



Districtwide Shared Governance Structure Self-Assessment

Spring 2010

Prepared by:
Office of Institutional Research and Planning
May 2010

BACKGROUND

According to the WASC/ACCJC guidelines found in Standard IV: Leadership and Governance, the district of a multi-college system provides primary leadership and support for ensuring and communicating educational excellence and integrity throughout the district. The guidelines further state (in Standard IV.B.3.g) that the district will regularly evaluate the role and the governance and decision-making structures and processes of the district in order to assure the integrity and effectiveness of educational goals. This report provides information on the approach the San Diego Community College District uses to evaluate the effectiveness of the districtwide administration and governance structures.

CONTEXT

The San Diego Community College District has eight districtwide shared governance committees with one committee, the District Governance Council, comprising constituents from each of these committees. Each of the committees has a defined set of functions and responsibilities which are consistent with Board Policy 2510 on shared governance. These functions and responsibilities are reviewed and reported annually in the *SDCCD Administration and Governance Handbook*.

APPROACH

The evaluation of the districtwide shared governance structure helps to improve the alignment between the Board Policy and the accreditation standards, as well as contribute to increasing opportunities for improved student learning and student success. The self-assessment instrument which is used for this evaluation is also consistent with the content and guidelines in AB1725. This assessment system for evaluating the districtwide administration and governance structures is an annual process and includes a formal review of the outcomes, as well as action planning. The development and implementation of the assessment system, including the instrument was as follows:

- 1) Development of Evaluation Rubric. The District Governance Council, working together with the Director of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP), developed a general evaluation rubric for all committees that comprised the districtwide shared governance structures. Using context and behavioral anchors from Board Policy 2510, Accreditation Standard IV.3.g, and the current functions and responsibilities from the eight districtwide shared governance committees, a rubric was created with a 5 point holistic scale. (February 2010)
- 2) Self-Assessment Process. Each of the districtwide shared governance committees (including the District Governance Council) participated in the self-assessment process which included an initial facilitated discussion by the Director of IRP on the purpose, process, and overview of the assessment, as well as taking the online self assessment. (March/April 2010)
- 3) Outcomes Reporting and Action Planning. Each of the districtwide shared governance committees discussed the results of the assessment which was provided by the IRP office. The Director of IRP facilitated the discussions to further the assessment and help to generate action items. The DGC then reviewed the outcomes report holistically to provide input to the various committees for closing any identified gaps. (May 2010)

OUTCOMES

Each of the districtwide shared governance committees participated in the self-assessment in Spring 2010 by taking the online *Shared Governance Self-Assessment*. The focus of the assessment was on the contributions the committee made to the districtwide shared governance structure as described through the four domains in the self-assessment rubric (see Appendix A). The survey assessment asked committee members to identify major activities or actions they believe their committee took on a regular basis that related to and impacted the qualities within each domain. The results were discussed within each committee via a facilitated discussion by the District Director of Institutional Research and Planning and additional actions taken or recommended were noted.

Each of the committee’s average scores for each domain is displayed in the **Scorecard 2010**. The total possible score overall is 5, suggesting that all major activities or actions of this committee were related to all of the qualities listed in the domain and had a strong impact on the way in which the domain was enacted, compared to the opposite end of the scale, 1, which suggests that very few to none of the major activities or actions of this committee were related to the qualities listed in the domain and may have had little to no impact on the way in which the domain is enacted (see Appendix A for the complete scale).

Preliminary benchmarks have been suggested here as a way in which to help establish target performance and comparison points for future evaluations. The benchmarks currently are set to the overall averages. It is recommended that the benchmarks be reviewed in light of the specific role and function of each committee and holistic or overall benchmarks be established accordingly.

SCORECARD 2010

Shared Governance Domains	Participation in Policy & Procedure Development	Communication	Collegial Consultation	Integrity & Effectiveness in Meeting Goals
Budget Development & Planning Committee	3.8	4.7	4.3	4.0
District Governance Council	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.0
District Research Committee	3.1	4.0	4.3	4.1
Instructional Council	3.6	4.1	4.7	3.7
Management Services Council	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.0
Marketing & Outreach Committee	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.9
Strategic Planning Committee	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.4
Student Services Council	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.8
Baseline Benchmarks 2010	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.7
Benchmark Control Limits	3.1 to 4.4	3.3 to 4.6	3.4 to 4.6	3.2 to 4.3

The *Baseline Benchmarks 2010* are based on overall mean scores or averages and provide a reference point for norming the contributions the committees make in supporting and enacting the shared governance structure. The *Benchmark Control Limits* are based on 1.5 standard deviations from the mean and provide a measure for identifying the upper and lower range of contributions within a domain; those which exceed or fall below the benchmark.

OVERALL CONTRIBUTIONS & RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

The following is a summary of comments from the self-assessment on the contributions and recommended actions the eight committees made in 2009/10.

Participation in Policy and Procedure Development

This domain in the self-assessment evaluates the contributions the committees make toward informing policy decisions. The behaviors anchoring this domain include those committee activities that provide current and relevant information which is based on a thorough analysis of the impact and feasibility of a policy. Committee activities that contribute to this domain would also include procedures that are developed via collective input and feedback from multiple constituency groups as well as continuous review for impact and quality of the implementation of protocols and standard operating procedures.

Many of the committees commented that they regularly review policies and procedures for impact, relevancy and currency (i.e., facilities, research, budget, and business services). The committees use their committee structure as an opportunity for vetting new or revised policies and procedures and to garner collective feedback and input that represent the opinions and interests of campus constituency groups. The information that is provided to committee members is used to share and inform their campus constituencies.

Some of the broad recommended actions within this domain from the committees are as follows:

1. Decisions to restructure or change policies should function as a long-range plan rather than being reactionary to crises.
2. Ensure that all related policies and procedures are posted and current on the district intranet and the internet websites.
3. Connect the District Strategic Planning Committee and other districtwide shared governance committees to provide input and feedback on research and use of data and information.
4. Allow committee members to influence policies and procedures developed by senior administrators.
5. When revisions of procedures or policies are made they need to be updated and brought to the DGC so they can be taken to campuses for feedback.
6. Develop an ongoing process to review instructional policies, and procedures.

Communication

This domain of the self-assessment evaluates the overall effectiveness of communication. The behaviors that anchor this domain include the activities that the committees engage in to ensure communications that are specific to their committee are accurate, relevant, accessible, timely, and clear with concise messaging and with widespread distribution of information for policy and decision-making. Additionally, the communication-related activities that the committees contribute to promote a climate of openness and transparency via ongoing communication and multiple venues or opportunities for two-way communication regarding decisions, plans, and policies and the implementation of procedures.

Most of the committees commented that communication within the committee is open and honest with robust discussions that provide a venue for problem-solving and sharing of ideas. The committees also commented that information received in the committees is valuable for sharing with campus constituencies to help keep them informed and updated on important initiatives, policies, procedures, and work being done in the various areas of the committees. Additionally, the committees receive input and feedback from their campuses that is shared and used to inform the work that the committees do.

Some of the broad recommended actions within this domain from the committees are as follows:

1. Improve strategies for effectively communicating the role and function of the committee to all constituencies.
2. Align messages on procedures from the district departments, colleges, and Continuing Education.
3. Focus on being sustainability-conscious in communication tools.
4. Continue to gather feedback on strategic planning processes in order to improve future planning.
5. Provide sufficient time to take information back to faculty, classified staff, and students before decisions are made.

Collegial Consultation

This domain of the self-assessment evaluates the degree of collegial consultation within the committee. The behaviors that anchor this domain include the degree to which the processes used to solicit input and feedback from campus constituencies are inclusive and allow for both adequate time for dialogue, as well as for staying within a designated timeframe for required feedback or input process. Additionally, the assessment looks at the degree to which distinct roles in the shared governance process are recognized and enacted, discussions and dialogue between and among constituency groups are open, honest, and transparent and working relations are supportive of a professional, respectful, and collegial climate that promotes diversity of opinions, ideas, and actions.

Many of the committees commented that the districtwide shared governance committee structure provides the opportunity to give input and receive feedback in a collegial manner. Consultation and dialogue is generally mutually beneficial and helps to promote a culture of collaborative inquiry. The committees also indicated that the structure has fostered improved relationships between campuses and district.

Some of the broad recommended actions within this domain from the committees are as follows:

1. Provide more time for discussions whenever possible.
2. Develop improved processes for communicating and making decisions using shared governance for the technical review process.
3. Continue to engage students in the shared governance process.

Integrity and Effectiveness in Meeting Goals

This domain of the self-assessment evaluates the quality and integrity of the shared values, mission, and goals between the colleges, Continuing Education, and the District. The behaviors that anchor this domain include activities that contribute to widespread recognition and support of institutional uniqueness and autonomy, support for regular measurement of institutional effectiveness that informs planning and improvement decisions, all of which focus on building and sustaining a climate of collaborative inquiry via opportunities.

Some of the committees commented that shared values and goals are promoted through the districtwide shared governance structure while respecting the differences and autonomy of each campus. Some comments also mentioned that some of the committee projects (i.e., districtwide strategic plan and evaluation component) have helped to maintain the integrity of goals across the district. The committees also indicated that the participatory discussions that occur within the committee structure help to inform and maintain the continuity of college and district goals, strategies, interventions, and policies.

Some of the broad recommended actions within this domain from the committees are as follows:

1. Evaluate the work the district shared governance committees do in relation to the work done on the campuses (e.g., district committee goals aligned to college goals).

OBSERVATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

This marks the first time that the San Diego Community College District has implemented a formal self assessment of the district-wide shared governance structure. The process was highly inclusive and outcomes focused. Moreover, it has been designed to be cyclical in order to close the assessment and planning loop. The discussions that occurred throughout the process were as valuable as the outcomes. As the oversight committee, the District Governance Council participated in the design of the assessment rubric through a collaborative inquiry process of reflection and analysis. The discussions were thoughtful, rich, and clarifying, bringing new and/or underlying issues and concerns to the forefront. Each shared governance committee had the opportunity to engage in dialogue around the contributions that their committee makes to the district-wide shared governance structure, and to examine the function and intent of the committee. Several committees discussed the possibility of using this evaluation and collaborative inquiry process as a way in which to help them clarify their committee's purpose, as well as to set goals and to plan actions for the future.

Many, if not all, of the committees had not engaged in a self-assessment requiring inquiry and dialogue around issues and problem-solving prior to this self-assessment. As a result, there was not full participation by committee members and the dialogue that occurred during the reporting of the results of the assessment was somewhat limited, not reaching any real conclusions or action steps for improving. This, however, is a process that will take some time to gather momentum and traction so that it becomes part of the district's effort to continuously improve the way in which student success and institutional effectiveness might be achieved. The Chancellor is committed to this being an annual process.

Appendix A

Districtwide Shared Governance Committee Self Assessment Rubric and Scale

SDCCD Districtwide Shared Governance Structure Self-Assessment Rubric

*Instructions: Identify **major** activities or actions your committee takes on a **regular** basis that relate to and **impact the qualities** listed.*

Domains	Qualities
<i>Participation in Policy and Procedure Development</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy decisions are informed by providing current and relevant information that is based on a thorough analysis of the impact and feasibility of the policy. 2. Procedures are developed via collective input and feedback from multiple constituency groups. 3. Protocols and standard operating procedures for policies are continuously reviewed for impact and quality of implementation.
<i>Communication</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communications are accurate, relevant, timely, accessible, and clear with concise messaging and widespread access to information for policy and decision-making. 2. Communications promote a climate of openness and transparency via ongoing communication and multiple venues or opportunities for two-way communication regarding decisions, plans, and policies. 3. Procedures are implemented via clear communications (e.g., written).
<i>Collegial Consultation</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Input and feedback on processes are inclusive and allow for both adequate time for dialogue, as well as for staying within a designated timeframe for required feedback or input process. 2. Roles in the shared governance process are recognized and enacted. 3. Discussions and dialogue between and among constituency groups are open, honest, and transparent. 4. Working relationships are supportive of a professional, respectful, and collegial climate that promotes diversity of opinions, ideas and actions.
<i>Integrity and Effectiveness in Meeting Goals</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Districtwide shared values are promoted through alignment of college, Continuing Education and District mission and goals. 2. Widespread recognition and support of institutional uniqueness and autonomy is exercised. 3. Regular measurement of institutional effectiveness is used to support and inform planning and improvement decisions which focus on building and sustaining a climate of collaborative inquiry via opportunities.

SCALE FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

Instructions: Use the scale below to rate the overall contribution your committee has made to the districtwide shared governance structure as defined in the four domains in the rubric.

Score of 5: Primary Contributor to All of the Qualities in this Domain

All major activities or actions of this committee are related to all of the qualities listed in the domain and have a strong impact on the way in which the domain is enacted.

Score of 4: Primary Contributor to Most of the Qualities in this Domain

Most major activities or actions of this committee are related to most of the qualities listed in the domain and have an impact on the way in which the domain is enacted.

Score of 3: Partial Contributor to Some of the Qualities in this Domain

Some of the major activities or actions of this committee are related to some of the qualities listed in the domain and may have some impact on the way in which the domain is enacted.

Score of 2: Partial Contributor to a Few of the Qualities in this Domain

A few of the major activities or actions of this committee are related to a few of the qualities listed in the domain and may have a slight impact on the way in which the domain is enacted.

Score of 1: Minimal Contributor to Few Qualities in this Domain

Very few to none of the major activities or actions of this committee are related to the qualities listed in the domain and may have little to no impact on the way in which the domain is enacted.