

Governance Forum
January 29, 2019
Governance Task Force
Data Evaluation Subcommittee

31 attendees
(Including presenters)

Presenters were the Governance Task Force Data Evaluation Subcommittee consisting of Claire Dannenbaum, Christina Howard, and Elizabeth Andrade. Also presenting was Adrienne Mitchell, LCCEA President.

The Data Evaluation Subcommittee was tasked with analyzing multiple sources of data from previous forums over the last year as well as the 2014 governance survey. Topics for the presentation include:

- What did we do?
- What did we find?
- Recommendations?

The subcommittee read and evaluated three sets of data from 2018:

- Spring 2018 conference
- Fall 2018 breakout session
- Winter 2018 forum and blog

The subcommittee developed a set of twenty-six recurring themes. The data was scored using the themes and aligning with the board principles on governance from BP325.

The data from the 2014 College Council survey were analyzed and summarized.

Many the comments from the forums were negative with an occasional affirmation.

The data was loosely coded according to board principles:

- Clarity
- Communication
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Participation
- Decision making
- Support

As well as:

- Accountability
- Vision

The lowest scoring principles were support, participation, vision, and efficiency. The subcommittee members noted the challenge of analyzing qualitative data.

The key concerns from the 2018 forums were:

- Clarity
- Effectiveness
- Decision-making
- Accountability
- Communication

The key concerns from the College Council 2014 survey were:

- Decision making
- Effectiveness
- Participation
- Communication
- Clarity

Clarity

Understanding of governance system is low
 Communication between councils and to the college community is uneven or nonexistent
 The mission of councils and scope of work is confusing
 Lack of understanding of processes
 Not clear how the work done contributes to “learning centered” environment

Effectiveness

Accountability is lacking
 Representation is problematic - not “authentic”
 Mission of councils and scope of work is not aligned to the college mission, values, core themes or strategic directions
 Not much work being done, few outcomes (E.g. policies renewed, revised, or created)

Decision Making

Isolationist or cliquish, absentee stakeholders
 Representation is problematic - not “authentic”
 Councils not using formal mechanism for majority and minority reports
 Not intentionally linked to strategic directions, equity lens, or mission

Accountability

Accountability is lacking

Leadership is lacking, abdication of responsibility
Mission of councils and scope of work is not aligned to college mission, value, core themes, or strategic directions
Campus has not incentivized participation so groups are left out of conversations, i.e. Part-time faculty, support staff

Communication

Neither “wide” nor “explicit” as required by BP 325
Communication is siloed by job type
Agenda, minutes, workplans, and outcomes are not widely shared
Many easy fixes but require systematizing channels
Transparency is lacking

Other Findings – about governance generally

Shared governance is highly valued
Staff want to participate but need support to do so
Many fixes are suggested in comments
Problems are more of will and intention to share power and decision making than by design

The system is not designed in a way that supports the board principles.

Recommendations

Apply the equity lens tools of access, equity, and inclusion to the following:

- Use board principles to craft solutions to problems in governance system
- Support engagement at all levels of college community
- Support leadership at all levels of college community
- Align council work to mission, values, core themes, and strategic directions
- Recommit to principles of shared governance

Use this data to shape future work of this task force:

- How can the work of this group benefit from the data
- Data team to pull suggestions from comments about specific issues
- What is the accountability for this work?

Work should be considered visible and used in the process.

CONCLUSION

- Learn from the data!
- Community is eager to find solutions and better governance system
- Apply the tools of the equity lens
- Uphold the values in BP325 through improvement
- It's a human-built system – humans can fix it!
- All councils should use principles to evaluate their effectiveness

Q&A

Q: How many comments have you received?

A: 247 comments from the three forums – comments may have been counted multiple times if they apply to several principles.
212 respondents from the survey

Q: How many policies have cleared the hurdles and been reviewed?

A: This is difficult to track, as there are competing data and reference lists. College Council now has a policy subcommittee to review this. There are 46 policies in COPPS and the revision history is there for everything since 2011.

Q: Have you thought about sending out the principles and having people rate them?

A: This is a bit messy since not all policies clearly align to the board principles. In addition, the subcommittee was tasked with analyzing the data and moving it forward to the taskforce.

Q: Were there any comments about the composition of the councils in terms of dominant personalities that may have had an impact? It would be good to distinguish between the setup of the councils and the personalities involved.

A: Yes, there seemed to be some burn out from wanting the work to be moved forward and getting stalled by dominant personalities, but we need a structure in place to mitigate those types of problems. There were many comments about those same people being on multiple councils.

Adrienne Mitchell presented information on the results of the October 2018 faculty survey. The survey included 200 questions was on a wide range of topics. She presented the results relating to the governance system.

For comparison, 225 faculty participated in the October 2018 survey – including part and full time faculty, members and non-members – while only 10% of faculty participated in the 2014 governance survey.

94% believe it is important or extremely important for the college to have a shared governance system that includes the faculty. However, only 50% think that the “important questions” impacting our college are being made within the governance system.

82% value the role of LCCEA in making appointments to LCC governance councils highly or very highly.

98% rated the LCCEA’s representation of faculty interests on the Budget Development Subcommittee (BDS) important or very important; the BDS is responsible for developing a balanced budget for the college annually.

85% rated as important or very important maintaining the authority of Faculty Council in decisions about grading policy, academic policy, and the campus-wide student evaluation instrument.

Also very highly rated (79-88%) were the role of faculty in decisions about: the college's organizational structure, whether faculty positions are filled, whether new management positions are created, and ensuring that growth in faculty positions is commensurate with growth in management positions.

Q: Was there anything that surprised you?

A: Not really.

The subcommittee is working on a report that will go to the Governance Taskforce once completed.

Faculty Council, although not one of the official governance councils, has good representation and is a good example of a council that is working. The decision-making is in the hands of people that are doing the work and those with expertise. Many of the members of Faculty Council are on other governance councils. The Vice President of Academic Affairs attends the meeting, so there is a checks and balances system. There is a charter, and the council uses basic Robert's rules to run the meetings. Voting is usually done by majority, but could be done by consensus as is explained in the charter. There hasn't been a lot of call to use decision-making guidelines; most recent decisions have been made agreeably.

Hamilton thanked the committee and all that attended. This has been productive work; the Board of Education and the college appreciate the hard work that has gone into analyzing the data.