Shared Governance Review and Recommendations

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Shared governance offers Kingsborough Community College a way of living its values and achieving the mission, while also describing ways in which members of the college community can engage in institutional decision-making. Dr. Allison Buskirk-Cohen was selected to facilitate a review of shared governance at the institution. During the spring and summer of 2021, she evaluated perceptions of shared governance through focus groups, individual interviews, and surveys. At the start of the fall 2021 semester, a shared governance task force was developed, which included members of the student body, faculty, staff, and administration at Kingsborough Community College. A member of another CUNY college also participated in the task force, providing an external perspective. Throughout the fall semester, the task force met as a group and individually with members of the college community to formulate recommendation and gather feedback.

The recommendations to improve governance at Kingsborough are divided into two sections: modifications to College Council and additions to governance. Recommended modifications to College Council include holding monthly meetings; developing a charge, policies, and procedures for the Committee on Elections; developing a charge and filling the role of Parliamentarian; and expanding the charge of the Students Committee to be more holistic and to include seats for advisory staff. Recommended additions to governance include development of a Constitutional Committee and a Shared Governance Committee; limiting terms and multiple roles; and establishing a task force to examine benefits of a faculty-only governing body. These recommendations are described more fully in the main report.

Moving the recommendations from theoretical ideas to practical implementation will require additional work from the institutional community. Institutional challenges may make this work more difficult. The report describes how the campus climate; communication and decision-making; and low participation in the shared governance review process pose additional challenges. To meet them, the institution must prioritize creating a safe and supportive environment. Resources are provided to assist in this transition. Shifting the cultural environment is not an easy task, but one that will provide new opportunities for growth at the institution. The report also contains references and appendices with the survey results and comparisons of committees at other CUNY community colleges.

Throughout the review process, efforts have been made to be highly inclusive. Members of the student body, faculty, staff, and administration are acknowledged for their participation in the process, with gratitude towards the members of the shared governance task force: Lubie Grujicic-Alatriste, Judith Cohen, Jessica Corbin, Mary Dawson, Beth Douglas, Andres Escobar, Matthew Gartner, Diane Lake, Kwame Nyanin, Rick Repetti, Benjamin Stewart, and Paul Winnick.

<center>**Shared Governance Review and Recommendations**</center>

Conceptualizing Shared Governance

According to the Kingsborough Community College website, the institution "responds to the needs of its diverse community by offering high quality, affordable, innovative, student-centered programs of study that prepare graduates for transfer and the workforce. The college strives for equity and seeks to provide each student with the appropriate resources and supports to foster success." It lists the following values, as well:

> "Respect - Civility, acceptance, appreciation, and support of individual differences
> Diversity - The proactive fostering of greater inclusion and ultimately equity at every level of college life
> Integrity - Fair and ethical standards in all policies, procedures, and practices
> Excellence - High quality teaching, student services, administration, and community engagement; and high standards for student achievement
> Accountability - Taking responsibility for our actions and outcomes
> Innovation - Creative thinking and approaches that enhance learning and support continuous improvement".

Shared governance offers institutions a way of living their values and achieving their mission. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), American Council on Education (ACE), and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) jointly formulated the 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities. This statement on shared governance emphasizes shared responsibility among the different components of the institution. In its preliminary considerations, the statement notes that

> The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.

In October 2017, the Board of Directors of the AGB issued a statement on shared governance identifying key principles to help guide boards "to achieve and support healthy and high-functioning shared governance." The four principles include

1. Boards should commit to ensuring a broad understanding of shared governance and the value it offers an institution or system.
2. For shared governance to work, it must be based on a culture of meaningful engagement.
3. Shared governance requires a consistent commitment by institutional and board leaders.
4. Institutional policies that define shared governance should be reviewed periodically to ensure their currency and applicability.

<center>3</center>

The statement asserts that shared governance adds "substantial value to institutional progress and innovation" and that its effective implementation is "more important than ever." The AAUP's Committee on College and University Governance issued a formal commendation of the October 2017 statement. Recent surveys of higher education indicate that challenges exist in shared governance across institutions and can be addressed to strengthen the operations of institutions (e.g., AGB, 2016; AAUP, 2021).

The Review Process

The review of shared governance at Kingsborough Community College consisted of several steps. The consultant, Dr. Allison Buskirk-Cohen, collected and reviewed existing policies and practices related to shared governance at the institutions and its peers. During the spring and summer of 2021, she evaluated perceptions of shared governance at the institution. She conducted 15 focus groups and 12 individual interviews with members of the faculty, student body, staff, and administration.

The information gleaned in these discussions informed the development of survey items. Survey data was collected for each campus group, with a 20% response rate indicating a representative sample. Of the full-time faculty body (129 members), 99 people (almost 77%) responded to the survey, which met the threshold for a representative sample. Unfortunately, only 30 part-time faculty members and only 153 members of the study body responded to their surveys. According to Asif Hussain, Assistant Vice President/Chief Information Officer, 481 part-time faculty members and 8,146 students received survey links. The 6% response rate from the part-time faculty and the 2% response rate from the students do not meet the threshold for a representative sample. Fifty members of the staff and administration responded to a survey, as well. The total number of staff and administration members was not reported; thus, the results of that survey should be viewed as informational (though they may not be representative). Key themes and survey results were shared with members of the campus community through video updates.

At the start of the fall 2021 semester, a shared governance task force was developed. Members of the task force included the president of the student government association; one external member (who is a member of another CUNY college); three staff members (two HEO-series and one member of professional/clerical/support staff); five faculty members (the Chair of the Curriculum Committee; one current member of College Council; one faculty member with diversity, equity, and inclusion experience;, and two faculty members who do not serve as department chairs, program directors, etc.); and two members of administration. Members of the task force were asked to work together to review data on shared governance along with best practices to bring forward recommendations to the entire campus community.

Definition of Shared Governance

Immediately, the Shared Governance Task Force identified a key challenge for the campus community in terms of developing recommendations: the lack of a definition on shared governance. Without a shared definition, conversations often spiraled without direction since individuals held varying (and, at times, conflicting) meanings in their minds. As the task force engaged in these discussions, the Strategic Planning Committee at the institution was doing so as well. The Strategic Planning Committee stated:

Effective governance is grounded in an educational institution's capacity to engage in substantive, collaborative decision-making through structures that allow for widespread participation. When governance structures and systems work, there are transparent mechanisms that ensure accountability for institutional decision-making.

Planning is the component of governance that continuously engages the college and community in analyzing and responding to the internal and external environment. Through effective governance and planning, KCC can position itself strategically as a forward-thinking institution that effectively balances careful stewardship with focused innovation.

The Shared Governance Task Force identified opportunities to strengthen the definition. The definition ought to emphasize how shared governance promotes opportunities for faculty, professional staff, administration, and students to participate in meaningful decision-making at Kingsborough Community College. The task force recognized that not all ideas will be implemented under shared governance, and that decisions are not always determined by consensus. Rather, decision making varies by authority and responsibility, depending on the matter at hand. To guide its work, the shared governance task force used the following working definition:

Shared governance at Kingsborough Community College is a set of practices in making significant decisions concerning the operation of the college. It relies upon the relationships of mutual respect, trust, commitment to transparency, and a shared sense of purpose between faculty, administration, staff, and students at Kingsborough Community College.

Recommendations to Improve Shared Governance

Currently, the College Council operates as the main governing body at Kingsborough Community College. According to the institution's website:

The College Council is the governance body of Kingsborough Community College, comprised of elected representatives from full-time and part-time Instructional Faculty and Staff, Students, Support Staff, Administrators, and Alumni. The Council generally meets twice each semester to address the ongoing business of the College, formulate policy, and assess a wide range of performances and practices at the College. The participation of dedicated members of the campus community is crucial to the mission of the Council.

Unfortunately, perceptions of College Council held by members of the faculty, staff, and administration were negative, as measured by the surveys. It is important to note that 94 faculty members responded to the survey, while only 50 members of staff and administration responded. When provided with the statement, "Overall, College Council is functioning effectively," 54% of faculty indicated they *disagree* or *strongly disagree*. In contrast, only 30% of the surveyed members of staff and administration responded that way. Members of faculty, staff, and administration viewed the statement "College Council communicates priorities clearly" in a

similar fashion, with 54% of faculty indicating they *disagree* or *strongly disagree* and 42% of staff and administration selecting those responses. One of the clearest response patterns came from perceptions regarding leadership development. Many faculty members (53%) and members of staff and administration (64%) indicated that they do not perceive College Council as a body that cultivates new leaders regularly.

Recommended Modifications to College Council

Taking these findings into consideration and after reviewing governance structures at other CUNY community colleges, the task force recommends several modifications to improve the functioning of College Council:

More Frequent Meetings. The task force recommends monthly meetings of the College Council. Borough of Manhattan, Bronx, Guttman, Hostos, LaGuardia, and Queensborough community colleges have monthly meetings of their college-wide governing body during the academic semesters. More frequent meetings will allow College Council to operate more efficiently and effectively.

Committee on Elections. The College Council bylaws reference the Committee on Elections three times. Article III- Composition of the College Council bylaws, Section IIIg and Section IVj state that electronic balloting "shall be permitted, as determined and administered, by the Committee on Elections." Article VI states that "All elections shall be supervised by the Faculty-Student Committee on Elections. This shall also apply to faculty voting under Article I, Section II and Article VI. The committee shall be selected by the Legislative Committee." However, the general website for the College Council does not identify any members of the Committee on Elections, nor does it describe any procedures for this committee.

The task force recommends an appropriate charge be developed for this committee, along with full procedures and policies regarding the training and execution of electronic balloting. Multiple individuals should be identified by their position on the committee to be trained in running the software for electronic balloting. Potential conflicts of interest should be articulated with appropriate plans in place to manage them, and it may be appropriate for the Election Committee to collaborate with Human Resources. Training and succession plans should be developed. Furthermore, this information should be posted on the College Council website so that it is easily accessible for all members of the institution. Hostos, LaGuardia, and Borough of Manhattan community colleges have an elections committee as a standing committee in their college-wide senates.

Parliamentarian. Section IV- Organization of Council, Section III states, "The Council shall elect a Parliamentarian, who need not be a member of the Council. If he/she is not a member, he/she shall have all rights and privileges of Council membership, except the right to vote." As with the Election Committee, there is no additional information available through the College Council website identifying the individual in this role or responsibilities associated with it. A parliamentarian can facilitate guidance in all College Council operations, ensuring the policies and procedures are applied correctly and followed. The task force recommends the College Council first develop the charge for the Parliamentarian and educate the campus community about this role. (SUNY provides an excellent example of an educational resource.) Then, the task force recommends that College Council ask for names of those interested in the position so that the Council can elect a Parliamentarian. All information should be posted on the College Council website for community access.

Students Committee. Identified in Article V- Powers and Duties of Committees Section 1g, the Student Committee "shall be concerned with policy pertaining to student recruitment, admission, attendance, retention, discharge, discipline, counseling, academic standards, graduation, ceremonies, student health and other services; extra-curricular activities including athletics, as well as other activities relating to the students." The task force recommends adding language to the charge so that this committees supports a holistic view of student development and altering the composition of the committee to include seats available to advisory staff.

Recommended Additions to Governance

The task force also recommends several additions to the governance structure at Kingsborough Community College to enhance shared responsibility of the institution:

Constitutional Committee. A constitutional committee would examine College Council bylaws to ensure consistency and relevancy, and work with compliance/ legal personnel at the institution, as needed. It would examine committee structure in relation to the institution's mission and recommend revisions, as necessary. All committees should have specific charges along with their own operating procedures. This constitutional committee also would be tasked with reviewing and approving any modifications to the constitution and/or committee bylaws. It would be similar to the Committee on Committees at Hostos, LaGuardia, and Queensborough community colleges.

Shared Governance Committee. A shared governance committee would ensure that the work initiated by this task force continues and develops further to meet the needs of the institution. Its initial charge would be to develop and approve a shared governance definition for the institution. This committee also would be charged with providing onboarding training and on-going education on shared governance. It should identify opportunities that formalize training, including live trainings, mock sessions to practice Roberts Rules of Order, and recorded/filmed sessions.

Limiting Terms and Multiple Roles. Questions about term limits received strong response patterns on the surveys among members of the faculty body, staff, and administration. A majority of faculty members (76%) reported that they *agree* or *strongly agree* with the statement, "College Council members should have term limits." Many (63%) also selected *agree* or *strongly agree* for the statement, "Department chairs, directors, and other local positions should have term limits." (The staff and administration survey did not contain these items.) For the item, "People should not hold multiple roles within a committee, task force, or other body," 70% of the faculty and 64% of the staff and administration selected *agree* or *strongly agree.*

Term limits should be established for all service positions, including those that are selected or appointed, as a best practice. Doing so increases opportunities for more individuals to be included in service opportunities and increases shared responsibility across the institution. Furthermore, an opportunity that may be a good fit at one point in time for an individual may not be as time progresses. Depending on each particular position, it may be advisable to simply limit the number of consecutive terms a person may serve. This recommendation excludes positions covered under working conditions of existing contracts, such as department chairs.

Furthermore, it is recommended for all governing bodies to review their policies and practices to prevent and handle role conflict. At smaller institutions, it is not unusual for people to wear "multiple hats" and serve in a variety of capacities. However, when people hold multiple roles within a governing body, power dynamics may make it difficult, if not impossible, to

exercise fair and impartial judgement and behaviors. Human resources may be an appropriate resource for consultation in how to best manage multiple roles at the institution.

      Task Force for Faculty-Only Governing Body. A review of the CUNY bylaws and of Kingsborough survey results demonstrated conflicting information on a faculty-only governing body. Article VIII Organization and Duties of the Faculty, Section 8.10 University Faculty Senate states

> There shall be a university faculty senate, responsible, subject to the board, for the formulation of policy relating to the academic status, role, rights, and freedoms of the faculty, university level educational and instructional matters, and research and scholarly activities of university-wide import. The powers and duties of the university faculty senate shall not extend to areas or interests which fall exclusively within the domain of the faculty councils of the constituent units of the university. Consistent with the powers of the board in accordance with the education law and the bylaws of the board, the university faculty senate shall make its own bylaws providing for the election of its own officers, the establishment of its own rules and procedures for the election of senators, for its internal administration and for such other matters as is necessary for its continuing operations.

      However, Section 8.11 College Governance Plans states, "The provisions in duly adopted college governance plans shall supersede any inconsistent provisions contained in this article." A brief comparison of other community colleges within the CUNY system shows various systems in place. The Borough of Manhattan, Bronx, and LaGuardia community colleges have college-wide governing bodies and faculty-only governing bodies. Both Hostos and Queensborough community college have college-wide governing bodies with faculty-specific committees. Thus, the CUNY system seems to encourage the development of unique governance bodies at each individual institution.

      Survey results were mixed regarding the creation of a faculty-only governing body. When provided with the statement, "A faculty Senate (or other faculty-only governing) body would improve governance at KBCC," 36% of staff and administration responded with *disagree* or *strongly disagree*. The same percent responded with *no opinion*. In contrast, 64% of faculty responded with *agree* or *strongly agree*.

      It is also important to note that 73% faculty members reported they *agree* or *strongly agree* with the statement, "The faculty has an appropriate degree of autonomy with regard to teaching and learning responsibilities." The AAUP's 1966 Statement describes shared responsibilities in governance and identifies the faculty voice as being authoritative in academic areas. While it is only one statement, the survey results suggest that faculty do feel their academic role is strong at the institution.

      Thus, the recommendation is for the creation of a specific task force charged with exploring the creation of a faculty-only governing body at Kingsborough. As part of their charge, this task force should address whether such a body would be part College Council or adjacent to it. Also, the task force should address how this body would differ from the curriculum committee and other academic committees that currently exist, and the purpose a faculty-only governing body would serve.

Challenges to Shared Governance

Campus Climate

Survey responses to items assessing views of campus climate demonstrate a split in perceptions. Just over half of those surveyed (51% of faculty, 54% of staff and administration) reported they *disagree* or *strongly disagree* with the statement, "Overall, the campus climate fosters success for the KBCC community." More members faculty body (58%) reported that they *agree* or *strongly agree* the statement, "Sharing opinions (even when they differ) is encouraged on campus" than did members of staff or administration (47%). A larger percentage of faculty (65%) compared to staff and administration (52%) also reported they *disagree* or *strongly disagree* with the statement, "Campus climate does not promote trust." Finally, more faculty (60%) than staff and administration (47%) reported they *disagree* or *strongly disagree* with the statement, "Campus climate does not promote civil discourse." The final item on campus was altered slightly for the campus groups. In the faculty survey, 54% reported they *agree* or *strongly agree* with the statement, "Concerns expressed by faculty are not taken seriously." Among members of the staff and administration, 64% reported they *agree* or *strongly agree* with the statement, "Concerns expressed by staff are not taken seriously." Efforts to better understand these perceptions and how to improve them are of vital importance. Taken as a whole, this data suggests that the institution's values of Respect ("civility, acceptance, appreciation, and support of individual differences") and Diversity ("the proactive fostering of greater inclusion and ultimately equity at every level of college life") are not fully realized. The data also can be seen as providing a baseline for perceptions. Follow-up surveys can evaluate how the campus climate changes over time.

Communication and Decision-Making

Overall, survey results indicate that members of the campus community are not satisfied with communication and decision-making. A majority of the members of the faculty body (65%) and the staff and administration (66%) reported they *disagree* or *strongly disagree* with the statement, "Overall, communication and decision-making are functioning effectively." Furthermore, a majority of the faculty (53%) and of the staff and administration (66%) reported that they *disagree* or *strongly disagree* with the statement, "Leadership seeks meaningful faculty/staff input on decisions." Some survey items were worded in the negative to ensure respondents read items carefully. Results show that 57% faculty members and 54% of staff and administration *agree* or *strongly agree* with the statement, "Faculty and administration do not have an open system of communication." Similarly, 49% of faculty and 64% of staff and administration reported they *agree* or *strongly agree* with the statement, "Faculty and administration do not discuss difficult issues in good faith." Finally, when asked to rate the statement, "Administration does not communicate rationale for important decisions," 57% of faculty and 56% of staff and administration indicated they *agree* or *strongly agree*. As with the findings on campus climate, the findings on communication and decision-making suggest institutional values are not being met. Specifically, survey results indicate problems with the values of Excellent ("high quality teaching, student services, administration, and community engagement") and Accountability ("taking responsibility for our actions and outcomes"). Again, the data also can be seen as providing a baseline for perceptions. Follow-up surveys can evaluate how the perceptions of communication and decision-making changes over time.

Low Participation

Participation rates in the shared governance review were lower than anticipated. Focus groups had strong representation from members of the faculty, staff, and administration. However, there were not many students who participated (n=3). Also, as stated earlier, there were not enough students who responded to the survey link for it to be considered a representative sample. Of those faculty members who responded to the survey, 70% indicated they *agree* or *strongly agree* with the statement, "I want to actively participate in changes to improve shared governance at KBCC." The percentage was lower among members of the staff and administration, but still positive with 52% reporting they *agree* or *strongly agree* with that statement. Unfortunately, regarding office hours, there were low levels of participation from students, faculty, staff, and administration. Shared governance task force members help office hours on a bi-weekly basis. Times varied along with format (virtual and in-person), and an email reminder was sent regularly with contact information. Despite these efforts, only about 20 people attended office hours across the entire fall 2021 semester. The low participation across the institution is worrisome and poses challenges for implementing the recommendations proposed in this report.

Meeting These Challenges

The goals of this review were to document current practices and identify how these practices could be enhanced to improve shared governance at Kingsborough Community College. Review of documents; surveys, focus groups, and individual meetings with campus community members; and conversations with the task force provided different perspectives on the state of governance at the institution. The recommendations to improve shared governance are general, given the broad scope of the original review goals. Many of them may require additional work to put them into practice. Operationalization may be needed along with modification and/or expansion of recommendations. Moving from theoretical ideas to practical implementation undoubtable can be difficult. The institution will need to educate and provide support to its community members.

To meet these challenges, Kingsborough Community College must prioritize creating a safe and supportive environment. Put simply, it must function as a high-performing team. Amy Edmondson's work on team psychological safety may serve as a helpful resource. Team psychological safety, the "shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk taking" (Edmondson, 1999, p. 354) is required for team high-performance. It "involves but goes beyond interpersonal trust; it describes a team climate characterized by interpersonal trust and mutual respect in which people are comfortable being themselves" (Edmondson, 1999, p. 354). Her recent book, The Fearless Organization: Creating Psychological Safety in the Workplace for Learning, Innovation and Growth (2019) offers a practical guide to creating psychological safety within organizations. Shifting the cultural environment is not an easy task, but one that will provide new opportunities for growth at the institution.

References

American Association of University Professors (2021, July). The 2021 AAUP Shared Governance Survey: Findings on Faculty Roles by Decision-Making Areas. Retrieved from: https://www.aaup.org/report/2021-aaup-shared-governance-survey-findings-faculty-roles-decision-making-areas

American Association of University Professors (n.d.). Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from: https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities

Association of Governing Boards (AGB). (2016). "Shared Governance: Is OK Good Enough?" Association of Governing Boards. Retrieved from: https://agb.org/reports-2/shared-governance-is-ok-good-enough/

Association of Governing Boards (AGB). (n.d.). Board Fundamentals: Shared Governance. Retrieved from: https://agb.org/knowledge-center/board-fundamentals/shared-governance/

Cramer, S.F., Faller, M., Gellin, S., Rosen-Brand, A. (2020). Becoming and Being a SUNY Parliamentarian: A resource guide for SUNY campus parliamentarians. Retrieved from: https://system.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/fccc/ParliamentarianResourceGuide2020.pdf

CUNY Bylaws. (n.d.) ARTICLE VIII ORGANIZATION AND DUTIES OF THE FACULTY. Retrieved from: https://policy.cuny.edu/bylaws/article-viii/#section_8.11.

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative science quarterly, 44, 2,* 350-383.

Edmondson, A. (2019). The Fearless Organization: Creating Psychological Safety in the Workplace for Learning, Innovation, and Growth. *Wiley.*

KCC College Council Constitution and Bylaws Revised Version – April 2018. (2018). Retrieved from: https://www.kbcc.cuny.edu/college_council/documents/college_council_constitution.pdf

Tiede, H-J. (n.d.). AAUP Committee Commends AGB Governance Statement. Retrieved from: https://www.aaup.org/article/aaup-committee-commends-agb-governance-statement#.YbUhyJHMJPZ

Appendix A. Faculty Survey Results

Campus Climate Items	Does Not Apply/ No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall, the campus climate fosters success for the KBCC community.	6	28	21	31	8
Sharing opinions (even when they differ) is encouraged on campus.	7	27	28	25	8
Campus climate does not promote trust.	4	14	15	33	27
Campus climate does not promote civil discourse.	6	15	17	32	25
Concerns expressed by faculty are not taken seriously.	8	11	24	28	23
Administrative Communication and Decision-Making Items	Does Not Apply/ No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall, communication and decision-making are functioning effectively.	8	31	31	21	4
Administration seeks meaningful faculty input on decisions.	11	23	27	25	9
The faculty has an appropriate degree of autonomy with regard to teaching and learning responsibilities.	7	8	10	51	18
Faculty and administration do not have an open system of communication.	8	10	23	39	15
Faculty and administration do not discuss difficult issues in good faith.	16	12	20	27	20
Administration does not communicate rationale for important decisions.	5	8	28	41	13

Departmental Shared Governance Items	Does Not Apply/ No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall, my department is functioning effectively.	2	11	15	40	26
My department chair does not demonstrate favoritism.	5	12	12	34	31
My department chair communicates priorities clearly.	4	12	4	43	31
My department chair does not support adaptation to change.	6	39	32	7	10
My department chair does not ensure diverse faculty input.	9	36	31	7	11
My department chair does not cultivate new faculty leaders regularly.	14	34	24	9	13
College Council Shared Governance Items	Does Not Apply/ No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall, College Council is functioning effectively.	20	33	18	19	4
College Council does not demonstrate favoritism.	30	34	11	11	8
College Council communicates priorities clearly.	18	34	17	20	5
College Council does not support adaptation to change.	22	8	19	22	23
College Council does not ensure diverse faculty input.	22	13	17	18	24
College Council does not cultivate new faculty leaders regularly.	22	7	14	21	29

Items on Potential Changes	Does Not Apply/ No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Department chairs, directors, & other local positions should have term limits.	8	11	15	24	36
College Council members should have term limits.	12	5	6	30	41
A faculty Senate (or other faculty-only governing) body would improve governance at KBCC.	15	9	6	27	37
Establishing a formal mentorship model for training faculty leaders would improve governance at KBCC.	13	2	5	42	32
People should not hold multiple roles within a committee, task force, or other body.	9	7	12	30	36
I want to actively participate in changes to improve shared governance at KBCC.	21	3	4	34	32

Appendix B. Staff & Administration Survey Results

Campus Climate Items	Does Not Apply/ No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall, the campus climate fosters success for the KBCC community.	3	10	10	19	8
The campus climate promotes diversity of ideas.	2	9	15	17	7
Sharing opinions (even when they differ) is encouraged on campus.	2	7	17	15	8
The campus climate does not promote trust.	3	9	12	15	11
The campus climate does not promote civil discourse.	7	8	15	15	4
Concerns expressed by staff are not taken seriously.	4	4	10	20	12
Communication and Decision-Making Items	Does Not Apply/ No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall, communication and decision-making are functioning effectively.	3	11	22	11	3
Leadership seeks meaningful staff input on decisions.	4	14	19	8	5
Members of the campus community do not have an open system of communication.	3	5	15	17	10
Members of the campus community do not discuss difficult issues in good faith.	3	4	11	23	9
Leadership does not communicate rationale for important decisions.	6	3	13	16	12

College Council Shared Governance Items	Does Not Apply/ No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall, College Council is functioning effectively.	15	7	8	17	3
College Council does not demonstrate favoritism.	18	6	12	12	2
College Council communicates priorities clearly.	14	6	15	12	2
College Council does not support adaptation to change.	21	3	13	8	5
College Council does not ensure diverse input.	17	2	14	13	4
College Council does not cultivate new leaders regularly.	14	1	1	19	13
College Council members should have term limits.	15	2	1	19	13
Items on Potential Changes	Does Not Apply/ No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
A faculty Senate (or other faculty-only governing body) would improve governance at KBCC.	18	6	12	10	4
Establishing a formal mentorship model for training leaders would improve governance at KBCC.	7	1	3	24	15
People should not hold multiple roles within a committee, task force, or other body.	8	4	6	16	16
I want to actively participate in changes to improve shared governance at KBCC.	17	3	4	16	10

Appendix C. Comparison of Elections Committees

Elections Committee at Hostos Community College
Retrieved from: https://www.hostos.cuny.edu/Administrative-Offices/College-Wide-Senate/Standing-Committees/Elections-Committee
A. Membership:
Membership will be chosen by the Committee on Committees.
B. Function:
1. To develop and recommend procedures for elections pertaining to the Senate that are otherwise not described in this Charter.
2. To implement those election procedures approved by the Senate.

Elections Committee at LaGuardia Community College
Retrieved from: https://www.laguardia.edu/senate/
The Committee on Elections shall recommend to the Senate procedures for all Senate-related elections held in the College and shall supervise those elections. Should the need arise, the Committee shall receive and hear grievances relating to elections, and shall make appropriate recommendations to the Executive Committee. The Committee should be composed of members recommended by the Committee on Committees. There shall be at least one student member of this Committee who is not a candidate for membership on the Senate.

Elections Committee at Borough of Manhattan Community College
Retrieved from: https://www.bmcc.cuny.edu/wp-content/uploads/ported/faculty-staff/governance_plan_2010.pdf
The Elections Committee consists of five members elected by the Senate. This committee certifies the procedures and results of all Academic Senate and College Council balloting, nominations, and elections.

Appendix D. Comparison of Committee on Committees

Committee on Committee at Hostos Community College
Retrieved from: https://www.hostos.cuny.edu/Administrative-Offices/College-Wide-Senate/Standing-Committees/Committee-on-Committees
A. Membership:
1. The Committee on Committees shall be composed of nine (9) Senate members, including two (2) student members and one (1) member from the non-teaching instructional staff, elected by the members of the Senate.
2. Student members will be elected every year at the first meeting of the Senate. Other members will be elected at the first meeting of each newly formed Senate.

B. Function:
1. To assign members from different College constituencies to the specific Senate standing committees before the second meeting of the Senate for the academic year.
2. To determine the number of members to be assigned to each committee, unless otherwise specified in the Charter of Governance.
3. To advise all Senate Committees in the development of internal operating procedures and to submit these procedures to the Senate for approval.
4. To consider and resolve issues relating to membership status and replacement of any committee member.
5. To disseminate information about opportunities for service on all standing and ad-hoc committees.
6. To maintain current lists of membership in all Senate Committees.
7. To maintain a file of the minutes of all Standing Committee meetings.

Committee on Committees at LaGuardia Community College
Retrieved from: https://www.laguardia.edu/senate/
The Committee of Committees shall be elected from among the members of the College Senate. The Committee shall be comprised of seven members, including a minimum of two students, elected after nomination from the floor. Tie votes shall be resolved by the Chairperson of the College Senate. The Committee shall meet immediately after the Senate meeting in which the members were elected to elect a Chairperson. Each year the Committee shall recommend to the College Senate individuals to fill vacancies on the Standing Committees in accordance with the guidelines specified in this document or the bylaws. The Committee shall have responsibility for nominating members of Ad Hoc or Special Committees as they may be created by the Senate.

Committee on Committees at Queensborough Community College
Retrieved from: https://www.qcc.cuny.edu/governance/academicsenate/coc/index.html
There shall be a Committee on Committees elected by the Academic Senate to draw up a proposed list of Committees to be presented for adoption to the Academic Senate. This Committee shall also be responsible for the nominations and elections to such Committees as established by the Senate. However, nominations and elections for the Steering Committee of the Senate and for the Committee on Committees shall be conducted directly from the floor at the duly convened May meeting of the Senate.

Section 8. Committee on Committees.
Organization

1. The Committee on Committees shall consist of nine (9) persons. These persons shall be voting faculty as defined in Article IV of the Bylaws of the Faculty.
2. Only one member from any department may serve at any time on the Committee on Committees. In an election where more than one member from a department is elected, the person having the most votes shall be eligible to serve. The other will then be automatically deemed ineligible. In the case of a tie, a run-off will be conducted. A hiatus equal to the number of years of service must exist between terms for a person re-elected to the Committee on Committees.
3. Nominations and elections for the Committee on Committees shall be conducted directly from the floor at the duly convened May meeting of the Senate except in the case of the first Senate body.
4. Except as provided in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection d, the term of office of each member of the Committee on Committees shall be three years commencing from the time of his or her election. For the first committee, however, the members shall be elected and serve as follows:
5. The nine (9) individuals receiving the greatest number of votes shall be deemed elected;
6. Of the nine (9) individuals elected to the committee, the three (3) receiving the greatest number of votes shall serve for a term of three (3) years; the three (3) receiving the next three (3) highest number of votes shall serve for a term of two (2) years; and the three (3) receiving the fewest number of votes shall serve for a term of one (1) year.
7. A person elected to fill an unexpired term shall serve only to the end of the term to which he/she was elected to complete.

The Committee on Committees shall:

1. Prepare a list of committees, their structures and functions for adoption by the Academic Senate.
2. Present to the Senate a slate of all nominations to standing committees, including those nominated by petition.
3. Fill all vacancies on standing committees other than the Committee on Committees which occur between annual elections and report all such actions to the Senate at the meeting immediately following such action.
4. Conduct the election of members at large to the Academic Senate as provided hereinafter.
5. Conduct any other election as requested by the Steering Committee or the Faculty Executive Committee.
6. Review and report on the operations of all of the committees of the Academic Senate.
7. Advise and provide assistance to committees in the mechanics of committee operations.
8. Designate a member(s) of the Committee on Committees as liaison(s) with Academic Senate committees.
9. Receive and report on suggestions to establish or terminate committees of the Academic Senate.