

2019 Evaluation of the Monroe County Community College Shared Governance Model

Summary Report

Table of Contents

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY3

II. INSTRUMENTAION4

 A. Question Description4

III. DATA COLLECTION7

IV. DATA ANALYSIS8

V. RESULTS9

 A. Participant Demographics9

Table 1. Participant Demographics9

Table 2 Participant Demographics; years of employment at MCCC10

 B. Question 3: Level of Agreement with Specific Statements Regarding the Shared Governance Model and Communication at MCCC11

Table 3. Participants’ Level of Agreement with Various Statements Regarding the Process of Information Sharing and Operations within the Shared Governance Model at MCCC11

 C. Question 4: Reasons for Lack of Council Meeting Attendance.....16

Table 4. Respondents’ Self-Reported Reasons for Not Attending their Council Meetings16

 D. Question 5: Reasons for Lack of Sharing Information at Council Meetings.....18

Table 5. Respondents’ Self-Reported Reasons for Not Sharing Information at their Council Meetings18

 E. Qualitative Comments.....20

VI. APPENDIX A: Qualitative Comments 22

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose: The purpose of the 2019 Evaluation of the Monroe County Community College Shared Governance Model is to assess the current perceptions of MCCC employees regarding the college's model of governance and communication. This data collection is led by the Governance Evaluation Committee (GEC), a standing committee in the MCCC Shared Governance Model. In collaboration with the Institutional Research Office, the GEC will use findings from this survey to improve the current model of governance and information sharing.

Instrumentation: The questionnaire was adapted from an existing version that was previously administered to college employees in 2015. The adaptations from the previous instrument were a result of input from the GEC and Coordinator of Institutional Research, Evaluation and Assessment.

In total, the questionnaire includes 8 questions, 5 closed-ended questions with forced response options and 3 open-ended questions that require the respondent to record text. Two of the closed-ended questions ask demographic characteristics such as employee classification and a range of years of employment at MCCC. The primary close-ended question contains several sub-questions measured on a 5-point Likert scale with response options ranging from 1- "strongly disagree" to 5- "strongly agree." Two of the closed-ended questions ask respondents about their council meeting attendance and information sharing/participation behavior. The open-ended questions ask respondents to provide constructive feedback regarding what they like most and least about the current Shared Governance Model as well as suggestions for improving the model.

Data Collection: Data were collected over a 4- week period with several follow-up email invitations sent to all MCCC employees from the Office of Institutional Research. Respondents were sent the invitation to participate in the electronic SurveyMonkey® questionnaire via a link provided to their employee email.

Data Analysis: Data were exported from SurveyMonkey® to and analyzed using SPSS version 25. The exclusive analysis tool used to report frequency data was the descriptive statistics/case summary function. Specific data analysis and reporting techniques are discussed throughout the full summary report.

Results: The response rate for this survey effort was 21.4% (n= 104, N=486). Overall, the majority of respondents feel neutrally or disagree that the current Shared Governance Model at MCCC is an effective method of promoting open communication on campus. The majority of respondents reported knowing how to submit items through the council for discussion and action. Detailed results of employee perspectives on specific issues regarding the Shared Governance Model are described throughout the report.

INSTRUMENTATION

Question Description

The questionnaire contains two closed-ended questions asking respondents employment demographic characteristics. These questions are provided below:

1. Which best characterizes your employment classification at MCCC?

Adjunct Faculty Full-time Faculty Part-time Support Staff/Maintenance
 Full-time Support Staff/Maintenance Administrator/Professional Staff

Other _____

2. How many years have you worked for MCCC?

Under 2 years 2-5 years 6-15 years 16+ years

The primary closed-ended question, containing several sub-questions, ask respondents to record their level of agreement with statements regarding the operations of the current Shared Governance Model at MCCC. This question is provided below:

3. Please indicate to which extent you agree with the following statements related to shared governance at MCCC.

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

- a) Our shared governance model at MCCC allows me to appropriately contribute to shaping the direction of the college.
- b) Within our shared governance model at MCCC, decision-making power is held by a variety of groups and individuals.
- c) Within our shared governance model at MCCC, topics/items are discussed thoroughly before significant decisions are made.
- d) Within our shared governance model at MCCC, many individuals are able to participate in making recommendations on important issues.
- e) Within our shared governance model at MCCC, new/revised policies and procedures are carefully thought through before being implemented.
- f) Our shared governance model at MCCC has influenced employees to work well together within my department/area.
- g) Our shared governance model at MCCC has influenced employees to work well together across departments/areas.
- h) Our shared governance model at MCCC allows reoccurring issues in my department/area to be resolved in a timely manner.

- i) When a new policy is approved that is related to my job function through our shared governance model at MCCC, I have sufficient time to implement it.
- j) Important information is adequately shared through our shared governance model at MCCC.
- k) The shared governance model creates opportunities for employees from all areas and of all classifications to work together.
- l) It is valuable for me to attend my council meetings.
- m) I consider it an expectation for me to attend my council meetings.
- n) Important information should be presented/discussed during my council meetings, even if it does not directly relate to my employee classification.
- o) I am well-informed about campus-wide issues because I attend my council meetings.
- p) I need supervisor approval before submitting an item to go through our shared governance model at MCCC.
- q) I am not able to form a task force or sub-committee through our shared governance model at MCCC to work on an issue specific to my department/area.
- r) I understand the process for submitting an information item through each council in our shared governance model at MCCC.
- s) I understand the process for submitting an input item through each council in our shared governance model at MCCC.
- t) I understand the process for submitting an action item through each council in our shared governance model at MCCC.
- u) I am able to find council items (e.g. proposals, agendas, minutes, responses, etc.) on Brightspace.
- v) Overall, our shared governance model at MCCC is an effective method of promoting open communication on our campus

The remaining closed-ended questions ask respondents why they do not attend council meetings and why they choose not to share information during council meetings. These questions are provided below:

4. Please select all that apply: I do not attend my council meetings because...

- a. I am not interested in our shared governance at MCCC
- b. I don't believe issues are discussed at meetings that matter to me
- c. I don't trust our shared governance model at MCCC to make real change
- d. I don't feel the meetings are a valuable use of my time
- e. I don't feel it is an expectation for me to attend the meetings
- f. I don't feel encouraged to share my thoughts or opinions during the meetings
- g. Other:

5. Please select all that apply: I do not share information at my council meetings because...

- a. I fear retaliation
- b. I feel that my thoughts or opinions do not matter
- c. I do not believe that any change or action will occur as a result of sharing
- d. I do not feel welcome to share information during the meetings
- e. I do not like to speak publically
- f. Other:

The final questions ask respondents to provide open-ended feedback regarding what they like most and least about the current Shared Governance Model at MCCC. Respondents are also asked to provide recommendations for improving the model. These questions are provided below:

6. Please describe what you like most about the shared governance model at MCCC.

7. Please describe what you like least about the shared governance model at MCCC. Please provide constructive feedback only.

8. Please provide constructive feedback regarding how the shared governance model at MCCC could be improved.

DATA COLLECTION

Data were collected over a 4- week period with several follow-up email invitations sent to all MCCC employees from the Office of Institutional Research. Respondents were sent the invitation to participate in the electronic SurveyMonkey® questionnaire via a link provided to their employee email. The email invitation was sent to the following total populations of employees at MCCC:

- 57 full-time faculty
- 293 part-time faculty
- 34 administrators/professional staff
- 50 full-time support staff
- 32 part-time support staff
- 20 maintenance

All potentially identifiable information such as the date and time of completion were removed from the dataset to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of participation. At the end of the collection period, data were exported from the data collection tool to SPSS version 25.

DATA ANALYSIS

Quantitative data (closed-ended questions) were analyzed using SPSS version 25. The descriptive statistics or frequencies and case summary functions were used to calculate percentages for demographic data as well as for mean focus area scores and individual question scores overall and by employee groupings. Methodology for specific calculations are as follows:

- **% response rate**= the percent of respondents out of the total population (all who were sent the invitation to participate via email)

Qualitative data (open-ended questions) were analyzed within the data collection software (SurveyMonkey®) using the common text function that identifies the most common words or phrases recorded in the open-ended items.

RESULTS

Participant Demographics

Employment Status	Faculty	Administrator/ Professional Staff	Support Staff/ Maintenance
All	n=49, *48.0% ** % employee group response rate= 14.0%	n=22, *21.6% ** % employee group response rate= 64.7%	n=31, *30.4% ** % employee group response rate= 50.0%
Full-time	n=35, *34.3% ** % employee group response rate= 61.4%	n=22, *21.6% ** % employee group response rate= 64.7%	n=28, *27.5% ** % employee group response rate= 40.0%
Part-time	n=14, *13.7% ** % response rate= 4.8%	--	n=3, *2.9% ** % employee group response rate= 9.4%

* n=# of respondents, % of total respondents= 102 where 2 did not respond to demographic items

**% employee group response rate= percent of respondents out of the specific employee group population

Table 1. Participant Demographics; n=102, total respondents= 104, total % response rate= 21.4%

Table 1 displays the overall response rate for total participants as 21.4%, which is low compared to other internal all-employee distributed surveys. There are several factors that could have contributed to this including a short data collection period, length of the questionnaire, complexity of the questions asked, hesitation of respondents to comment on sensitive workplace information, and lack of access to an electronic device to complete the questionnaire. Administrators/professional staff represent the greatest employee group response rate, where 64.7% of all that were sent the invitation responded. The most represented employee group among the entire sample was faculty at 48.0%, with full-time employment status being most represented.

Years of Employment at MCCC

Years of Employment at MCCC	*# respondents, % of total
Less than 2 years	n=11, 10.7%
2-5 years	n=12, 11.7%
6-15 years	n=41, 39.8%
More than 16 years	n=39, 37.9%

*n= # of respondents, % of total respondents= 103, where 1 respondent did not provide a response

Table 2. Participant Demographics; years of employment at MCCC

Table 2 displays the % of total respondents that have been employed at MCCC for a range of years. The majority (greater than 70%) of respondents have been employed at MCCC for more than 6 years. Few respondents (less than 30%) have been employed for less than 5 years.

Question 3: Level of Agreement with Specific Statements Regarding the Shared Governance Model and Communication at MCCC

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Our shared governance model at MCCC allows me to appropriately contribute to shaping the direction of the college.	n=17, *16.3%	n=21, *20.2%	n=28, *26.9%	n=32, *30.8%	n= 6, *5.8%
Within our shared governance model at MCCC, decision-making power is held by a variety of groups and individuals.	n=13, *12.5%	n=30, *28.8%	n=20, *19.2%	n=34, *32.7%	n=7, *6.7%
Within our shared governance model at MCCC, topics/items are discussed thoroughly before significant decision are made.	n=14, *13.5%	n=25, *24.0%	n=29, *27.9%	n=29, *27.9%	n=7, *6.7%
Within our shared governance model at MCCC, individuals are able to participate in making recommendations on important issues.	n=13, *12.6%	n=25, *24.3%	n=22, *21.4%	n=38, *36.9%	n=5, *4.9%
Within our shared governance model at MCCC, new/revised policies and procedures are carefully thought through before being implemented.	n=17, *16.3%	n=18, *17.3%	n=36, *34.6%	n=29, *27.9%	n=4, *3.8%

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Our shared governance model at MCCC has influenced employees to work well together across departments/areas.	n=29, *28.2%	n=28, *27.2%	n=24, *23.3%	n=20, *19.4%	n=2, *1.9%
Our shared governance model at MCCC allows recurring issues in my department/area to be resolved in a timely manner.	n=28, *26.9%	n=25, *24.0%	n=36, *34.6%	n=13, *12.5%	n=2, *1.9%
When a new policy is approved that is related to my job function through our shared governance model at MCCC, I have sufficient time to implement it.	n=10, *9.6%	n=11, *10.6%	n=52, *50.0%	n=27, *26.0%	n=4, *3.8%
Important information is adequately shared through our shared governance model at MCCC.	n=19, *18.3%	n=23, *22.1%	n=30, *28.8%	n=29, *27.9%	n=3, *2.9%
The shared governance model creates opportunities for employees from all areas and of all classifications to work together.	n=17, *16.3%	n=23, *22.1%	n=30, *28.8%	n=31, *29.8%	n=3, *2.9%
It is valuable for me to attend my council meetings.	n=16, *15.4%	n=19, *18.3%	n=23, *22.1%	n=38, *36.5%	n=8, *7.7%

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I consider it an expectation for me to attend my council meetings.	n=13, *12.5%	n=22, *21.2%	n=20, *19.2%	n=31, *29.8%	n=18, *17.3%
Important information should be presented/discussed during my council meetings, even if it does not directly relate to my employee classification.	n=5, *4.8%	n=3, *2.9%	n=17, 16.3%	n=58, *55.8%	n=21, *20.2%
I am well-informed about campus-wide issues because I attend my council meetings.	n=19, *15.4%	n=23, *22.1%	n=33, *31.7%	n=27, *26.0%	n=5, 4.8%
**I need supervisor approval before submitting an item to go through our shared governance model at MCCC.	n=20, *19.4%	n=37, *35.9%	n=34, *33.0%	n=10, *9.7%	n=2, *1.9%
I am able to form a task force or sub-committee through our shared governance model at MCCC to work on an issue specific to my department/area.	n=7, *6.8%	n=13, *12.6%	n=48, *46.6%	n=28, *27.2%	n=7, *6.8%
I understand the process for submitting an information item through each council in our shared governance model at MCCC.	n=5, *4.8%	n=19, *18.3%	n=31, *29.8%	n=40, *38.5%	n=9, *8.7%

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I understand the process for submitting an input item through each council in our shared governance model at MCCC.	n=6, *5.8%	n=21, *20.2%	n=28, *26.9%	n=40, *38.5%	n=9, *8.7%
I understand the process for submitting an action item through our shared governance model at MCCC.	n=6, *5.8%	n=22, *21.2%	n=27, *26.0%	n=40, *38.5*	n=9, 8.7%
I am able to find council items (e.g. proposals, agendas, minutes, responses, etc.) on Brightspace.	n=4, *3.8%	n=22, *21.2%	n=24, *23.1%	n=42, *40.4%	n=12, *11.5%
Overall, our shared governance model at MCCC is an effective method of promoting open communication on our campus.	n=28, *26.9%	n=23, *22.1%	n=25, *24.0%	n=24, *23.1%	n=4, *3.8%

n= number of respondents

*percent of the total respondents that recorded each response. **Bolded** values represent the greatest percent recorded combined disagreement or agreement for each statement, where “strongly disagree” and “disagree” are combined as disagreement and “strongly agree” and “agree” are combined as agreement. For statements with more than two bolded response values, this indicates that respondents equally agreed and disagreed with the statement.

**indicates a negatively worded statement where disagreement is favorable.

Table 3. Respondents’ level of agreement with various statements regarding the process of information sharing and operations within the shared governance model at MCCC.

Table 3 depicts the self-reported level of agreement of total respondents with various statements regarding the process of information sharing and operations within the shared governance model at MCCC. The following summarizes the statements that were reported with **least combined percent agreement** (disagreement) among respondents. Disagreement is a

combination of response options “strongly disagree” and “disagree:” *The italicized statement below is a negatively worded item where disagreement is a favorable response.*

Least Combined Percent Agreement (Disagreement):

- Decision-making power is held by a variety of groups/individuals
- Topics/items are discussed thoroughly before significant decisions are made
- New/revised policies and procedures are carefully thought through before being implemented
- SGM has influenced employees to work well together across departments/areas.
- SGM allows reoccurring issues in my department/area to be resolved in a timely manner.
- Important information is adequately shared through SGM
- SGM creates opportunities for employees from all areas and of all classifications to work together
- I am well-informed about campus-wide issues because I attend my council meetings
- *I need supervisor approval before submitting an item to go through our SGM*
- Overall, the SGM is an effective method of promoting open communication on our campus

The following summarizes the statements that were reported with **greatest combined percent agreement** among respondents. Agreement is a combination of response options “strongly agree” and “agree:”

Greatest Combined Percent Agreement:

- Many individuals are able to participate in making recommendations on important issues
- SGM has influenced employees to work well together within my department/area
- When a new policy is approved that is related to my job function, I have sufficient time to implement it
- It is valuable for me to attend my council meetings
- I consider it an expectation to attend my council meetings
- Important information should be presented/discussed during my council meetings, even if it does not directly relate to my employee classification
- I am able to form a task force or sub-committee through the SGM to work on an issue specific to my department/area
- I understand the process for submitting an information item through each council
- I understand the process for submitting an input item through each council

- I understand the process for submitting an action item through each council
- I am able to find council items on Brightspace

Question 4: Reasons for Lack of Council Meeting Attendance

Response Option <i>“I do not attend my council meetings because...”</i>	n=number of respondents	% response of total respondents
I am not interested in our shared governance at MCCC	11	10.6%
I don’t believe issue are discussed at meetings that matter to me	9	8.7%
I don’t trust our shared governance model at MCCC to make real change	27	26.0%
I don’t feel the meetings are a valuable use of my time	26	25.0%
I don’t feel it is an expectation for me to attend the meetings	12	11.5%
I don’t feel encouraged to share my thoughts or opinions during the meetings	13	12.5%
*Other (most common open-ended response: “I do attend my council meetings”)	18	17.3%

*indicates reporting of an open-ended response due to error in question construction. There is no option for respondents to indicate that they do attend their council meetings. Due to this error, the data yielded from the “other: I do attend my council meetings” response are not a reliable indicator of council meeting attendance and should not be used to extrapolate the percent of employees that attend their council meetings.

Table 4. Respondents’ self-reported reasons for not attending their council meetings.

Table 4 depicts the self-reported reasons that respondents do not attend their council meetings. The question does not ask about specific frequency of attendance. Therefore, these results do not indicate reasons that respondents never attend their council meetings, only in general. Also, as described in the asterisk note below **Table 4**, this question is incorrectly constructed which impacts the reliability of any response option. This question also does not accurately measure self-reported attendance and results in the **Other (most common open-ended response: "I do attend my council meetings")* response row are not a reliable source to extrapolate overall employee council meeting attendance (**Table 4**). Of the options provided in question 4 (**Table 4**), the most common reason respondents self-report not attending their council meetings are almost equally that they do not trust the shared governance model at MCCC to make real change (26.0% of all respondents) and they do not believe attending their council meetings is a valuable use of their time (25.0% of all respondents).

Below are prominent qualitative themes that emerged from the open-ended "other" response option for reasons for lack of council attendance (in addition to self-reported attendance). The raw qualitative comments are provided in **Appendix A**:

- Lack of time because of workload and other obligations
- Lack of attendance at council meetings where quorum is not needed for action item voting or where input is not being elicited
- Self-reported discouragement from former supervisors and lack of expectation to attend council meetings
- The shared governance model is ineffective regarding decision-making and timelines of accomplishments (or lack of accomplishments)

Question 5: Reasons for Lack of Sharing Information at Council Meetings

Response Option <i>“I do not share information at my council meetings because...”</i>	n=number of respondents	% response of total respondents
I fear retaliation	23	22.1%
I feel that my thoughts or opinions do not matter	21	20.2%
I do not believe that any change or action will occur as a result of sharing	38	36.5%
I do not feel welcome to share information during the meetings	10	9.6%
I do not like to speak publically	3	2.9%
*Other (most common open-ended response: “I do share information at my council meetings”)	12	11.5%

*indicates reporting of an open-ended response due to error in question construction. There is no option for respondents to indicate that they do share information at their council meetings. Due to this error, the data yielded from the “other: I do share information at my council meetings” response are not a reliable indicator of information sharing behavior at council meetings and should not be used to extrapolate the percent of employees that share information at their council meetings.

Table 5. Respondents’ self-reported reasons for not sharing information at their council meetings.

Table 5 depicts the self-reported reasons that respondents do not share information at their council meetings. The question does not ask about specific frequency of information sharing at council meetings. Therefore, these results do not indicate reasons that respondents never share information at their council meetings, only in general. Also, as described in the asterisk note below **Table 5**, this questions is incorrectly constructed which impacts the reliability of any response option. This question also does not accurately measure self-reported

information sharing behavior and results in the **Other (most common open-ended response: “I do share information at my council meetings”)* response row are not a reliable source to extrapolate overall employee information sharing behavior (**Table 5**). Of the options provided in question 5 (**Table 5**), the most common reason respondents self-report not sharing information at their council meetings is they do not believe that any change or action will occur as a result of sharing (36.5% of all respondents). The next most common reasons respondents self-reported lack of information sharing are their fear of retaliation (22.1% of all respondents) and they feel that their thoughts or opinions do not matter (20.2% of all respondents).

Below are prominent qualitative themes that emerged from the open-ended “other” response option for reasons for lack of sharing information at council meetings (in addition to self-reported information sharing). The raw qualitative comments are provided in **Appendix A**:

- Lack of information sharing because of lack of attendance
- The opinion that decision are made by administration and anything discussed through the councils is a “charade” or a formality and does not impact the outcome
- Inappropriate behavior occurring during council meetings (verbal attack even from those that know little about the topic)- administration needs to deal with this to promote open information sharing/communication

Qualitative Comments

Participants were asked in an open-ended question to describe what they like most about the Shared Governance Model at MCCC. Below is a summary of the prominent or recurring themes that emerged from the data. The raw qualitative comments are provided in **Appendix A**:

Prominent (Recurring) Themes:

- The model allows employees to be heard
- Sharing of information across multiple areas, keeps employees informed
- All members of an employee group can come together to discuss ideas/issues
- Information/input can be gathered from all employee groups

Participants were asked in an open-ended question to describe what they like least about the Shared Governance Model at MCCC. Below is a summary of the prominent or recurring themes that emerged from the data. The raw qualitative comments are provided in **Appendix A**:

Prominent (Recurring) Themes:

- Administration makes decisions outside of the model or presents information after a decision has been made (input is not considered from councils)
- Administration allows faculty to dominate the shared governance process
- The model may be used as a tactic to stall decision-making (extensive discussion on issues delays decision-making)
- The current model encourages working in silos
- Meetings are time consuming and not productive
- Lack of agenda items is troubling, items listed do not cover all issues that need resolution
- Lack of participation, people are not attending meetings nor sharing during meetings

Lastly, participants were asked in an open-ended question to provide constructive feedback regarding how the Shared Governance Model at MCCC could be improved. Below is a summary of the prominent or recurring themes that emerged from the data. The raw qualitative comments are provided in **Appendix A**:

Prominent (Recurring) Themes:

- Eliminate standing committees and move to forming task forces through the councils to handle specific issues
- More investment from Administrators in using the model appropriately (bringing all decision-making through the councils and considering input)
- Better enforcement of the model processes, accountability to use the model appropriately

- Mandatory participation
- Better processes for reporting discussion and information between the councils and standing committees

APPENDIX A

Qualitative Comments

“Other” Option for Question 4: I do not attend my council meetings because... (n=46)

- Adjunct Faculty are part-time and must work other jobs to make ends meet; This leaves little time to do more at MCCC than teaching
- ADMINISTRATION IS NOT DOING THEIR JOB.
- As an adjunct, since I am forced to find secondary employment, I do not have time to go to meetings.
- I always attend
- I always attend meetings unless there is an unavoidable conflict
- I always attend unless I have a conflict
- I am not on campus at some of the times of the meetings.
- I attend
- I attend all faculty council meetings.
- I attend Council meetings when my schedule permits.
- I attend every council meeting I can.
- I attend every meeting
- I attend my council meetings
- I attend regularly
- I attend the meetings, even though I think the shared governance model is a failure. The model is a canard for inclusion and exploration of new ideas and approaches.
- I attend the meetings.
- I attend these meetings when there is an action item that requires a quorum or request for input ,but I don't always attend when there are no action items since the information items are posted.
- I do attend my council meetings
- I do attend.
- I have never been told that I should go to the meetings. I have been discouraged from going by 2 former supervisors. When I did go, myself and others felt that Part-time people don't matter.
- I really do not believe that my opinion matters to those who are asking for it. Leadership or lack of will keep doing as they wish.
- I usually attend meetings unless student issues come up.
- I usually attend unless a work deadline creates a conflict.
- i work at the Whitman Center

- It takes forever to use this model. It reminds me of the uselessness of the federal govt. to decide anything in a timely manner.
- Lack of staffing in our area
- Limited time
- Meetings are dominated by the same set of loud-mouthed hooligans.
- meetings not close to my scheduled adjunct hours and it is a long drive
- my work load dont have time
- n/a
- N/A
- NA
- Not Applicable
- scheduling issues
- Sometimes I am too busy
- The only time I do not attend council meetings is if I am excused by my supervisor.
- These meeting are a waste of time because NOTHING gets accomplished in ANY timely matter. It is very discouraging to me that MCCC uses this Governance model. We need to go back to having commitees that meet regularly , then share information to the rest of tyhe college.
- This structure is used to imply faux participation
- This system is just window dressing to satisfy the HLC.
- Too many people on the committee, with certain lod-mouthed faculty who dominate with their own agenda.
- We never have enough time to meet. Faculty Council meets once a month for one hour, which is wholly inadequate. The college needs to develop a master calendar with a 2-3 hour dedicated time slot with no classes. Then faculty could meet, get through an agenda and possibly get something done.
- When I don't attend meetings, it is because I am working on something and forget, or have a time sensitive project to complete.

“Other” Option for Question 5: I do not share information at my council meetings because... (n=33)

- As an adjunct, since I am forced to find secondary employment, I do not have time to go to meetings.
- At this current time, I simply do not have the time to be involved even though I may be in the future.
- Cliques and back-room dealings are encouraged by the administration. Decisions have already been made and the councils are a charade.
- Council meetings tend to be for show, like PAG.
- Don't care
- Fear of being verbally attacked
- I am comfortable to share information at council meetings
- I am unable to attend
- i attend
- I do not attend council meetings
- I do share
- I do share if I have something to add to the discussion
- I do share information when I feel it is important and do not fear retaliation.
- I don't feel welcome to attend
- I feel comfortable sharing my comments with any of the Council meetings.
- I have no issues sharing info at council meetings.
- I share at every meeting
- I share information
- I share information and ideas, but rarely feel "welcome."
- I would share info when topic is relevant to my department.
- I would share information I felt was pertinent to the topic
- no reason not too, other than if my point has already been ade
- Not Applicable to me
- Some faculty seem to bully other speakers with opposing opinions.
- The Administration overrules anything they disagree with.
- The entire process is confusing, with a few faculty dominating discussion.
- The process is cumbersome. If the topic is not 'popular' you will be attacked. Folks with no knowledge of topic will belittle you. There is a general lack of respect for peers.
- There are certain individuals who will attack you whatever you say whether or not it is applies to them personally or their area. This behavior should be handled appropriately and promptly in order to really make this governance process to work!

- There is little time to be involved because adjunct faculty need to spend time teaching at MCCC and at working other jobs.
- This is a bad question. Don't assume I don't share.
- Too early to tell
- Typically do not attend council meetings
- Why will anything change at this point. We need leadership to take charge and lead this college.

Please describe what you like most about the shared governance model at MCCC. Please be specific (n=69).

- Allows employees to be heard.
- Chance to see some colleagues from other divisions.
- Currently, for me, nothing. I think many like it because it is one meeting that is not required.
- don't have time to attend due to my work load
- Faculty listen and hear one another.
- Getting to know other employees in different departments and hearing their comments and concerns.
- Hearing about other things going on around campus, even if they do not affect me. Keeps me informed.
- I am not involved enough in shared governance to answer
- I am only somewhat familiar with the shared governance model so I do not have strong feelings either way.
- I and other faculty like this system because we do not have to do anything. I can stay in my office and nobody cares. I can show up for a faculty council meeting and nobody cares. What a perfect system.
- I appreciate the exchange of information at the Administrator Council meetings.
- I appreciate the feedback mechanism once a final decision has been made by the president.
- I feel like concerns are ignored and decisions are not based on factual data.
- I helps me understand what decision makers from all areas are thinking. I don't feel like everything is happening to me.
- I like that discussions are had regarding potential changes at the college.
- I like that every employee group is given the same information so that everyone is aware of what is being discussed.
- I like that the faculty are not required to attend meetings, because overall I believe the shared governance process is a waste of time. See below.
- I like that the individual units can meet with their peers to discuss issues related to their particular unit. Some of these issues are not of interest to others.
- I like that there is a opportunity for all members of a group to get together to talk about issues
- I like the idea of having a vehicle for sharing ideas/changes with all employee groups but it does not work with meetings not being mandatory and if the council model is not utilized.
- I like the theoretical possibility of having an action item and forcing the powers that be to recognize the issue.

- I like this model because it provides an avenue for information and policy changes to be shared with all campus groups.
- I think it is more streamlined and not as 'clunky' as the committee model. I think it allows for more equal representation as well.
- If I want to look up information, for example policies and procedures it's at your fingertips
- If used effectively can be a form of cross-campus communication.
- In theory, it is inclusive.
- Information is shared across campus
- information sharing, input
- It allows for open communication.
- it allows much more information sharing, input opportunities, and communication than under previous models/regimes
- It did away with all the committees.
- It gives us an opportunity to implement a process that would not otherwise be considered.
- It is a good idea in theory.
- it is a process that has specific guidelines to follow on policy and procedure.
- It is a vehicle for someone to check a box and say that they are trying to make a difference.
- It is more inclusive than the previous "standing committee model, and has the ability to promote better communication among employee groups if we use it correctly. I feel better informed about the effects various decisions have on the different areas of the college. This is important because a positive effect for one area does not guarantee a positive effect for all areas. We need to work toward decisions that work best for the whole entity.
- It provides a forum to discuss issues/items and gather information from all employee groups.
- Monthly meetings to share information
- Much more information is available to all employees through presentations at the council meetings.
- n/a
- NA
- Neutral
- Nothing
- NOTHING!!
- Openness.
- Opportunity for discussions
- Opportunity is there. But everyone knows decisions are made in cabinet or President's office.
- Opportunity to discuss issues facing the college

- Really there is nothing that I find outstanding.
- seems information does get to all groups equally
- That I am not required to attend
- That I do not have to participate in it.
- That it is in place and exists.
- That it would work if used correctly
- The ability to discuss topics that are of importance to the entire campus.
- The ability to personally present info relevant to all councils and answer questions.
- The concept of sharing and problem solving.
- The fact that encourages people to be involved. I have been involved in far too many organizations, that simply say this is the way it is without any discussion.
- The important subjects/items shared at the meetings
- The meetings are organized. The agendas and minutes are readily available through Brightspace.
- The opportunity to exchange information with colleagues.
- The opportunity to know what's happening around campus even if it doesn't effect me directly.
- The shared governance model as implemented by the administration makes it easy for faculty to ignore this important responsibility.
- unsure
- You are able to have your voice heard and have input in the form of voting on key issues.
- You can become very involved in the process if a person decides to do so.

Please describe what you like least about the shared governance model at MCCC. Please be specific and provide constructive feedback only (n=76).

- 1. Don't have a chance to interact and work with colleagues from other divisions in a small-group, helpful, productive environment. 2. documentation conventions are awkward and not intuitive. Blackboard/Brightspace is supposed to be helpful, but it's confusing and difficult to figure out. When I get update emails from Brightspace I know that it will be a struggle to find what I'm looking for. Often fail. 3. I think of shared governance as the place where good ideas go to die. And the messengers of good ideas get beat up for trying. 4. Atmosphere is hostile among faculty. Territory has been staked out, the math/sci faculty is opening dismissive of colleagues across campus. Listen to the tone of questions from certain math/sci staff and it's nothing short of badgering. What should be open and challenging discussion often deteriorates into efforts to shut down the "opposition." 5. The diagram of the model is informative. It's actually an overhead picture of "silos", something that most smart organizations move away from. 6. There is no where to bring an issue that doesn't get mired in endless "examination" and talking, but not resolved. Or refused/overturned by administration. 7. Issues come to us as information items that should have been vetted through the council model or through cross-division committees of knowledgeable and interested people. So decisions continue to get made without the real input of the people who are expected to live with the consequences, for example, the financial aid/scholarship matrix for high school students, the decisions about HLC reporting and self-study. 8. Sadly, the fight has become to preserve the model rather than a fight to provide excellent instruction, services, and support for our students and community. No wonder enrollment has fallen.
- Administration continues to sabotage the model by not using the governance structure appropriately. For example, recent decisions by LAC on assessment and decisions regarding changes to summer classes were only presented after the fact after being reminded of the process.
- Administration does not do their job. Faculty seems to think they should have a say in all operations of the college. Best example was the recent directive to have all syllabi in a standard format. Faculty whined about academic freedom, but this is an administrative issue. There is not administrative freedom.
- Administration lets faculty run the college. That's not academic freedom, that's anarchy.
- Administrators do not follow the model. They still make decisions in a vacuum, implement their solution, and inform us when they see fit.
- As an adjunct, since I am forced to find secondary employment, I do not have time to go to meetings.

- As that I am not that involved the only thing that could be an issue (but I have not directly witnessed) is extended time for items to be resolved due to extensive discussion.
- Decisions are being made elsewhere
- Dominating faculty. Confusing process.
- Employees are now isolated to their respective group...basically we are working in silos
- Finding time to get more involved.
- I am not involved enough in shared governance to answer
- I am only somewhat familiar with the shared governance model so I do not have strong feelings either way.
- I believe the meetings are pointless, and most issues are really non issues.
- I believe these meetings become gripe sessions with the same old people talking a lot.
- I don't believe that the Shared Governance Model allows input, but all decisions are still made at administrative level.
- I don't have anything negative to say about it. I think the model is an excellent way to communicate the same information and gain input to all of the employee groups at approximately the same time.
- I feel as if the agendas dont really reflect all of the work that needs done at the college. With all of leadership at the table, it seems we could be more productive in moving items ahead.i.e make better use of that time
- I feel not all important decisions are vetted through the council model.
- I feel segregating staff into groups (by job classification/pay) creates barriers. I understand the Administrators having their own council meeting if they are talking about higher level decisions. I do not feel the Professional Staff and Support Staff should be segregated. I believe the goal is for MCCC staff is to be a team and/or family. When you are on a team, team mates do not have separate practices.
- I feel that one particular group presents their information or policy recommendations and strong arms everyone else to agree with them.
- I think the SGM is a great idea, but it seems to be degrading over the last couple of years. I believe people need to be re-educated (often) about how the model works, and reminded that all information should go to all three councils in some form (e.g. request for action, request for input, or information item), which is what makes the communication piece works for this model.
- Important decisions that directly affect my work and directly impact the students I teach are made by top-level administration, particularly by cabinet and the VP of Instruction without consultation or faculty input. A recent notable example is the change from a 6-week spring/summer term to an 8-week only term. This decision was presented to faculty council as a fait accompli. The decision was made without substantive research and without

the input of faculty or students who will be most impacted. The implementation of this decision, and many similar examples over the past several years, is precisely the reason that a faculty union is needed at MCCC. Such a decision would be subject to bargaining if it involved the fall/winter terms, but the spring term is not subject to bargaining, so the VP of Instruction and cabinet can unilaterally implement this decision without broad and appropriate input. It comes across as "We'll do it because we can and you can't do a thing about it." Why have faculty council, and why pretend that we have a collaborative decision-making process? The committee process in place before we implemented the shared governance system was much more meaningful and valuable to the organization, in my opinion.

- Important items have not been brought to faculty council soon enough, often administration has already made a final decision on the matter, for example, combining spring/ summer semester and important details such as start date and length of courses.
- Individuals are not actively participating in the council meetings.
- Ineffective model
- Information is shared, then decisions are made, it does not matter if the group has concerns, if someone higher up wants something to happen it happens with no input from the lower groups. In my opinion.
- IT does not work and needs to be changed. Our competition education institutes are passing us by. We have no direction and no communication on this campus.
- It feels like it's so time consuming to get anything done anymore because you have to take it to all the councils. Now we just meet in our own groups and do not get to talk as a whole entity.
- It is a vehicle for someone to check a box and say that they are trying to make a difference.
- it is much better than the alternatives
- It is not being used. Administration is the most guilty of NOT utilizing the Council Model.
- It is often not followed by administration. I believe administration thinks that they don't always need to follow the model because it is "their job" to do what they believe needs to be done.
- It seems at times as if top college officials - the president and vice presidents - don't respect the shared governance model. They make decisions, then after the fact remember that they should have taken that issue through the council process.
- It seems like things take a long time. I think Robert's rules are fun, but sometimes the process seems like overkill.
- It usually turns into who is the loudest voice in the room either MCCFA or Administration.
- Items seem to work their way through the councils, but then the final decision is made above and it seems the suggestions are not taken into consideration
- Lack of agenda items

- Low attendance/participation.
- Many are not open-minded and do not accept change
- Many decisions are still being made without use of the council model.
- May get bogged down
- Most decisions are made outside of the councils. While this may be appropriate for some issues the councils should still be informed of the decisions.
- N/A
- Neutral
- no comment
- Not enough time. No one is sure about the power of the council vs. other standing committees.
- Not everything goes through the councils that maybe should to keep the campus well informed.
- Not much other than perhaps once people get used to it more than it will function "better." We need more experience with it.
- Part-time faculty are not represented and nobody is looking out for our interests
- People do not attend the meetings so participation is very low. When issues arise in a division no one seems to know where the issues should be addressed when there are no specific committee to address certain issues like enrollment or safety.
- silos
- Some of the most important decisions in the past couple of years have been made outside the council model. The door barrier devices were installed before there was any discussion in the faculty council. Taking these kinds of things to the council model was certainly not paramount in the minds of administrators.
- Sometimes employees think every decision made should go through the councils, or at least their council. Nothing would get done if we had to consult every council on every decision.
- Sometimes it feels like the council meetings are just a formality, that those in charge have already made their minds up and regardless of any discussions, they are going to go thru with whatever they want input on. (I know it's a moot point, but just ask anyone who has been here a little while about the Math program.) It just seems like sometimes, ONLY SOMETIMES, the council meetings are only for show, that they aren't really collecting feedback or opinions but just going thru the motions. now I only attend one council so who knows maybe my council gets out voted some of the time. but sometimes it doesn't feel that way.
- Speed in which things get done.
- That concerns are ignored and decisions are made by administration with no relevant data to support them.

- The concept of shared governance is absurd. The inmates are running the asylum. The administration is incompetent, and needs to start doing their job.
- The council provides an opportunity for all members to be present and have indepth discussion on important issues, yet meetings are often canceled due to lack of agenda items. How can it be that there isn't anything to discuss when MCCC has so many serious problems? The conversation had about agenda items (when we have them) is superficial. Problems are never solved despite the presence of a room full of campus leaders and the group rarely takes action. The council has potential if it was utilized appropriately, but at this point, it is not very effective.
- The fact that others blow off meetings and do not participate.
- The hypocrisy. The model is fine. Any model would be fine if implemented sincerely. Cabinet runs the college. The President never showed much enthusiasm for shared governance.
- The lack of intergroup communication. The old committees had people from all groups on campus work together. Now we are silos, no real conversation between groups. It is just a report out.
- The lack of participation, preparation for discussion of council members and, particularly related to the faculty council, the hard stop 50 minute session makes it very difficult to present, discuss, and receive thoughtful feedback - especially when it appears very few staff members have come prepared to discuss the issue. There have been times where I have had to come back multiple times to present the same item due to a lack of time on the agenda.
- The meetings are not mandatory, the faculty can be very disrespectful to their peers without consequence, and the process of making change is very tedious.
- The process is long and tedious, and is not useful for issues that need quicker resolutions. Additionally, one council group may be biased toward an item being presented because of the group it comes from. (i.e. - faculty council would be partial to passing an action item that is brought to all the councils, even though it would have negative impacts toward other groups)
- The process. It's too cumbersome and takes more time than needed.
- The transfer faculty flood the zone with adjuncts and defeat many items or pass items with little campus support.
- There isn't anything I dislike, but I think most of the information I am given comes from department meetings
- Time allotted is too short for most issues.
- timing of the day. we cram 4 days out of 5 to meet faculty schedules. it is exhausting. All Division meetings are smack in the middle on Tuesday during the lunch hour to boot!
- Too formal

- Too many know-it-alls sticking their noses in where they don't belong. The administration lets them do it.
- unsure
- We often run out of time for agenda items to be discussed. Presenters are often rescheduled.
- What I like least is Faculty Council decisions being shot down by the administration. It makes me wonder why we bothered. I also dislike having only one hour per month to discuss business.
- With the current council model, employees continue to work in silos based on their classifications. It also takes too long to move items through every council, and as a result it feels like we are very slow to take action on issues that have to be presented at the councils.

Please provide constructive feedback regarding how the shared governance model at MCCC could be improved. Please be specific (n=65).

- A plan to follow, real buy in to the plan, directions for the plan, follow through with a plan and real outcomes that can be measured. It seems we are all over the place without real directions, this needs to come from the top down. Give me a plan I can follow and I will do my best to follow that plan.
- Abolish curriculum committee and move function to the divisions. For example, Humanities knows nothing about requirements of Nursing, they should have no say in their courses and programs. Everything else should be run by the administration. Too much discussion and deliberation. It takes far too long to get things done.
- Abolish Committees. Form task forces with specific goals. Once goal is addressed or accomplished, committee is dissolved. In Acid.
- Add specific task groups to the mix that combine members from all three councils.
- Add two or three more critical committees into the model, such standing committees on retention and program review.
- Administration needs to buy into and follow the process.
- Administrative restructuring to get talent into positions of authority. Improve effectiveness of people and belief in system, governance would be more effective.
- All three councils should report out a brief synopsis of what happened at their meeting to each of the other two councils. Financial Decisions/ Renovation Updates should be frequently presented by Sue Wetzel. She seems to least utilize the council model. Academic/ Schedule/ Instructional decisions need to be communicated by Grace Yackee, again another member of MCCC who is not effectively using the model system. Registrar/ LAL/ Financial Aid should be regularly reporting updates at council meetings, as well as IT. It would be nice to hear from staff/ maintenance / grounds workers to know their concerns and updates. The model system is in place and should provide for communication. I hear that most employees are unwilling to speak at their meetings. Therefore, MCCC is suffering from poor communication, distrust, disrespect, and poor morale.
- Bag it. Or figure out a way to incorporate additional committees that can focus on issues over a longer-term basis. By design, the task-forces or work groups are short-lived, so they throw effort at an issue and then disband. That works for some campus issues, but other issues take shape and shift over time. For example, the instructional technology committee has done a good job of overseeing tech topics related to student learning and services (Brightspace, computer use). That committee makes decisions as part of the bigger picture of cross-campus, long-term instructional tech. There are other things on campus that will never go away, they will just change (campus safety, support services like tutoring, library,

or retention of students), so why take a piece-meal, isolated approach to these critical issues? The current model drives a lot of short-term thinking, but little long-term, big-picture, inclusive planning. That takes leadership and thoughtful reflection, something in short supply. I'd rather work for a college that brought us together to solve real problems rather than to support a failed model.

- Be sure the documents are posted to the SG website in a timely manner. Also, keep the tone respectful when presenting controversial topics.
- Bring all pertinent items to all councils. Seek faculty input through the council process before final decisions are made.
- By dividing the groups into their respective areas(Administrator, Faculty, Staff) I feel limits the cross communication and awareness that might happen if groups were blended to incorporate individuals from each area.
- Eliminate it.
- employees take it seriously and participate
- Ensure that civility is maintained and ensure that the process of changes is streamlined and that feedback on outcomes of decisions are given in a timely fashion.
- Everyone should follow the model for everything that is covered by the model. It is as simple as that.
- Go back to standing committees that we enjoy to be a part of and that have a better impact on the campus. Also, for personal enrichment when an employee can speak to their strengths.
- Go back to the old model. Shared governance is known around campus as a "place to take ideas to die a slow death."
- Have relevant factual data to support decisions made by administration.
- I do not claim to have a silver bullet, but under the former committee style of governance you needed to work with others to come up with a solution or plan to submit to the president for consideration. This form of governance does not promote any "cross pollination".
- I don't believe it can be improved. There will always be differing opinions on decisions that need to be made in running an institution. The administrators are paid to make those decisions and the responsibility that follows. It is a good thing for all departments to at least have input and be made aware of changes, but it can never truly be a share governance.
- I don't think it is the structure of the model that is the problem, it is how people use it/value it (or don't). Members need to be engaged and empowered to be part of the problem-solving process on campus and feel comfortable bringing up issues for discussion. Members should feel compelled to share their thoughts and ideas and engage in indepth discussion on important items. However, when key members of the council stroll in late and stroll out early or forget about the meeting altogether, then it is hard to take the council seriously. Maybe the decisions are being made elsewhere and action isn't necessary in this

venue therefore the council is meeting its purpose as an informational tool only. But it seems like this meeting has great potential that is not being utilized.

- I have only been an employee for a short time, however, I am still unclear about what types of items and when it is appropriate to have to gain council support on a proposal.
- I like the model.
- I need to understand shared governance more to give a constructive answer
- I shared my opinion in #7.
- I suggest going back to the committee model with cross representation of employee groups. I feel the old model was more effective and efficient with action items.
- I think it is a work in process that needs a considerable amount of minor tweaking. But none of the minor issues are serious. The more serious problem is the lack of respect for it by top college officials. For example, the president has his own meetings of administrators, where most of the business of the college is done. Separate from that, the administrative council meetings are poorly attended and nearly meaningless. That is not sharing governance - it is paying lip service to shared governance.
- I think we need to be extremely careful and limit the number of committees that are formed (ad hoc or standing) otherwise you will be inadvertently caught in a strange hybrid of the two systems, and then it won't make sense.
- I would use the Faculty Council Meeting time as a place to report what the different committees, groups, etc. are doing. Not a place to debate everything. If folks do not like what the committees are doing, then attend that committee meeting so you can give your input. Go back to the old structure of meetings where people cared about their group's agenda instead of being forced into a group because we have to attend a meeting.
- I'm not sure it can.
- Individuals should keep an open mind regarding new information
- It may be helpful for the Councils to have more standing / Subcommittees to address certain areas that often have issues to address, like enrollment and safety subcommittees
- It needs to be completely "re-vamped" followed by lots of Damage Control to try to bring back some form of teamwork and comradery that this college DESPERATLY needs!
- It seems as if the SG model has further isolated campus into 3 distinct groups. Also, I believe the SG model eliminated some important committee work devoted to enrollment and retention issues.
- It would be nice if items could be presented to all the councils at once for questions and answers followed by a meeting in the individual councils for voting. This way everyone is voting based on the same information.
- Make administrators follow the model. Administrators have either never been in a classroom teaching or have been out of the classroom too long to make informed thoughtful decisions about policy here at the college.

- Make attendance at the council meetings mandatory for all employee groups.
- Mandatory participation. I'm also not convinced that breaking the councils down by employee groups is contributing to the deliberative process. Possibly balancing employee groups would provide a greater diversity of thought and engender a more constructive discussion. I do think under the current system that faculty council needs to possibly have a mandatory meeting on Friday every month, and meet as long as they need to complete the business before them, with understanding that the chair manages the flow and content on the agenda. Finally, staff must come prepared for discussion.
- Maybe ask for a highlight to be presented from every division to make all better aware of the challenges and victories our colleagues are experiencing.
- Maybe have one combined council, or maybe have a representatives from each council give some kind of in brief report letting the other councils know what kind of support a proposal is getting in the other councils?
- Maybe having a better understanding among employee groups of which types of decisions need to go through councils. Otherwise, I feel that the model serves its purpose more than previous methods.
- Meet as a whole and have faculty related issues time, support staff time, administrator's time, etc.(and all groups can add input to the subject matter). Then if it's something that faculty need to spend more time on they could have a separate session called to resolve it and the same for the other groups. I'm not the expert, but I think a different model could be developed so that we could communicate as a whole group and get things done more efficiently.
- Meetings should be at least open to 1.5 hours. More participation is needed to effect real change.
- More open and honest communication. Listen to what people have to say with out them feeling like there could be retaliation for their input if it is not what the higher ups want to hear.
- N/A
- Nametags or meeting in a venue with name tents. Use the announcement function on brightspace to LINK to specific meeting minutes and agendas just before the meeting will occur, etc.
- Neutral
- people can agree to disagree
- prefer former committee structure with defined roles for each committee.
- Roberts' Rules of Order are not always followed. Most of the time there are numerous side conversations and interruptions. I think this is due to a variety of reasons such as a peer will listen more intently, people do not want to speak up, and/or whatever someone wants to say is not always valid or just a complaint.

- Schedule meetings on weekends.
- Scrap the shared governance model and implement something similar to the system in place before it. That was a system that offered a much more collaborative process where committee members from all employee groups worked together on issues of mutual interest. The shared governance process, at best, separates employee groups - faculty, administration, support staff and maintenance into their respective tribes. It does not allow for nor encourage collaboration.
- See number 7. There is a difference between academic freedom and administrative freedom. One is useful, the other is not.
- The college should adopt a hybrid of the council/committee model in my opinion. We need to meet with our peers for many issues. Other issues need to be addressed by everybody in a committee setting. This "all or nothing" approach, being dedicated to either the committee model of the past or the council model we have not is not productive.
- The model itself is not conducive to getting anything done quickly. The people who participate should be commended, but they also should be limited in the amount of floor time they get to talk.
- There need to be more opportunities for employees of every classification to meet together to discuss College business. Even though there is a Town Hall each semester, these meetings are not effective for in-depth discussions and planning.
- There was nothing wrong with the previous governance model. People could serve on committees of interest, rather than 35 people on Academic Review that only meets a couple of times a year. Until the council model is mandatory for faculty, it will be at best a flawed system. At worst, ineffective with its only purpose to produce some ice fog for the HLC team. Town Halls at MCCC are lectures from the President and VP's or hand-offs to other administrators.
- This governance model is not an efficient way to govern because of the length of time it takes to send information and action items through each council.
- This is all a charade. Let's just admit it and do away with all these silly councils.
- unsure
- We now have four standing committees, yet there is still no formal process for feedback to the other councils, with the exception of the Annual Committee Report at the end of each year. I believe the standing committees should be reporting out in some fashion (written summary, in-person report, etc.) to each council at least monthly or bi-monthly.
- When someone is hired, explain the system and how that person is expected to fit into that system.
- While I support the model conceptually, I do not think that the culture at MCCC is one that can operate under this model.

- Written instructions on what the council is for, allowed to do, how to submit action items verses motions etc.