2019 ASSESSMENT OF UCC SHARED GOVERNANCE REPORT TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION SEPTEMBER 27, 2019

College Council has the responsibility to conduct an annual assessment of campus governance, share the results with the College and the Board of Education, and use the findings to refine and improve governance policy, procedures, and processes. (See Board Policy and Administrative Procedure 2510.)

DATA COLLECTION

For 2018-2019, College Council's assessment of governance was informed by three sources:

A. Survey of the governance councils
B. Survey of the campus
C. Feedback from NWCC

A. Survey of Governance Councils

College Council created a survey based upon assessment criteria in the College Council charter and the assessment requirements in Administrative Procedure 2510. Surveys were sent to each governance body with instructions to complete one survey per council, preferably utilizing the input of all members of each council. Seven statements were presented:

1. We feel our roles, responsibilities, and processes are clear.
2. We have wide and explicit communication with campus constituencies.
3. Employees and students participate in our council's problem-solving and decision-making.
4. For our council's work, decision-making is made at the appropriate level by the appropriate group with the requisite expertise.
5. Our council and our governance system are efficient and timely.
6. Our council contributes to the effective guidance of the campus.
7. This survey is an effective college governance assessment tool.

Council/committee members were asked to rate their council's performance on each item and provide comments. An optional section was provided for additional comments.

Governance groups completing the surveys in June 2019:

- College Council
- Communications Council
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Council
- Facilities Council
- Institutional Effectiveness Council
- Provost Council
- Technology Council

B. Survey of campus

A general survey for the campus was created by College Council to gauge the campus's understanding of and involvement in shared governance. The survey included the following questions:

1. Are you confident that you know the definition of shared governance on campus?
2. *UCC's Definition: Shared governance is the structure and process by which employees, students, and the Board of Education contribute to the College's institutional-level planning, policy, and procedure decision-making. (Inherent in shared governance is a commitment to trust, collaboration, communication, transparency, inclusiveness, honesty, and integrity. Shared governance provides an opportunity for campus-wide input and feedback while recognizing that the ultimate authority to make decisions lies with the Board of Education and President.)* Does this definition align with your previous understanding of shared governance?
3. What sources did you use to form your understanding of shared governance?
4. What sources do you use to stay updated on shared governance at work on campus?
5. How are you actively involved in shared governance on campus?
6. What obstacles, if any, keep you from becoming more involved in shared governance?

C. Feedback from NWCCU

In April 2019, an evaluation team of two from NWCCU conducted UCC's Mid-Cycle Visit.

Evaluator Findings: *Excerpts from evaluators' confidential report to campus*: The new shared governance process brings employees from different functional areas of the college together to discuss and address the work of the college. Many employees spoke positively about the process and progress being made, explaining that it was an effective way for diverse voices from stakeholders across the institution to be heard as well as a good way to communicate information throughout the college. Employees generally recognized the value of the changes in shared governance and the development of policies and procedures as a result of the need to respond to NWCCU recommendations. While there appeared to be broad based participation in the shared governance process and a general understanding of the mechanics of how the shared governance process worked, there still seemed to be some confusion about what types of decisions where to be addressed by councils or committees as well as the scope of authority for the different bodies. Presumably, this was due to the recent implementation. Further use of the new governance structure and employee training will provide additional clarification.

Evaluator Suggestions: Continue to implement and refine the new Shared Governance structure. At the same time, continue to educate the campus community on key concepts of how the structure is designed to work and build commonly understood definitions.

NWCCU Official Recommendation in Need of Improvement (in July 2019 letter): Further formulate and implement plans to increase institutional stability through effective leadership and a widely understood governance structure (Standard 2.A.1).

FINDINGS

During UCC's inservice on September 17, 2019, members of the governance councils convened and reviewed the results of the Spring 2019 surveys (to the campus and to councils) and feedback from NWCCU evaluators during the April 2019 Three-Year visit. The following findings emerged from discussion at the 9/17 inservice meeting.

1. **Areas of strength**
    a. INVOLVEMENT. All areas of campus (faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators from multiple departments and areas of operation) are involved in governance.
    b. COLLABORATION. Councils have improved collaboration across campus; people from various departments who typically do not work together have a chance to do so in councils.
    c. PERSPECTIVE. Staff are able to see the bigger picture outside of their own immediate department.
    d. STUDENT INVOLVEMENT AND GROWTH. Students are able to learn and share information about the College; they gain experience in committee work; they learn collaboration.
    e. IMPACT. Many councils are making a difference on campus and sharing their work; e.g., Strategic Energy Management.
    f. PARTICIPATION. Many survey respondents participate in goverance by serving on councils and/or providing feedback on policies and procedures.
    g. FUNCTIONALITY. The councils themselves seem to function well within their own meetings.
    h. COMMUNICATION. Councils share information about their meetings/actions/discussions on the intranet; people get their understanding of shared governance from department meetings, email, and inservice.
    i. DEFINITION. When given the definition of shared governance, about 75% of campus respondents agreed that their own understanding was aligned with the definition.
    j. SURVEY. The college council survey was considered a fairly good tool for gathering information.

2. **Areas that need improvement**
    a. DEFINITION. The definition of shared governance is long and uses jargon; it's not clear that the definition has been widely shared.
    b. CLARITY. Purpose, process, and roles are not clear for some people. It's unclear if outputs of councils are considered recommendations or actions. It's not clear if all councils should be governance or if some are operational. It's unclear if council members are considered experts and whether their recommendations should be accepted as those of experts; as a result, some council members feel disenfranchised.
    c. COMMUNICATION.
        i. There are many places to get information about shared governance, possibly confusing people as to where to find information.
        ii. Many people appear to *not* seek information about governance meetings and actions.
        iii. Forums held by individual councils consistently had poor attendance.
        iv. The committee-to-committee communication is unclear.
    d. FLOW OF INFORMATION. Employees seem to know the names of the parts of the governance system, but they can't yet explain how information moves through it or how decisions are

made. It is not clear how councils are notified and given explanations if their recommendations are not upheld. Turnaround time is long – it takes a month or more for councils to know if their recommendations have been accepted.

e. COLLABORATION: There is not cohesiveness among councils; it is unclear how committees relate to each other and feed decisions.

f. PARTICIPATION. Lack of time, meeting schedules, and/or distance from the main campus (i.e., people work at Woolley, JOBS, WCJC, etc.) were cited as reasons for non-participation.

g. CAPACITY. It is unclear if we have enough people to fill all the roles of governance councils.

h. SURVEY.

    i. The campus survey question about participation was mostly answered by those who serve on councils; many people did not answer the question about participation. It's possible that the data from this question are not representative of the campus at large.

    ii. The council survey instrument could be improved.

ACTION PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT

Based upon the findings of the assessment of governance, the College Council during its September 24, 2019 meeting, identified the following actions for the 2019-2020 year.

ACTION	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE	SUCCESS INDICATORS
DEFINITION. Craft a succinct, simplified definition of shared governance and share it widely across campus.	Jesika Barnes and Michelle Bergmann	October 31	All items will be monitored for on-time completion. Effectiveness of changes will be measured through a revised campus survey in May; the survey will explicitly address the noted categories for improvement and the effects of the proposed changes:

Definition: Widely understood definition

Clarity: Campus community's |
| CLARITY.
1. Rename councils as advisory; change language in charters from "decision-making" to "making recommendations"
2. Review and modify charters for purpose and process; submit to College Council and seek clarification from College Council.
3. Meet with DEI Council to determine its role as advisory or operational. | 1. Deb

2. Deb to notify; CC to review

3. Deb | October 4 notification

End of October

Sept 26 | |
| COMMUNICATION.
1. Revise intranet web presence for governance, making it easier to access information.
2. Require councils to preface minutes with a brief summary of actions/discussions.
3. Require councils to publish summaries in Umpqua Updates after each meeting.
4. Make published minutes searchable. | 1, 4. Deb Thatcher working with Art Lucero and Robynne Wilgus | 1, 4. Nov 1

2, 3, 5. Notify by Oct 4 | |

			understanding of governance
5. Encourage regular governance reports in division and department agendas.	2, 3, 5. Deb to notify. CC to monitor		
FLOW OF INFORMATION. Create a flow chart that describes and standardizes how information moves through governance and operations and where recommendations and decisions are made.	Deb Thatcher, Robynne Wilgus, Vincent Yip	Mid-October	Communication: Improved communication transparency to the campus community
COLLABORATION. Require policy/procedure recommendation forms to include consultation with other individuals and/or departments on campus that may be affected by the recommendation.	Deb Thatcher, Robynne Wilgus.	Mid-October	Flow of Information: Campus community's understanding of governance, operations, & decision making
PARTICIPATION. 1. Publish a schedule of council meetings. 2. Publish the agenda of council meetings at least 3 days in advance, notifying people of topics and inviting any interested person to attend the meetings.	Deb to notify. Council chairs to enact.	Notify by Oct 4; CC to monitor monthly	Collaboration: Campus community's understanding of how policy & procedure affect operations
SURVEY. 1. Provide definitions of ranking of answers. 2. Make the survey available using on online tool. 3. Reconsider clarity of questions.	College Council	April 2020	Participation: Governance participation through publication of governance advisory meetings