

2015 Council Model of Shared Governance Evaluation Results

Jamie DeLeeuw, Ph.D.
Office of Institutional Research
September 10, 2015



MONROE COUNTY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

enriching lives

2015 Council Model of Shared Governance Evaluation Results

This report summarizes employee satisfaction with the Council Model of Shared Governance (CMSG), which MCCC began piloting in August of 2012 following the CLARUS Corporation's recommendations. The CMSG is comprised of four standing committees (Academic Review, Curriculum, Learning Assessment, and Instructional Technology), Staff Council, Faculty Council, Administrator Council, and the Governance Evaluation Committee (GEC). Feedback from each council and the vice presidents is forwarded to the president. MCCC's traditional governance structure consisted of various committees that made recommendations to the three vice presidents, who then reported to the president. Within both models, in cases where an action and/or decision impacts policy, the president forwards the information to the Board of Trustees for consideration. The survey was implemented by the GEC to stimulate campus-wide discussion about whether or not to adopt the CMSG. A secondary purpose of this evaluation is to present results to the HLC during the 2015 Focused Visit.

Method

Procedure

Current MCCC employees were invited by email on March 20, 2015 to participate in an electronic survey. Via "token" assignment, employees could complete the survey only once, and responses were anonymous, meaning even the researcher could not link responses with names. The survey closed on April 6; two follow-up reminders were sent within this timeframe to encourage participation.

Participants

Out of 347 employee invitations, 38% of employees ($N = 132$) participated in the survey. The response rate is considered at least average for internal surveys and high when one considers that adjunct faculty comprise 46.4% of college employees. Comparatively, CLARUS's 2011 response rate was 31%, and the 2013 *Council Model of Shared Governance: Formative Evaluation Results* response rate was 40%. Table 1 illustrates response rates by employee classification. Between the 2013 CMSG survey administration and current administration, the response rate of each group decreased, except for administrators/professional staff, who had the highest response rate (89.3%).

Table 1. Response Rate per Employee Group

Employee Status	Actual College Composition	Response Rate Per Group
Adjunct Faculty	46.4%	26/161 = 16.1%
Admin/Professional	8.1%	25/ 28 = 89.3%
Faculty	18.4%	43/ 64 = 67.2%
Full-time SS/Maintenance	20.5%	30/71 = 42.3%
Part-time SS/Maintenance	6.6%	8/23 = 34.8%
Total	100%	132/347 = 38.0%

Measures

Twenty-nine questions addressed satisfaction with the CMSG using a five-point Likert scale: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, and Strongly Agree, which were later recoded as 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively, to calculate descriptive and inferential statistics. To ensure that respondents did not feel pressured to respond to questions that did not seem applicable, a “N/A” response choice was provided and respondents could also choose not to respond to particular questions. To reduce acquiescence bias, wherein one tends to agree with a survey item when unsure of how to answer, some of the questions were written so that to agree meant one had an *unfavorable* view of the CMSG.

Twenty-five questions were included in the satisfaction scale reliability analysis, which is a calculation of consistency in participants’ responses across questions. The negatively worded questions were reverse-scored so that for each question, low responses (e.g. 1, 2) indicated negativity towards the CMSG, whereas high responses (e.g. 4, 5) indicated positivity towards the model. For instance, if one responded with Strongly Agree (5) in terms of being dissatisfied with the CMSG, the score was recoded as Strongly Disagree (1). The satisfaction scale questions can be found in the 2013 *Council Model of Shared Governance: Formative Evaluation Results* [<http://www.monroeccc.edu/institutionalresearch/surveyresults/CMSG%20Formative%20Evaluation%20Results.pdf>]. Cronbach’s alpha was high, .95, indicating that the questions measured one construct, satisfaction with the CMSG, and that there was little measurement error. Typically a coefficient of .70 is considered acceptable in social science research. The remaining Likert scale

questions (see Table 3) were excluded in this reliability analysis because they were added to the survey following the 2013 administration and were specific to measuring employees' interest, knowledge, and satisfaction with recent changes to the CMSG, as implemented by the GEC.

Results

Participants had to respond to at least 80% of the 25 questions regarding satisfaction with the model for a scale item average score to be calculated; 118 individuals met this criterion. The respondent average was 3.03 ($SD = .77$). Overall the perception of the Council Model of Shared Governance was neutral. Table 2 displays statistics per employee group. Administrators and professional staff indicated the greatest satisfaction, and full-time support staff/ maintenance, the least. The standard deviation (SD) conveys the average dispersion from the mean. A small SD indicates that responses tended to be very close to the mean, whereas a large SD indicates more spread, or dissent amongst a group. Applying the 68-95-99.7 rule, this means that overall about 68% of responses fell within one SD of the mean, between 2.26 (3.03 minus .77) and 3.80 (3.03 plus .77). Regarding employee engagement with the CMSG, Table 3 illustrates that employees expressed some interest in proposals brought through the CMSG. Overall satisfaction with changes made by the GEC to the CMSG, was neutral ($M = 3.13$).

Table 2. CMSG Scale Satisfaction by Employee Group

	N	Mean	SD
Adjunct Faculty	23	3.08	.38
Faculty	42	2.97	.92
PT SS/Main	6	3.02	.51
FT SS/Main	26	2.75	.70
Admin/Professional	21	3.41	.81
Total	118	3.03	.77

Table 3. Engagement by Employee Group

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

		N	Mean	SD
I am uninterested in learning about topics that go through the CMSG.	Adjunct Faculty	25	2.20	.91
	Faculty	43	2.07	1.01
	PT SS/Main	8	2.38	.92
	FT SS/Main	30	2.77	1.07
	Admin/Professional	23	2.13	1.22
	Total	129	2.29	1.06
I keep myself informed of CMSG activities (e.g. read proposals, agendas, minutes, responses, etc.).	Adjunct Faculty	25	3.52 ^a	.71
	Faculty	41	3.95 ^b	.89
	PT SS/Main	7	2.71 ^{bc}	1.11
	FT SS/Main	30	3.43 ^d	1.10
	Admin/Professional	23	4.39 ^{acd}	.72
	Total	126	3.75	.99
I am knowledgeable of changes made to the Shared Governance Handbook following the 2013 administration of the CMSG survey, which evaluated satisfaction with shared governance and communication at MCCC.	Adjunct Faculty	16	3.56	.63
	Faculty	32	3.66	.94
	PT SS/Main	4	3.00	.82
	FT SS/Main	17	3.53	1.23
	Admin/Professional	19	4.11	1.15
	Total	88*	3.68	1.01
I am satisfied with changes made to the CMSG by the GEC (and approved by the councils) following the results of the 2013 administration of the CMSG survey, which evaluated satisfaction with shared governance and communication at MCCC.	Adjunct Faculty	22	2.91	.68
	Faculty	43	3.12	1.22
	PT SS/Main	6	3.17	.75
	FT SS/Main	25	2.84	.99
	Admin/Professional	22	3.68	1.25
	Total	118	3.13	1.10
How many of your own council's meetings did you attend during Fall 2014? **	Adjunct Faculty	24	.50	.83
	Faculty	38	2.55	.76
	PT SS/Main	5	.80	1.10
	FT SS/Main	23	2.70	1.36
	Admin/Professional	22	4.68	1.36
	Total	112	2.48	1.74

Note: Superscripts (e.g. ^a) denote statistically significant, meaning reliable, differences between groups.

*Question only appeared to the 70.5% of respondents who indicated being aware that changes had been made to the Shared Governance Handbook following the 2013 administration of the CMSG survey.

** Inferential tests were not conducted because the councils met a different number of times; Faculty Council met 3 times, Support Staff Council met 4 times, and Administrator Council met 6 times.

Qualitative Comments

If you attended council meetings infrequently (0-2 times; 0-1 time if faculty) during the Fall 2014 semester, why?

Adjunct

1. I am not available in the morning hours
2. As adjunct faculty member I am not aware of scheduled meeting times, or if I am even able to attend
3. Don't know if I'm invited
4. Schedule conflicts
5. I was not aware of most meetings, and if I did read about meeting on e-mail, I'm not sure I'd be welcome.
6. Busy schedule. Do not feel as adjunct faculty, I would be a viable part of the process.
7. Not on campus/ available at those times.
8. time and place were never convenient, nothing held at Whitman Center....have limited hours of time b4 personal schedule comes into play..... TACO Tuesdays and events held on main campus are great but most times, Whitman Center is left out.....it is a chore to drive to main campus to attend an event.....
9. I don't fit into any of those groups.
10. Conflict with schedule. I work part time and at both Main Campus and Whitman.
11. Work conflict
12. I attended one of the first meetings when the new system was being planned several people seemed very against the idea of adjuncts being involved. I felt like I wasn't wanted. Also, the meeting times often conflict with my other job.
13. Really don't know anything about it.
14. As an adjunct I don't really feel that my input will carry the same weight as full time faculty.
15. Conflicted with class.

16. No interest

17. not aware of this

18. Scheduled time of meetings

19. Was invited to attend by a full-time faculty member. Sometimes meetings are held at days and times I am in the classroom teaching.

Faculty

1. Waste of Time.

2. Schedule conflicts and personal illness.

3. The meeting was not run with the proper use of Robert's Rules. I felt it was a ""bitch"" session, and nothing was accomplished.

4. This model is ineffective.

5. Nothing is accomplished. We spend entirely too much time in meetings with no real outcomes.

6. Standing committees have been replaced by a plethora of task forces that keep everyone occupied, but no forward progress is made.

7. waste of time. No committee meeting with 70 members will ever be productive. A few loudmouths dominate through brow beating and intimidation.

8. I was attending a conference.

9. I have a workload that is time consuming, and my time is better spent on my teaching workload and interacting with my students. In addition, I don't see anything accomplished at these meetings.

10. They are a waste of my time.

PT SS/Main

1. I have Fridays off and most of the time the meetings are on Fridays

2. They were held during class time for me.

3. lack of coverage in our department

4. I work in a small office that constantly needs adequate coverage. It is hard to make it to any meetings during the business day.

FT SS/Main

1. I am part of a student service area and we can't just shut down the place to attend the meeting.
2. Is it mandatory Never has been accountability in the past or now Lack of proposals with genuine input Prefer the original standing committee meetings over shared governance model Time of the day, coverage in office is difficult Low interest All of the above
3. I have been busy with my work. Sometimes too much talking on one subject, prolonged discussions.
4. I don't feel the process works well plus with increased work loads, I don't feel I often have time to attend
5. We do not always have student coverage and cannot get away from the office
6. Hard to get away from my desk at the meeting times.
7. Other priority issues going on at the same time
8. Work needed to be done.
9. Lack of effectiveness, lack of importance of input at meetings, workload

Admin/Professional

1. My supervisor requires I attend so if I did not attend, I was either out of the office or had a meeting conflict.
2. Mostly due to conflicting meetings and/or off campus assignments.
3. Lack confidence in proceedings. Weak leadership from vp instruction. Collusion and deal making before meetings. Lack of balanced attendance. Too many administrators in attendance at fac council mtgs chills honest discussions.

Please describe what you like most about the CMSG (You may describe multiple strengths). Contrasting the CMSG with the standing governance structure may help shape your thoughts.

Adjunct

1. agenda items and minutes are posted for preview and or review.
2. Comfortable speaking in front of own group
3. I like the three separate groups. I think it helps the flow of ideas and gives more people input than before.
4. I teach one class each semester...from my end, things have been the same for 20 years...neither good nor bad...I teach, my students learn...no complaints, no concerns.
5. input is diversified, which is good. communication seems to be more forthcoming, and all board meeting minutes are readily available and sent to user, they don't have to go looking for them.
6. Input is taken from adjunct as well as full-time. The purpose of this institution is to educate so that this human may be an employable resource in society. Each interaction needs to be addressed in a positive tone. When you are not sure, you ask. If you feel scared to ask, then an issue develops. This is why you want to make each day better than the previous by ""Enriching a Life"".
7. Not sure
8. Not sure as I have been more involved since the Shared Governance model has been in effect.

Faculty

1. 1. Availability of councils' agendas ahead of time. This helps with communication. But this doesn't rely on CMSG, could be done within any model. 2. I can opt out of meetings without being truant. 3. The standing committees often were little more than work groups for the ex-officio VPs-- the VP decided on what needed to be done, brought the task to the committee so that it felt like it was actually making a decision on the direction of the college. The council model has at least moved us away from that.
2. 1. The greatest strength of the council model is that important issues are brought to each council, so every employee of the college knows what is happening before decisions are made. Before, I often learned of important issues after the decisions were already made. 2. Any employee can bring an issue to the councils. That gives every employee a voice - a role in the process. At the same time, every employee also has a vote - a chance to influence every important decision. Under the committee structure, only members of a committee had a vote, and many decisions didn't even go through a committee.
3. Ability to address a large group at one time.
4. All faculty have input and it goes directly to the president for determination. No veto power by VPs.

5. Every one has a voice. Administrators are forced to respond to questions and concerns.
6. Everyone has a voice and an opportunity to weigh in on most important issues. Everything is vetted across all groups. Communication and knowledge about what is happening on campus has surely increased.
7. I appreciate getting the opportunity to know about all of the changes proposed and issues raised, and I have an opportunity to offer my perspective. It's okay with me that I don't always get my way because that's not the point of a participatory system like this; instead my viewpoints are heard and I get to better understand others'.
8. I believe the most important aspect is how quickly decisions can be made however the entire voting structure can tend to be quite difficult.
9. I intensely dislike the CMSG. The procedures are cumbersome, the council has no real authority and the subcommittees have no time to meet.
10. I like that all employee groups have an opportunity to be informed.
11. It allows all members of the campus community a voice in government. It prevents a small number of individuals from making major decisions without the input or knowledge of the rest of the campus community.
12. It brings all the voices and opinions to an open forum.
13. It is a common spot where information can be relayed to those that want to know what is going on.
14. More democratic
15. Nothing
16. Nothing.
17. Nothing.
18. That I do not have to attend.
19. That one does not have to attend the meetings.
20. The ability to be a part of the decision making process.
21. The CMSG allows individuals to promote change on campus in a way that the standing governance structure did not. The CMSG requires transparency and for the President to justify decisions made and the standing structure did not do either of these. We are all better informed about issues/concerns across campus with the CMSG.
22. The CMSG did provide all college employees to have a voice in decision making.
23. The CMSG gives everyone that cares a voice. The only way to not have your voice be heard is to not speak up and that is hardly the fault of the model. At the same time, several divisions within various academic areas involving faculty have sprung up since the model was implemented. The model

did not cause these divisions; rather, they were always there and the model was effective in causing them to come to light. Now we know where everyone stands.

24. The concept is great that there is a forum for suggesting changes and a place to have open dialogue.

25. The Council Model has a time line attached. When decisions are made the decisions are implemented or the final decision maker must give rationale on why the plan or idea was stopped. In the standing governance model, ideas would be generated and plans made in meetings, but that was the end of the idea or plan. It seemed the good ideas never made it to the implementation phase.

26. The one strength I do see is the opportunity for all groups to come together to discuss issues but the downside to this is that there are so many people that very few decisions seem to be made.

27. The strength is that multiple issues can be brought before a large audience and awareness of issues is campus wide.

28. Vastly more open and democratic method of governance. Decision making is not in the hands of a few small committees and administrators.

28. What I like most about the CMSG is that it does give council members a voice and mechanisms to participate in decisions that affect MCCC and its constituents.

29. You have 60+ opinions to deal with and nothing gets done.

PT SS/Main

1. Ability to hear happenings from other parts of the college that I otherwise would not know

FT SS/Main

1. A way to get to know people from another department.

2. An employee has the opportunity to be involved and/or informed as much as he or she chooses to be.

3. I am more aware of and educated on the policies and procedures of the college. I have a voice and can influence decision making at the college. I can promote change at the college through the Council Model by submitting a proposal. I know about changes before they happen rather than after the decision has already been made.

4. I think that CMSG has made a good effort to improve communications on campus - but Support Staff is still treated as if we are not important and even when heard what we have to say does not matter.

5. Information given at the meetings. Individuals are able to ask questions.

6. Just hearing about things that are happening in other groups of employees.

7. More aware of ideas/decisions being made around campus. Glad liaisons were removed - feel it is easier to be open with thoughts and opinions

8. More aware of what is going on college-wide and of other employee groups' perspectives on issues as opposed to the standing governance structure. CMSG also brings other employee group representatives into meetings to discuss and explain topics they support.

9. Nothing

10. Nothing

11. Nothing, all we do is go round and round and it takes forever for anything to get done.

12. The CMSG seems to give more purpose to our Support Staff meetings. I feel like the topics we address have more substance. This structure does help disseminate information across campus.

13. The model should bring important topics to the forefront to the entire campus.

Admin/Professional

1. - Meetings are canceled for lack of agenda items; no point calling busy adults together to do round robin updates to fill time. - Meetings are relatively optional. - Really like the order with which meetings are conducted that keeps things moving along

2. All employee groups given an opportunity to weigh in on important decisions. Ability to have discourse and disagreements about important issues in an environment welcoming of such discussion. All action items are vetted out and president gets to weigh input from all areas before making a final decision. Great place to share updates and informational items. Items must be acted upon; old system allowed them to seemingly disappear.

3. Every group has a voice and a role to play in the governance of the college. The administration sincerely solicits input into the college's processes.

4. Everyone does have an opportunity if they wish to exercise it to participate.

5. Everyone has a voice, if they choose to participate.

6. Everyone has an opportunity to be involved!

7. Everyone who chooses to participate has a voice.

8. Free flowing discussions.

9. I'm basically neutral about this system. It seems like not very much gets done anymore because no one takes ownership of different issues and to start things. We are all busy enough that we sit back and let someone else do the work. It must be frustrating for the higher administration, too. Pushing people uphill.

10. It gives everyone an opportunity to participate in the shared governance process.

11. Meetings are more structured and to the point. Also, the elimination of so many other committees.

12. Not sure at this point.

13. Nothing

14. Opportunity for ALL employees to have input Debate Consensus on issues/initiatives Awareness of issues/initiatives Decisions and actions do no lag Opportunity to hear and understand others position

15. Structured agendas

16. The CMSG gives all employees the opportunity to be informed and engage in discussions pertaining to important topics on campus. It offers a venue to explore topics or ideas that may or may not be the direct responsibility of your department/division but that may affect your work. The process is designed to assist in making stronger, more informed decisions based upon multiple perspectives and input. The CMSG offers all employees the opportunity to hear about and discuss topics that they may not have even known were being discussed/considered when we operated under the standing governance structure. If used as designed, it can serve as a tremendous communication tool. The financial updates have offered employees and opportunity to gain knowledge about the College's finances and to offer input and suggestions.

17. The thorough presentations have been very informative. Being new to campus it has helped fill in some of the gaps in my understanding of events and issues.

18. Very Little.

Please describe what you like least about the CMSG. In other words, what are potential areas for improvement?

Adjunct

1. main conflicts and few resolutions
2. Nothing of real importance is brought to the councils
3. I teach one class each semester...from my end, things have been the same for 20 years...neither good nor bad...I teach, my students learn...no complaints, no concerns.
4. If the meetings could be at alternative times, hence flex time meetings. One might be in the morning, another in the afternoon, and a final in the evening. This way an employee may attend a portion if not all of the meetings.
5. Not sure
6. I think my knowledge bases of other departments and their roles on campus has increased. I also believe it has given faculty a better milieu to express concerns.

Faculty

1. Many faculty hardly attend and we have fewer standing committees than previously. How can we have less faculty participation and yet have more being accomplished?
2. The old committee structure was much better. The CMSG is too large to make decisions effectively. Issues formerly addressed by the councils are lost in the CMSG.
3. The time frame is not long enough to get anything accomplished. Often on faults are pointed out without any helpful suggestions or solutions to those presenting. There is a lack of feedback and understanding about what happens to proposals after the councils vote on them.
4. 1. Slow and cumbersome, results very slow to arrive at. 2. Too much political maneuvering & backstabbing among the faculty divisions. 3. Too many other issues (health and safety, instructional technology, learning resources, etc.) not getting done because no one has responsibility for it. No incentive to take problems to the council because it's so cumbersome and mostly nothing gets done. 4. The Handbook is a mess of double-talk and procedural flim-flam. 5. Hiding behind the ""task force"" or [comment discontinued]
5. I think we're still struggling with what kinds of issues belong as information or action items before the councils, how much information is needed, and how best to provide that information to employees. The experiment with Blackboard as a communication portal hasn't worked well. Although it has succeeded in putting council information in a central location accessible to everyone, it hasn't been successful as a portal that all employees accessed regularly to stay informed on campus issues. As a result, we still don't have a very good place for ""information items"" that don't rise to the level of needing a 10-minute presentation to three councils, but do need to be widely disseminated. Another weakness is we haven't clarified what happens when the councils disagree, or one council amends a proposal, etc. The current process is to just send it to the president to make a decision. That could very

well leave important issues unresolved, and as a result put the president in a difficult position. It seems to me we need another step in some cases. Maybe something like the "conference committee" structure that Congress uses when the House and Senate pass different versions of a bill. They don't just send it to the president and hope he's wise and fair. They sit down and work it out.

6. Since councils are divided by faculty, admin and support, there isn't an opportunity to hear from all groups at one single time. Councils are too large to be productive work groups.

7. There is no way one meeting a month can accommodate the issues that arise within instruction and other areas.

8. It is difficult to know what things should be decided by a majority vote and which should not. The GenEd votes at faculty council caused much conflict among faculty. Also, it is not a good idea now to start adding other standing committees. If outside committees are added they should report to and have their suggestions voted on by the appropriate council.

9. The professionalism amongst the members could be an area of improvement. I also feel that making these a mandatory meeting would allow for a greater response throughout the campus.

10. We need to return to the previous model of governance. And we need to carve out a few hours each week where no classes are offered and everybody has a chance to meet and work together.

11. The process seems complicated and slow. Sometimes matters that are pertinent to one area of the college become topics of debate at other councils that are not willing/able/fully equipped to make a decision on that topic.

12. Discussions at council meetings can become rambling and off topic. I seem to hear the same arguments over and over.

13. The current model separates the different units on campus. We are farther divided. There are many tasks that need to be accomplished that require work from staff, faculty, admin., maintenance and support staff (and any other group I missed.) I am only hearing about issues that deal with faculty.

14. compensation for chairs and secretaries

15. 1. Run meeting with limitation of the time a member can speak. 2. Streamline the process of making decisions.

16. Takes too long to do anything.

17. The same individuals speak and dominate meetings.

18. Disband it. The concept of shared governance is silly. Let the administrators do their job. Let me do mine.

19. The CMSG is ineffective and laborious. As long as it is voluntary, it will be ineffective. It allows administrators to skirt their responsibilities, then they can overrule the actions of the councils. Fewer than 50% of the faculty attend most meetings and having meeting canceled because of no agenda items are pretty strong indicators of its ineffectiveness. After almost three years of piloting this model, we are still unsure what needs to go to which councils.

20. Faculty need to be respectful and maintain a professional tone and dialogue when discussing particularly sensitive topics.
21. We should reevaluate if we need to reinstate any standing committees, but this should be done cautiously and sparingly.
22. -It seems it took such a long time for proposals to get through the 3 councils and onto the president's desk for a decision. This year there were very few proposals presented. -Important issues that were addressed in committees in standing governance se
23. I believe the CMSG should be mandatory for faculty.
24. The concept of an open forum for suggestion and dialogue is great. Those with the power of decision making are not really using it. I think the reality of decision making at MCCC is still done within the A building without participation through this open format. VP of Administration seems the least involved with CMSG and interacting with fellow employees at MCCC.
25. There is a tremendous amount of work the chair and the secretary must do to prepare for the council meetings, especially the secretary. If these positions could be given release time or comp time. I think that would be helpful. If not a full semester of credit hour release time, maybe a work day off without it counting as a personal day.
26. It seems very difficult to get to many issues in the amount of time we have for the meeting.
27. I don't see faculty council getting anything done that is important for faculty or the pending issues of the College. The previous governance structure was neutered by the previous College President (ignored committee recommendations and circumvented committees when he wasn't assured of his desired outcome), and the CMSG was developed as an alternative to the committee structure that wasn't broken; it just wasn't used effectively by administration. The term ""shared governance"" is an oxymoron in CMSG.
28. Many members are vastly uninformed about even the basics of parliamentary procedure and Robert's Rules, making the system confusing and highly frustrating for them. People spend far too much time and energy trying to understand how to accomplish what they want to do or even asking ""can we even ask this/do this?"" We likely need a parliamentarian who members can turn to do answer questions or periodically explain how the basic process works to people so they're less likely to be confused/intimidated by the openness and power granted under this system.
29. That the model does not provide a mechanism that requires even participation from council members. For example, those who are members of some remaining standing committee's have a greater workload than others. Perhaps participation in certain activities (e.g. a task force) should also occur on a rotating basis amongst members of a council.
30. Go back to the original model.

PT SS/Main

1. I am unaware of what this is.

2. The time it takes to get anything accomplished.

FT SS/Main

1. Very little attendance - very few items on the agenda - makes the meetings feel like a waste of time.
2. There are some issues that don't involve me and it seems weird that I should have input on such items. It was never explained clearly to what you can bring to these meetings to discuss. There is no incentive to take on chair or secretary positions. We are asking people to take on more work and responsibility when they may already feel they have enough on their plate.
3. Nothing ever seems to get done and no one has a real understanding as to how or why we are running the council model. It is ineffective in achieving a goal and should be abandoned.
4. Some items go through CMSG and it becomes a lengthy drawn out process to get anything approved. Other items never even to to CMSG and upper management just puts them in place.
5. This way of doing things separates the three groups. We need something to bring all of us together.
6. Process for proposal submission, debate and decision is too lengthy and complicated.
7. Very unclear about what items need to be brought to the councils and which items need to be discussion items -vs- items that need to be voted on. I feel it is very unfair that one council gets to vote on an item while it is a discussion item for the other councils.
8. Low attendance.
9. There are still changes made without any notice to anyone. There are certain groups where there is no influence from the other groups because they're decision is already made.
10. It seems that overall people need a better understanding of what needs/should come through the council model and how (i.e. action, information, input). I have thoughts and ideas that I am unsure if that is the appropriate method.
11. Since there isn't a quorum at many meetings, I think voting via email should be allowed in order to move important issues forward.
12. Nothing gets done in a timely manner when you pretend to give everyone a voice
13. It's a red tape ineffective model that wastes a lot of time.
14. Get rid of it and make the meetings (with each group) at one meeting per month mandatory.
15. It takes a long time to get items through the Councils making for slow decision-making and implementation. When final decisions are made or something has been approved, it may not always be communicated to the Councils.

16. The timeliness of important topics being addressed. Oftentimes, things are delayed due to lack of presentations, quorum, etc.

Admin/Professional

1. The Council Model calls for the President to make the final decision on proposals (the councils submit recommendations to his office). There is a need for more timely decisions to be made by the President on these proposals (need to close the loop). Also, Cabinet level recommendations and decisions made by the President need to be communicated to the campus so everyone is aware of the final disposition of a proposal.

2. It moves too slow, and is too big of an umbrella to deal with issues effectively, i.e. not everybody should have a voice on topics that don't honestly deal with them.

3. - Limiting which items are open for votes depending on the council and which items are even allowed on the agenda -- again, depending on the council -- is tantamount to the re-siloization of the employee groups. - Open voting is divisive and inhibiting

4. People need to participate if they want a voice. Some people express concerns to peers but yet they do not attend the meetings. Not sure how to improve that via the system, though.

5. I think there is still room for improvement in establishing and communicating the processes by which proposals move through the process.

6. Lack of time to discuss topics at any depth. Lack of participation and proposals. During the current academic year the Master proposal spreadsheet dated 2/23/15 shows that only 3 request for actions were presented with one of them only to faculty, another one to all 3 councils and it was approved (IT committee), and the third still pending is regarding timesheets. 3 requests for input and two information items. So it leads to the question, where are all of the other important initiatives being discussed?

7. Meeting times are not conducive to part-time employee schedules.

8. Time it takes to get some items through Lack of a forum at some meetings

9. No accountability for the president to follow through and complete the process.

10. Although discussions are free flowing, I think they go on for too long about the same points.

11. Very few people are engaged in moving forward. There is an inertia in the group perhaps because the responsibility no longer is spread out into the standing committees. These committees would be in charge of a small piece of the pie and look to take care of their issues. Now it seems we are abdicating all this for ""someone else"" to do. Trouble is, someone else is really each of us. Seems like the model is easy to take advantage of not doing any work....just leave me alone to do my regular job type of thing.

12. It still takes too long to move items through all of the councils.

13. Does not seem to be much clarity about informational items, proposals, etc...what needs to come forth, what does not. So frequently it seems like we do not fully understand the process.

14. There is no opportunity for interaction with employees from around campus. Faculty meets with faculty, staff with staff and administrators with administrators.
15. This is a failed experiment.
16. Attendance should be mandatory
17. Attendance at the council meetings continues to be a problem and this could slow down the decision-making process. The proposal process, while improved, still seems to be confusing to people. Once the proposals have worked their way through the councils, the VP review process still needs fine-tuning.
18. There are too few subjects/items brought before the group each meeting.
19. Complicated and confusing. No work or progress is completed. The lack of cross functional/combination of membership from all work areas within a committee structure has reduced communication and understanding.

Please describe specific suggestions for improving the CMSG's processes. If your previous answer addressed this question, skip to the next question.

Adjunct

1. It seems that the Adjunct Faculty are left out of this process. Also, part-time employees do not seem to be valued or listened to.
2. Effort should be made by the administration, addressed specifically to the adjunct population, to solicit ideas about the things normally taken care of by the full time faculty.
3. Not sure
4. It does not seem that the Shared Governance Model is effective in giving faculty the power to really effect change since everything has to go through the Administrative Council for approval most of the time.

Faculty

1. Scrap it!
2. Scrap it at least for faculty.
3. Increase the time. Provide better structure to keep the meetings civilized. Have the proposals returned to the council they were generated from if another council disagrees with it. Because all of the councils are getting the information during the same month, councils might vote different ways on a proposal and then everything goes to the President. There doesn't seem to be a mechanism to have the councils work together on a solution.
4. Move away from the idea that the CMSG is a cure-all and that the standing committee structure was evil. Both have some good and bad points. However, the current advocates of the council model have worked hard to make sure that any effort to expand or target some specific areas of need on campus (instructional technology as an example) is met with vocal and occasionally dishonest, ""sky is falling"" opposition. The faculty council recently approved the addition of instructional technology as a standing committee, but who knows what sort of back-room arm-twisting is going on to keep it from advancing further?
5. My suggestions based on the two issues mentioned above: - Work toward a better campuswide communication portal - either through Blackboard or something else. - Create a way for issues that are treated differently by the councils to be reconciled before they go to the president. Maybe they could go the GEC and then back to the councils again. But it would have to be a way that didn't require a two or three-month back-and-forth process between the councils.
6. A hybrid model seems more productive where committees meet and do work, then report out to councils.
7. Some additional standing committees are necessary, like the Safety committee. Those issues are never addressed within a particular council meeting.

8. Keep administrators out of support staff meetings so they may talk freely.
9. Parameters need to be determined for which types of items go to the councils and which types of items need to be treated uniquely.
10. There are times in the past when action was taken without review by the councils. I think it's important that we get into the habit of including the CMSG as a part of any significant decision-making (even if it's via information items), and I think that's improving.
11. Each council may have areas it needs to discuss without involving other councils. Maybe these could be items simply read in minutes in Blackboard. If these matters clearly involve only one area, there should be a ""faster track"" for decision-making.
12. See number 11.
13. It would be great to get more adjunct faculty participation.
14. Make it mandatory. Really have critical decision making happen there. Administrators are still isolated due to the three councils and still make decisions where staff and faculty are not involved nor informed.

PT SS/Main

1. This should be part of the orientation process
2. Not sure

FT SS/Main

1. Attendance has been dwindling. I am not sure if there needs to be a specific reserved meeting time where all staff council members are able to attend and other meetings can't be made during this time. I find a lot of people saying they can't get away from their area for lack of office coverage. Also, I think staff members feel they do not have the time to participate. Maybe decrease meeting to every other month to make the agenda more valuable and attract more participation.
2. Let the specific committees vote and determine what is best to their specific expertise. Let the groups (Faculty, Support Staff, Administrators) approve and discuss the items that are only relevant to their specific expertise. I feel like it's a informational wheel that's spinning that never goes anywhere. Nothing is getting accomplished anymore. People that are bringing items up for discussion are getting extremely frustrated with the whole process. Something simple turns into an inquisition and bitch session.
3. I would like to see all three Councils meet during the same week. I think this would speed up the process.

4. Having the entire campus meet together more than once a year would be a good start. Allowing everyone to have a dialogue and not allowing any one person to dominate the discussion would also be nice.

5. Answer to #12 Also, I think that somehow the Staff council should be given updates on what is occurring in the standing committees. Faculty and administrators are part of the standing committees so they know what is being discussed and decided. It might be nice for Staff's input to be heard in those committees as well. Faculty, Administrators, and Staff all have a different perspective that would/should be utilized with making decisions. Staff may think of an aspect that the committee members did not - most of support staff are working ""the front lines"" with students, which gives a different and useful perspective that should be considered utilized.

6. Meeting times are flexible among each group, which causes delays in presenting and moving items through the Councils for resolution. Maybe having the Council meetings set by the GEC and deadlines for getting items passed through would be more effective.??

Admin/Professional

1. Meetings between the three councils still hasn't happened.

2. - Make the chairing and scribing a one-meeting deal or a rotating 3-month commitment if continuity is really an issue; No one wants to sign on to a two-year stint. - When an item is placed on the agenda, it is done so with the understanding that propone

3. Faculty senate. Program Chairs. Committees allowing individuals that want to participate together from cross functional areas the ability to, but not there to fill the committee quota. Business model of decision making. One that empowers the leaders to implement action items before it is to late.

4. Critical issues that need a vote could be voted on by email.

5. Include consequences for presidential non-action.

6. Maybe have a time limit for discussions.

7. I think there may be opportunity to have a listed menu of the types of issues that each of the standing committees used to handle. Then make sure that each of these are reviewed once per year to see if there are things that come up. You could still have individuals who would gin up ideas for that topic and then it could be reviewed by the larger group.

8. To help speed up the process of moving agenda items through the councils that require input or action, I recommend that each council have two meeting dates per month. One date will be the regular meeting date for the month and the other date will be an alternate meeting, which can be cancelled if there is no business to address.

9. Better training on how the committee is designed to work.

10. Meet in smaller working groups to report out issues to various councils.

11. Scrap it.

12. Training on submitting proposals might be helpful to continue to educate everyone on what should/could be submitted as a proposal and how the process works. The VP review process may be more effective if handled at a once-a-month meeting following the conclusion of all three council meetings. the purpose of the meeting would be to review the proposals that have moved through the process during that month, discuss proposals working through and upcoming, and a review of the Working Tactical Implementation Plan. An option to address quorum issues would be to look at a representative model for the Councils, allowing departments/divisions to send ""representatives"" to the meetings with a requirement that the information be reported on at the next department/division meeting.

13. It might help to have smaller committees bringing more information to the council each meeting.

14. Might bring back a ""limited"" number of interest oriented standing committees. Instructional Technology, Campus Development, Special Events/Community Enrichment, Recruiting and Retention, etc. and use the councils for announcements and report-out function. Not everything needs the input/discussion/vote of the entire campus body.

If you were able to personally redesign the college's governance structure, what would you do?

Adjunct

1. implement the "undercover boss" things for the top positions at the college and have the vips attend some classes and activities as a student.....what do they pick up?create the "be a vice president for a day" not only for students but maybe for adjunct and full time faculty as well.....see how the day goes.....
2. I teach one class each semester...from my end, things have been the same for 20 years...neither good nor bad...I teach, my students learn...no complaints, no concerns.
3. Attempt to give a set schedule to part-time adjuncts. For example, if you are only allowed to teach 10 hours per term, then set a schedule where the adjunct may teach on M-W, T-TH, or some other pattern but keep the pattern consistent. If you are a part-time adjunct, you do not know if you have employment the following term. This is why knowledge is power. You may be a better husband, father, mother, and make a difference in the Monroe County, MI community as well as the other surrounding areas.
4. Not sure
5. Find a more effective, less burdensome process to effect change.

Faculty

1. Return to the standing governance model.
2. Decide what standing committees are absolutely necessary (no more than 5 or 6) and implement a faculty senate. The senate should be relatively small (2 or 3 representatives from each division). 3. Faculty would be required to be a member of at least one committee/senate. Items would move from the committees to the senate. Support staff and administrators could maintain their council if they wish.
3. Toss the CMSG to the curb and go back to the former structure.
4. Consider envisioning a broader council model, one with more standing committees to address campus-wide issues. "Careful consideration should be given before adding or disbanding a committee as the college does not want to move governance backward or create a hybrid of the Council Model and a standing committee model" (page 10 of the Handbook). My question is, "Why not?" If this hybrid model would be more productive than the CMSG we have now (not much of a reach) and actually help to get important work done, then why not? That does not "move governance backward."
5. I think we're on the right track, with three councils and a small number of standing committees. As we gain experience with the process, I hope we'll be able to refine and streamline it.
6. Streamline the way you have to fill the paper work out to have your idea acted upon. Probably add some standing committees that report to the Council.

7. Non-administrator groups would have veto power over budget items. Employee groups would have voting representatives on the board of trustees.
8. Keep the current council model, with necessary subcommittees reporting to the council for policy changes or changes that affect that council's group. I would redesign the curriculum committee's role in what needs to be approved by them to increase efficiency. Some curriculum changes and satisfier decisions should rest with the deans and V.P. Too much goes to curriculum committee. The faculty should own the curriculum, but to the extent that they UNDERSTAND and respect issues across divisions and learning topics and that is not always the case.
9. I have no idea. I think what we have works.
10. Make the meetings mandatory.
11. I would return to the previous committee model and add 2-3 hours per week some time between Monday & Thursday for people to meet and get some work done.
12. The current model should be left the way it is.
13. I would move back to the old method with the various committees that dealt with issues the employees are interested in. I would keep the council meeting for a report out on what was happening, or could be happening in the various committees. Then everyone could be informed of activities on campus and if they were interested could get involved. It takes too long to form a task force, or interest group or sub committee....or whatever it is called.
14. I would go back to the old committee system. It was invigorating and useful. The Faculty Council allows too many cooks in the soup which dilutes getting anything done. Some people in this council speak too much, and they are not reigned in.
15. Bring back committee structure, just fewer committees.
16. Return to committee structure and give committees some actual influence in decision making.
17. See number 11.
18. Go back to the old model of governance. It worked for 40 years. That it didn't work under one president doesn't mean it was a bad model. It did say something about the communications skills of the leader(s) at the time.
19. Perhaps an faculty senate model?
20. I would probably go back to the standing committee structure.
21. Return to a committee structure to provide more focus on individual issues with participants who have experience and expertise regarding the issues; and also have a Faculty Senate that would be part of larger ""voting body"" on campus that is inclusive and representative of the groups on campus.
22. Use the original Model

FT SS/Main

1. No.
2. Return it to a committee process.
3. Go back to the old way of specific committees voting and determining what is best to their specific expertise and let the groups (Faculty, Support Staff, Administrators) approve and discuss the items that are only relevant to their specific expertise. We can all read minutes of each group and become informed without having an information item addressed at our specific group.
4. Revert back to standing committees and hold people accountable. Need checks and balances.
5. I like the Council Model and would like to continue with it making changes for improvement as necessary.
6. Start with the leaders of this institution. President and Vice Presidents presenting any items for discussion. Decisions made can affect other departments with their ripple effect. Make the all campus meetings mandatory.
7. Some things just need to happen, people with power and the majorities best interests at heart need to make decisions and stand by them, stop waffling and do what your salaries indicate you should be smart enough to do.
8. Get rid of this model and REALLY start talking with each other to make decisions. Support and trust have to be earned...not demanded.
9. Make a mandatory once a month(or when needed) meeting and address every group at once and vote and discuss then and there.
10. Doing away with representatives from each Council having to attend other Council meetings was a step in the right direction. Information was being duplicated among groups.

Admin/Professional

1. Specific committees all reporting to one governing body - say cabinet.
2. I support continuation of the council model; however, if it were to be ""voted out"", I would suggest a model that includes a Campus Senate model.
3. - Adopt the council model as a bridge to a finished product if the current CMSG is not enthusiastically adopted as a permanent replacement at this point. Then, presented for consideration in the spirit of free and open communication... - Research best p
4. Require attendance by all and increase the frequency of meetings.
5. I would change it so that VP accountability were increased.

6. For the sake of the President, I would add a college council for synthesizing council input and formulating recommendations.

7. Continue with a hybrid of standing committees that feed information to the councils, still allow anyone to bring something to councils. Have additional meeting times for all group since it is important to discuss these items. Have five possible meeting days in the week and make the meeting mandatory. Then create a governance structure that will work and meet the needs at MCCC and implement it.

8. Only change as suggested in question 13.

9. Have subgroups in the councils that are responsible for various categories of the operation. they would review the topic annually and report out suggestions for change, start initiatives, etc. We do not have anything that gives a "state of the college" type of issues report that is internal only. This would be what are the major initiatives, what was done, what succeeded, what did not, what is still left undone, etc. We have the report on how the model is working, but not on what initiatives with follow up.

10. See above

11. Establish standing committees and limit the number to those that address vital areas.

12. I like the CMSG combined with standing committees in cases of frequent meeting and routine matters, Curriculum Committee, Learning Assessment Committee, Institutional Governance Committee, etc... Full vetting of what standing committees should be retained and what new ones should be added. All committee recommendations go through appropriate council(s). Councils meet every other month. Inactivate the Institutional Governance Committee and replace with the Governance Evaluation Committee

13. I believe we are on the right track with the new system. It's not perfect, but it is much better than the previous multiple committee structure where only a handful of people did the work but many people met to "offer suggestions" on how the work should be done.

14. I have way too little experience in this work environment to adequately answer this.

15. See above.

Please share any additional comments you may have about the CMSG and/or communication at MCCC.

Adjunct

1. I teach one class each semester...from my end, things have been the same for 20 years...neither good nor bad...I teach, my students learn...no complaints, no concerns.
2. By being informed, I am learning about events that I never would of know about in the past. I am grateful for being informed. This way, I may help my student who has given me the opportunity to educate possibly better information because I was made aware of a matter because of the CMSG.
3. Communication still needs a great deal of improvement. Announcements of activities and events are often sent out only hours or sometimes minutes before the activity or event.
4. I have been totally impressed with the way the moderators have facilitated the meetings. Both Joanna and Lisa have acted totally professional and made every individual feel their comments and efforts were both appreciated and beneficial. The leadership of the Committee has been amazing. They have been wonderful at keeping the meetings professional and appropriate even when discussions became a bit ""heated"".

Faculty

1. So the council model was an experiment, now we're trying to examine it's effectiveness. Let's look at it for it's effectiveness at getting work done and problems addressed, not assume that it serves as the cure for our communication ills.
2. I think we have an improved system that is still a work in progress. I would hate to throw it out and go back to the flawed system we had before, which in effect gave employees very little access to the decision-making process.
3. I am not sure the Council model helps faculty as much as, for example, staff. I don't think they had as much input before as they do now, which is good. A couple things have helped faculty through the council, like when to turn in grades and hopefully electronic time sheets. However, sometimes the council drags on because there are too many people talking about the same topic.
4. The CMSG is bureaucratic, dysfunctional disaster and it needs to be scrapped.
5. CMSG is a good model which enhances communication among all the stakeholders at the college.
6. Could the various meetings be put into the Outlook calendar with the location and agenda attached? That way if someone was interested, they would know where, when and what the meeting was going to be about. Fishing around in Blackboard can be annoying.
7. It is in a state of disrepair.
8. See Number 11.

9. There should be a pre-/post- campus climate survey completed under the new president so it would be available to present to the HLC when they are on our campus in the Fall 2015. The need for the council model was driven by communications issues that were/are broader than governance. This survey does not drill down much in that arena. The CMSG will be kept until the HLC visits, then it will die under its own weight. The HLC will be happy. They are more interested in activity than results. We will be able to demonstrate that we have engaged in a lot of activity; whether we have improved anything will be left unanswered. The HLC will not care. Neither will most employees.

10. CMSG is so much better than the committee model. While there is always room to improve we need to keep this model.

11. Communication has not improved. The idea of CMSG is sound, the use is not there.

12. The CMSG needs to be abandoned. A more streamlined and efficient shared governance structure needs to take its place. In addition, a new structure should actually be shared governance beyond just using the label.

13. The CMSG is an excellent model of governance, but it can be confusing for people who do not see how to use or who do not understand governance systems. While a few seem actively opposed to it out of a desire to return to a less democratic system that is easier to control and manage if you are positioned on a few specific committees and can manipulate the process, CMSG is vastly more democratic and allows all voices to be heard rather than a strident few. Many more are confused, ill-informed, or honestly intimidated by a system that is still very new, untried, and offers so much voice and agency to people who clearly are unused to having it here at MCCC. The college Administration should also specifically seek to work with MCCCFA to make Faculty Council one of the committees we are required to serve on. Then faculty may serve on academic review or curriculum committee, giving them more options and freeing them from having to make the choice of serving on academic review and attending ""extra"" meetings of the Faculty Council.

FT SS/Main

1. I don't think there is complete buy in to the council model. There is not enough participation to see it continuing as it is structured.

2. We have a new President and I think he should hold all staff meetings again.

3. Would like to see the College go back to the committee structure. Feel that the committee structure gave people a voice in things they were interested in.

4. Good luck - I know that there are a lot of complaints about the CMSG but I think it is a good process. I have learned that people just like to complain; you will never please everyone.

5. I believe the Council Model promotes better communication across the campus.

6. The college continues to have fiscal issues. The support staff were strong in the disapproval of a new building.. but administration and the board went ahead with it anyway. Now we cannot pass a mileage because of public opinion and we are having to restructure our staff because of financial issues. Of course these things are now being done on the back of our support staff. We continue to be the ones who suffer by others poor decision making. And our voices are not heard or do we have a say in how

things are done. The college is starting to lose good employees because of this and it will only continue to get worse.

7. Even though we have this model, communication still isn't happening. We need to remember this is a community college so we need to be here for the community by offering a more diverse curriculum.

8. I highly suggest having professional development/team building days/activities that involves all of the groups (Admin., Staff, and Faculty). The majority of the time we are only working with/associating with people within our own group, what better way to promote good communication than by having a "fun" team building activity. Support staff used their professional development funds last year for a team building, scavenger hunt and received good reviews/positive feedback about it being a great team building activity. In addition, it would also be useful to have more all campus meetings. To summarize, I believe it would be beneficial to get all of the groups together more often.

9. Truth, integrity, humanity, balance, and faith is what I hope our leaders will be able to keep in mind while making decisions that affect us all.

10. In my opinion it does not meet the needs of MCCC.

11. Communication is a little better. I do feel like I understand more of what is happening in other departments/divisions.

Admin/Professional

1. Regular reminders that employee opinions are welcomed, encouraged and valued.

2. Courageous and self-sacrificing work on the part of the few has benefited the many.

3. Communication is an inside job.

4. Thanks to the GEC and all of those employees that have volunteered for leadership roles within the CMSG!

5. It is not perfect, but it is working

6. Please devote the man hours necessary to keep all documentation up to date.

7. Three very large groups meet. Faculty Council is largely ineffective as there is no mandatory attendance requirement. It is difficult to ascertain how cross divisional interest affect functioning of the councils and issues at hand.

8. This fiasco has resulted in less transparency and communication due to ad-hoc committees, task forces and study groups that are by invitation only make policy and don't produce minutes or email documentation of discussions. Vp instruction has overturned the curriculum committee on more than one occasion that leads me to conclude there really is not a true shared governance model.

9. Improving communication at MCCC is a complex issue, especially when there are individuals who simply do not want to see things improve. However, the majority of MCCC employees worked very hard to make the CMSG work and did so with the utmost sincerity. The council model is effective but

should not stand alone. It is my opinion, as noted above, that the most effective governance system for MCCC would be one that includes both the council model and standing committee structure, as well as, opportunities for information sharing and discussion at the department and division levels.

10. Individuals who want to engage and be informed now have many tools with which to do so. There are open forums to ask questions and a process to submit topics/ideas for input and decisions.

11. A representative from the other 2 councils should attend the other's meetings to share pertinent meeting information they discussed.