



**COSUMNES**  
RIVER COLLEGE

## **2019-2020 Participatory Governance Committee Survey Summary**

**Office of Equity, Institutional Effectiveness & Innovation**

Summer, 2020

Author:

Paul Mainz, IT Business/Tech Analyst

## Background

At the end of the 2019-2020 academic year, the Office of Equity, Institutional Effectiveness, and Innovation surveyed members of 11 participatory governance (PG) committees – Resource Committee, Institutional Effectiveness (IE), Cultural Competence & Equity (CC&E), Curriculum Committee, Distance Education & Information Technology (DEIT), Foundations for Academic Success (FASC), Health, Safety, and Facilities (HSF), Student Success & Equity (SSE), Student Learning & Instructional Support (SLIS), Professional Development (PD), and Participatory Governance Council (PGC). This report summarizes the findings from this survey.

## Method

Each member of a participatory governance committee was emailed a personalized link to the PG survey. They were asked to indicate their constituency group and their 2019-2020 PG committee participation. After these initial questions, they were asked to rate their agreement with eleven statements describing prototypically positive features of a committee (*Table 4*). High agreement with these statements would indicate a good committee experience. Each participant was also asked to indicate what each committee did well, what challenges were overcome, and what challenges need to be addressed. *Due to extremely small sample sizes, and for the purposes of anonymity, the last three questions are not summarized here. These responses can be discussed with committees upon request. Additionally, the findings for SLIS are not summarized here because too few respondents completed the survey from this committee.*

## Summary

1. 40.3% of contacted individuals (52 out of 129) completed a survey. Faculty constituted half (50%) of the respondents (*Table 1*, page 2).
2. In general, agreement with each statement was high across committees. In no circumstance did surveyed committee members disagree on average with a statement.
3. The Curriculum and DEIT committees had the highest member ratings across all eleven questions.
  - a. Curriculum rated the highest or tied for the highest participant ratings on four out of eleven questions, and DEIT rated or tied for six out of eleven. These areas can be found in *Table 4* (page 4).
4. The Resources Committee scored (or tied for) the lowest ratings among committee members in five out of eleven areas. However, in half of these areas, the ratings were accompanied by high variability in responses (as measured by standard deviation in ratings; *Table 4*; page 4). It is also worth noting that the response rate was relatively low for the Resources Committee.

## Limitations

The small (and perhaps expectable) sample sizes limits our ability to draw conclusions from the PG survey. In many cases, respondents may not represent the viewpoints of committee members as a whole. For this reason, it was difficult to draw general themes from any written comment or response. Additionally, acquiescence bias – the tendency to agree – may have inflated committee ratings due to the way questions were phrased.

### **Recommendations**

Tri-chairs of each committee should review the findings here, identify areas of improvement for the committee to follow-up on, and discuss how processes can be further improved. Additionally, areas that had high variability in ratings (e.g., high standard deviations), may also warrant further consideration, as this may indicate conflict in beliefs about the committee.

## Participants

A total of 129 faculty, staff, and administrators were contacted for participation. After two weeks, 52 individuals completed the survey, a response rate of 40.3%. A breakdown of participation by constituency group can be found below (*Table 1*) and the number of respondents by committee can be found in *Table 2*. Note that sample sizes were small for each committee. Faculty provided half (50.0%) of the responses to the Participatory Governance Survey.

*Table 1. Response by Constituency Group*

Position at CRC	%	Headcount
Faculty	50.0%	26
Classified	36.5%	19
Administrator	13.5%	7
<b>Total</b>		<b>52</b>

*Table 2. Respondents by Committee*

PGC Committee	Respondents
CC&E	2
Curriculum	8
DEIT	8
FASC	3
HSF	4
IE	7
PD	7
PGC	8
Resource	5
SSE	3

## Analysis of Responses by Committee

Participants on each committee rated their agreement with eleven statements (see *Table 4* below for the list of questions) on a five point scale (*Table 3* below). Note that the second statement of the survey (“The mission of the college and its strategic goals serve as the foundation for the work of the committee”) did not have a neutral rating option. For the purposes of analysis, statements of agreement or disagreement were assigned values of 1-5 (5 = *Strongly Agree*, 1 = *Strongly Disagree*).

*Table 3. Agreement Scale*

Rating	Value
Strongly Agree	5
Agree	4
Neutral	3
Disagree	2
Strongly Disagree	1

The average agreement (5 = *Strongly Agree*, 1 = *Strongly Disagree*) with each of the eleven statements was calculated for each committee. These averages can be found in *Table 4* below. For each question, the highest and lowest average rating is highlighted in green or red, respectively. In addition to average agreement, the standard deviation in agreement rating was calculated in order to measure how much a particular rating varied from person to person on average. In this case, a large standard deviation might indicate a lack of consensus, whereas a low standard deviation would indicate a high level of consensus among members. These standard deviations are presented in parentheses below each average.

The DEIT Committee had the highest average agreement on six of eleven statements (*Table 4*): “The committee’s charge accurately reflects the work of the committee”; “The mission of the college and its strategic goals serve as the foundation for the work of the committee”; “The committee and decisions are data driven”; “The discussions that take place address substantive issues”; “The committee’s recommendations reflect effective decision-making processes”; and “Committee members and participants feel free to discuss difficult issues honestly”. Moreover, Curriculum also had a high level of agreement with the statements – rating (or tying for) the highest in four areas: “The committee ensures all those assigned with tasks are involved in the discussion”; “The committee’s recommendations reflect effective decision-making processes”; “Committee members and participants feel free to discuss difficult issues honestly”; and “The planning process on this committee is as efficient as possible given the need to include all stakeholders”.

Additionally, PD and IE tied with DEIT for the highest rating on the statement “The mission of the college and its strategic goals serve as the foundation for the work of the committee”. These ratings were accompanied by zero disagreement by respondents (a standard deviation of zero). PGC tied for the highest rating for two statements: “The committee’s recommendations reflect effective decision-making processes” and “Committee members and participants feel free to discuss difficult issues honestly”. Finally, IE rated the highest in the last two statements: “My participation on the committee matters” and “I regularly share what I learn at the committee meetings with others in my unit/department/constituency group”.

Finally, the Resource committee rated the lowest in agreement in five areas. However, it is important to note that three of these areas had standard deviations above 1. This means that, on average, committee members disagreed with each other by one point – a relatively high level of disagreement.

*Table 3. Average Rating (and Standard Deviation) by Committee (1 - Strongly Disagree, 5 - Strongly Agree) - 2019 -2020*

Question	CC&E	Curr.	DEIT	FASC	HSF	IE	PD	PGC	Res.	SSE
The committee's charge accurately reflects the work of the committee.	4 (0)	4 (1.32)	4.88 (0.33)	4 (0.82)	3.25 (1.3)	4.71 (0.45)	4.86 (0.35)	4.5 (0.71)	4.2 (0.75)	3.67 (0.47)
The mission of the college and its strategic goals serve as the foundation for the work of the committee.	4.5 (0.5)	4.63 (0.48)	5 (0)	4.67 (0.47)	4 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	4.86 (0.35)	4 (1.1)	4.33 (0.47)

The committee and decisions are data driven.	4 (0)	4.57 (0.49)	4.63 (0.48)	3.33 (0.47)	4 (0)	4.57 (0.49)	4.29 (0.45)	4.38 (0.48)	4 (0.71)	4 (0.82)
This committee ensures all those assigned with tasks are involved in the discussion.	4 (0)	4.88 (0.33)	4.75 (0.43)	4.33 (0.47)	4.5 (0.5)	4.43 (0.49)	4.29 (0.45)	4.5 (0.5)	4 (0.63)	4.33 (0.47)
The discussions that take place address substantive issues.	4 (0)	4.86 (0.35)	4.88 (0.33)	4 (0.82)	4.25 (0.43)	4.29 (0.7)	4.57 (0.49)	4.63 (0.48)	3.6 (1.02)	4 (0)
The committee's recommendations reflect effective decision-making processes.	4 (0)	4.75 (0.43)	4.75 (0.66)	3.5 (0.5)	4.25 (0.43)	4.43 (0.49)	4.43 (0.49)	4.75 (0.43)	3.6 (1.02)	3.67 (0.47)
Committee members and participants feel free to discuss difficult issues honestly.	4.5 (0.5)	4.5 (0.71)	4.75 (0.43)	5 (0)	4.5 (0.5)	4.71 (0.45)	4.29 (0.7)	4.75 (0.43)	4.2 (0.4)	4.33 (0.47)
Committee members and participants in meeting discussions are sufficiently prepared and make effective recommendations.	4.5 (0.5)	4.75 (0.43)	4.63 (0.48)	3.5 (0.5)	3.75 (0.43)	4.14 (0.83)	4.29 (0.45)	4.38 (0.7)	3.4 (0.8)	3.33 (0.47)
The planning process on this committee is as efficient as possible given the need to include all stakeholders	4 (0)	4.63 (0.7)	4.5 (0.71)	4 (1)	3.75 (0.43)	4.43 (0.49)	4.29 (0.45)	4.5 (0.5)	3 (1.26)	4 (0.82)
My participation on the committee matters.	4.5 (0.5)	4.5 (0.5)	4.38 (0.7)	4 (0)	4.25 (0.43)	4.71 (0.45)	4.29 (1.03)	4.38 (0.48)	3.8 (0.4)	3.67 (0.47)
I regularly share what I learn at the committee meetings with others in my unit/department/constituency group.	4.5 (0.5)	4.25 (0.66)	4.38 (0.7)	4 (0)	4 (0.71)	4.43 (0.49)	4 (0)	4.14 (0.99)	4.2 (0.4)	4 (0)
<b>N Responses</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>

*Note.* For each question, the highest and lowest ratings are highlighted in green and red, respectively.