

Council Model of Shared Governance: Formative Evaluation Results

Jamie DeLeeuw, Ph.D.
Office of Institutional Research
February 28, 2013



MONROE COUNTY
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

enriching lives

Council Model of Shared Governance Formative Evaluation Results

This report summarizes employee satisfaction with the Council Model of Shared Governance (CMSG). In accordance with the CLARUS Corporation's recommendations, currently MCCC is piloting the CMSG, which began August of 2012 and is comprised of three standing committees (Academic Review, Curriculum, and Learning Assessment), Staff Council, Faculty Council, Administrator Council, and the Governance Evaluation Committee; feedback from each council and the vice presidents is forwarded to the president. MCCC's traditional/standing governance structure consists of various committees that make recommendations to the three vice presidents, who then report 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 to improve CMSG processes during the remainder of the pilot year and to stimulate campus-wide discussion about whether or not to adopt the model. When the intent of an evaluation is to improve processes, it is known as a formative evaluation. A secondary objective of this evaluation is to present results to the HLC during the March 2013 Focused Visit.

Method

Procedure

Current MCCC employees, excluding student assistants and Lifelong Learning adjuncts, were invited February 6, 2013 by email to participate in the 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 was open for one week; two follow-up reminders were sent within this timeframe to encourage participation.

Participants

Out of 435 employee invitations, 173 participated in the survey. The overall response rate was 39.8%, which is considered at least average for internal surveys and high when one considers that adjunct faculty comprise 52% of college employees. Additionally, some recently hired employees did not participate given unfamiliarity with the CMSG and standing governance structure. Table 1 illustrates response rates by employee classification. Response rates were high

for full-time employees, with faculty having the highest response rate, 82.5%. Only two individuals chose not to report an employee classification. Comparatively, CLARUS’s overall response rate was only 31%, with 19% of respondents reporting no employee classification.

Table 1. Response Rate per Employee Group

Employee Status	Actual College Composition	Response Rate Per Group
Adjunct Faculty	52.2%	42/227 = 18.5%
Admin/Professional	6.7%	21/29 = 72.4%
Faculty	14.5%	52/63 = 82.5%
Full-time SS/Maintenance	19.1%	45/83 = 54.2%
Part-time SS/Maintenance	7.1%	11/31 = 35.5%
No Response	N/A	2 respondents
Total	100%	435

Fifty-six percent of respondents were female and 43% were male, closely representing the gender distribution at the college (52.6% female, 47.4% male). Regarding length of employment, 14% of respondents reported working for MCCC for less than 2 years, 17% for 2-5 years, 37% for 5+ to 15 years, and 32% for 15+ years. There was a small correlation ($r = .22, p < .05$) between length of employment at MCCC and number of council meetings attended (administrator council convening one less time than faculty and staff council was controlled for). Length of employment also had a statistically significant small relationship with satisfaction with the model (#2). Individuals employed at MCCC for 5 years or less were more satisfied with the model ($M = 3.65, SD = .84$) than those employed at the college for longer than 5 years ($M = 3.18, SD = 1.17$).

Measure

In addition to demographic questions, a Yes/No question regarding whether most of the Shared Governance Handbook was read by the respondent, and frequency of council attendance, 27 questions (Table 3) 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 included and respondents could also choose not to respond altogether. 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.

Reliability

Twenty-six questions were included in the reliability analysis, which is a calculation of consistency in participants’ responses across questions. Two questions are presented in Table 3 but excluded in this analysis because they did not pertain to satisfaction with aspects of the model: “At Board of Trustee meetings, I think each council should briefly present the trustees with updates and concerns (#26)” and frequency of meeting attendance (#28). 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.

- There are major faults in the CMSG’s processes.
- The CMSG has created more divisiveness between employee groups (e.g. administrative, staff, faculty).
- The standing governance model is more democratic than the CMSG.
- If I wished to submit a proposal (e.g. informational, input, action) to the councils, I would feel the need to gain supervisor approval prior to doing so.
- I feel unwelcome at my council’s meetings.
- Overall I am dissatisfied with MCCC’s CMSG.
- Within the CMSG, ultimately my opinion has little influence.
- I am reluctant to take time away from my work tasks to attend my council’s meetings.

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). Cronbach’s alpha was high, .94, 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.

Results

Participants had to respond to at least 80% of the 26 questions regarding satisfaction with the model for a scale item average score to be calculated; 146 individuals met this criterion. The

respondent average was 3.28 ($SD = .68$). Overall the perception of the Council Model of Shared Governance was slightly positive. Table 2 displays statistics per employee group.

Table 2. Scale Item Statistics by Employee Group

	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Adjunct Faculty	21	3.15	.35	2.22	3.68
Faculty	51	3.07 ^a	.77	1.54	4.31
PT SS/Main	8	3.27	.47	2.67	3.92
FT SS/Main	43	3.37	.60	2.04	4.68
Admin/Professional	21	3.69 ^a	.69	2.22	4.77
Total	144	3.27	.67	1.54	4.77

Note: Two respondents did not indicate their employee group.

“a” indicates a statistically significant difference between the two groups noted.

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 to the table above, this means that about 68% of responses fell within one SD of the mean, between 2.6 (3.27 minus .67) and 3.94 (3.27 plus .67). As illustrated in Table 2 and Table 3, faculty tended to have the most dispersion within their group, followed by administrators, but not always. For instance administrators had the most dissent regarding whether each council should briefly present the trustees with updates and concerns at Board of Trustees meetings (#26).

Regarding specific questions, employees responded most strongly that

- They feel welcome at their council meetings (#17).
- Council members are respectful of one another during sessions (#15).
- They are able to find council items on Blackboard (#20).
- Workload has not been reduced as a result of the CMSG (#11).
- They are encouraged by supervisors to attend meetings (#25).
- One’s council makes good use of its time (#21).
- The CMSG gives all employees a voice (#18).

When there were statistically significant, meaning reliable, differences between groups, they tended to occur between faculty and administrators and are noted in the tables with alphabetical superscripts (e.g. ^a). For instance for “The Council Model of Shared Governance (CMSG) is an effective decision-making model.” (#1) and “The tone across campus has improved since the CMSG was piloted” (#7), administrators agreed almost a full point more than faculty. Including all employee groups, overall respondents slightly disagreed that the tone across campus has improved since the model was piloted (#7), while also disagreeing that the CMSG has created *more* divisiveness (#12). Interestingly, respondents also tended to perceive increased dialogue among groups (#4) and increased perspective-taking (#6) since the CMSG was piloted.

Table 3. Results Per Question

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

		N	Mean	SD
1. The Council Model of Shared Governance (CMSG) is an effective decision-making model.	Adjunct Faculty	32	3.41	.71
	Faculty	51	2.94 ^a	1.26
	PT SS/Main	9	3.33	.71
	FT SS/Main	45	3.38	1.01
	Admin/Professional	21	3.86 ^a	1.06
	Total	158	3.30	1.07
2. Overall I am satisfied with the CMSG.	Adjunct Faculty	30	3.47	.68
	Faculty	51	2.88 ^a	1.34
	PT SS/Main	9	3.56	.53
	FT SS/Main	45	3.42	.99
	Admin/Professional	21	3.81 ^a	1.03
	Total	156	3.31	1.09
3. The CMSG is an improvement over the standing governance structure.	Adjunct Faculty	29	3.17	.47
	Faculty	51	3.10	1.43
	PT SS/Main	9	3.33	.50
	FT SS/Main	42	3.45	.99
	Admin/Professional	21	3.62	1.28
	Total	152	3.30	1.12

	Adjunct Faculty	29	3.31	.76
4. The CMSG has increased dialogue among different groups and individuals across campus.	Faculty	50	3.16	1.38
	PT SS/Main	9	3.56	.53
	FT SS/Main	45	3.60	1.03
	Admin/Professional	21	3.71	1.27
	Total	154	3.42	1.14
	Adjunct Faculty	26	2.85	.54
5. There are major faults in the CMSG's processes.	Faculty	49	3.43 ^a	1.23
	PT SS/Main	9	2.67	.71
	FT SS/Main	44	2.84	1.10
	Admin/Professional	21	2.33 ^a	.97
	Total	149	2.95	1.09
	Adjunct Faculty	29	3.10	.82
6. Since piloting the CMSG, I better understand the perspectives and interests of different parties.	Faculty	51	3.16	1.21
	PT SS/Main	9	3.11	.33
	FT SS/Main	45	3.38	.83
	Admin/Professional	21	3.71	1.10
	Total	155	3.28	1.00
	Adjunct Faculty	29	3.00 ^b	.66
7. The tone across campus has improved since the CMSG was piloted.	Faculty	48	2.35 ^{a,b}	1.08
	PT SS/Main	9	3.11	.60
	FT SS/Main	45	2.69	1.00
	Admin/Professional	21	3.33 ^a	1.16
	Total	152	2.76	1.02
	Adjunct Faculty	30	3.27	.98
8. I feel more informed about important issues under the CMSG test phase than under the standing governance structure.	Faculty	49	3.08	1.22
	PT SS/Main	9	3.33	.50
	FT SS/Main	43	3.49	.99
	Admin/Professional	21	3.57	1.25
	Total	152	3.32	1.09

	Adjunct Faculty	24	3.17	.87
9. I feel free to disclose my knowledge and opinions at council meetings.	Faculty	51	3.00	1.20
	PT SS/Main	8	3.50	.54
	FT SS/Main	44	3.32	.98
	Admin/Professional	21	3.57	1.17
	Total	148	3.23	1.06
	Adjunct Faculty	27	3.19	.62
10. CMSG processes are effective.	Faculty	51	2.65 ^a	1.25
	PT SS/Main	9	3.22	.67
	FT SS/Main	44	3.14	.93
	Admin/Professional	21	3.43 ^a	.98
	Total	152	3.03	1.03
	Adjunct Faculty	26	2.42	.76
11. My workload has been reduced as a result of the CMSG.	Faculty	48	2.23	1.21
	PT SS/Main	9	2.44	1.01
	FT SS/Main	37	2.14	.67
	Admin/Professional	20	2.85	1.04
	Total	140	2.34	.99
	Adjunct Faculty	25	2.84	.62
12. The CMSG has created more divisiveness between employee groups (e.g. administrative, staff, faculty).	Faculty	48	3.02 ^a	1.12
	PT SS/Main	9	3.11	.60
	FT SS/Main	41	2.76	1.07
	Admin/Professional	21	2.19 ^a	1.08
	Total	144	2.80	1.03
	Adjunct Faculty	26	2.77	.59
13. The standing governance model is more democratic than the CMSG.	Faculty	51	2.82	1.20
	PT SS/Main	8	2.63	.52
	FT SS/Main	43	3.02	1.01
	Admin/Professional	21	2.90	1.26
	Total	149	2.87	1.04

	Adjunct Faculty	27	2.89	.32
14. Decisions are made more swiftly under the CMSG than the standing governance structure.	Faculty	51	2.73	1.20
	PT SS/Main	10	2.80	.79
	FT SS/Main	43	2.67	.89
	Admin/Professional	20	3.35	1.09
	Total	151	2.83	.98
	Adjunct Faculty	19	3.42	.90
15. Individuals are respectful of one another during council meetings.	Faculty	51	3.69	.88
	PT SS/Main	8	3.75	.71
	FT SS/Main	43	4.00	.69
	Admin/Professional	21	4.10	.63
	Total	142	3.81	.81
	Adjunct Faculty	27	3.22 ^a	.89
16. If I wished to submit a proposal (e.g. informational, input, action) to the councils, I would feel the need to gain supervisor approval prior to doing so.	Faculty	50	2.80	.93
	PT SS/Main	10	3.30	1.06
	FT SS/Main	43	2.53 ^a	1.05
	Admin/Professional	19	2.89	1.10
	Total	149	2.85	1.01
	Adjunct Faculty	23	2.39	.94
17. I feel unwelcome at my council's meetings.	Faculty	50	1.92	.78
	PT SS/Main	8	2.63	.92
	FT SS/Main	43	1.95	.82
	Admin/Professional	21	2.10	1.22
	Total	145	2.07	.91
	Adjunct Faculty	27	3.37 ^a	.88
18. The CMSG gives all employees a voice.	Faculty	51	3.37 ^b	1.04
	PT SS/Main	9	3.56	.73
	FT SS/Main	45	3.64	1.05
	Admin/Professional	21	4.14 ^{a,b}	.66
	Total	153	3.57	.98

	Adjunct Faculty	30	3.20	1.06
	Faculty	51	2.96 ^a	.87
19. The CMSG encourages part-time employee participation.	PT SS/Main	10	3.10	.99
	FT SS/Main	42	3.31	.81
	Admin/Professional	19	3.84 ^a	.90
	Total	152	3.22	.94
	Adjunct Faculty	28	3.46	.88
20. I am able to find council items (e.g. proposals, agendas, minutes, responses, etc.) on Blackboard.	Faculty	51	3.67	1.07
	PT SS/Main	10	3.70	.82
	FT SS/Main	45	3.69	1.06
	Admin/Professional	20	4.20	.89
	Total	154	3.71	1.01
	Adjunct Faculty	22	3.27	.55
21. My council makes good use of its meeting time.	Faculty	51	3.24 ^{a,b}	1.26
	PT SS/Main	8	3.75	.71
	FT SS/Main	44	3.91 ^b	.80
	Admin/Professional	21	3.95 ^a	.87
	Total	146	3.58	1.01
	Adjunct Faculty	28	2.68	.77
22. Overall I am dissatisfied with MCCC's CMSG.	Faculty	51	3.12	1.40
	PT SS/Main	8	2.75	.71
	FT SS/Main	45	2.53	1.10
	Admin/Professional	20	2.45	1.28
	Total	152	2.76	1.19
	Adjunct Faculty	26	3.00	.80
23. Within the CMSG, ultimately my opinion has little influence.	Faculty	51	3.25 ^a	1.16
	PT SS/Main	9	3.00	1.00
	FT SS/Main	45	3.07	1.05
	Admin/Professional	20	2.40 ^a	1.00
	Total	151	3.03	1.06

	Adjunct Faculty	24	3.25 ^b	.99
24. I am reluctant to take time away from my work tasks to attend my council's meetings.	Faculty	50	3.02 ^a	1.44
	PT SS/Main	8	2.75	.71
	FT SS/Main	45	2.67	1.26
	Admin/Professional	20	2.00 ^{a,b}	1.08
	Total	147	2.80	1.28
25. I am encouraged by my supervisor to attend my council's meetings.	Adjunct Faculty	29	3.07	1.00
	Faculty	48	3.73	.84
	PT SS/Main	9	2.89	.93
	FT SS/Main	44	3.75	.92
	Admin/Professional	18	4.50	.71
<i>*Produced many statistically significant differences between groups.</i>	Total	148	3.65*	.98
26. At Board of Trustee meetings, I think each council should briefly present the trustees with updates and concerns.	Adjunct Faculty	26	3.54	.71
	Faculty	50	3.56	1.05
	PT SS/Main	7	3.00	.82
	FT SS/Main	45	3.53	.87
	Admin/Professional	20	2.65*	1.39
<i>*Admin was statistically different from all groups except PT SS/Main.</i>	Total	148	3.40	1.03
27. The CMSG processes outlined in the Shared Governance Handbook are clear.	Adjunct Faculty	13	3.92 ^a	.49
	Faculty	31	3.16 ^{a,b}	.78
	PT SS/Main	3	4.00	.00
	FT SS/Main	21	3.38	.97
	Admin/Professional	17	3.88 ^b	.60
<i>Respondents are those who reported reading most of the handbook.</i>	Total	85	3.51	.81
28. Support Staff Council and Faculty Council each met 5 times during the Fall 2012 semester, while Administrator Council met 4 times. How many of your own council's meetings did you attend?	Adjunct Faculty	39	.49	1.12
	Faculty	48	4.67	.60
	PT SS/Main	8	1.13	1.73
	FT SS/Main	39	3.51	1.43
	Admin/Professional	19	3.21	.98
<i>Inferential tests were not conducted given that councils did not meet the same number of times.</i>	Total	153		

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

Qualitative Results

Common themes found in the qualitative data:

Positive:

- Opportunities to be heard
- More informed/openness
- Faculty needed a forum outside of their faculty association meeting

Areas for Improvement/Suggestions

- Explain the three types of proposals and method for countering another council's submission type (e.g. presented as an information item rather than as an action item)
- Add joint sessions amongst the councils to avoid "silos"
- Pay adjuncts to attend council meetings and educate them about the model
- Councils are currently large and run by a few
- Concerns about liaison and ex-officio presence
- Timeliness of action items; increase frequency of meetings
- What happens to the items once the meeting is over? Where do recommendations go?
- Streamline processes (e.g. proposal submission, insert online voting and/or web-based discussion)
- Pay those involved in leading (chairs, secretary, recorder) the CMSG, and/or increase delegation of these responsibilities
- Set aside time so everyone can attend council meetings; provide Student Service coverage
- Have a combination of councils and committees
- Clarify handbook terms and processes such as who can create a task force, and whether it is reported on the tracking form
- Blackboard concerns
- Increase information sharing on non-controversial happenings around campus
- Additional initiatives are needed to improve trust across campus

Other

- It has not been long enough to evaluate the CMSG
- Part-timers do not have time to participate in the CMSG

Qualitative Comments

If you attended council meetings infrequently (0-2 times) during the Fall 2012 semester, why?

Adjunct

1. As an adjunct, I work full-time outside the college. Attending during the daytime when meetings are scheduled is not an option.
2. Scheduling issues
3. As a part time employee other commitments caused a conflict.
4. Doesn't happen while I am at work at MCCC. I work another job.
5. I feel this is not part of my job.
6. Conflict with my class schedule, as well a conflict with other responsibilities.
7. Adjunct faculty are not welcomed by full time faculty. Also, it is not always convenient for me to go to meetings due to schedule conflicts.
8. insufficient time to devote to attending
9. Don't know when they are scheduled.
10. Work 9-5 at another job.
11. schedule conflict
12. As an adjunct not on campus when most were held.
13. This is my first semester(Winder)at MCCC. I know very little about the council described above. I have not received a specific handbook, nor have I been advised the importance of these meetings. No orientation was offered.
14. I attended orientation when the process was reviewed. I am adjunct nursing faculty with my task at the hospital. I am not routinely on campus. I have been full time faculty at other institutions in the past and know that the functioning of a campus requires a big effort. At this time I do not have the available time for extra work activities with family and personal responsibilities.
15. I was not teacher that semester and was not on campus.
16. I don't know about them
17. Meetings are held during the day.. impossible for adjunct to attend who have full time careers outside the college

18. Meetings may have been held during hours I was teaching.
19. I am only on campus while I am working here. It is a long drive to get here and I have a full-time job elsewhere.
20. I just haven't reached out enough to participate.
21. Time constraints
22. Schedule Conflict
23. I live over one hour from the college, and I commute to MCCC for night classes.
24. I work full-time outside of the college and am unable to attend the meetings.
25. As an adjunct instructor and also working full time I do not have time.
26. Doesn't matter to me, I actually have another job that takes >60 hours / week. I am an Adjunct, because I believe in the need of the students I teach.
27. I had a class that conflicted with the meeting time.
28. Hard to find the time to come to the college when I'm not working.
29. I was going to grad school and could not attend the meetings. I plan on going to more now that I have graduated, so I can learn more about the CMSG process.
30. Adjunct faculty whose full-time responsibilities elsewhere conflict with meeting times

PT SS/Main

1. two jobs, not available
2. I do not work on Fridays
3. Had Prior commitments.
4. Meetings are during my off days and not during my shift. I have personal responsibilities that require my attention.
5. Was not encouraged to attend by my supervisor

FT SS/Main

1. There is not enough coverage for me to attend. The meetings are conducted on Fridays and the office I am employed in does not have student assistance for that day.
2. work schedule
3. Meeting conflicts.
4. We are student service area and you have to keep it staffed and coverage wasn't always available so

that someone could attend.

5. I have students and real work to attend too.

6. conflict in schedule

7. Too busy with work related activities.

8. Got reports from those attending.

Admin/Professional

Was out of town on business and out sick.

No Classification

**Response removed to protect the individual's anonymity.*

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. More information sharing across campus groups
2. I have no opinion since I know very little about CMSG.
3. No one has ever even explained to me what this organization is, so how can I possibly even know what this organization does or if I even agree with its conception & or purpose.
4. Information imparted by various members/divisions of College Community
5. I've never been required to participate.

Faculty

1. I like that it provides everyone a place to voice their opinions.
2. Cleaner lines of communication Greater visibility of presidential decisions More efficient use of time
3. The governing model is just a package, or a method. We do not have shared governance here @ MCCC because the administration's decision making remains top down. Faculty and support staff still have no real voice in my opinion.
4. The CMSG model takes too long to accomplish anything. It's a lot more talk and a lot less action than the standing model.
5. Democratic process and accountability. Anyone can submit a proposal.
6. The increased dialog among different groups in a larger group setting.
7. I believe everyone has an opportunity to be heard. I like the process of filling out proposals and getting an item on the agenda. I feel this keeps some of the frivolous issues out of the council meetings. I feel I am more informed about campus issues and activities because of the council model.
8. I like the idea that all of the groups are aware of issues and can discuss them as a group. The standing governance structure did not have a standing forum for all of a work group to come together to discuss a campus wide issue.
9. The opportunity to hear from the Support Staff on their issues has been helpful. It feels more collaborative because that group was isolated. Blackboard delivery has improved with some method to file labeling. Still needs work.
10. Its too early to determine its effectiveness.
11. I like nothing.

12. The Standing Governance structure was broken, but only because the current administration wanted it to be broken, or at least offered little or no effort to make it function effectively. The current administration circumvented committee recommendations whenever administrative needs became evident. In addition, several of the committees just quit meeting because they realized nothing they worked on ever came to fruition. The only committee the current administration engaged in from my knowledge was Curriculum Committee, and that was only to get rubber stamps for administrative decisions; and when the rubber stamp wasn't available or too slow, the administration circumvented that committee as well, to create courses in radio and tv and welding as two examples. The CMSG, in my opinion, was only initiated after HLC observed the disastrous shape the governance structure was in upon their campus visit. As part of that dysfunction, the HLC also noted the low morale amongst faculty, staff, and even several administrators. The CMSG was ultimately a decision made out of fear by the administration as they needed desperately to create some new form of governance so they could check another box on the HLC report regarding "things accomplished" for the return visit in winter of 2013. I have no idea if the CMSG will be better or worse than the SG structure, but my informed guess is that it will be as dysfunctional and ineffective as SG was because the administration's heavy-handed, unilateral decision making process will most likely continue and employee moral will not improve.

13. The processes that drive this new model are onerous. The previous model was effective for over 30 years and worked until the current crop of administrators were put in their positions. The Deans have been rendered basically figureheads with no real authority or influence. The only reason to have them is because the VP's rarely come out from their caves to see what is going on the campus. The CMSG does allow for the employee groups to meet, but there is little interaction and communication with the other employee groups. In other words, we have created formal silos, not broken down the old ones.

14. Multiple resource input defines the direction the college is going. Faculty council has a voice.

15. - The greatest strength, so far, of the council model is the sharing of information. The information and action item presentations during the council meetings provide lots of information I never would have heard before. - I feel like I have a voice. Under the committee structure, issues could go through the process and be approved before I even heard about them. Now I hear the pros and cons, along with everyone else, and have a chance to give my opinion. - The faculty desperately needed a forum to discuss important academic and governance issues. The faculty association meetings were filled with union issues, which is appropriate. Whether a faculty senate or a faculty council, the concept is the same. We haven't had many critical issues come before the faculty council during this first year, but at least the forum exists when its needed.

16. The CMSG enhances the communication of issues to all fulltime employees. Also, allows input at all levels prior to decisions being made. I like that each council is allowed to vote on action items rather than decisions being made by committees.

17. Nothing

18. Recommendations for change could be made at the source of the activity and forwarded for acceptance or denial at the next level. In actuality, the source of the activity is where the work is done and where the accountability lies.

19. It provides information from different areas and allows some dialog.

20. The meetings are nice because everyone "should" know what is going on...if they listen.
21. CMSG is a movement toward a more open and democratic system. That said, it is horribly inefficient for those very reasons. However, this is a necessary sacrifice because a college is best run collegially, and with faculty as the strongest voices. Administrators do not understand education, period. Even former educators who move into administration become more focused on that job and lose contact with the purpose of colleges and students. The faculty must have a stronger voice and this is the only way to guarantee it.
22. With the CMSG we are better informed about what happens on campus. 2. We are part of a democratic process, even if the majority vote does not reflect your own position. 3. One person has the power to enact change on campus through the CSMG. We did not have that before.
23. Nothing
24. It brings everyone together, I guess that is a good thing. Your (Jamie) presentation and financial aids presentation were excellent. I wish we had known more about financial aids in the past. At least everything can be discussed, in principle.
25. I like that the meetings focus on issues that are relevant to the group's concerns.
26. Based on the experience of the last few months, I believe the council model does provide all groups on campus with a voice, with ways to communicate with each other, and, most importantly, mechanisms to implement changes in a time-effective manner. I believe the model is one that is inclusive of all groups and represents a fair decision-making process. I am very strongly in favor of continuing use of this model and make improvements to it as we all gain experience as a campus community.
27. Hearing what is happening and concerns that are occurring throughout the campus. Getting better idea of the big picture and what's happening within each department or area.
28. The processes for changes are clear.
29. I like the idea that various groups (faculty, Staff, and administrators) have a secure place to voice concerns. The old model did not have this structure in place.
30. The CMSG did provide the forum for groups on campus to get together to discuss issues and in theory, allowed all on campus to have a voice.
31. I feel that the structure allows more input from everyone. I also feel that I have a better understanding of changes that are happening campus wide.
32. I like the ability to generate a proposal. I like that feedback is required from the other councils and the President.

PT SS/Main

1. The best part is that everyone has an opportunity to ask questions and be informed.
2. Don't have enough information to make a judgment

FT SS/Main

1. I like that there is a time limit as to how long a proposal can remain unresolved. I also like the fact that issues are brought to all of the councils and that the minutes from each meeting are posted on Blackboard. I believe this is very helpful in the communication department.
2. Every one has an opportunity to speak on an issue that relates to them. More communication between divisions.
3. Fairness is evident. Not one council/committee/group has total control in making an important decision that may/may not affect a portion of or the entire campus community. Everyone has input and all voices can be heard. Although this may take a bit longer in some respects, the overall question/problem/suggestion is considered by everyone.
4. With the council model I know what is going on around campus. Before things were kept in their respective committees and you didn't find out things till after the fact; if at all.
5. Not sure there have been many proposals that have been passed through the process yet. Secondly as a support staff I have no idea what I'd use Blackboard for? I logged on for the first time after participating in this survey and am not sure how I should be using blackboard in my daily work.
6. There was nothing wrong with the committee structure we had in place at the College for over 40 years.
7. We may hear more of what is going on around campus.
8. I like that the new model gives every employee the opportunity to have a voice in the decision making processes of the college. The model provides an opportunity for more effective communication across campus, although it does require individuals to take personal responsibility to be as informed or uninformed as he/she chooses to be (meetings are optional for administrators and staff. Information is no longer pushed, rather it is widely available). We have reduced our number of standing committees from 19 standing committees to three Councils and three standing committees, which should significantly reduce the strain on our human resources. With the old standing committee structure, only a small group of individuals were involved with the decision making processes of the college. Often these committees were made up of many of the same people. the new process eliminates these small silos. This is a test year and we understand that the model will be modified as we discover the weakness and strengths of its structure. The model is still very new to MCCC, so continued education is critical to our success. In all, this was a positive change to the governance structure of the college.
9. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss items that are churning throughout the campus community even if they are things that do not directly effect my work.
10. Everybody knows what kinds of items are being proposed around campus. Every council gets to put their input into each proposal.
11. I feel the CMSG allows everyone on Campus a voice, as opposed to the committee structure we had previously. If you were not on a committee, you had no idea what was going on with the committee. I feel most of the time the committees were ineffective, as we did not hear about anything that they did.

12. I like the model because it has a good purpose. We need better communication at the college. It tends to feel very "us vs. them" - I think CMSG is a step in the right direction.

13. I think the idea behind the CMSG is a good one. With the old governance system a select number of people sat on committees and it took time to keep the rest of the college informed about decisions being made. I definitely think that is a strength.

14. I believe the CMSG allows me to learn about the inner workings of how decisions are made. It also allows the decision makers to hear different perspectives.

15. I feel that it is way too early to really know if this is more effective than the standing committees. For the most part, I think it could be very effective. This really needs more time. However, I don't feel that this has changed the climate on campus as far as with communication and shared governance. These issues run much deeper. The CMSG will not fix this problem.

16. Concerns that affect the college as a whole are supposed to be brought forward instead of decisions made behind closed doors.

Admin/Professional

1. A plus is hearing about Faculty and Staff Council driven proposals directly from a staff or faculty member. It's easy to review minutes of all three councils to be aware of concerns, comments. Pushes an active final decision from the President that becomes known to all.

2. It's a good means for employees of all groups to know what is happening at the college. Everyone has the opportunity to provide input before a decision is implemented, which should help prevent inappropriate policies and problems across departments.

3. Less committee requirements.

4. I think the CMSG gives more employees opportunities to participate than the standing governance structure.

5. I think that this new model is a vast improvement over the previous model because it provides a feedback loop and closes that loop. In the old model, there were too many committees and many were not even productive. This allows individuals and groups to take ideas to the councils for input, approval or as an info item and get feedback immediately. It also allows for all initiatives that affect multiple areas of the college to be vetted across the whole campus. I think people, in general, feel very comfortable giving their input in the councils. Sure, it has a few kinks to work out, but any huge governance overhaul will in the first year. Overall, it has really improved interaction among employees and employee groups. A totally positive transformation over the cumbersome model of the past.

6. In my view, the CMSG provides everyone with the opportunity to offer input and cast a vote if appropriate. The original standing committee structure lacks a venue for college-wide discussion, input, and debate. I commend those who have stepped forward to lead during this year of testing.

7. -Everything being posted to Blackboard is nice and well organized

8. opportunity for immediate dialogue and input; participation; efficient; no issue with missing meetings; everyone has a voice

9. There are fewer meetings, and the council meetings are shorter.

10. Information about what is happening at the college is flowing more freely and individuals are not only more informed but they also have an opportunity to voice their thoughts on each item. The model has helped to curb the ""gossip"" on campus as everyone has opportunity to hear first hand the issues and to ask questions to clarify their understanding. The additional meetings with the Vice Presidents and President (Brown Bags and State of the College) are very informative and have offered yet another venue for information sharing and questions.

11. Enhanced understanding of what's happening on campus by way of (1) dialogue/presentations at the meetings, (2) reports by liaisons of the other Councils at my meeting, (3) creates the frequency of topics coming before the Councils, and (4) discussion about the topics continues after the meetings across the campus. Seems to provide rumor control - tends to give rumors short life

12. Openness, inclusiveness.

13. Opportunity for each employee to participate in a meeting.

14. Meetings are concise. Proposals have been vetted by interested/knowledgeable stakeholders close to the activity before being presented to the larger group. Each group at the College has an opportunity to learn about the proposals and ask questions before commenting and/or voting. Each group's proposals and comments get an airing in each of the other groups.

No Classification

Not sure where we are headed. How does individual voices get heard? At times too cumbersome.

Lumbering and problematic way to get things done. We could not get major projects done if every council had to vote on every matter.

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

Adjunct

1. All meeting times are during the normal work day and do not allow for many adjuncts to attend. Most of us work full time jobs and have no voice in any governing structure.
2. Continue to not require me to participate.
3. FYI-Some I have spoken to state that sending action items through to Administrative Council does not always seem effective, since they can basically return them to counsel. They voice that the ability to effect change stays at Administrative level. I personally think we have not had enough time to actually evaluate this area since very few action items have been addressed thus far.
4. I don't have enough information to give an opinion.
5. Rather cumbersome decision making tool. Limited time to address important campus issues
6. see above

Faculty

1.- I wish it didn't have to be so bureaucratic. The best word to describe the proposal tracking form is obtuse, and the forms for proposing new action and information items aren't much better. Only a few insiders - such as the members of the former governance committee - really understand the system. Most employees take one look at the forms and decide to stay away from them. As we move forward, I hope there is a way to make the process more user friendly.

- There is quite a bit of confusion about the process - when does an issue enter the system, how it moves through, etc. That's understandable and to be expected. It will take time to work it all out. I hope, however, that we can avoid the temptation to just add more bureaucracy, more rules, more prescriptive, regimented approaches. While some guidelines are necessary, I hope flexibility, openness, collegiality and common sense can prevail as much as possible.

- One of the biggest challenges, it seems to me, is getting the right issues before the councils at the right times. Who decides when to propose a study group or task force, and when to make it an action item. Who decides membership on study groups or task forces, etc. I hope we learned a lesson with the committee membership study group. There were no representatives from two important groups - deans and the IT Division. Both ended up unhappy with the result. Seems to me this could be a role of the GEC committee. The Divisions and the Cabinet also could play a role in helping to channel issues to the councils at the right times. "

2. The same person or small group of people still are making the ultimate decisions on any given issue. The process is lengthy and complicated. It seems like an issue could travel from council to council for a long period of time.

3. 1) The number of scheduled Faculty council meetings. 2) The loop-hole that emerged as a result of the Faculty Council serving as the one 'required' committee for faculty from a contractual stand point. Loop-hole example: As recorded via the December 19 Industrial Technology Division meeting minutes with regard to the agenda item: Curriculum and Learning Assessment Committee Structure,"....Faculty opted unanimously however not to represent the Division on either committee." 3) The 'side-lining' of all standing committees with the exception of the 'big three' and the Governance Evaluation Committee. On paper establishing the Faculty Council to meet the contractual one committee requirement for faculty and 'side-lining' all but three of the standing committees and the Governance Evaluation Committee during the pilot year was a good idea. However, this has: 1) led to some unforeseen difficulties in securing "faculty volunteers" for the remaining standing committees 2) created a loop-hole by which full-time faculty are refusing to serve on standing committees 3) resulted in inequities (although voluntary) in the number of committees on which individual faculty serve.

Recommendations: Change the wording of the next faculty contract such that all full-time faculty are 'required' to serve on the Faculty Council and one additional standing committee during the academic year with the requirement that faculty in each division are to fill committees with designated committee membership first and the division dean will assign membership to a committee having a designated committee membership, if necessary. Reduce the number of scheduled Faculty council meetings to two meetings in the fall semester and two meetings in the winter semester with a clause stating something similar to the following: "If a critical issue arises an additional council meeting may be called during the semester by the Faculty Council chairperson." Schedule at least one of the two Faculty Council meetings during the fall and winter semesters on a faculty 'work day'. In conjunction with reducing the number of Faculty Council meetings, reactivate 2-4 'key' standing committees in existence prior to the 2012-2013 academic year. Reactivation of a standing committee may be at the discretion of the Vice President to whom the committee is/was 'assigned' and/or put forth as an action item via the council model.

4. Adjuncts do not seem to be attending Faculty Council. We should be paying them to come. I am concerned with the standing committees that are on hiatus and wondering what work is not getting done.

5. A standing committee with 70 members is not designed to get things done. It is designed to fail. Sub-committees have been hijacked by certain loud-mouthed individuals pushing their own self-serving agenda. The administration knows this, and seems amused by it. Personally, I think shared governance is a crock. The administrators should run the college and be held accountable for it. This is not the function of faculty or staff. The faculty should stick to purely academic matters.

6. Agenda is so full and seems like things are rushed through at times. Seems like some things need more thought and ideas from all before final decisions made. Not sure if always hearing the WHOLE story.

7. CMSG is far too large (too many members) and the process or steps are cumbersome and ineffective. The CMSG has simply given a few people a forum to be heard by ""everyone"" instead of a few people in a smaller committee meeting. These are the same people who always talk at any meeting they attend, and when they finish talking the meeting is over. Employees, who might have contributed in a more focused committee with fewer participants, are either intimidated by the vocal few, or less likely to speak because of time constraints with such a large group. The CMSG also lacks focus in that every issue is put into the pipe from the back and has to wait its turn, or at least that seems to be the case so far. I have to say that once HLC is gone, anything and everything that emanates from CMSG will be ignored by this

administration with the same disdain for employee concerns, ideas, or projects as in the past. There is absolutely no evidence that the CMSG will affect any changes in administrative/employee relations. This is just rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic, so to speak. What is needed is a new collaborative and cooperative attitude by administration with the goal of improving curriculum and instruction at MCCC, not a goal of grabbing newspaper headlines with unneeded buildings going up while the quality of curriculum and instruction declines.

8. Flailing about...same people speak...

9. Frankly, the biggest problem is that too many people simply do not understand how the system works. They spend too much time arguing "can we do this" instead of simply saying "we are going to do this" to the other two councils and letting a dialog actually begin. Sadly, the Faculty Council also has a tendency to guard their cheese. When Administrative Council points out an issue with Faculty Council and requests open dialog on the issue, it should happen. Joint Committees for special situations should be used when two Councils disagree to see if an agreement can be reached in the next 30 days before both Councils send a recommendation to the President. The distrust between administration and faculty is still high, caused I feel because Administration believed it had sole ownership over the college, when Faculty honestly should have been leading administration by setting goals and requirements and then having administration find ways to make it work or firmly and politely explain why it won't work. Now this has led to a reverse problem, Faculty Council is clearly willing to push too hard without always working with Administration. More still needs to be done to establish a working relationship between these groups. To stress that while Faculty's voice should lead the college, it is Administration that accomplishes the Faculty vision and makes it feasible and keeps it reigned in to budgetary and bureaucratic realities. The presence of the model itself is a tool, and the right tool--but only when it starts being used the right way.

10. I am concerned that some projects that would be done by a standing committee are being neglected.

11. I did not think anyone fully comprehends the process and what happens to the items once the meeting is over.

12. I don't like presenting a proposal to three different groups.

13. I think it is cumbersome for small specific issues to be discussed in the large committee structure. I am also not clear as to how it is determined whether an issue is designated as input, informational or action. It seems, if I want to decide or take an action on an issue on my own or with a small group I could submit an issue as informational only item to all groups and it would just move through the model to the President without anyone else having the ability to offer input or take an action.

14. I would like to see us working out more effective ways of bringing up ideas and items at the various council meetings without having to complete so many forms and following an initial protocol that seems a little convoluted. Perhaps the ability to bring up items to our respective councils as an open item and then, if, from there the idea or item evolves into a study group, task force, etc., then the person that brings up the item is tasked with completing the required paperwork. Also, it would be useful if council items were available through an alternate drive or network aside from Blackboard (e.g. WebPal). I do not use Blackboard that often.

15. In a large group, the individual voice not heard.

16. Issues go round and round. Little opportunity to discuss current concerns. Meetings are a series of reports. Very little dialogue. Big waste of time and they are mandatory.
17. It seems cumbersome and inefficient. Perhaps this is because it's new, but I think the processes could probably be streamlined (e.g. online voting, web-based discussions, etc.).
18. Problems: 1. Putting an item on the agenda is a headache. You don't know which one to choose, and then you need to fill out three forms. That is just crazy. 2. We do not have enough time to meet. The college needs to dedicate a 2-4 hour period on the slowest day of the week to meetings. No classes will be held during this time period. Then we could have a real chance to do something.
19. Seems that the same people talk and nothing gets resolved. Others just sit and then complain after a decision is made.
20. That adjuncts are still not kept in the loop any better than with the standing governance structure.
21. The CMSG allows for employees (such as faculty who were former Deans) to use the CMSG to push their agendas.
22. The CMSG has not been applied correctly in all instances. One example is the decision to rename the Tech Division, which was presented to the president for action before it was discussed in the faculty council.
23. The decision-making process was extremely slow and cumbersome in the CMSG. Proposals took too long to get through all 3 councils and ultimately on the president's desk for a final decision. Seems like there are many issues on campus that normally would have been being discussed in smaller groups (e.g. developmental education and enrollment issues) that may not be appropriate for the CMSG model.
24. The negativity by naysayers who aren't happy about anything. Sometimes too much redundancy.
25. The new model was instituted to allow more involvement in the governance of MCCC. However, the process has been subverted by a group of individuals interested in narrow agendas with disregard for inclusion of all. Instead of decisions being made during meetings it appears that individuals are scheming in offline private meetings to subvert the process. I don't know how to improve this mess.
26. The new system creates silos. There are no face to face meetings with other key groups. In the old--and much better system--faculty, staff and administrators would work on issues of common interest. The problems with the old system were fixable. To scrap it for one that is inferior was foolhardy. It has not improved communication, it has suppressed it. The only reason we came up with this new system was that the leadership of the College (the Cabinet--but most importantly the president) was not able to lead using a shared governance model. The current cabinet knows that one way of keeping control is to divide the groups. This is what they have done. I can only hope that a new president will see the importance of truly SHARED governance. Currently faculty can sit in the background and DO nothing. All that is required is attend the Faculty Council meetings. Faculty need to be more active.
27. The paper-trail necessary to originate and champion an idea can be prohibitive

28. The procedures for introducing an item of interest or action are too laborious. Perhaps it keeps marginal items from the agenda, but it also drives out other ideas and proposals. The Faculty Council makes it too easy for faculty to do nothing. The Administrators Council is little different from the old Administrative Council. The president talks, the administrators dutifully listen, nothing changes, and they go about their business.

29. The process is really cumbersome, moving from one council to another to another-- the endless loop. Tracking the written materials is trying, figuring out what's what in Blackboard. It's improved over what it was in the beginning, so this is progress. This isn't much different from the traditional standing committee process-- council recommendations go to the VP and president, who ultimately have decision-making authority. This looks more transparent, but it still leaves authority with the president. We've changed the entire committee process because we have an autocratic, self-absorbed president and a few self-interested board members who pilfer the college for their pet projects. Our president thinks that "communication" is talking AT people in a variety of ways, rather than seeking out genuine input from campus. The public relations department is stuck making this foolish process look productive. It isn't. Most of this is to be pretty for the North Central visit, but nothing has changed really. The standing committee/sub-committee/task force process wasn't perfect. But this CMSG model is an effort to fix the perception of communication on campus, not to really change communication. The standing committee process seemed more efficient than this, even when it was slow.

30. The secretary, it seems, has a tremendous amount to work to do keeping minutes, posting items... Maybe the job of secretary could be divided among two people.

31. There is a lack of collegiality in the committee. We need to remember that we are here for the students.

32. There is just too much to cover in one committee. It is impossible to discuss in one committee, what 10(?) previous committees did in the past. Only major issues are brought up. Little concerns like computer use, ID badges, etc. will not likely be considered because most people think it only affects them, and time for the whole group should not be wasted."

33. Too many people. Ultimately, the decisions made are not ours.

PT SS/Main

1. Do not have enough information

2. I think the huge downfall in the model is the amount of time it takes to make it through all the councils to get a proposal approved. If there are requests for information, the proposal could be on an endless loop for many months at a time.

FT SS/Main

1. Because they are on a Friday I am not able to attend a majority of the meeting.

2. Blackboard works but it is not the easiest system to navigate through.

3. Divisiveness.

4. Getting everyone used to visiting the BlackBoard site - especially in regards to reading and participating in discussion prior to council meetings.
5. I don't feel we have covered any topics in our meetings that have impacted all employee groups. It is very nice to have the information about what is happening at the college, however, the information presented has mostly been informational. Also, anything presented that did require some type of input/etc. seems to get lost in the circle of council meetings. Decisions do not seem to happen quickly through this model.
6. I feel that we need better direction of how the process works because it is still new. For example, explanation about when we need to make an item an action item. There was an information item brought about from a different council as an information item. It seemed that myself and a few others did not approve. However, were not aware that we would have needed to "request it to be an action item" Also, it seems that the council liaisons make people less likely to open up about concerns. Especially if the liaisons comment during the discussion.
7. I feel there should be more information/clarification for everyone on campus as to what constitutes an information item, a request for input and an action item. It is confusing to figure out what people are looking for when they submit proposals.
8. I think there needs to be more items flowing through the council. Thus, I think there should be some samples of past things that happened that would have flown through the council if we had one at that time.
9. It appears to be a slower than expected process and I think the Councils need to meet more than once a month.
10. It seems everybody is just going around in circles and nothing gets done. Why not just one meeting everybody attends and get it over.
11. It seems like no matter what is said at a council meeting, some decisions are already made. Some of the information presented at meetings would have been easier in a handout instead of long presentations.
12. The council model puts the burden of work on just a few committed individuals.
13. The time frame between when a proposal is made and a decision is made. I think it would be better served if we had 2 meetings a month instead of 1 to expedite the process.
14. The whole process is very convoluted. Although the Handbook is somewhat helpful, I think it isn't as clear as it needs to be. For instance, does a Task Force get reported on a Request Form? We have a couple of Task Forces that have been formed but the Handbook does not explain the process very well. There is no reference to Task Forces on the Request form. It is also unclear as to what items go through the Council model. In my mind items that affect the campus on a whole but that isn't necessarily true. How do you define what becomes a Request or is just something that needs to be handled within a department/division?

15. There is a negative feeling toward the msg from administration and they do not want to make it succeed. Due to the previous point, there have been less smaller discussions to look at things that need to be addressed that can then be brought to the councils.

16. There is no longer any cross talk between employee groups on campus aside from all campus meetings.

17. There seems to be a small group of individuals that are extremely unhappy with the new council model, although many were not happy with the old standing committee model either, and to my knowledge there have no suggestions for other models. I believe this unhappiness is largely a lack of experience with and understanding of the model and its processes, which can be addressed through further conversation and education so that people feel more comfortable with this major cultural shift. Change is never easy. We need to make some changes to reduce redundancy in the process. For now, redundancy is better than leaving something out.

18. This process can be very cumbersome. By having to send action and information items through every council this process can take a couple months and that is not effective communication. The timing of the council meetings is also difficult because there is not always a report in your council because the others haven't met yet. Then the council hears about it one month later. So I think the timing of the councils is not effective, but I don't have a suggestion to fix it. I also think that presentations to councils should be based on need to know. If it doesn't affect the group..ie support staff maybe an overview at the meeting without the presentation.

19. Unless all recommendations are being posted to blackboard for comment I've not seen any recommendations come across outlook. Not sure any have even been submitted for comment? Again, see previous comments about Blackboard, We've never been encouraged to use it.

Admin/Professional

1. Administrators hear less "news" from the President about his work and thoughts about forces, trends that drive and impact the College.

2. A simple item or update doesn't seem to have a place in the system. At least that seems to be the perception.

3. Adequate time should be identified to ensure that each group can meet monthly in order for business to be discussed in a timely manner. Use Outlook to place each group's meeting on everyone's calendar.

4. As we continue to use the model, we need to update the handbook to help in everyone's understanding of how the model works. There has been some confusion about how to run items through the Councils and what items rise to the "Action" level versus information or input. Over time, I believe this will become more clear as we work through various issues and topics.

5. I can't say that there is anything that I like least. If we decide to adopt this model, I believe we (the college community) will continue to learn and improve the process as we move forward.

6. I find the process of moving something through the councils to be very slow. I don't like that the groups are segregated and aren't coming together for joint meetings to discuss important issues. I feel like the

open communication and dialogue we want to achieve are hindered by this separation between the groups. The liaison's role is a reporting role and is not designed to fill this gap. I feel we're still working and thinking in silos, based on what group we are in.

7. -In my opinion, some items being submitted as proposals should not be. Why do we need to approve the creation of a task force? Shouldn't a task force form and then send their recommendations to the councils? This is one example of why it takes longer to get things done. -If a committee makes a motion to resubmit a proposal as an action item, shouldn't it automatically become an action item for all committees to vote on? Isn't shared communication and having a voice the point of this new structure? This did not happen with the Standing Committee Membership Recommendations.

8. Navigating the council documents is a little challenging. Difficult to following an issue through from proposal to decision.

9. Process to address issues is lengthy. If an issue requires cycling through more than once it becomes a slow process.

10. Redundancy, presence of liaisons. Presence of authority everywhere is unnecessary.

11. the fear that not all staff members are comfortable tracking the topics on BlackBoard.

12. The opportunity to work with others from different work groups (faculty admin ss, etc.) has been eliminated. We have structurally created circles that eliminate communication, not enhanced it. The good work done by the standing committees has now been totally eliminated...look at the various council agendas.....nothing there.

13. There are some process issues that need to be resolved, not substantive but they do need to be resolved. We were aware that adjustments would need to be made based on experience and feedback from pilot.

14. There could be more feedback from each of the councils when there are actions for input. While not everyone is going to be interested enough in a particular topic to examine presenters' materials and provide suggestions, council members could certainly stand to become more involved. Perhaps council chairs could rally input from their members.

15. There is limited discussion on the agenda topics, and no other conversation about what other areas across campus are engaged in or operational/planning issues. The CMSG process may be a good vehicle for dealing with major or controversial issues on campus, (assuming people feel free to give input at the meetings), but all other communications/sharing has stopped.

16. Too early to tell if its an improvement, or if changes still need to be made.

No Classification

Dictatorship of the majority at times is a problem. Abrogating management rights or faculty rights to something headed where we do not know is perplexing. Who is in charge of running the college at any given time it seems impossible for one to discern.

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

Adjunct

1. Find a way to include more Adjunct Faculty. The percentage of instructors who are teaching as Adjuncts has increased greatly. I would like to hear more of their feedback. I understand logistically this is very difficult to accomplish.
2. New staff should be oriented about CMSG.
3. Vary the meeting times so even adjuncts who are only available during the evening may attend; and provide substitutes for those adjuncts who wish to attend a meeting, but are unable to because they are teaching.

Faculty

1. Assign task forces to get work done.
2. Review accomplishments at the end of each semester.
2. Disband it.
3. Drop it. Keep the standing model.
4. Fire the former Deans and scrap the CMSG model.
5. I think the best thing would be to return to the Standing Committee system with the addition of a smaller Faculty council and Support Staff Council. The administrators have always had their own Admin Council. That can remain.
6. I wish I had some specific suggestions. It would be impractical for councils to meet more than one time per month, which might help to speed up decision-making. Maybe the campus needs to add a few committees to the 3 existing to address particular issues.
7. I would try to give authority on decision-making to the people who are authorities in a given area. For example, give the faculty decision-making authority on questions related to instruction. "
8. In the current form I feel there is no simple fix. Given the abuses of the model by former administrators, it may be best to scrap it.
9. Limit which typed of proposals need to go to all three councils. Possibly re-instate some cross-area committees to deal with specialty concerns.
10. Members could be directly asked if other committee work needs to be discussed at a council meeting.
11. Need to allocate more administrative support to leadership of the different councils to facilitate the paperwork requirements
12. The paper forms that need to be filled out are cumbersome, to say the least. It also seems like the chair and secretary have too much to do and I imagine that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to find

people to volunteer to serve in these posts in the future. Having representatives from other areas, although I understand their purpose, restricts open discussions.

13. The support that was supposed to be provided for the council chairs has been very limited. Taking away any vote for the Deans on the Curriculum Committee is nuts. While the Faculty Council meeting is the one required committee, faculty are also required to participate on the other three committees. The workload has increased, while compensation has remained flat for 3 years. The Town Hall Meeting by the president was pathetic. He had 18 months in which he could have held a town hall-type meeting. He waited until he could read his letter of resignation to hold one. When he did, it was too formal and he was very uncomfortable in the setting. He is much better off campus where the public does not have to live out the ineffective decisions and oppressive atmosphere he so successfully created on campus.

PT SS/Main

Maybe there needs to be a time limit put on how long something can be floating out there in the councils before an action must be taken.

FT SS/Main

1. Bimonthly meetings.
2. Create a "carrot" for everyone to open the "intranet" daily and not expecting all notices/info to be emailed.
3. Have coverage in our offices so everyone can attend or have the meeting on a different day of the week.
4. Haven't needed to submit anything for review so the process is foreign.
5. I think time is the only thing that is going to improve the process. A constant review and revision of the process needs to take place on a semesterly basis at minimum and as the campus continues to move through the process I think that will iron out all of the confusion.
6. Possibly more meetings, or another way to get topics passed through each council more quickly. Also a better explanation of how this council model should work, because it was in a way, thrust upon us and we didn't get great explanation about how an item would be passed through the model.
7. We need to expand upon the handbook (further define and clarify processes, terms, etc.) and are keeping a running tab of suggestions and changes to be made. A rubric to help people quickly determine whether an item should be submitted via a Request for Proposal, or simply brought up in the open part of the meeting is in process. There seems to be some resistance by some individuals to attend the new meetings implemented as a result of the approved "Implementation Plan." Video taping and posting of all the meetings will begin taking place to accommodate those who may not be able to attend said meeting for whatever reason. All videos will be posted to the Blackboard Shared Governance organization for easy access. Further discussion and modification to meeting times and education about the model processes will help resolve these issues.

Admin/Professional

1. None currently.
2. Administrative staff members are generally reluctant to voice their true opinions at the council meeting with the president in attendance. Since all of the recommended actions are presented to the president in the end anyway, there might be more candid discussion on the topics if the president were not in attendance. I also believe the regular presence of the liaisons at the respective meetings restricts candid and open discussion of issues. People are reluctant to express their true feelings on an issue that may affect another council group when a member of that group is attending the meeting. Although the design is intended to open up communications between groups, it ultimately hinders open discussion. Everyone can read the minutes of the respective council meetings if they wish, so there is no need to have them summarized at each meeting by their respective members. If a council wishes to invite a liaison from another group for input/clarification on a topic they could attend for a portion, and then be excused.
3. Clarification/discussion on what issues and topics should run through the model and at what level (action, input, information).
4. Clearer guidelines for determining when to submit a proposal and on what topic, input, information, a action.
5. Depending on the complexity and degree of an issue, I feel that there needs to be a structure in place that will help us determine when it is appropriate to have joint meetings between the councils to discuss the issue in greater depth, with representatives (not just the liaisons) from all councils present.
6. Drop liaisons. No ex officio attendance.
7. Go back to strong, organized, effective standing committees. A little re-organization of the committee structure might have been in-order...not throwing out the entire structure.
8. Perhaps Chairs can work on nixing lengthy discussion on rather unimportant topics and steer conversations back on track when side issues get mentioned that convolute the primary discussion.

No Classification

Not all matters relating to administration or instruction needs to be brought to the councils. Not sure how all councils can provide input to all matters regardless of their scope and responsibilities. How does maintain talk about a health program viability? Conversely how does instruction comment on the viability of a large scale maintenance project. The action of small committees need to be revisited. Faculty, administration and staff need to be valued for what they do in their respective areas.

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

Adjunct

1. I can't make any suggestions on a structure that I have not been familiarized with its procedures.
2. I do not have enough knowledge base to even approach this.

3. Not sure.
4. see above
5. Think its fine the way it is..

Faculty

1. Abolish it.
2. Fewer administrators. Open and honest budget and expenditure discussions. Administrators that were tenured faculty at some point in their careers.
3. Give decisions to those who are qualified and accountable. Follow the handbook.
4. Go back to the old committee structure where individuals had a vested interest in the topics. Then have a meeting of the chairs of each committee to share concerns and information.
5. Go back to the old method. We need effective administrators skilled in communication to improve communication not this new model.
6. I am more pleased with this new structure than the previous standing committee structure as far as idea generation and follow through. I don't think this encourages interaction among employee groups, it actually isolates us from each other. More meetings for the entire campus. I don't recall the last time I saw the President or Vice-Presidents outside of my area.
7. i don't think we have given it ample opportunity to see if it is effective.
8. I personally preferred the standing governance model that worked for several years. I think the that model could have been improved by using Blackboard to communicate between standing committees.
9. I would follow a similar path used to design the council model
10. I would like to see the council model evolve to increase communication of the various groups that comprise the council model with the Board of Trustees of the college, perhaps by including a presentation from each of the councils at each of the Board's meetings.
11. In an ideal world, when administration truly values and wants input from all members and actively seeks those out and demonstrates a servant leadership style, councils such as this are not needed. Trust is won, not automatically given. I know this type of environment does work, but sadly, they are rare. If leadership sees themselves as autonomous, a gulf develops, and if trust and integrity are broken, then these type of councils are necessary. In the end, it comes down to leadership style.
12. It's going to take a little more time to come up with a plan.
13. Keep the standing model.
14. Possible combine elements of both systems: Standing committees to address specialty concerns and councils to vote democratically on issues that affect the entire campus.

15. Reduce the number of standing committees in the old governance system. Give some authority to the committee, so recommendations made are influential in final decision making. Membership on committees should not be mandatory and those who choose to serve should be compensated. Committees would then consist of individuals who are interested and willing to put forth the energy and time to improve policies.

16. Return to a Standing Committee structure. During the work days have various groups come up with standing committees that are appropriate to OUR current needs.--Technology, Health/safety, Curriculum, etc. All groups will be members of the committees. The best thing coming from this new system is the creation of 2 councils. We need to have a (smaller) faculty and support staff council that can present issues appropriate to their specific groups. In addition, there must be a paper trail of decisions--those made by the committees (and approved by the admin) AND those that are rejected. A time line needs to be established so that "can kicking" cannot be done. Also, I am tired of committees who want to exclude voices--I am in favor of inclusion. Let all voices be heard--and then let the vote speak!

17. Return to smaller, more focused committees, but find a College President who will understand and nurture a collaborative working environment, instead of the hostile and threatening working environment this administration has fashioned. A competent administration that respects employees and engages in a process to engender authentic improvements would be a welcome breath of fresh air after years of chaos, incompetence, and dysfunction.

18. The administration can call a meeting of the campus employee groups anytime they want. They could do this to communicate with any or all of the employee groups--they elect not to. The current president has been here for 9 and a half years and has only met with the faculty once, and that meeting was at the faculty's request. The preferred communication method and style among senior administrators is still one-way. None of the cabinet members has demonstrated the capacity or willingness to change their approach. They talk and we listen. The Board of Trustees did nothing with the CLARUS Report and neither did the senior administrators. They keep hoping that a new governance structure will replace the essential but nonexistent trust and respect on campus. While the effort has been sincere by some, particularly the Vice President of Instruction, it has not worked. All of the employee groups are viewed by the Board of Trustees as a huge expense. They frequently complain that some 85% of the budget is for the people who make this thing called a college work. The Board of Trustees will not be happy until 85% of the budget is spend on buildings and only 15% spent on employees. The employees are never seen as an asset. The only real human asset they see is the President. They refuse to acknowledge for almost a decade the damage that has been done and that will be left behind when he heads back to Iowa. There should be a return to the old model, with a revised council structure where the councils would meet twice a semester. The administrative procedures and reporting should be made less cumbersome and the chairs and secretaries be given some kind of stipend for their willingness to take on those responsibilities.

19. The CMSG is a viable option with modifications.

20. The problems on campus have nothing to do with a governance structure. Here's the problems as I see it... 1. The problem is the college has a group of former Dean's who have an agenda to see the current administration fail. 2. The current administration cannot make a decision if their life depended on it. 3. The current Dean's despise each other and do everything in their power to see the other Dean's fail. 4. The

President and the VP's have created an environment of distrust, hatred, and animosity between employee groups and within employee groups. RESULT: TERRIBLE WORK ENVIRONMENT

21. The strongest thing about the CMSG is the inclusion of the support staff. Consider a return to the standing committee model with wider inclusion to take the support staff into account. More task- and project-oriented rather than the big meetings of everyone. Maybe only one or two council meetings a semester, with smaller standing committees to tackle the work. Consider our next president--one who will lead by example, not bury his face in his Blackberry at all turns. One who will strong enough to have the confidence of the board while not bowing to the self-interest of a couple board members.

22. This is too big of a question for a survey. It would take me weeks of research to come up with an appropriate alternative. That's what members of the Governance Committee did, and I'm okay with the alternative they proposed.

FT SS/Main

1. I feel there was nothing wrong with the old committee structure. I would keep the current council model in place until the President retires and re-evaluate after that. Shared Governance is great, but some decisions can just be made by the appropriate Dean or VP - such as name badges.

2. At this point, I don't think we've had enough time with the current process to see if it truly works. Or we haven't had an important enough issue on campus to rally lots of comment.

3. Go back to the old system.

4. I like the council model. I think as time goes on, the campus community will understand the model better, and it will allow for input from the entire campus community.

5. I think the Council Model is moving in the right direction. It has reduced the silos that have been in place for a long time, but I think the Council Model needs to incorporate certain committees, ie: where does Strategic Planning fit into this? Those committees then need to report back to the Councils as they meet and continue to work.

6. I would continue to build and modify the Council Model. The standing committee model is no longer an option for MCCC as it is not inclusive.

7. Maybe not have liaisons actively at the meetings. It seems people could read the minutes to know what happened at the meetings.

8. No suggestions.

9. Nothing at this time.

Admin/Professional

1. Require that standing committees that have a named seat on them be filled irregardless of willingness of faculty to serve.

2. Adopt the CMSG.

3. Build on what has been started. Have an open forum with each group by year's end to be sure that all concerns and roadblocks to full and productive participation are addressed. This activity would be done with a view toward even greater communication, increased collaboration and improving the quality of institutional decisions.
4. I think the model is extremely well designed and the handbook is a very helpful tool.
5. Keep this new model!!!!
6. Love the Council Model, make adjustments all agree upon and adopt it. Keep three standing committees in place, CC, AR, LAC
7. My only recommendation is what I suggested in my previous response - that there are times when I think it would be beneficial to schedule joint meetings between the councils.
8. Refine this one so that counsels operated more or less independently.

No Classification

Councils should make broad decisions that affect the entire college. Multiple councils are not useful. It is unclear the role of management, faculty and support staff in this model. Judgements and pronouncements can be made but it is left to individual areas to implement, which can be a problem.

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

Adjunct

1. Because I was not involved with the previous structure.. this survey seems a bit skewed.
2. I am embarrassed to say that I have not been paying attention to the CMSG. I am not able to answer these questions at this time.
3. I like the sharing of information between divisions/faculty.
4. I'm not familiar with CMSG: the piloted Council Model of Shared Governance and “standing” refers to MCCC’ s long-standing governance structure.
5. My communication with MCCC is depending on emails I receive because I work full-time outside MCCC during the week. My status with MCCC is an adjunct who works evenings.
6. My only comment is that the handbook is not available online. So I have yet to review it. A PDF should be added like all other content under 'Shared Governance.'
<http://www.monroeccc.edu/governance/index.htm>
7. None right now.
8. see above

Faculty

1. 1. At a meeting recently, individuals were still expressing after a year that they did not understand how the CMSG works. They were unclear as to the criteria used to determine if something is an informational, input or action item. If an item goes as input, for example, does it then have to go back to the Councils as an action item. 2. Two semesters is not enough time to evaluate the CMSG. In terms of data collection, we should run this model for several years, modifying as needed. MCCC has spent alot of time and money on this model to abandon at the end of this semester with very little data. 3. Abandoning this model right after HLC visit will give the appearance that the CMSG was only developed and implemented to look favorable in the eyes of the HLC focus visit and no real committment by the administration for change on campus. 4. The new CMSG does not fix the trust and respect issues on campus. 5. If the administration is serious about improving shared governance and communication on campus they will make sure that all MCCC constituent groups are part of the upcoming Presidential search. There is more to shared governance than three circles.
2. Communication has improved over where it was but the level of mistrust is still significant. It will take time to build trust up. I think the CMSG can assist if it is maintained.
3. Communication is poor at best.

4. I also wonder if it is the best approach to make the council meetings mandatory? Practically, I understand why this is done; however, I wonder if the effectiveness/synergy of the council group is harmed by making folks attend that really don't want to be there?
5. I hope we move forward with the Council model, continuing to tweak it until we have an effective process. The former system was broken, and I'd hate to go back to it.
6. I think I have said enough.
7. I think the council model can work. I do not think one year is a sufficient length of time to determine if we should stay with the council model or go back to the original committee structure.
8. The Board of Trustees has consciously decided to turn a blind eye and deaf ear to the harm caused by one person on campus. The higher the pile of detritus on campus, the higher the pile of accolades for the president. The bullying that exists on the campus begins with the bullying that occurs on the Board of Trustees. The employees are not the inert ingredients they are perceived to be and neither is the public. The Board of Trustees can continue to ignore the world they have created. They are not royalty appointed for life. The last election demonstrated that the public can be educated about the license taken by the trustees as elected representatives of the community. The public does not see as readily as the campus employee groups the damage and deterioration of the climate on the campus and the way the Trustees have abused their public charge. But that has begun to change. The trustees can continue to do so at their own reelection peril. While employee names should not be used here, it is unavoidable to add that Penny Dorsey Naber has been put upon time and time again in this governance process. She is in a position where she cannot refuse the duties for which she is often 'volunteered,' but none of her workload was ever reduced. She literally ran a division for years while there was only a phantom dean. Shame is not in the senior administrators' repertoire, but the President should be ashamed of what he has done to this employee. She is too proud to complain.
9. The CMSG is a red herring for North Central, a desperate attempt to "fix" campus. We need strong and confident leadership, not an atmosphere of retaliation and fear. So get rid of retaliation and fear, and either CMSG or the standing committee processes would work fine. The governance structure can help us achieve our goals, define our goals to begin with, but no matter what the structure, self-interested leadership in the form of the president and board will bring us to failure-- thus we have diminished trust and suppressed communication on campus.
10. This has served as a faceless means of communication. Though issues are addressed better under the CMSG, personal communication between employees and administration may be even less now.
11. Waste of time and effort.
12. We have had a decade of the worst leadership imaginable at MCCC. My colleagues hold back on initiatives that they would like to pursue because of the poisonous atmosphere; our staff hardly speaks to one another. The vp's are nowhere to be found and the President is so invisible; actually, is he still here?
13. You can rearrange the furniture all you want but the fundamental problem is that there are too many former administrators dedicated to the failure of the current administration.

PT SS/Main

As a part time employee I do not feel as empowered as I would if I were in full time position. In other words I do not feel part of the main work force. I do not have the benefits or sense of belonging that would come with full time employment.

FT SS/Main

1. Communication has gotten worst since this has gone into effect. Minutes from Cabinet meetings come 4 to 6 weeks after the meeting. This has taken each group and split us up. Instead of bringing us together now we don't interact with other groups.
2. I do feel MCCC has made efforts to address communication on campus and is trying to be more transparent. It is difficult to please everyone because there are always naysayers but I have noticed the effort.
3. I feel the communication is much better on campus and if someone doesn't think so then they are not participating in their councils.
4. I will make a better commitment to make council meetings and log into Blackboard.
5. I would like to commend all of the work that Penny Dorcey-Naber has PERSONALLY put into this. She is an hourly employee who has taken on a HUGE role with this program.
6. Instead of a few words in a policy that mandates trust and states that people act in a trusting manner. How about we all just "say what we mean, and mean what we say", trust is not a mandate it is an action, that builds upon action. I think maybe we wait till we get a new leader, (President), and see how that person implements some sort of structure for us to follow. If I had a leader that showed empathy, resolve, direction and strength, I would get behind them with everything I have to give. Having a clear and concise direction to follow would get this college up and sprinting again. This communication thing is more disjointed then ever before, it has become bits and pieces, then you try to cobble them back together. The best thing that has come of this in my opinion is using blackboard as a place to put information that can be accessed from anywhere.
7. Overall step in the right direction - just feel we need to work out a few kinks.
8. The council model seems to have brought out a few more pieces of information, but there still seems to be a lack of communication across campus from administration.

Admin/Professional

1. Staff in my area seem not to have a clear view of the difference between Support Staff Council and Support Staff Association. They seem to give less importance to Support Staff Council...where they have input on decision-making! I'm not clear why Support Staff Association needs to exist now.
2. I believe that communication at the College is greatly improved since the implementation of the Council model. I regularly hear people discussing issues/topics that in the past they would not have known about or been involved in.

3. It is a work in progress. I think there has been positive change and I think there is still room for improvement in our model.
4. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion.
5. the CMSG and it's adoption on campus is transformational
6. This process may be well intentioned, but the reality is there is probably less ""communication"" than before.
7. To early to tell how the new process will work. To date, 1 or 2 items have been through the system completely.
8. Victoria has done a great job organizing council Blackboard documents.