Valencia College
Shared Governance Redesign Retreat
July 11-12, 2013

Background and Objective
At Valencia College, there has been a commitment to Shared Governance with faculty, staff and administration. However, as the College has grown with an organizational structure of both college-wide and campus oversight and planning, the complexities have challenged the current Shared Governance structure and level of engagement. A 2011 Review of Shared Governance was done but since it preceded the decentralized Valencia structure, it was important to discuss the new reality of Shared Governance.

This retreat was to consider the Shared Governance needs of the college and collaboratively develop new ideas to make it more effective for the participants and the College to be shared with Sandy Shugart for next steps.

Sandy’s definition of success for this retreat session:

- People involved and not feeling like we are beating a dead horse, a productive session and that the stakes are not too high
- That it begins to shape common language and expectations
- That there are choices which will accelerate the fork, simplify communication and raise the engagement of the front line with making decisions

At the conclusion of the retreat, all participants selected one of seven ‘two week’ Task Teams to further develop recommendations from the day and their work is reflected in this summary (see pages 3-15) – these teams met to:

1. Frame up the new proposed models
2. Clarify the difference in roles between college-wide and campus
3. Define word definitions
4. Describe how the values look like at Valencia
5. Craft a vision for Shared Governance
6. Recommend new names for Shared Governance
7. Prepare how a change would be communicated college-wide

The Appendix includes the Retreat Agenda and all flip chart work from the day.

Retreat Participants
Kathleen Plinske, Falecia Williams, Michele McArdle, Mike Bosley, Keith Houck, Susan Ledlow, Joyce Romano, Joe Battista, Bill White, Deidre Holmes DuBois, Rob McCaffrey, Bob Gessner, Jean Marie Fuhrman, Lisa Macon, Chris Borglum, Karen Marie Borglum, Wendi Dew, Carl Creasman, Christina Hardin, Joe Sarrubbo, Liza Schellpeffer, Donna Kosloski, Michal Ewing, Kari Makepeace, Celine Kavalc-Miller, Kurt Ewen, John Niss, Scott Crosby, Undria Stalling, Damion Hammock, Wendy Givoglu, Amy Bosley
On-Purpose Partners Observations
Shared Governance is a topic of deep importance and passion for those in the room and their energy resulted in lively yet respectful discussions. The meeting space itself definitely added to the ability to share and create.

From the pre-survey it was evident that many were discouraged with the current system. Individual participants were also impacted by

- Doubts that this retreat would be productive in breaking through with any new ideas or consensus
- Concerns of the difficulty of ultimately implementing changes within the college
- The challenge of considering a new system when they were instrumental in the original structure – and not wanting to “throw the baby out with the bath water”
- The fact that some in the room had not been involved in the Shared Governance process yet had definite opinions
- Whether it was truly possible to engage more people in Shared Governance or whether the same people would continue to do all the work

During the discussions, several foundational topics emerged which impact Shared Governance and will require additional thought and discussion:

1. Clarity around expectations, responsibility and ownership of College-wide and Campus leaders which included a matrix organizations discussion.

2. Branding expectations – the discussion example used was
   - Are we Darden with several different restaurants brands?
   - Are we all Red Lobster’s with different locations and size?

   The group felt it was the Red Lobster example as there is a desire for Valencia consistency and the need to clarify what things should be consistent and where there is site flexibility

3. The true definition of Governance – and whether Valencia Shared Governance is about governance or more about influence, a decision process, or counsel. Changing the name was also a topic of discussion. Several individuals were equally passionate about whether to keep to keep governance in the name or “call it anything but governance”

4. The ongoing need to ‘build trust’ and ‘engage the disengaged’ within the Valencia culture

5. In thinking ahead – where do faculty stand on this issue? How will this change be communicated throughout the college and engaged more participation?

6. The importance of training around collaboration, around how to work successfully within these new councils – setting people up for success
1. Four New Proposed Models – Designs A, B, C and D

Design Plan A

Summary
Redesign the existing council make-up in an effort to establish a collaborative, interdependent, supportive system for decision making and project completion. The impetus for the redesign is on developing a system of accountability of mutual and individual ownership, responsibility, and obligation to include partners and stakeholders / constituents across the College who are willing and able to make decisions and take actions. The goal of this plan is to establish a culture of trust and innovation that supports the mission of Valencia.

The proposed structure includes a central Collaborative Advisory Group (CAG), Campus Executive Teams, and campus-based and college-wide Action Teams. We recommend the continuation of existing standing committees across the college, like the College Curriculum Committee and the Learning Assessment Committee, who have specific, clear, and ongoing work / goals. Additionally, this model supports the idea of empowering the VPs and their groups to continue their efforts to make local decisions in their area of responsibility. These new and existing groups will work together to accomplish campus-based and college-wide work.

The Collaborative Advisory Group will include one academic dean from each campus, one faculty representative from each campus, and one staff member from each campus, all of whom will be elected from the Campus Executive Teams (see below for make-up of the Campus Executive Teams); the current senior team; and the College president, at his discretion. We propose that the representatives from the Campus Executive Teams serve a two-year term on the CAG for consistency and cohesion. The CAG will be chaired by a member of the senior team and one person from the campus executive team. The College president will be responsible for selecting these co-chairs.

The Campus Executive Teams will be comprised of the campus president; two faculty representatives (a faculty council president and VP or two faculty council presidents – i.e. East and WP’s Executive Team) elected by the campus; all deans (academic and student); operations (IT, security, facilities, etc.); and career and professional staff representatives elected by their peers. Each Campus Executive Team will be responsible for electing members onto the Collaborative Advisory Group.

Action Teams will be commissioned to complete specific projects and move work forward – college-wide and at the campus level; these will be work teams, not advocacy groups. Selection of the members of the Action Teams will be thoughtful so that the teams are comprised of experts and stakeholders most interested in a particular topic (i.e. curriculum, salaries, policy, student assessment, etc...). We propose that Action team members are identified by the Campus Executives Teams and college-wide departments so that there is a wide pool of faculty and staff engaged in work across the College. We envision, too, that some Action teams may need to move to a standing committee rather than a closed timeline type group, depending on the scope of the project or work.
This model proposes that we move away from a top-down approach to identifying and accomplishing work across the College. Projects / work to be completed will be identified both at the campus level and at a college-wide level. The Collaborative Advisory Group will be a visioning group responsible for identifying immediate and future college-wide initiatives; Campus Executive Teams will make decisions affecting the campus. Campus Executive Teams will identify projects / Action Teams that support local needs and campus-based projects, but will also support college-wide projects / initiatives and action items. Campus-level projects commissioned by a Campus Executive Team and college-wide initiatives commissioned by VPs do not require approval by the Collaborative Advisory Group. The Collaborative Advisory Group will work with the Campus Executive Teams, existing councils, and VPs to support projects / work and inform decisions.

All groups will work together with the ultimate goal of serving the needs of the college. Clear lines of communication will exist between groups. The Collaborative Advisory Group will meet twice a month and focus on a one or two agenda items per meeting so the meetings are thoughtful and productive. This group will be responsible for communicating the work and providing the feedback loop on projects.

The President and the Board will still hold the final say on all matters affecting college-wide operations and functions, but we propose that the President trust the decisions of the Collaborative Advisory Group and its constituents.

We envision the new structure working like cogs where all teams are working together to inform decisions and accomplish goals supportive of Valencia’s mission. Each team will be accountable to one another and will not operate in isolation.

Summary

Collaborative Decision Making Progression Model

In this decision making model, the level/amount of engagement and collaboration flows from the originator of the plan being implemented and depends on the level of impact of the change on the college. The model starts with the set of plans developed within the college and its divisions/departments. For example, the College Strategic Plan, Campus Plans, Vice President Plans, Enrollment Plan, Department Plan, etc. When the leader begins to process for design and implementation, s/he considers the levels of impact of the change on: number of stakeholders, systems, resources needed.

There are 3 proposed levels for decision making:

1. With small scope of impact, the leader would initiate within their area without formal collaboration, but following general accepted practices of inclusion and engagement with those affected by the change;

2. With medium scope of impact, the leader would consult with appropriate formal groups to start with, such as the Instructional Affairs Committee (IAC), the Calendar and Scheduling Committee, the Faculty Association (If the change only affected faculty or needed initial consideration by only faculty);
3. With full scope of impact, the leader would submit a formal, written design plan (Plan to Plan) to the Initiative Consulting Group (ICG) for feedback and approval before starting the actual design. Once approved by the ICG (with edits as needed), the leader would follow the design plan and bring the recommendation from that work to the ICG again for approval or feedback on implementation. This level of work normally will then require submission to the Senior Team for approval and/or resource allocation. In some cases, the recommendation will also require District Board of Trustee approval (i.e. policy changes).

Some caveats:

- Deciding where to start with initiating new work would be a learning process for Valencia leaders. This would be conducted in a learning/consultation spirit, rather than one of judgment.
- Professional process consultation should be available to college leaders who wish to move plans forward, especially faculty leaders who are understandably new to these organizational processes and always will be given the brief tenure of their faculty leadership positions.
- Formal Collaborative Tools would be developed to support this model such as: Plan to Plan Template, Decision Making Timelines (particularly related to resources, compliance issues, academic cycles), Case Studies, Process design, decision making engagement strategies.

Design Principles:
1. The ICG would include: Campus Presidents, Vice Presidents, Chief Information Officer, 3 selected representatives from: Faculty, Deans (AA, AS and Dean of Students suggested), Career Staff, and Professional Staff. The selected representatives would serve for 2 year overlapping terms so there would be assistance in learning the process of the ICG.

2. The ICG will provide consultation and approval of design and implementation plans to college leaders on specific initiatives based on their organizational plans that have a wide impact on stakeholders, systems, and/or resources of the college. The ICG will review written Plan to Plan documents and provide feedback to ensure that high level of collaboration and engagement are included in the Plan in order to support the best decisions to improve the colleges’ success outcomes.

3. Members of the ICG will become familiar with collaborative decision making and the Plan to Plan process in order to positively contribute to the development of authentic collaborative college improvement plans sponsored by various college leaders. Members will review Plan to Plan proposals prior to the meeting and seek any additional information needed to fully participate prior to the meeting. In providing feedback and approval, members will represent their stakeholder point of view and consider overall college impact. To represent
their stakeholder point of view, members may rely on their own understanding or interactions with stakeholders, or seek formal stakeholder feedback, as appropriate in their judgment. Members will also be responsible for communicating the work of the ICG to the stakeholders they represent. Members may also serve as individual consultants to college leaders who are developing the Plan to Plan prior to submission to the ICG.

4. The ICG chair will receive and schedule Plan to Plan proposals from leaders so that no more than 2 or 3 proposals will be considered at each meeting. Meetings will be scheduled weekly at a designated day, time and place so that access is predictable to college leaders. The Chair will cancel meetings at least 4 days before the meeting if there are no Plan to Plan proposals to be considered that week. The ICG chair will work with the Senior Team Special Assistant to the President to coordinate the timing of decisions that will be recommended to Senior Team for consideration, as appropriate.

**Design Plan C**

**Summary**
This plan proposes creating a single, representative Steering Council that would create Action Teams to achieve a task or solve a problem.

The Steering Council would meet at least twice a month. They would consider what work needs to be done and create specific charges and scopes for Action Teams to follow. The Council would be comprised of certain members of the Senior Team and transitive representatives from deans, faculty, professional, and career staff.

The Action Teams would meet as needed. They would have a named primus to move the work forward, and membership of internal stakeholders closest to the particular work being undertaken. They would also have a sponsor—a member of the Steering Council who has the power to implement recommendations made by the Action Team. The Action Team’s first task would always be to create a ‘plan to plan’ and share it with the Steering Council before proceeding with work. Once the plan is approved, the work is implemented.

A Steering Council facilitator would keep track of the work being done by all Action Teams to ensure that work continued to progress, and reduce the chance of redundant initiatives. The facilitator would also help teams reflect on their plans, processes, and outcomes, so that both the Steering Council and Action Teams could learn from mistakes and build on successes of other teams.

The tasks that are assigned to Action Teams could come from a variety of sources. Some Action Teams might be formed to address an external challenge (e.g., new developmental education legislation) while others might coordinate work that is college-wide, but partly or wholly implemented at the campus level (e.g., the QEP or Service Learning). There would also be an open process whereby individuals or groups could suggest calls for action (e.g., to research options for a new program designed to help 3-prep students).
The Steering Council meetings would be open. There would be a regular process of communication when new Action Teams were formed, when Action Teams completed their plans, when plans were approved, and when work started and completed implementation. The Steering Council would have members of the Senior Team as needed, but we anticipate permanent members to be the campus presidents, an academic affairs rep, an student affairs rep, an HR rep, a rep from continuing education, and rep from finance, a rep from OIT, and a facilitator (sort of the current Senior Team role of Joan Tiller, but with a coordination component for the Action teams). It would also have transitive representatives from deans, faculty, professional, and career staff. The terms of these transitive members would be long enough to ensure continuity of work through the transitions. As an example, the faculty rep might serve a total of three years, with an “incoming” year on a partial release from teaching and the expectation that they will become oriented to Steering Council work and be assigned any long-term issues they should sponsor. This would be followed by a year in which they are the main faculty sponsor, working on full release to do Steering Council work. Finally, they would be on partial release again for an “outgoing year” and expected to finish or transition any work not complete. In this way, they might serve a three-year term while only being away from teaching for one year.

The Steering Council would try to assign work by consensus first, but would decide on a decision-making process (like voting) in case consensus is unsuccessful.

The Steering Council would create charges for Action Teams, defining the scope and purpose of work to be undertaken. The charge would also include the type of decision-making process (either command, consensus, vote or some other process) that would be used to approve the recommended decisions or plans that Action Team produced. The sponsor or primus would then form the Action Team and begin work on the plan to plan. These P2Ps would return to the Steering Council where it would be approved, amended or halted. If approved, the plan of work would begin, and the Action Team would transition to implementing the work, or in cases where the planning team is no longer needed, the Action Team would simply retire and their plan of work would move forward. It would be fine for the Steering Council or an Action Team to decide, after study and reflection, that the work may be handled through existing college processes or employees.

The Steering Council facilitator would work with the primus or sponsor to keep abreast of the work and get the plans and progress reported back out to the college on an ongoing basis. The Steering Council meetings would be open and have a transparent process for bringing calls to action to a team. There should be a central website listing work and offering opportunities for employees to volunteer for Action Teams. College-wide communication would go out when new Action Teams were formed, when Action Teams completed their plan-to-plans, when P2Ps were approved, and when work started and completed implementation. The facilitator would help keep track of any problems encountered during the planning or implementation of work and use that as an ongoing feedback loop to the Steering Council and Action Teams.

While the Steering Council Facilitator would be responsible for communicating progress in general terms, each action team’s primus would be responsible for reporting on the team’s progress college-wide.
Steering Council meetings will be open and represent a true collaboration between Senior Team members and dean, faculty and staff representatives who may influence the decisions of the Steering Council. This should cut down on the feeling that “real” decisions are made during closed Senior Team meetings.

Moreover, a single council will help eliminate redundancies in our current structure and help add clarity as to how to move work forward. We think there will be a higher level of broad participation, since the Action Teams will have specific charges and clear goals. There won’t be a need to “serve a term” on a Council without knowing what work you will be expected to do. The terms will now be shorter, more diverse and always action-oriented. Someone interested in working on a general education initiative will not need to commit to the broader scope of the Learning Council.

Decisions will be improved by reducing the line of work to a single line from Steering Council to Action Team to the college at-large. There will be a reduction in repeated presentations to multiple Councils and time saved by not having the same people serving on multiple Councils and committees.

We think the Senior Team would still meet to complete whatever business needs to be done outside the Steering Committee. They might be able to coordinate meetings to fall on the same day as SC so Senior Team members don’t have important meetings on two separate days.

We think the deans, Faculty Association, Professional Staff, and Career Staff will still need to address having college-wide meetings of their respective groups to address concerns outside of the Steering Council, and campus-based leadership teams will still meet to address campus-based issues.

**Design Plan D**

**Summary**

The shared governance process currently in place at Valencia has served the institution well for more than 10 years but needs to be rethought in light of institutional evolution, growth and reorganization.

In its current state, the shared governance process at Valencia does not adequately address the following:

- The newly established decentralized leadership structure and the desire for campus-based innovation.

- The tension between the work of governance in the development / articulation of strategic vision and the day-to-day demands of administrative decision-making.

- The challenges associated with the authentic engagement of stakeholders in the work of shared governance.
The proposed redesign of the current shared governance process at Valencia includes the following:

- Three Councils with a revised charge
  - Learning Council (establishes the strategic learning focus of the College)
  - Faculty Council (charge to be determined)
  - Planning Council (ensures the development and maintenance of an integrated strategic and operational planning process that integrates the College’s learning, technology, and staffing needs with the budget development process)

- Three Councils with a revised membership structure
  - Representation based on an institutional matrix that includes a consideration of role, reporting structure,
  - Appointed staff to support the work of the council (e.g., Institutional Research)
  - An appoint historian
  - Clearly establish terms of service (number of years, expectations for professional development to support council membership, expectations for communication)

- Three Councils with a coordinated annual planning process with the College President to ensure alignment with established institutional priorities.

- A clearly understood distinction between the broad “direction setting” role of governing councils and administrative responsibility for implementation.
  - For example, the Learning Council is responsible for commissioning work intended to establish a vision for Valencia’s work in the assessment of learning. The Learning Assessment Committee is an administrative tool for implementing the vision

**********
2. A Point of View and Discussion on College wide/ Campus ownership

Agreements (Principles of Engagement):
- Time is a resource all parties should support a culture of responsiveness
- Start with a mutual understanding of definitions
- The success of our students is paramount in all we do
- Trust is key
- College-wide provides big picture direction which allows for campus connection
- Identifying a common experience for students will help further define roles

Unanswered Questions:
- What is College-wide work?
- What is Campus based work?
- Where do final decisions lie with Campus Presidents or with Senior Team?
- Who can veto decisions? CW departments or Campus Presidents and why? Whose decision stands? How do we respect the decision?
- How are campus plans derived and at what point should CW departments get involved?
- Are decisions made in the department that the budget comes from?

Some examples:
- Continuing Education is a CW department that works with campuses for space, needs etc. but all decisions are typically made at the college-wide level.
- Libraries: Libraries are housed at each campus and there is some college wide coordination to insure that students have a common experience. Students have access to materials and services on all campuses.
- Student Services and OIT: Provides a common experience to students and staff at all campuses, but collaborates and the campus level through staff that are housed on each campus.
- Online Tutoring: currently there is no college wide plan for online tutoring, although it is funded through a college-wide budget and is seen as a tool, therefore if it adds to the students common experience, should it be treated as an opportunity for college-wide collaboration?

How work fits into each category: (not an exhaustive list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College-wide</th>
<th>Campus Based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy (college, State, DOE, etc.)</td>
<td>Implementation of program and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum (faculty decisions)</td>
<td>Scheduling/ Program and Course Offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR/Legal/Accounting, etc.</td>
<td>Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Word definitions:

**Governance** is the shared process by which a person may influence decisions at Valencia. It includes offering counsel, overseeing work, collaborating with colleagues, and acknowledging the authority of appropriate parties.

**Representation** is the valued expression of the perspectives or interests of constituents, either through a trustee or instructed delegate model, for the production of design or policy.

- Trustee model: the representative is charged to make the best decision given the information he or she has.
- Instructed delegate model: the representative is charged with gathering information from his or her constituency before weighing in.

**Collaboration** is a process of working together and embracing different perspectives that includes appropriate representatives or stakeholders to achieve a clear goal.

Principles of collaboration:
- The process by which the work proceeds should be clearly defined, including how participation will be encouraged and how communication will be accomplished.
- Representatives or stakeholders should be a diverse group with a broad view of college functions, specialized expertise, or closeness to the work.
- All participants should share their best ideas, but they must realize that the work is shared and all will advocate for the outcome that evolves from the work.

**Engagement** is an open and honest willingness to be informed, to inform others, to actively participate when needed, and to accept and trust the consequences of the outcome whether or not one participated.

**Accountability** is the establishment of individual and mutual ownership, responsibility, and obligation including partners and constituents who are willing and able to make decisions, take actions, and then convey and justify those decisions/actions.

Effective **communication** is the exchange of ideas, messages, and information between individuals and/or a group that considers not only the audience and purpose but also leads to understanding although not necessarily agreement. The sender and the receiver are both responsible for listening.

Note -- other words suggested at the retreat for future definition discussions: Ownership, Buy In, Conversation, Input, Consensus, Transparency, Timely, Campus-wide responsibility, College-wide responsibility, Success standards.
4. Values Definitions for Valencia College Shared Governance

**Integrity** is the expectation of a consistent adherence to ethical principles, methods and actions, which lead all constituents to feel decision making is honest, open and inclusive. The VC shared governance system should create a policy creation implementation tool that creates real solutions to actual problems that face a forward looking college.

**Courage** is the strength and determination to venture in new directions to achieve the goals of the college and to persevere in the face of discouragement. The VC shared governance system not only serves as an important institution for designing and implementing policy but also serves as a source of innovation at the college.

**Wisdom** is the accumulation of knowledge, insight and judgment needed to determine a course of action when making decisions and the realization that uncertainty plays a role in making difficult decisions. The VC shared governance system encourages a wide range of talent, interests and ideas that draws from the real strength of the college – the collective teaching and learning experiences of faculty, administration and staff.

**Trust** is the assurance that all constituencies can rely on each other to demonstrate integrity when decisions need to be made at the college. The VC shared governance model implies that decisions made are transparent and reflective of the input of college-wide interests. The system would not be seen as a vehicle for implementing policies that are narrowly supported by a small cadre of interests.

**Effectiveness** is the ability to use our best wisdom, talent and creativity to achieve the goals of the college in an efficient and timely manner. The VC shared governance system is a reliable structure for tackling a wide variety of interests and policy needs. The system would not be seen as unable to manage strategic policy implementation.

**Creativity/Innovation** is the ability of the college to join in bringing forth new solutions and ideas to campus and college-wide concerns and needs. The VC shared governance system encourages creativity and innovation by allowing for a wide range of perspectives to converge on policy creation.

**********

5. A Vision for Valencia Shared Governance

*Shared governance at Valencia is the collaborative process of the college making courageous, wise choices that moves our work forward. Using the strengths of diverse individuals and giving a voice to various constituencies, everyone contributes with good faith and effort, transparency and integrity.*

*The process articulates clear expectations, includes a timeframe, provides a communication plan, and allows for meaningful and efficient participation. The conclusions are trusted, accepted and respected by the entire college as the work of good people making the best decision possible at the time.*
6. **Naming Options for Shared Governance**
If not called Shared Governance, then...(new proposed names)

- **Entrusted Collaboration**: During the retreat there was much discussion about the importance of trust within this collaborative process as it relates to the those who are college representatives and the Board of Trustees who are involved in the task of making final decisions.

- **ITE Collaborative Leadership**: The idea for this label stems from the top three “Shared Governance” values identified at the retreat – Integrity, Trust, and Effectiveness.

- **Collaborative Governance**: The way the College is governed is an integral part of this discussion. Call it what it is – it is the structure in place to govern the college. Additionally, collaboration is the most important underpinning of this work.

- **Collaborative Decision-Making**: Various constituents are sharing in key decision-making processes. In order for the structure to be effective, the decisions must be made in a collaborative environment

*********

7. **Recommendations for Communications Plan for New Shared Governance Model**

**Goals and Objectives:**
The primary goal of this plan is to facilitate the greatest possible awareness of the purpose and structure of the new governance plan designed by and for the college. Other goals of communication of the plan include the following:

- Maximize employee support for the new model
- To allow all employees the opportunity to offer their thoughts on the development and deployment of the new model
- Address employee concerns/anxiety regarding transition away from the old model

Specifically, the following points should be clearly communicated to all college employees:

- Why a new structure seems necessary
- What role(s) different employee classes will play in the new structure
- How the new structure will be developed and decided upon
- How the new structure will improve the college’s ability to maximize student learning
- How the new structure will improve meaningful productivity and efficiency
- A timeline for development and implementation of the new governance structure

**Target Audience(s):**
Obviously, all college employees comprise the general target audience of communications about governance, though not all employee classes need to be part of all communications. At the very least, leadership of various employee groups (career staff, professional staff, faculty, administration) should be recipients of all communications, with the responsibility of sharing information and presenting constituent feedback.
Key Communication Messages:
The following ideas should be clearly and repeatedly presented to all stakeholders in the new governance model:

- How to share ideas/suggestions regarding the development of the new model
- Specific reasons why the old model wasn’t accomplishing the college’s work
- What role(s) different employee classes will play in the new structure
- How the new structure will be developed and decided upon
- How the new structure will improve the college’s ability to maximize student learning
- How the new structure will improve the college’s efficiency and productivity
- A timeline for development and implementation of the new governance structure
- What areas of college governance various employee groups (or their representatives) will be part of, and why
- All employees are encouraged to be part of the work and/or to share feedback regarding it, understanding that shared vision and compromise will be necessary in creating the best governance model. It must be communicated more than once that opportunities for feedback must be taken before decisions are made; after decisions are made, feedback may no longer be helpful or needed.

Communication Channels:
For a change of this magnitude, it’s wise to over-communicate, using as many methods of sharing information with college employees as possible. Such channels should include the following:

- Large announcements and timeline can be regularly communicated in The Juice and The Grove, and The Campus Concentrates.
- Direct e-mails to employee classes from their leadership representatives
- Face-to-face information/feedback meetings on each campus, led by people close to the development work (perhaps including those who attended governance retreat)
- Nominating certain “point people” who are close to the work who can be contacted by those looking for more information or wanting share feedback
- A governance redesign website on the Valencia page, preferably with a comments section; this website of course should be itself communicated/advertised through The Grove and through college-wide e-mail
- Qualtrix survey focused on feedback from specific employee groups’ feedback

Timing and Frequency:
The Grove already included an item on the Governance Redesign retreat, but a direct college-wide e-mail, sent before the fall academic term begins, would be a good way of ensuring that a full faith effort to communicate the beginning of this time-constrained work; such an e-mail also reduces the ability of any employee to suggest s/he was never informed of the existence of this work. Some mention of the work at the Academic Assembly would also be wise. After that, messaging through the channels mentioned in the section above should be frequent; the website should be updated as frequently as decisions are made, while e-mails and The Grove can update larger changes less frequently (perhaps bi-weekly).

Responsibility:
Overall responsibility for communication likely falls with the VP of Human Resources, though leadership of various employee constituencies should be responsible for facilitating
communicating to and from their groups. Having said this, ultimately if the changes are communicated thoroughly and frequently, each employee will be responsible for being as engaged in this work as s/he sees fit, with the clear knowledge that opting NOT to be involved in the work or sharing information works as a de facto agreement with the work being done.

Appendix – Flip Charts

Retreat Agenda
July 11 – 8:30-4:30
Morning – Establishing the “Common Core”

- Participants documented three key take-a-ways from the pre-survey and a ‘brainstorming naming board’ for possible new names for Shared Governance

- Amy Bosley welcomed and encouraged participants to consider this their process

- Mary conducted a ‘perceptions’ activity encouraging to think of what could be Rob McCaffrey shared top line summary from participant take-a-ways from pre-survey – see Appendix for the complete list:
  - broad-based involvement
  - transparency
  - clearly defined goals
  - increased pace
  - improved perceptions

- Understanding the needs of both college-wide and campus discussion – each group prepared and presented their work – see Appendix
  - We (College-wide / Campus) define success as...
  - The biggest challenges for us are...
  - The other group (College-wide / Campus) can help us by...
  - We can help (College-wide / Campus) by...
  - Shared Governance for us means...

- Words were selected for definition work by small groups
  - Collaboration
  - Representation
  - Communication
  - Governance
  - Engagement
  - Accountability

- Design Principles from the pre-survey were discussed – mentioned most often:
  - Membership selection - Stakeholder / representative involvement by all categories / classifications of employees, expertise, avoidance of repetition in group membership
- Clear Charge for each council - Focus, roles, purpose, direction, responsibilities, work plans, how decisions will be made, common vision, actual work done in smaller teams, Best decisions to be made, what is best for students and the college, decisions to advance and positively impact the vision, mission, goals and strategic plan of Valencia
- Membership behaviors - Recognizing that every voice has relevance, collaboration with an open mind, trust, accountability with decisions made, strong leadership, training for governance, models of collaboration to guide our work
- Clear communication - About councils, between councils, college-wide, broad and perpetual, transparency

- A values exercise was done for Shared Governance – selected values and (votes)
  - Integrity (15) – Words and deeds match up. I am who I am, no matter where I am or who I am with
  - Effectiveness (11) Executing with precision to achieve
  - Trust (9) - Firm reliance on the integrity, ability, or character of a person or thing
  - Courage (8) - The willingness to take calculated risks, step outside of one's comfort zone
  - Creativity / Innovation (7) - Thinking outside the box; trying new ways of accomplishing a goal
  - Wisdom (7) - Deep understanding, insight, and knowledge, the ability to make good judgments

Other values and vote totals:
Efficiency (6), Commitment (5), Accountable (5), Structure (4), Quality (3), Teamwork (1)

Afternoon – Visioning and Design Work
- Vision Casting – In three years, Shared Governance at Valencia College is...
  - Participants created individual statements - and key words and phrases were identified – see Appendix pg. for the complete list
- Shared Governance Redesign - Breakouts into groups to begin new design work
  - Preliminary design presentations with discussion
- Homework – to continue to refine the opportunities

July 12 – 8-Noon – Redesign and Next Steps Planning
- Discussion of overnight “ah-ha’s”
- Revise of word definitions based on feedback
- Design groups reconvened to refine proposals considering:
  - Design Principles: Membership Selection, Clear charge for each council, Membership Behaviors, Communication tone
  - How examples would run through the process: Online-learning and Elimination of application fee
  - How does their model build trust? How will their model help make better decisions? How will their model enable collaboration?

- Presentations and common themes discussion
Common themes for all models:
- A learning center position
- Plan to plan
- One overarching council
- The need for training
- Timelines and deliverables – action work flow
- Transparency
- The need for structure
- Differentiation between ‘day to day’ work and ‘big rocks’

- Two weeks task teams assigned to develop work and next steps were discussed

Participant takeaways from the Pre-Survey:
- Efficient outcomes - need to be timely that meet the needs of the institution
- Keep Shared Governance broad based group
- Improve communication and pace
- Discover a way to heighten its priority for everyone
- Ensure faculty / Administration / Staff collaboration
- Action / Decision time too slow
- Collaboration used a lot
- Lack of clarity and continuity
- Relevant expertise
- A wide range of experience with Shared Governance
- Many still seem to have a positive perception of Shared Governance
- Voice/input verses decision verses approval
- Need clear lines of communication
- Transparency
- Clearly defined roles and responsibilities
- Provides a logical framework
- Look for opportunities for synergy
- Most invitees responded to most questions
- Communicate often and broadly
- Better decisions
- Very different views of history
- Much agreement that decisions take too long
- Pessimism and low energy
- Most frequent example of when worked had clear, finite timeline / deadline and clearly defined expectations / boundaries / guidelines and when doesn’t work - work is commanded, progress is made, and then teams sent back to drawing board because proposal won’t work
- More decisions, better discussions, faster decisions
- 11 of 23 responses had no concern for this meeting - shows division of state of college
- Representation and focus
- Values - participants should feel their feedback and engagement is valued and actually plays a role in the decisions made
- Effectiveness / timeliness verses collaboration
• New design is need now
• New design needs to address the decentralized work flow model
• Input verses decisions
• Decision making verses decision verifying
• Slow processes
• Unsure of council charge
• Clearly define each council's purpose and work
• Confusion existing between Shared Governance and decentralization
• Trust in Shared Governance and clear transparent communication for Shared Governance Councils is needed
• Involving a broad variety of people in decision making - better decisions, creates transparency, builds trust
• Inclusiveness - the decision making process should be representative of the college community and diversity
• It is surprising how many people didn't know how the process works, but are sure it doesn't work

*********

Understanding the needs of both college-wide and campus discussion – each group prepared and presented their work

We (College-wide / Campus) define success as...
The biggest challenges for us are...
The other group (College-wide / Campus) can help us by...
We can help (College-wide / Campus) by...
Shared Governance for us means...

Campus Leaders Perspective:

Success
• Student Learning
• Gainful Employment for student
• Appropriate amount of collaboration
• Reasonable time frames for making decisions
• Clear decisions
• Purposeful connection between college wide and campus
• Simple, clear process
• Optimal use of resources
• Access for all

Challenges:
• Communication tension between campus and college wide based upon "ownership" or "specifically" of issue
• Splintered communication systems may distract focus on primary
• Differing philosophies on addressing issues
• Resources (facilities, staff, space, etc.)
• Bringing new people into the conversation; informing; orienting; on boarding ...
• Rarely on campus when I have to do college level work
• There is a certain amount of apathy and different perceptions of history. We never start at the same place. We never find this out until we are deep in a process.
• Rapid growth means all players can’t be in the room
• Major decisions aren’t put in writing (who communicates?)
• Interest and participation by all stake holders
• Less hoops to jump through
• Timely responses to questions (if we are ignored, is the answer yes?)
• Getting our culture together

College wide leaders can help us by:
• Help by being “single source of truth”
• Provide platforms to communicate (i.e. current developed meetings college wide, ccc website)
• Mind the academic calendar and pace
• Streamline processes for responding to campus requests
• Building a culture of responsiveness
• Decrease imposition on time “scheduled” off or other purposes
• More faculty to express what they want
• Strategic time for faculty to be engaged
• Proactive communication that prioritizes issues for dissemination
• Invite college wide leaders into the campus conversations
• Resource – “Big Picture” perspective
• Allow campuses to focus on campus work
• Provide campus specific data
• Cut down on last minute rush requests for information

How can we help College Wide?
• Be timely in our responses
• We need to have faculty/dean conversations so college wide doesn’t do double duty of holding meetings with us and with State.
• Invite college wide leaders to campus work meeting

Shared Governance for Campus Leaders Means:
• Misnomer
• Doesn’t mean governance; means something else very important and valuable, but it’s not governance
• Collaboration without necessarily getting exactly what you want
• Access to all information, input and how the discussion gets made
• Having a voice in the process
• Having influence on the decision that will be made
Clarity on how the decision will be made on each stage/issue; expectations are clear
Shared both on campus and throughout college
5 chiefs 1 Indian
Roles of stakeholders are clear
With every decision, know ahead of time if this is command, vote, consensus, etc.

**College Wide Leaders Perspective**

**Success**
- Getting the right things done and communicating effectively
- Participation- Facilitating the process
- Supporting Campuses- Vision, Mission work down to the level of student and staff learning
- Supporting College wide vision and work down to the level of student and staff learning
- Listening
- Leading/Leadership

**Challenges**
- Role of campus/college - sometimes ambiguous; roles are different on different campuses. This is brought into conversations at different times
- Sweet spot between leading and supporting
- Looking beyond your area: how do your decisions affect others?
- Providing consistent experiences for students, faculty and staff

**Campus Leaders Can Help Us**
- Agreeing to developing consistent processes
- Communicating campus based decisions back to college. Thinking back to how decisions might affect college wide areas.
- Engaging us in conversations about risk

**We can help campus leaders**
- By providing the bigger picture
- By developing and maintaining systems

**Shared Governance**
- Designing processes that allow for input and collaboration and move work forward
- Clarity about how decisions are made and communicate
- Ensuring that Valencia College processes are followed college wide
- Advocating for process
Participant vision statements - In three years, Shared Governance. . .

. . . helps us get things done in a transparent, efficient process.

. . . is a creative and collaborative process that capitalizes on the strengths of individuals to make good decisions and develop effective programs and practices.

. . . is a diverse representative collaborative process that provides knowledge and information for informed decision making.

. . . is a process we all support and believe in.

. . . is a collaborative process where trust and integrity bring forth open and honest communication to achieve a goal through engagement of appropriate representation which gives a voice to various constituencies.

. . . is an effective and collaborative process resulting in better decisions that moves our work forward.

. . . a collaborative process that helps management/administration make the best decisions.

. . . is a collaborative, inclusive and purposeful strategic method used to advise decision makers at Valencia.

. . . is a collaborative decision making process that involves all pertinent voices.

. . . a collaborative process to all represented groups.

. . . will gather the wisest appropriate input for, and promote the widest possible understanding of our decisions.

. . . an agreed upon process that utilizes collaboration to accomplish specific goals and decisions.

. . . a collaborative process that aids our decision making at the college.

. . . a commitment from colleagues to achieve a learning-centered outcome through informed collaboration and mutual understanding.

. . . is a model of collaborative decision-making, whereas various internal stakeholders come together to make decisions that will move the work of the college forward.

. . . continual work at leadership making courageous, wise choices where everyone contributes with good faith and good effort, and the conclusions are accepted and respected by the entire college as the work of good people making the best decision possible at the time.

. . . is collaborative and transparent, harnessing the collective expertise and experience of the Valencia community to best achieve college goals.
... a collaborative, clear and effective process that leads to great decisions about college priorities.

... a well-defined process understood by all that leads to desired results.

... a collaborative cross section of employee categories working together to help with the decision-making process at Valencia.

... an opportunity to achieve our mission through authentic collaboration and communication.

... a process by which all members of the college community have the opportunity (expectation?) to actively participate in the decision-making process; participants have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities, and the process articulates clear expectations regarding the desired outcomes, including timeframe, while allowing for meaningful and efficient participation.

... efficient and understood; everyone knows his/her roles and responsibilities in the process, and outcomes are achieved to move us towards our common goals.

... a system of policy design and implementation that incorporates perspectives and participation form a variety of college interests.

... trusted

... decision-making that addresses the needs and requirements of the institution and includes diverse collaboration from effected areas.

... a collaborative, accountable decision-making process involving all groups and individuals involved in the process.

... a proactive process that moves forward the mission of the college.

Vision Words chosen 5+ times by participants as inspiring:

- Actively Participate
- Trusted
- Authentic
- Commitment
- Courageous, wise choices
- Inclusive
- Proactive
- Trust and Integrity
- Strengths of individuals
- Efficient
- Transparent
- Collaborative process
Brainstorming Names -- If not called "Shared Governance" then...?
- Planning Advisory Councils / Teams / Groups
- Shared Representation
- Informed Collaboration
- Dynamic Partnership / Leadership
- Shared Design
- Voices for Valencia
- Collaborative... Structure, Engagement, Spirit, Decision Making, Influence, Governance
- College-Wide Collaborative  - Collaborative Decision Process