

Fall 2012

President's Council/Strategic Planning Shared Governance Survey



Randy Brown, Ph.D.

Office of Institutional Research

Gavilan College

Fall 2012

Highlights

- ❖ There was good participation in the current study and corresponding survey. All personnel groups were well represented except part-time faculty, who participated at a 6.7% rate.
- ❖ While respondents' reported relatively low levels of *knowledge* of the President's Council and shared governance, and planning processes, these rates have been steadily increasing since Fall 07.
- ❖ Respondents' reported awareness and attitudinal rates regarding shared governance and integrated planning improved from previous administrations of the current survey.
- ❖ Respondents rated the elements of integrated planning as relatively high. These rate have risen from previous survey administrations.
- ❖ There have been new efforts to generate more awareness and participation in both shared governance and planning.
- ❖ There is a continued need for more involvement in and explanation of the shared governance and planning processes.

Introduction

The Gavilan College integrated planning and shared governance processes are meant to meet state and accreditation requirements along with providing a system for guiding a complex and ever-changing organization. Currently, shared governance processes include the committee structure and the President's council. The planning processes include the strategic plan, the *program plan*, and budget allocation.

As a part of the continuous improvement cycle, it is necessary to regularly conduct assessment efforts to evaluate current processes while providing information for future modifications.

In particular, the current study was designed to:

- ❖ Assess the knowledge of and attitudes about the Gavilan College planning processes and the workings of the President's Council;
- ❖ Assess attitudes about shared governance;
- ❖ Compare the current data to previous survey results;
- ❖ Provide specific suggestions on how to improve the President's Council, planning processes, and shared governance.

Methods

In Fall 2007, the original survey was developed by representatives of the President's Council and the Office of Institutional Research. The survey assessed the knowledge and attitudes of respondents, as well as prompted respondents for specific suggestions. In the second administration of the survey (Fall 09), the survey was broadened to include more items on shared governance. These items were added by a Shared Governance sub-committee led by the VP of Instruction. In Spring 2011 and Fall 12, additional items were added by the college's Strategic Planning committee to measure respondents' awareness and opinions on the planning and the budget allocation processes (see Appendix A for the actual survey).

The Fall 12 survey was administered via email to all staff using the same procedures as the previous administrations. Since many of the facilities staff did not have access or readily use email, the survey was made available to these staff via a paper-and-pencil versions.

Of the 107 people who responded to the request for participation, 103 chose to participate in the study (96.3%). The sample represents 22.4% of the combined number of total staff (459), including temporary staff and faculty. Table I shows how respondents identified themselves.

Based on the Fall 11 staffing levels^[*], the following represents the approximate participation levels of the respective groups: Administrators 36.8% (19 total), Full-time

* Staff figures were taken from the "11/12 CCCO report and some categories were different from the categories used in the survey item.

faculty 32.0% (75 total), Part-time faculty 5.6% (230 total), Supervisors/Confidentials 63.3% (22 total), and Professional Support staff 18.6% (113 total).

Table 1: Respondents' group

	Count	%
<i>Administrator</i>	7	8.6%
<i>Full-Time Faculty</i>	24	29.6%
<i>Part-time faculty</i>	13	16.0%
<i>Supervisor/Confidential</i>	14	17.3%
<i>Professional Support Staff</i>	21	25.9%
<i>I don't know</i>	1	1.2%

Findings

Below are the findings from the survey:

Table 2: Knowledge of President's Council.

	Nothing		A little		Much		Very Much	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The purpose of the President's Council</i>	14	17.3%	27	33.3%	21	25.9%	19	23.5%
<i>How the President's Council operates</i>	15	18.3%	34	41.5%	14	17.1%	19	23.2%
<i>How you can bring an issue to the President's Council</i>	21	25.6%	27	32.9%	15	8.3%	19	23.2%
<i>How the President's Council fits into College decision-making</i>	16	19.8%	25	30.9%	21	25.9%	19	23.5%
<i>Who your representative is</i>	24	29.6%	16	19.8%	14	17.3%	27	33.3%
<i>The information reported at the President's Council</i>	22	26.8%	28	34.1%	12	14.6%	20	24.4%
<i>The decisions made at the President's Council</i>	24	29.3%	26	31.7%	15	18.3%	17	20.7%

Table 3: Knowledge mean (average) comparison (Fall 07 to Fall 12)

	Fall 07	Fall 09	Spring 11	Fall 12
<i>The purpose of the President's Council</i>	2.29	2.19	2.49	2.56
<i>How the President's Council operates</i>	2.14	2.06	2.34	2.45
<i>How you can bring an issue to the President's Council</i>	2.07	2.00	2.31	2.39
<i>How the President's Council fits into College decision-making</i>	2.21	2.10	2.29	2.53
<i>Who your representative is</i>	2.26	2.28	2.33	2.54
<i>The information reported at the President's Council</i>	1.98	1.97	2.17	2.37
<i>The decisions made at the President's Council</i>	1.93	1.97	2.10	2.30

Table 4: Knowledge of planning processes

	Nothing		A little		Much		Very Much	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>The current strategic plan</i>	12	14.6%	30	36.6%	27	32.9%	13	15.9%
<i>What the process is for modifying the strategic plan.</i>	23	28.0%	26	31.7%	16	19.5%	17	20.7%
<i>The budget allocation process.</i>	19	23.5%	24	29.6%	19	23.5%	19	23.5%

Table 5: Knowledge of planning mean comparison (Spring 11 to Fall 12)

	Spring 11	Fall 12
<i>The current strategic plan</i>	2.46	2.50
<i>What the process is for modifying the strategic plan.</i>	2.15	2.33
<i>The budget allocation process.</i>	N/A	2.76*

* First year of this item.

Table 6: Attitudes about shared governance.

	Not at all		Slightly		Well		Very well	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>How well do you feel your group is represented at the President's Council?</i>	5	6.8%	25	34.2%	23	31.5%	20	27.4%
<i>How well do you feel your group is represented at strategic planning development?</i>	7	9.6%	21	28.8%	30	41.4%	15	20.5%
<i>How well do you feel your group is represented in the development of your program's Program Plan?</i>	7	9.6%	18	24.7%	22	30.1%	26	35.6%

Table 7: Attitudes about planning, research, and decision-making.

	Not at all		Slightly		Much		Very much	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>How much do you think College planning is shared by all groups?</i>	6	8.0%	24	32.0%	37	49.3%	8	10.7%
<i>How much do you think College decision-making is shared by all groups?</i>	8	10.5%	32	42.1%	29	38.2%	7	9.2%
<i>How much have you participated in shared governance?</i>	15	19.7%	19	25.0%	21	27.6%	21	27.6%
<i>How much do you currently use data to help you in making the important decisions that are part of your job?</i>	15	20.3%	21	28.4%	26	35.1%	12	16.2%
<i>How much do you think the college uses data to make important decisions?</i>	6	7.9%	19	25.0%	35	46.1%	16	21.1%

Table 8: Attitudes about shared governance, planning, research, and decision making mean comparison (Fall 07 to Fall 12).

	Fall 07	Fall 09	Spring 11	Fall 12
<i>How well do you feel your group is represented at the President's Council?</i>	2.39	2.40	2.65	2.79
<i>How well do you feel your group is represented at strategic planning development?</i>	-	-	2.63	2.73
<i>How well do you feel your group is represented in the development of your program's Program Plan?</i>	-	-	2.82	2.92
<i>How much do you think College planning is shared by all groups?</i>	-	-	2.53	2.63
<i>How much do you think College decision-making is shared by all groups?</i>	2.23	2.06	2.32	2.46
<i>How much do you currently use data to help you in making the important decisions that are part of your job?</i>	-	-	2.46	2.46
<i>How much do you think the college uses data to make important decisions?</i>	-	-	2.70	2.80
<i>Budget allocations are appropriate to improve student learning.</i>	-	-	N/A	2.80*

* First year of this item.

Table 9: Attitude about planning and its relationship to student success.

	Strongly		Slightly well		Well		Very well	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>Budget allocations are appropriate to improve student learning.</i>	5	7.0%	10	14.1%	50	70.4%	6	8.5%

Table 10: Ratings of shared governance, research, President's Council, and planning processes.

	Not at all well		Slightly well		Well		Very well	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<i>Rating of strategic planning</i>	4	5.6%	23	31.9%	38	52.8%	7	9.7%
<i>Rating of program planning</i>	4	5.6%	18	25.4%	42	59.2%	7	9.9%
<i>Rating of President's Council decision-making</i>	5	7.0%	24	33.8%	36	50.7%	6	8.5%
<i>Rating of the connection between planning and decision-making</i>	9	12.7%	23	32.4%	31	43.7%	8	11.3%

Table 11: Mean comparison of Ratings of shared governance, research, President’s Council, and planning processes (Spring 11 to Fall 12).

	Spring 11	Fall 12
<i>Rating of strategic planning</i>	2.47	2.67
<i>Rating of program planning</i>	2.65	2.73
<i>Rating of President’s Council decision-making</i>	2.44	2.61
<i>Rating of the connection between planning and decision-making</i>	2.29	2.54

Table 12: Involvement in shared governance.

	Yes		No	
	Count	%	Count	%
<i>Would you like to be more involved in shared governance?</i>	23	33.8%	45	66.2%

Specific suggestions

For the item, *suggested improvements in the Strategic Planning or Program Planning processes* (15 responses), below were the clustered themes (See Appendix B for actual responses):

- ❖ Make decisions more transparent;
- ❖ Strategic plan should be more streamlined;
- ❖ Use more of a bottom up report;
- ❖ Get more part time faculty involved;
- ❖ Make information more accessible.

For the item, *suggested improvements in President’s Council* (14 responses), below were the clustered themes (See Appendix B):

- ❖ Improve communication;
- ❖ Have an open house;
- ❖ Add an additional faculty member;
- ❖ Better follow up from representatives.

For the item, *suggested improvements in research and suggested studies* (17 responses), below were the clustered themes (See Appendix B):

- ❖ Collaborate and comparisons with other colleges in region;
- ❖ Get additional part time support;
- ❖ Part time faculty performance from a student perspective;
- ❖ Improved data quality.

Summary

Survey Participation

There was a relatively good participation rate in the survey. Approximately, 22% of the staff participated in the study. As expected, part-time faculty were not as well represented as other groups, with only 5.6% participating. This rate was driven lower by the dramatic increase in part time instructors as compared to Fall 10 (+10%). Any interpretation of the findings must include the understanding that survey respondents represented only a proportion of the total staff and student population. Thus others who did not participate may have distinctly different attitudes and/or opinions. The sample rate matched the four previous administrations of the survey.

President's Council

There is clearly a continued lack of knowledge about the President's Council and how it operates. A majority of respondents reported knowing "nothing" or "a little" about most aspects of the President's Council (percentages ranged from 50-60%). These reported knowledge rates were similar to the previous survey administrations, however, most averages increased slightly (See Table 3). This increase demonstrates a trend of annual increases in knowledge of features of the president's council.

While knowledge of the President's Council is relatively low, it seems to be well regarded. Nearly sixty percent of respondents reported that the President's Council process functioned either "well" or "very well". The majority of respondents also felt as if their group was adequately represented at the President's Council. While it is clear the President's Council is still challenged with how to improve communication with constituent groups, it appears that a majority of respondents feel the process is operating well. Some suggestions for improvement were to conduct an open house and encourage representatives to improve information dissemination.

Planning and Budget Allocation

Respondents' knowledge about the planning processes (strategic planning, *program plan* planning and budget allocation) was at a similarly low level (See Table 4). Respondents' understanding of the budget allocation process was slightly higher. These rates of knowledge about the planning processes also increased from the previous year.

Respondents rated the strategic planning, program planning, and budget allocations at relatively high levels. For example, nearly 70% of respondents rated the program planning process either "well" or "very well". This year's averages were an improvement on the previous year's rates.

Overall, respondents seemed to feel as if the planning and decision making process was sound. Over 55% of respondents rated that the connection between planning and decision making is operating either "well" or "very well". Clearly, however, respondents' knowledge and approval of the planning process has room to improve. Some specific suggestions were to: make decisions more transparent; include more part-time faculty; and to streamline the strategic plan.

Research

Items on research were focused on the incorporation of data into college decision making. It appears a majority of participants report that data is being used in their area and in college decision making overall. Over fifty-one percent reported that they used research “Much” or “Very much” in important decisions associated with their job. Additionally, a considerable majority of respondents reported that the college used data in its decision making (67.2%). The Fall 12 data for both of these items represented a slight increase from the previous administration. While there is certainly room for improvement, it seems as if the college is making progress on its use of data in decision-making.

Shared Governance

Representation

Most respondents seemed to report that they felt that their group was well represented at the President’s Council, strategic planning, and in program plan development. For example, 66% of respondents reported that their group was “well” or “very well” represented in the development of their program’s program plan. Nevertheless, there remains 10% of respondents who felt as if their group was not represented “at all” in any of the planning and decision-making groups.

Most survey participants reportedly had at least some participation in shared governance, with only 20% reporting no participation at all. Nevertheless, most respondents (53%) reported that *College decision making is shared by all groups* “Not at all” or “slightly”. These rates, while arguably low, are a steady improvement on previous administrations of this survey in 07, 09, and 11. Reported college decision-making sharing rose 10% from Fall 07. Indeed, it appears a greater proportion of respondents are actually getting involved in shared governance.

These results aside, most respondents did not want to be more involved in shared-governance (66%). Surprisingly, this proportion was the inverse of the previous year. Respondents suggested that greater effort be conducted to encourage part time faculty to be involved in shared governance. Thus, the respondents reported that they did not want to get more involved, but recommended that others not traditionally involved be pulled into the processes.

Summary

In sum, this survey was only a sampling of overall staff and faculty knowledge and attitudes. It appears that many participating in this study are unclear about the President’s Council, the planning and allocation processes, and their role in college decision-making. The rates of knowledge of these processes, however, seem to be rising.

Survey respondents seem to be relatively satisfied with how these processes are representing their groups and how they operate. Moreover, respondents’ awareness

and attitudinal rates have increased in comparison to previous administrations of the survey.

Since the last administration, a variety of activities were conducted that may have had an effect on the awareness and attitudes of respondents. In Spring 11, the strategic plan was more intensively reviewed and updated. This review included input gathered from two college-wide strategic plan forums. Additionally, the program plan forms were revised to make them more user-friendly and to improve their linkage to other planning processes. Most importantly the shared governance and integrated planning road show was presented throughout campus. The road show, conducted by the Executive Vice President and the Director of Institutional Research, was presented at instructional and non-instructional unit meetings.

It is clear, however, that more work needs to be done to improve both awareness and attitudes around the President's Council, shared governance, and planning processes. The college has established an integrated planning task force that takes input from this survey and other sources to review and improve the planning processes. With the coordination of this committee, future changes will help to improve processes and knowledge of these important parts of college planning and operation.

Appendix A: Survey

Planning Survey

Please help us learn more about your opinions and suggestions for Strategic Planning and Shared Governance. Participation in this survey is voluntary and your decision of whether or not to participate will not affect your status as a faculty or staff-person. Your responses will be anonymous and the survey should take approximately 10 minutes. Thanks for your assistance

*** 1. Do you want to participate?**

Yes

No

1. What group best describes you?

Administrator

Full-time Faculty

Part-time Faculty

Associated Student Body representative

Supervisors/Confidential Staff

Professional Support Staff

I don't know

2. How much do you know about the following:

	Nothing	A little	Much	Very much
The current strategic plan.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
What the process is for modifying the strategic plan.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Your administrative, student service or instructional program "Program plans".	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The purpose of the President's Council	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How the President's Council operates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How you can bring an issue to the President's Council	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How the President's Council fits into College decision-making	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Who your President's Council representative is	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The information reported at the President's Council	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The decisions made at the President's Council	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1. How well do you feel your group (Administration, Faculty, ASB, Supervisors/Confidential, and Professional Support Staff) is represented at the following?

	Not at all	Slightly	Well	Very Well
President's Council	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strategic planning development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the develop of your program's Program IPan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. How much do you think College planning is shared by all groups?

- Not at all
- Slightly
- Much
- Very Much

3. How much do you think College decision-making is shared by all groups?

- Not at all
- Slightly
- Much
- Very Much

4. How well do you think the following operate at our college?

	Not at all well	Slightly well	Well	Very well
Strategic planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Program plan planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
President's council decision-making	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The connection between planning and decision-making	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Over the past year, how much have you participated in Shared Governance (e.g. participation in College committees, involvement in planning, discussions, and/or decision-making)

- Not at all
- Slightly
- Much
- Very much

6. How much do you currently use data (reports, survey results, College data, focus group results, etc.) to help you in making the important decisions that are part of your job?

- Not at all
- A little
- Much
- Very much

7. How much do you think the college uses data (reports, survey results, College data, focus group results, etc.) to make important decisions?

- Not at all
- A little
- Much
- Very much

8. What are your suggestions for future research studies or for improving our College's office of Institutional Research?

9. Would you like to be more involved in Shared Governance?

- Yes
- No

10. Do you have any suggestions to improve the Strategic planning or program planning processes?

11. Do you have any suggestions to improve the President's Council?

Thanks

Thank you for your time.

Appendix B: Comments

Do you have any suggestions to improve the Strategic planning or program planning processes (Actual Responses)?

- ❖ Make the decisions more transparent. Publish the process and results.
- ❖ Get more people involved. Use professional development as a way to highlight the opportunities that exist to have meaningful impact at the college.
- ❖ Make public information more accessible. Also share resources that are used to obtain it.
- ❖ One hard copy of internet references, research, outside consultant's reports and previous program plans on file in the Library for easy of writing Program Plans and developing Strategic Plans.
- ❖ Strategic Plan should be more streamlined and focused.
- ❖ In addition to top-down approach, implement a few bottom-up strategies allowing staff to provide feedback directly to Institutional committees. Granted this mechanism is not going to be fully utilized; however, a few employees may contribute and feel a little more empowered. Finally, implement a closed-loop feedback mechanism where administrators provide feedback directly to staff (bypassing middle-men/middle-women and committee representatives).
- ❖ Better integration with budget decisions.
- ❖ I didn't hear of program planning until I read Dr. Kinsella's email last week. Strategic planning is doing quite well, but we do not hear back from our representatives.
- ❖ More recruitment of part-time faculty. This can be a challenge because of limited time, and has been for myself. But I believe we have valuable experience to offer.

Do you have any suggestions to improve the President's Council (Actual Responses)?

- ❖ Send out a newsletter.
- ❖ The President still has veto power over recommendations and this is the only reason why I marked the efficiency of the President's Council
- ❖ Have them designate a meeting as an "Open House" and invite the whole of the college community to come and observe the decision making process in action.
- ❖ need to know what it does, who is on it, when it meets, what happens there.
- ❖ Add 1 more faculty rep.
- ❖ Better communication with the campus in general.
- ❖ Our CSEA representatives need to follow-up with their constituents on any outcome from President's Council. Email is swift with messages! I remember making paper copies to place in mailboxes for CSEA members, and it took three members to get it all together.

What are your suggestions for future research studies or for improving our College's office of Institutional Research (Actual Responses)?

- ❖ Holding Department Managers more responsible for keeping staff informed at Department Meetings!
- ❖ More direct communication between faculty, and admins.
- ❖ collaborate with other colleges
- ❖ Comparisons to other colleges in the region, state, and national levels.
- ❖ Working well but could use additional help to adequately handle the research requests.
- ❖ Researcher does an excellent job communicating current trends.
- ❖ Hire a part-time person for Randy
- ❖ Accurate, reliable data.
- ❖ Active communication. Ask before tell. Adjunct faculty are not involved at all.
- ❖ Dr. Brown is a very busy employee. I applaud him for his exceptional work. What would make his work hours more efficient?

- ❖ I think it would be interesting to see what students' views are in regard to part-time faculty. Specifically, if their needs are being met by part-time faculty who may have responsibilities at other campuses. I would also be interested to know if there are any correlations between student performance, retention, and graduation rates the number of full-time and part-time faculty on campus.
- ❖ Holding Department Managers more responsible for keeping staff informed at Department Meetings!
- ❖ More direct communication between faculty, and admins.
- ❖ collaborate with other colleges
- ❖ Comparisons to other colleges in the region, state, and national levels.
- ❖ Working well but could use additional help to adequately handle the research requests.
- ❖ Researcher does an excellent job communicating current trends.
- ❖ Hire a part-time person for Randy
- ❖ Accurate, reliable data.
- ❖ Active communication. Ask before tell. Adjunct faculty are not involved at all.