   5. By writing up the results of all the above activities.
   6. By formulating a draft motion based on those results.
   7. By submitting the report and draft motion to the Senate before a decision is made.

C. Once such issues are flagged, they shall be publicized as Senate agenda items and be the subject of at least two formal discussions, after any or all of the steps outlined above in section B are completed, at Faculty Senate meetings. If action is required on the part of Faculty Senate, it will be taken following the two formal discussions.

IX. RELATION TO FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE GROUP

The Faculty Senate is a forum for any faculty concern. However, the faculty recognizes the unique role of the elected Faculty Representative Group in the Meet-and-Confer process. Therefore, in order to safeguard the value and integrity of the established grievance procedure, the Faculty Senate will refer to the Faculty Representative Group those concerns specifically provided for in the current Faculty Personnel Policy Statement.

X. CHANGES TO THE FACULTY SENATE CHARTER

The Senate charter can only be amended by a formal vote of the Faculty Senate. The changes to the charter must be studied and discussed in one Executive Session. If the proposed changes are deemed acceptable to a majority of those in attendance, the proposed changes shall then be discussed and voted upon in a subsequent regular Senate meeting. To approve the proposed changes, two thirds of those in attendance will have to vote in the affirmative.
XI. RECORDS

Faculty Senate audio-visual records shall be kept in the archives of the West Campus Library. The Senate Secretary will forward copies of those records to the Library on a regular basis to keep the collection up to date. The Senate Secretary shall also retain a digital copy of all Senate agendas and approved minutes and archive it once a year at the West Campus Library.
Appendix H. Sample Faculty Association Constitution
CONSTITUTION OF THE VALENCIA COLLEGE FACULTY ASSOCIATION

Preamble

The faculty of Valencia College, committed to the philosophy that the faculty be provided with a formal voice in the development of the college, does establish this Constitution. In recognition of the faculty role in the college’s shared governance model, the Faculty Council, defined below, shall serve as the voice of the Association as a governing council of the college.

Article I Name and Purpose

Sect A. This organization shall be known as the Valencia College Faculty Association.

Sect B. The purpose of the organization shall be:
1. to advise the President of the college on matters of college improvements and faculty related interests,
2. to promote communication and mutual understanding within the faculty and between the faculty and other groups, and
3. to provide a democratic means of formulating questions and articulating problems and solutions.

Sect C. "Association" shall mean the Valencia College Faculty Association.

Sect D. There shall be a Faculty Council (defined in Articles III and IV) that shall act as the voice of the Association in the college’s governance model. "Council" shall mean the Valencia Community College Faculty Council.

Article II Members of the Association

Sect A. Full-time professors, librarians, counselors and other professionals who devote at least sixty (60) percent of their regularly assigned duties to instructing or counseling students shall be members of the Association.

1. A member of the Association placed on a contract of less than full-time for a portion of the year remains a member of the Association for the remainder of the academic year that member is employed part-time by Valencia College.
2. A member of the Association fully reassigned for no more than one academic year from instructional or counseling duties to work on faculty or instructional issues shall remain a fully vested member of the Association.
3. A member of the Association fully reassigned for a term of more than one academic year shall relinquish his/her Association status until he/she returns to regular duties. Consecutive reassignments for a period of more than a year shall require a member to relinquish his/her Association membership.
4. A member of the Association reassigned to work in an administrative capacity shall relinquish his/her Association status until he/she returns to regular duties. If an Association member's reassignment status is unclear, his/her status will be determined by a majority vote of the Faculty Council.

Sect B. The President and Vice-President (President-Elect) of the Association must have earned tenure before taking office.
Article III Campus Faculty Organizations

Sect A. A campus faculty organization shall include the members of the Association whose place of employment is on that campus. The membership of the campus faculty organization may include representatives of faculty non-members of the Association as specified in the by-laws of the campus faculty organization.

Sect B. The by-laws of a campus faculty organization may contain such additional or implementing matters of internal organization as are deemed appropriate to that campus provided they are not in conflict with this Constitution.

Sect C. The purposes of a campus faculty organization shall be consistent with Article I, Section B and in addition shall be to advise the chief administrative officer on that campus.

Sect D. A campus faculty organization with officers shall elect its representatives to the Faculty Council in either November or December of each year. These representatives will begin serving on the Council in January.

Sect E. The primary duty of campus senators/representatives will be to share the perspectives of the faculty at their campus with the campus faculty organization and at meetings of the Faculty Council.

Sect F. The campus senate will make recommendations for appointments of faculty from its campus as requested by the Council.

Sect G. A "campus" is defined as a place of instruction with representation on the Executive Council or equivalent. The current campuses are East Campus, Osceola Campus, West Campus, and Winter Park Campus.

Article IV Faculty Council and Officers of the Association

Sect A. There shall be a Faculty Council composed of the President of the Association, the Vice-President (President-Elect) of the Association, and at-large representatives selected by the campus faculty organizations. Each campus faculty organization shall select one at-large representative as a member of the Faculty Council for every forty full-time faculty members employed on that campus; one more will be selected for any remainder of full-time faculty members in excess of forty. Any campus organization representing fewer than forty full-time faculty members shall select a second representative on the Faculty Council. The President and the Vice-President of each campus faculty organization will be the first two selected representatives of the campus's faculty to the Faculty Council.

Sect B. The Faculty Council shall serve as the official voice of faculty in college governance, and as a governing council, to take actions for the Association, with the exception of decisions reserved for the Association as a whole. Decisions specifically reserved for the Association include policy-level decisions regarding compensation, benefits, workload conditions, and constitutional revisions (see Article VIII).

Sect C. The Faculty Council has the right to defer decisions to the Association when it deems appropriate.

Sect D. At-large representatives from each campus shall hold office for two (2) years or until the election and installation of a successor in the case of removal or resignation. Elections for at-large members shall be staggered. All other members of the Faculty Council shall hold office commencing with the installation of the new members of the Faculty Council and lasting for one year or until the election and installation of a successor in the case of removal or resignation. A vacancy on the Faculty Council shall be filled at the earliest convenience by the
campus faculty organization in a manner determined by the members of the campus faculty organization.

**Sect E.** The officers of the Faculty Council shall be a President, a Vice President (President-Elect), and a Secretary. Only a member of the Association can be an officer of the Council.

**Sect F.** No more than seven days before the March meeting of the Council, members of the Council must communicate the name of any Council member or former Council member they wish to nominate for president. Former Council members must serve on the Council within the two previous calendar years in order to be eligible for nomination.

**Sect G.** Before the April meeting of the Faculty Council, the candidates will prepare a one-page document explaining their experience at the college and in governance as well as any other pertinent information.

**Sect H.** Within two weeks after the April Council meeting, a secure election must be held in which all Association members will be eligible to vote for one president from the slate of candidates. The candidate receiving the most votes will assume the position of Vice President (President-Elect) of the Association at the May Council meeting.

**Sect I.** At the May meeting of the Council the current Vice President of the Association shall automatically assume the office of President of the Association.

**Sect J.** Officers of the Association shall hold office commencing with their election at the meeting of the Faculty Council in May and lasting for one year or until the election and installation of a successor in the case of removal or resignation.

**Sect K.** The procedures of selection of nominees for president of the Association shall be as specified by the Faculty Council.

**Sect L.** In the event the office of President of the Association becomes vacant, the Vice President of the Association shall assume the office of President for the remainder of the term. If the remainder of the term assumed by the Vice President is less than four months, the Vice President shall also automatically assume the office of President for the ensuing calendar year. Any other vacancy of the presidency of the Association shall be filled at the earliest convenience by the Faculty Council in a special election with full vote of all Association members on nominees selected by the Council.

**Sect M.** The immediate past President of the Association shall act as an advisor to the current President of the Association and to the Faculty Council and shall attend all meetings of the Faculty Council as a non-voting member.

**Article V Meetings and Duties of the Faculty Council**

**Sect A.** The Faculty Council shall hold regular meetings once each month during Sessions 1 and 2. The Council shall meet at least twice in Session 5. Special meetings of the Council may be called by the President of the Association. Upon a call or petition to the President by at least twenty-five (25) percent of the membership of the Council, the President shall call a special meeting of the Council.

**Sect B.** A quorum for any meeting of the Faculty Council shall consist of a majority of the members of the Faculty Council, including one member from each campus.

**Sect C.** It shall be the duties and functions of the Faculty Council to:

1. represent the Association in all matters of faculty interest;
2. hear, discuss, coordinate and recommend action on the various reports of Association
committees and of campus faculty organizations;
3. disseminate to the members of the Association appropriate information regarding issues affecting all members of the Association;
4. advise the President of the College on all matters of college improvement or other matters of faculty interest that may affect the operation of the college; and
5. act on all other matters of business which are not specifically reserved for the Association members and which are necessary and proper in order to carry out the foregoing duties and functions.

**Sect D.** If a member of the Faculty Council misses two (2) consecutive regular meetings or three (3) meetings during the course of a calendar year, 2/3 of the total membership of the Council may vote to remove that Council member.

**Article VI Duties of Officers of the Association**

**Sect A.** The President shall:
1. preside at all meetings of the Association;
2. preside at all meeting of the Faculty Council;
3. serve as spokesman for the Association on all matters pertaining to the concerns of the Association;
4. call special meetings as provided for in Article V and in Article VII, Sect A;
5. appoint all committees of the Association at the direction of the Faculty Council;
6. make provisions for the discharge pro tempore of necessary duties of absent members;
7. carry out instructions given to the President by directive of the Association and/or Faculty Council;
8. perform such other duties as pertain to the office of the President;
9. provide appropriate files and other materials to the incoming President to assist in the transition of office;
10. issue notices and agendas for Association and Faculty Council meetings;
11. be a voting member of the College Planning Council, College Learning Council, and College Executive Council, and Learning Leadership Team;
12. represent the Association with voice at meetings of the Board of Trustees of the college;
13. represent faculty (or appoint a proxy to) at all meetings of all councils, work groups, task forces and other gatherings at which issues affecting faculty are discussed; and
14. manage any budget of the Board in accordance with the wishes of the Board membership.

**Sect B.** The Vice President shall be an aid to the President and, in case of the absence or disability of the President, shall pro tempore perform the duties of the President. The Vice President shall also attend all meetings of the Council Officers and other meetings in place of the President when so directed by the President.

**Sect C.** The Secretary shall:
1. record the proceedings of all Association and Board of Directors meetings; and
2. maintain a file of the minutes and, if requested by the President, maintain files of the minutes and membership of college-wide committees and faculty committees.

**Article VII Association Meetings**

**Sect A.** One regular meeting of the Association may be held each year, the time and place to be determined by the Faculty Council. The Faculty Council by majority vote may direct the President of the Association to call a special meeting of the members of the Association. Twenty-five (25) percent of the membership of the Association may, in writing, direct the Association President to call a special meeting of the Association. A simple majority of a campus senate or campus association may direct the Association President to call a special meeting of the members of the Association.
Sect B. All members of the Association shall be notified in writing of the time, place, and purposes of a special meeting.

Sect C. A quorum for a regular or special meeting shall be the number of members of the Association present.

**Article VIII Decisions Reserved for Association Membership**

Sect A. All policy-level decisions regarding compensation, member benefits, workload conditions, or constitutional revision shall be made by the full Association membership.

Sect B. The decisions or opinions of members of the Association shall be obtained by a majority vote of those present at a regular or special meeting when the issue to be decided has been submitted to the members of the Association in writing prior to the meeting.

Sect C. Between meetings, the decisions or opinions of members of the Association shall be obtained by a majority vote of those responding to a written ballot or questionnaire distributed by the Faculty Council.

**Article IX Constitution and By-Laws**

Sect A. This Constitution may be amended by a majority vote of the members of the Association provided that written or printed notice of the proposed amendment is given to all members of the Association at least two weeks prior to the balloting.

Sect B. Bylaws of this Association may be adopted by a majority vote of the members of the Association, provided that previous notice is given. After the bylaws are adopted, they shall be amended only in accordance with the provisions set forth in the bylaws.

Revised December 1994
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Revised September/October, 2004

Final Revision November 19, 2004
Appendix I. Sample Of Shared Governance Council Model
**Shared Governance Structure**

ACC is committed to fostering collaboration, communication, and access to information among its faculty, staff, and students. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees has adopted Policy C-5 to address Shared Governance and the College has adopted Administrative Rule 3.05.005 to implement that policy.

**Still in effect (FY12):** Responses from President's Office in regard to Shared Governance (PDF). Additional changes must be approved by the President/President's Leadership Team.

1) The Fundamental Principles of Shared Governance

- Decisions are made by the appropriate person or body within the college after solicitation of, and taking due account of, input from those with relevant expertise or information, including all stakeholders (through their representative organizations).
- Decisions and their rationale are shared with those who provided input through ACC’s system of Shared Governance.
- Representatives who serve on recommending bodies ensure the accurate and timely flow of information between those they represent and the bodies on which they serve (in both directions).

2) The Fundamental Structures of Shared Governance—Councils and Committees:

Institutional decision making at ACC is supported by a system of Shared Governance composed of councils and committees that function as recommending bodies with respect to those matters that fall under their sphere of responsibility.

A “council” is a recommending body that makes recommendations directly to the President and which has a sphere of responsibility of particularly broad scope or significance. ACC shall have the following five councils:

- Administrative Services Council
- Student Services Council
- Academic and Campus Affairs Council
- Institutional Planning Council
- Shared Governance Review Council

A “committee” is a recommending body that makes recommendations to a council and whose sphere of responsibility falls within that of the council to which it makes its recommendations. A committee is either a “standing committee”, which is expected to meet an ongoing need of the college, or an “ad hoc” committee”, which is expected to meet it function(s) within a limited
time after which it will be disbanded. Every committee shall be assigned to an appropriate council to assure that recommendations are reviewed appropriately and forwarded ultimately to the President.

3) Access to Information

All councils, standing committees, and ad hoc committees will have a written function statement, membership list (including terms of appointments), and contact information posted in Organizational Reference.

Chairs of all committees and councils listed in the Organizational Reference are encouraged to post provisional minutes of meetings within 10 days of the meeting date, and must post final, approved minutes within 10 days of the committee’s next meeting. Minutes will be posted on the ACC Meeting Minutes Repository or on individual sites.

4) The Functions and Purposes of Councils and Committees

The commitment to Shared Governance at ACC entails a commitment to the effective use of participatory governing councils and committees to draw upon the expertise of the members of the ACC community, and to represent the stakeholders within the ACC community, in the process of governing the college and guiding it towards fulfillment of its mission. The role of each governing council or committee is to make recommendations to the appropriate council and, ultimately, to the President of the college with respect to a designated sphere of responsibility. For a committee to be effective in its work, its sphere of responsibility must be clearly defined in a set of functions, the fulfillment of which constitutes the purpose of the committee. To properly regulate committees, they must be created with a clearly defined and well constituted purpose, they must be evaluated with respect to both the continuing significance of their purpose and their ability to fulfill that purpose, and they must be continued, modified, or dissolved on the basis of those evaluations.

5) Creation, Modification, and Dissolution of Committees

A) CREATION OF COMMITTEES

A new committee is created when it is determined that some sphere of responsibility needs the attention of a representative, recommending body and that there is no currently constituted body to which the responsibility appropriately can be assigned. Anyone in the college community can propose the creation of a committee in writing to the President who will decide (possibly after soliciting input from some relevant council(s) or committee(s)) whether the committee should be formed and what its exact function and membership ought to be.

The proposal for creating a new committee must include the following information:

- A general description of need for the committee including whether it will
be a standing committee (permanent) or an ad hoc committee (temporary)

- A specific description of the function(s) of the committee
- Identification of the council to which the committee will forward its recommendations
- A draft of a work plan for the first year
- Suggested membership of the committee
  - **Ex officio** members (i.e., people who serve because, and so long as, they fill a specified position at ACC, e.g., AVP, Information Technologies, VP, Student Success and Support Systems, etc.)
  - Slots designated for representation by categories (including suggested term lengths)
  - Representatives of job functions (e.g., deans, campus managers, lab assistants, etc.) and college offices (e.g., Distance Learning, Campus Police, etc.)
  - Representatives of ACC constituencies (e.g., two from CEA, two from SGA, etc.)

Note: The rules above do not apply when a committee creates a sub-committee from a subset of its membership to address an issue that falls within its current sphere of responsibility.

Necessary components for a new committee roster listing for the ACC Organizational Reference. (PDF format)

**B) REVIEW, MODIFICATION, AND DISSOLUTION OF COMMITTEES**

To ensure that the efforts of each committee are worthwhile and contribute to the mission of the College, each committee will evaluate itself at the beginning of each fiscal year, report its evaluation to the council to which it makes recommendations, and be reviewed by that council. These evaluations will include a review of the functions of the committee, an assessment of whether the activities of the committee have been appropriately directed to its functions, and an assessment of whether the membership of the committee is appropriate for its functions. On the basis of these evaluations recommendations may be forwarded to the President for the modification or dissolution of a committee (except in the case of sub-committees for which all authority over modification or dissolution rests with the parent committee) in the late Spring. Councils will engage in a similar self-evaluation and make report to the President.

- **Modification of a committee’s function:** A recommendation may call for an addition to, change of, or deletion from, the existing functions of a committee within its sphere of responsibility.
- Modification of a committee’s membership: A recommendation may call for a change in the membership of the committee to assure access to valuable expertise or that all stakeholders are appropriately represented.
  - formal requests for association representative changes should be made to the President during the late Spring.

- Dissolution of a committee: A recommendation may call for the dissolution of a committee if either:
  - the work of the committee has been completed, or
  - the committee’s essential function(s) are better fulfilled by another body. Such a recommendation should include a suggestion addressing the transfer of the essential function(s) to another committee (or other committees).

6) Representation on Councils and Committees

- Employee Organizations and the Student Government Association appoint their own representatives to councils and committees. (Grid showing # of association reps FY12)

- NEW: Beginning Fall 2010, Shared Governance Review Council (SGRC) co-chairs send an email to the Presidents of the four employee associations and the SGA and to the chairs of all ACC councils and committees, and a submission to be included with the President’s Friday Announcements, requesting recommendations with respect to the structure, functions, and membership of councils and committees at ACC. All responses to this solicitation are to be submitted to sgrc@austincc.edu by the second Friday in November.

- Each council will be co-chaired by an employee or student representative, elected by its members.

- Association and Organization representatives have the responsibility to represent their constituencies’ interests and to communicate with their constituencies regarding their work on councils and committees. It is the responsibility of each organization to determine how its representatives will communicate with its membership.

- Students and members of the Adjunct Faculty will receive a stipend for participation in shared governance as discussed in (9) below.

7) Responsibilities of Chairs/Co-Chairs include:

RE: Meetings:

- Establish an annual calendar of meetings.

- Hold meetings at HBC to the extent compatible with other institutional interests.
• Solicit agenda input from Council/Committee members at least 10 working days before each meeting.

• Distribute a proposed agenda at least 5 working days before each meeting. A Chair is not required to include all proposed items within the proposed agenda, but must explain omissions in advance to the requestor.

• Begin each meeting by calling for a vote to approve the agenda, permitting modification of the agenda by amendment during that process.

• Keep meetings focused on the agenda and encourage participation.

• Permit a vote only when a quorum (i.e., a majority of the currently appointed members) is present.

• Conduct electronic voting only in accord with the approved procedure (see (8) below).

• Record attendance at meetings and report chronic non-attendance to the appointing personnel.

• Use the Suggested template (available internally only) to prepare provisional minutes and post them; preferably within 10 days of each meeting. Post final, approved minutes within 10 days of the committee's next meeting.

  • Meeting minutes can be posted:

    • on an individual or department website, examples:

      • Campus Facilities Operations Committee

      • College Wide Technology & Capital Outlay Committee

    • utilizing the ACC Meeting Minutes Repository (preferred, if not on an individual website)

• The Chairs of the ACAC, ASC, and SSC must distribute a provisional (unofficial) copy of the minutes of the Council of which she or he is Chair to the presidents of the four employee associations and the SGA within 5 working days of each Council meeting (to keep the associations apprised of the status of proposed ARs, Procedures, or revisions of the same in a more timely manner).

**RE: Personnel:**

• Orient new members to the council or committee and its functions.

• Process Stipend payments in accord with ACC Administrative Rule (see (9) below).
**RE: Other Shared Governance Concerns:**

- Forward all recommendations to the appropriate body in accordance with (2) above.
- Solicit regular reports from all immediately subordinate committees as to their activities and their fulfillment of their functions.
- Initiate the committee’s self-evaluation early each fiscal year and present the results to the body to which the committee makes its recommendations (as per 5B above).
- Assure that the committee’s functions, membership, and contact information are properly presented in Organizational Reference.
- Council Chairs: Distribute to the Presidents of the employee associations and the SGA a draft of any proposed new administrative rule, change to an administrative rule, new college procedure, or change to a college procedure at least 10 working days prior to taking a final vote on the matter.

**8) Electronic Voting**

Councils and Committees may use electronic voting in accord with the following procedures:

- Only the Chair of a Council or Committee is authorized to call for an electronic vote.
- An electronic vote is appropriate only when a matter has already been substantially addressed by the Council or Committee but some minor issue (e.g., the completion of minor revisions or the distribution of a piece of information) needs to be addressed prior to the vote or when, in the judgment of the Chair, the interests of ACC will be damaged if the matter has to wait until the next scheduled meeting.
- The call for an electronic vote must be made on a listserv that includes all members of the Council or Committee or by an email for which the distribution lists includes all members of the Council or Committee. In all cases, the communication medium employed must be one that reaches all members of the Council or Committee and one that facilitates making responses that are automatically distributed to all members of the Council or Committee.
- At the discretion of the Chair, the voting may commence immediately, or only after some designated period set aside for discussion.
- Council or Committee members may vote only through replies that are distributed to all members of the Council or Committee.
- Once a majority of the Council or Committee has voted, the vote will remain open for an additional 24 hours, at which time the decision of the
majority shall count as the decision of the Council or Committee, except that at whatever time a majority of the Council or Committee registers votes on the same side, that immediately becomes the decision of the Council or Committee.

9) Stipends

- A stipend shall be paid to any Student or member of the Adjunct Faculty who serves as an official representative of the Student Government Association (SGA) or the Adjunct Faculty Association (AFA) on a council or a committee listed in the Organizational Reference.

- A stipend shall be paid to any member of the Adjunct Faculty who participates as either an official voting or non-voting member of a departmental governing body.

- Stipend payments are determined as part of the annual operating budget and will be announced by the President.

- Stipends are to be paid as noted below:
  - Fall - End of December for SGA
  - Spring - End of May for SGA
  - Summer - Mid-August for SGA
  - Adjunct Faculty may be paid monthly. Committee/Council chairs are responsible for reporting the attendance of adjunct faculty and ensuring that adjunct faculty are paid for their service.
  - Department Chairs are responsible for requesting stipends for adjunct faculty through the Personnel Authorization system for departmental governing body meetings.

- Additional Information:
  - Adjunct Faculty Association stipends
    - Administrative Rule for Adjunct Faculty Stipends
    - Specific dates/instructions in memo from HR (PDF)
    - HR FY10 Payroll schedule
  - Student Government Association stipends
    - Administrative Rule for Student Stipends
    - Specific dates/instructions (PDF)
Administrative Services Council

Functions:

1. Develops recommendations for district-wide policies and procedures.
2. Develops budget and staffing priorities for assigned units.
3. Provides for the continuous improvement of administrative services on a college-wide basis.
4. Enhance consistency of campus/center operations across the district. \textit{(moved from ACAC; effective June 1, 2011)}
5. Reviews annual Effectiveness Improvements Report and Improvement Plans and Progress Reports.
6. Seeks to better coordinate services among all campuses/sites.
7. Provides linkages between campuses and the various District administrative units.
8. Responds to requests and recommendations from assigned Task Forces and Committees.
9. Develops recommendations for district-wide facilities and preventative maintenance plans.
10. Develops annual revenue projections and updates five-year expenditure estimates.
11. Communicates interests and concerns of staff and constituency groups.
12. Communicates Council decisions to staff and constituency groups.
13. Promotes full utilization of existing technology within the district and helps define new applications.

Recommendations: Forwarded to Executive Vice President, Finance & Administration, and President/CEO

Agenda and Minutes

## Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Appointed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVP, Finance &amp; Administration</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVP, College Operations</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology, AVP</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources, VP</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget &amp; Finance, AVP</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operations, Director</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement &amp; Materials Management, Director</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings &amp; Grounds, Director</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audit, Director</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services, Dean</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Facilities &amp; Construction (moved from ACAC; effective June 1, 2011)</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health &amp; Safety, Executive Director</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Police, Chief</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Manager</td>
<td>EVP, College Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty Association</td>
<td>Association Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty Association</td>
<td>Association Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional-Technical Employees</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Pres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional-Technical Employees Association</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Employees Association</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Government Association</td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Services Council

Functions:

1. Develops recommendations for district-wide policies and procedures.
2. Determines effectiveness indicators for Student Support and Success Systems.
3. Reviews annual student success reports to assess progress.
4. Serves as a forum for discussion of initiatives and encourages excellence and innovation.
5. Considers Student Support and Success Systems initiatives to determine validity for district-wide adoption and garner support for implementation.
6. Monitors Closing the Gaps Participation and Success targets to ensure institutional progress in meeting these goals.
7. Evaluates the progress toward meeting designated goals of the Master Plan.
8. Reviews college priorities to deliver exemplary services to current and prospective students.
9. Coordinates the planning and development of Student Support and Success Systems programs with college-wide Councils and Departments.
10. Coordinates services to provide consistency among all college sites.
11. Promotes opportunities for student leadership and participation in the shared governance process at the college.

Recommendations: Forwarded to the President/CEO.

Meetings FY12: Information will be posted here as soon as it becomes available.
## Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Appointed By</th>
<th>Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President, Student Support &amp; Success Systems</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>RVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP, Student Support &amp; Success Systems</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP, Effectiveness &amp; Accountability</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director, Public Information &amp; College Marketing</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>CYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>SAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>NRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>EVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>RGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>PIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>RRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Services</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>RVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Admissions &amp; Records</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Articulation and Transfer Services</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Financial Aid &amp; VA</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Special Populations</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>RVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Student Learning Services</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Student Life</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>RGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Enrollment Management</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Dean, Cont. Ed.</td>
<td>VP, Instruction</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Dean</td>
<td>VP, Instruction</td>
<td>RVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Supervisor</td>
<td>VP, SS&amp;SS</td>
<td>RGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>VP, SS&amp;SS</td>
<td>RRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Center Coordinator</td>
<td>VP, SS&amp;SS</td>
<td>SAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>VP, SS&amp;SS</td>
<td>NRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Lab Manager</td>
<td>VP, SS&amp;SS</td>
<td>RRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Center Supervisor</td>
<td>VP, SS&amp;SS</td>
<td>RGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
<td>VP, SS&amp;SS</td>
<td>PIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSD</td>
<td>VP, SS&amp;SS</td>
<td>RRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>NRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>RVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty Association</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Technical Employees</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>SVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Technical Employees</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>EVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Employee Association</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>EVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Government Association</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>RGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Government Association</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>RGC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Academic And Campus Affairs Council**

**Functions**

1. Make recommendations regarding district-wide policies, administrative rules and procedures.
2. Reviews all relevant administrative rules in accordance with Administrative Rule 3.03.011.
3. Review and evaluate research data to evaluate progress in meeting institutional goals.
4. Responds to recommendations from Committees/Task Forces which report to the Council.
5. Communicates interests and concerns of staff and constituency groups to the appropriate entity.

**Recommendations:** Forwarded to the college President.

**FY12 Meetings:** Information will be posted here as soon as it becomes available.

**Meeting agendas and minutes**
### Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Appointed by</th>
<th>Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP, Instruction</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP, Student Support &amp; Success Systems</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVP, College Operations</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP, College Access Programs</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP, Information Technology</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>SVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP, Effectiveness &amp; Accountability</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP, Instructional Resources &amp; Technology</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP, Student Success</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Applied Technologies, Multimedia, and Public Service</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>RVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>RGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Business Studies</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>PIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Communications</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>EVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Computer Studies and Advanced Technologies</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>NRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Dean, Health Sciences</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>EVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Math &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>NRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Social Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>RGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Dean, Continuing Education</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Library Services</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>RGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director, Adult</td>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Professional</td>
<td><strong>Ex Officio</strong></td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Manager, NRG</td>
<td><strong>Ex Officio</strong></td>
<td>NRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Dean of Student</td>
<td>VP, Student Support</td>
<td>NRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>&amp; Success Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Manager</td>
<td>EVP, College Operations</td>
<td>PIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>CYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>EVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate, Developmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>NRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRT/Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>NRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>RVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>RGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>SVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Employees</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>HBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Government</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>RGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Government</td>
<td>Association Pres.</td>
<td>RGC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>