GOVERNANCE SURVEY RESULTS SPRING 2022

SURVEY RESPONSE MAKEUP

A total of 257 faculty, classified professionals and administrators participated in the 2022 Governance Survey. Students from student leadership positions were also invited to participate, but none responded.

Group	n	% of Total Responses
Administrators	15	6%
Full-Time Faculty	98	38%
Associate Faculty	43	17%
Classified Professionals	101	39%
Students	0	0%

OVERALL AGREEMENT

The table below reflects the percentage of respondents who either agreed or strongly agreed with each statement.

	Percent Agree or Strongly Agree
I am aware of the current governance structure and its committees.	80%
The committee responsibilities are easy to understand.	69%
I generally know how to use the governance structure to raise an issue or present an idea.	57%
The governance structure addresses issues within a realistic timeframe.	58%
All constituent groups are encouraged to participate in the governance structure.	71%
My constituent group is encouraged to participate in the governance structure.	79%
Decision-making at MiraCosta follows a clear process.	49%
Decisions made within the governance structure are communicated broadly.	61%
Overall, decision-making at MiraCosta values participatory governance.	63%

Within the survey there were several questions that allowed us to disaggregate the data, including constituent group and recent experience serving on governance committees. When

the information was broken down by constituent group, there were definite differences in levels of agreement depending upon the specific statement presented.

	Lowest Agreement by Constituent Group	Highest Agreement by Constituent Group
I am aware of the current governance structure and its committees.	71% - Associate Faculty	89% - Full-Time Faculty
The committee responsibilities are easy to understand.	60% - Classified Professionals	78% - Full-Time Faculty
I generally know how to use the governance structure to raise an issue or present an idea.	48% - Associate Faculty	80% - Administrators
The governance structure addresses issues within a realistic timeframe.	45% - Classified	79% - Associate Faculty
All constituent groups are encouraged to participate in the governance structure.	53% - Administrators	76% - Full-Time Faculty
My constituent group is encouraged to participate in the governance structure.	64% - Administrators	89% - Full-Time Faculty
Decision-making at MiraCosta follows a clear process.	44% - Classified Professionals	71% - Administrators
Decisions made within the governance structure are communicated broadly.	55% - Classified Professionals	67% - Administrators
Overall, decision-making at MiraCosta values participatory governance.	57% - Classified Professionals	69% - Administrators

Breaking out the data by ethnicity did not result in any consistent agreement patterns, but this may be due to the differences in the number of responses within each group. There were no consistent agreement patterns based on gender or years of service. Recent committee experience generally resulted in higher levels of agreement.

OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

At the end of the survey individuals were presented with two open-ended questions:

- Please indicate 1-2 areas of strength in the governance process
- Please indicate 1-2 areas where improvement to the governance process is possible.

The responses to each of the two questions were reviewed and organized around general themes.

The most common themes cited as areas of strength included

- Broad participation and inclusivity
- Good or frequent communication
- Strong leadership (Senate, administration, committees etc.)

The most common themes cited as areas of improvement:

- A need to improve the communication process
- The need for broader participation and outreach (specifically among Associate Faculty and Classified Professionals.)
- A perception of the administration overriding decisions made at the committee level
- need to improve education on the governance process, including and onboarding process four new committee members

The responses to these questions are provided below in their original format. No attempt has been made to correct for spelling or grammatical errors.

Areas of Strength
- open meetings - wide share of information
1) Regular emails are sent about when meetings are taking place 2) Meeting minutes are distributed regularly.
1. Ability to communicate information broadly 2. Strong leadership on most Senate committees
1. Clearly defined 2. Transparent process
1. Many things are being done all through our campus. 2. Lots of caring people doing a lot of good work.
1. PD initiatives
Ability for faculty to more deeply understand how the college operates. Allow faculty to provide suggestions for future work/decisions.
Abundance of resources Clarity in communications and engagement in the staff and community
Academic Senate does a good job of representation for constituents.
Academic Senate leadership the last 3-4 years has improved communication and collaboration, it's been a great step in the right direction and processes have been more transparent and made more sense. Meeting and collaborating with colleagues from various departments that i normally would not work with. In getting to know them I've learned a lot personally and professionally, and it's also led to collaborations that impact my classroom directly.
Administration section
After 8 years with MCC, I don't see areas of strength in the governance process. On the committees where I have served there has been some nice communication and collegiality but the work has been slow and often with little to few results.
All are required to serve
As an associate faculty, I think that governance committee positions seem to be communicated effectively through email.
At least faculty do have a voice, which is not the case at other institutions. The streamlining process that took place many years ago helped to reduce the onerous nature of collegial governance.

Areas of Strength
Better recommendations and decision due to the diversity of voices and constituent groups A process flow tht is easy to understand and follow. Provides clear participation routes and opportunities
Broad input from constituent groups
Broad input from faculty.
broad input opportunity from all stakeholders
Can't say since the entire process is a mystery.
classified staff are not encouraged to participate in collegial governance
Clear commitments of the length of time for roles being served.
Clear communication
Clear structure. Notes from committee meetings readily available.
Collaboration and collegiality
Collegiality and cross-representation.
Committees are populated with faculty; A clear chair is leading
Communication
Communication is the key to a better understanding and I believe that their communication channels are strong and clear and timely.
Communication to everyone regarding current and future activities.
Consistency with meetings and letting people know when meetings are taking place. Transparency with agenda items.
Constituent groups are encouraged to participate in the governance process.
Cultural diversity
Diversity amongst various departments/disciplines
don't know
Efforts to have representation from multiple constituent groups.
Email communication
Email communications and sharing agendas and minutes
Employees get a true say in how their work is structured and how it is conducted.
Faculty led and driven processes. Committees are given autonomy to pursue their charges.
Faculty roles in governance are valued, and administration works well with faculty in most cases.
for the most part things run smoothly throughout the semester so there is little impact on the students.
frequent communictation
I believe the governance process is confusing to many and it scares people from participating. Supervisors should be more active in engaging their staff to understand and participate.
I can only really speak about the Classified Senate as I have not participated nor do I hear much about the other governing bodies. However, I think the Classified Senate is pretty good at communicating and trying to stay on top of things.
I don't have this information.
I just started working at MiraCosta, and I am not familiar with the governance process or structure.
I know the governance process is a good one, but I do not have enough experience with it or its processes to provide feedback in this area.
I like the way it works and that it's not a union

Areas of Strength
I teach at several colleges and I don't pay much attention to the governance process. I can't really answer this.
I think it is good to have collective governance, but I do not really understand how it works at MCC.
I think the communication is good, but ONLY if you actually read the emails. Sometimes the number of emails received can be overwhelming.
I wouldn't know. I'm too busy teaching.
If this survey is about the governance committees, I think they are doing the best they can in the administrative environment.
In order to walk the equity walk, associate faculty should be allowed opportunities to hold positions similar to full-time faculty. There are few instances where a part-time faculty member should not apply, however, we would not volunteer for any task, workgroup or committee that we did not want to support.
Inclusive
inclusivity
Involvement and engagement of the full-time faculty.
It does enable broad participation and input from stakeholders.
It is faculty-driven.
It results in better data. It makes the data more trustworthy.
Its attempt to be inclusive
Its easily accessable.
It's inclusive of all constituencies. It has a solid, well-organized structure.
Lots of opportunities to be involved. Some committees seek to collaborate with others which is good as decisions in one may impact others.
Lots of people ah w the opportunity to participate. Sometimes because of the time commitment or lack of direct connection to someone's job- interest in participation may wane.
Many are committeed to an effective governance process. Many participate and are engaged in the process.
many choices of committees to be on
Many opportunities for involvement
MiraCosta appears to be more proactive than reactive in the governance process. Issues appear to get resolved quickly and with participation from all constituent groups.
My governance leaders consistently keep me apprised of what's happening.
Open invitations are sent via email for anyone to attend meetings if they are interested.
Our senators do a good job of keeping us updated on senate-related issues.
People can sit at the table and have an opportunity to get their voice heard.
-Progress has been made in various areas since I was hired -Greater faculty diversity and commitment to DEI work due in part to our governance work
provides a way to inform constituent groups of current status/issues. opportunity to meet others.
Provides an opportunity to have a voice
Public broadcast of meetings/access to minutes
Representation from multiple campus programs

Areas of Strength
Representation seems diverse. Many committees on campus, so there is something for everyone to contribute to, and it's nice working with others outside our own department for different or broader goals. Good communication and record keeping helps for new members too.
Some committees are functioning at a high level; differentiating committee vs. workgroup
Some transparency
Strength - fantastic leaders and stewards of the governance process. People who take it seriously and are looking to do good, relevant, and forward-thinking work.
Strong faculty leadership Overall faculty seem to do a good job being supportive of one another
That each group has a representative committee and generally has representation on the districtwide committees - I am thankful for this. I am also thankful that this provides a voice at the negotiations level for benefits, cola, etc.
The classified staff who serve in governance and on committees, particularly the officers, seem to have a genuine desire to help, and give their time and energy towards doing what they can within the limits they are given.
The college's overall planning and governance structure clearly has nothing to do with decision making. Clearly decision making is made at the executive level with little input from constituencies or their groups.
The committees I've served on have given me the chance to contribute.
The establishment of constituencies allows the Senate to interact with faculty to discern their needs.
The governance group attempts to communicate with all employees clearly and often.
The governance process effectively encourages and provides college participation.
The inclusion of all constituent voices is well represented and received by the process and its participants.
The process is often lengthy, which allows for extensive feedback. College Council is the ultimate governance committee and allows for last minute catches and birds eye view of governance issues.
The promotion of equity and inclusion with respect to each students' learning experience. The maintenance of a culture of kindness on the campus
The structure is easy to understand.
There are a few good people who actually represent adjuncts, but the majority of the people are full-time or are serving to get prepare for their move up the ladder to become an administrator.
There are opportunities to participate.
There are very clear statements as to what is proposed and what is coming down the pipeline.
There is a committee for everything and broad partipation
There is ambiguity in the purpose of certain councils, committees.
There is an attempt to document and create procedural routes for specific types of questions and issue resolution. Agendas and meetings are often broadcasted.
There is an opportunity to move/switch governance commitments.
There is obvious participation from the faculty in the governance process.
They governance wants to help make MCC employees more active and aware for their own benefit. They look out for us.
Utilizing student voice to actually make decisions.
We hold lots of meetings and pat ourselves on the back claiming we're doing a great job.
Well-organized Good communication

Areas of Strength
When a person joins a committee, they are able to actively participate in the process.
When it is done well, it is a collective decision making process.
Widespread participation from a myriad of employees.

Areas of Improvement
- too many groups do not lend time for staff to participate in meaningful way - redundant; process focused rather than discussion and critical dialogue
* Governance is employee groups spinning the wheels because no matter what the consensus, Administration rules in its favor.
1) There isn't any work to get others involved in shared governance at MiraCosta (I am at other schools where the process in much more inviting and transparent). Shared governance at MiraCosta is very closed, not to mention all of the ways in which adjunct faculty are devalued and pushed out of the processes. 2) When positions become available for adjunct faculty, it is not well publicized and at times those positions disappear within a day of posting, not following any clear process. This needs to change.
1. Actually place value on governance process by ensuring the work is valued and actually used to plan and make decisions. 2. Ensure participation at all levels and including all constituents. Right now I believe there is lack of participation because we know that no planning or decision making includes input from employees in general, let along governance committees. Most are apathetic about governance because the average employee knows planning and decision making is centralized at the executive level of the college.
1. Classified are not represented well because it is not equity minded. Equity minded classified are not encouraged to support the Classified Senate because the structure impedes the work making it not a worthwhile use of time to get involved on top of the mountains of work and responsibility placed on a classified employee. 2. Board approval occurring monthly is ridiculous- if monthly meetings are the best option than some things should be able to be approved at the district level and just reported on to the board.
1. Create / allow a more in depth communication process. 2. Allow / provide equal pay for equal work for the associate faculty.
1. Lack of currency on the public facing sites. Many of the major governance committees do not have updated websites and their minutes posted in the portal are not current. IPRC for example still shows Diane Dieckmeyer as a member and she's been gone for over half a year. Minutes in the portal stopped in 3/19/21 for IPRC and BPC stops at 4/16/21. OAC website does not have the latest agenda or minutes for spring 2022. 2. It takes too long to get anything done, and decisions made are not adequately shared. You have to hunt for information that affects the college and its employees.
1. Less emails, and more personalized communication. 2. Less emails and written communication and more videos of voice communication.
1. lessen the bureaucratic nature of the college 2. be open to more ideologies than the Marxist tendency of the campus
1. Processes are cumbersome, taking a long time to address critical issues 2. Jumping on every bandwagon of any new initiative... ACP, Redesigning Student Experience, Dual Enrollment but very little results with a lot of money poured in.

3. A lot of Administrative decision making and implementation of policies and procedures without true engagement of all constituent groups.
Associate faculty opinions are not sought out or appreciated at MiraCosta. Many of our opinions and issues are NOT the same as the full-time faculty, with regard to our students and our professional work. Full-timers are always the default when administrators talk about faculty, yet we have more associate faculty members. Maybe this is because administrators came up through full-time ranks? We are exhausted with being disregarded and disrespected. MCC needs to drastically readjust its thinking about who is actually teaching most of our students.
Better communication of changes and updates. Having a central place to access information and meeting schedules.
-Better onboarding for new faculty to create a more meaningful sense of the governance structure and the work being done by the various committees -The amount of reassigned time that is provided to do governance work varies and should be examined
Better use of technology to help navigate the MCC's organizational complexity that presents itself as a barrier for individuals that want to participate. Many times governance doesn't listen to all sides only those that are congruent with its long-standing positions. This makes the college's adaptive responses too slow to reactive to the speed and transformation that is happing in the "broader" world. It will be very important to build these empathic skills (deep listening) to incorporate all sides and points of view or we run the risk of making incomplete and ineffective non-diverse decisions.
Classified staff have no legit, mandated release time to serve. Our manual states that the college suggests managers/ supervisors support Classified staff service on committees, but that level of support is different for each department and each supervisor. This is one reason we see little Classified staff on committees across campus. We are also rarely included in college wide issues. For example, I am only one Classified member serving on Academic Affairs. That is a committee that makes decisions on academic calendars. Yet, academic calendars impact faculty, staff, and students. In fact, academic calendars is an area where many classified members are impacted due to hiring timelines in summer and associated on-boarding considerations, yet we have a significantly disproportionate level or representation on AAC and other committees. Why? The college needs to train faculty and staff in governance concepts. Paid time learning what AP and BPs are and how they work would be a starting place. Encouraging Classified staff to serve on committees based on their role in the college and the committee focus would be ideal. Next, actually mandating release time (stop asking us to serve during our unpaid time) would create actual buy in and show we are valued. Changing the Classified manual to require release time to serve would codify our place on committees. Dissemination of what is happening in each committee on campus in a google doc would be a good start to getting more involvement and understanding of how committees work, what is happening in each of them. We can't go to every committee meeting, but having a monthly "highlights" doc for all the governance areas that would come out well before the next month's meetings would help stakeholders see the bigger governance picture.
Classified staff need more say in the process. It often feels like being included is a formality to check a box and there is no real power. Decisions are drive by faculty and administrators.
Clearer methods and expectations for participation and input.
Cohesion across committees: time and space is needed for committees to understand where their work/goals overlap and intersect
Committee reports should go out in a newsletter of some kind; Committee chairs should receive training on how to facilitate dialogue across committee participants enabling true participation

Communication about what's going on at the committee level. The newsletter the AS just launched is a good start.
communication and paid opportunities for Associate Faculty participation
Communication to and with constituent groups could be improved.
Communication within the governance, as a new committee member communication of how to join meetings was not addressed. No welcome, no one to show a new member how things work within the governance, or a walk-through of procedures.
Continue Zoom college updates even after the pandemic is over. Possibly expand reports to include other areas of the college's governing structure.
Couple issues: Scheduling decision-making events when a majority of faculty are with the students or when the district completely neglects what faculty have shared and implements their agenda.
Create or distribute a document or webpage that lists the governance process in a clear and concise manner, with short descriptions, and include links to websites or contact information for committee members that could provide more details. Maybe offer a Flex workshop.
Decisions at MCC are made by administrators after a period of pretending that input from faculty and staff will be considered. Decision making processes are often opaque and sometimes invisible. Like other colleges, MCC has steadily increased the number of administrators over many years, further cementing their control of college operations. I don't see any possibility of improving this system without wholesale elimination of layers of deans and VPs, which is unlikely.
DEI is not a priority in many governance groups There could be clearer explanation of roles and expectations for participants. It seems that the loudest voices are heard, regardless of what those voices are sharing. I'd like to see more students rather than just one ASG rep. And more opportunities for student input into descisions.
dissemination of information, decisions, etc. involving appropriate constituencies prior to making decisions
don't know
Effectiveness of the process. What is the purpose of some committees? If a committee serves primarily to distribute information, then it should not be a committee. What is the work that is being accomplished? Also, the same people are heavily involved in the governance process, while others skate by without ever actively participating in the process. Each faculty member and administrator should be required to serve on at least one committee. How can we more effectively communicate what is happening within a committee, outside of distributing minutes and agendas? Can there be a highlight video or some "State of the District" with reports from each committee reported out a couple of times per year? Can the work be tied to goals and outcomes? How are we assessing those goals and outcomes?
Employees with responsibilities who cannot have backfill support cannot join any of these governance committees.
Engagement with those who are not on governance committees
ensure release time actually is provided to staff who do work on collegial governance and require supervisors to understand how to support participation in collegial governance

Everybody knows that Sunny and the full time faculty make all the decisions around here. There is nothing collegial about how decisions are made. As it stands, information is shared after decisions are already made, and it's usually made by faculty-driven needs; not student needs. I stopped participating in "collegial governance" because my voice doesn't matter.
Feasibility of participation when PT faculty are spread thin across many colleges without the ability to participate in areas outside of their immediate responsibilities
Finding a way to encourage non committee members to feel welcome and able to come to any meeting or attend via Zoom might assist with the feeling that there is a lack of communication.
For a newer employee it seems as if you have to figure out how and when to participate; all on your own. It would be nice if they had a "Governance Process 101" orientation and/or flex. It feels intimidating to ask questions because then you feel like it will affect tenure.
For Classified Senate specifically I would really like to see pay or release time for those that are actively participating. It is completely volunteer except for the President getting someone to backfill their position. I think that hinders people from taking a more active role because many do not have the time to dedicate to the committees. It seems to be the same handful of people always active within the CS. Most committees would only require a dozen or so hours each semester. Getting an extra stipend for that time would be extremely valuable.
For newer FT faculty, it can be overwhelming figuring out what each committee's responsibilities are and understanding how they overlap / interconnect.
Frustrating when not all FT faculty participate in governance. It is quite unbalanced.
Have a newsletter or portal area where meeting notes are posted so we can go to one place rather than keeping track of multiple emails or webpages
Honestly, I have been here over two years and have no idea how it works other than there are certain committees that new items get passed to for approval. I am sure there is somewhere I could get this information, but I have probably been too busy to think about it or try to find out.
How the committee assignments work is confusing.
I am not confident that the ranking for new full-time positions is fair or equitable. It seems like some positions were green-lighted for arbitrary reasons while other positions (replacement hires) were unfairly rejected. More transparency and communication is needed.
I believe that on some committees, classified professionals don't have much to say in terms of decision making. Many committees are faculty oriented. On committees where classified professionals are included, I find that many staff are hesitant to speak up and offer opinions. Perhaps co-chairs can encourage that.
I can see none.
I don't believe most people understand the governance structure. It has changed massively while I've been here and I know people still use language that sounds like former structures, so I imagine there are many who don't really understand how it functions.
I don't have this information.
I just started working at MiraCosta, and I am not familiar with the governance process or structure.
I know the governance process is a good one, but I do not have enough experience with it or its processes to provide feedback in this area.
I sometimes feel like I'm serving on committees that don't really have a voice and are only there to advise.
I teach at several colleges and I don't pay much attention to the governance process. I can't really answer this.

I think it is important to ensure that all employees are represented. I feel that committees are made up of people who have been with the institution for a very long time and sometimes that can create self-serving agendas. It is important that all employee's needs are represented.
I thinks communication is the key to most things. Communication must continue to be a priority.
If this survey is about the entire way the college is governed, it has vastly deteriorated into rule by administrative fiat, as evidenced in the recent denial of all faculty members who requested to go fully online during a global pandemic, despite all online structures being fully in place. Shared governance has been decreasing for a long time, and when this kind of decision is made by a non-transparent, unexplained process were are at the end of the concept.
I'm not sure if this is an issue with the governance process or emails I may be missing, but more transparency as to the yearly outcomes of the different committees may be helpful.
Incoherent. The proof is the consistent use of task forces and work groups and any other name for something other than a governance committee to do essential work. Governance committees languish, meanwhile.
increased communication to constituents
Increased inclusion in department decision-making and in shared governance communicate Part-Time faculty are a valued part of the MiraCosta community.
It is hard for us front line workers to participate because we cannot leave our positions without affecting other office staff. Some of the committees do not directly affect my office especially if it is faculty oriented.
It is pretty clear that people are resistant or outright against leadership positions - in particular, elected positions. It is sad that and something that needs further investigation and intervention.
It might be nice to have a governance webpage/website with all agendas posted and important notices listed (maybe on Canvas)?...The number of emails we receive about committee meetings is absurd and renders the content meaningless. If we got one "governance digest" email each Monday, everyone could easily locate agendas and get information about other important topics/events. Just a thought...
It seems like many things are sunshined at EMT before they come through the governance process.
It's not always clear to whom to go when I have input or a question on governance. I have received quick replies when I have approached by Senate representative and from my Union representative and they both go out of their way to direct me to the correct person and or committee.
Lack of clarity with language and processes in some committees. Many are not student-centered and do a poor job of orienting new members, especially students. Brown Act processes are outdated and based in White supremacy. There is a lack of turnover in Committees like the Outcomes Assessment Committee because there is no accountability.
Lack of leadership training, especially in regard to DEI/facilitation. AS started doing some chair professional development but needs more legs on it to stand. When it comes to DEI and facilitating meetings and any issues regarding microaggressions, equity within committees responsibilities, etc., there is a lot of room for improvement. Perhaps having new/continuing chairs attend NCORE so that those who attend bring back what they learned to their committee. Not everyone puts in a consistent amount of work. As in, a minimum that we should all be adhering to as full time colleagues. This adds more work to other faculty, usually the chairs. This could also come from lack of training/onboarding committee members. Chairs should consider doing a retreat or some kind of onboarding before official business/meetings at start of the year
Less bureaucracy.

Many don't participate so the workload falls on the few. It's the Pareto Principle where 20% of the people do 80% of the work.
MCC's governance leadership and processes have developed and encouraged a culture of exclusion and blame over the past 4 years. Incredibly sad to see.
More diverse voices and participation is needed from the constituency groups
More incentives for associate faculty to participate.
Most decisions are made by EMT so the committee work is not valuable.
n/a
n/a
none
Not all classified staff feel comfortable expressing their thoughts and ideas because they have limited protections
not sure
Participation for online-only faculty needed More options for participation that doesn't require an elected position
Perhaps faculty will have a different perception due to their stronger voice, but from the perspective of a Classified employee, the organization feels very hierarchical. Most meaningful decision-making is very hierarchical and top-down, particularly when it comes to working conditions for Classified employees.
Process and committees do not support diversity of opinion - only the current cultural opinions are tolerated. Folks who have different points of view are bullied and fear for their jobs.
Provide committee information at the beginning of each new school year as to who the committee members are.
Providing information to new employees more readily. I struggled to understand the process when I first started. Had trouble finding the information (it was buried in SharePoint which I was not familiar with). A crash course in governance might help new employees when they start. At least a simple email with a link to pertinent information.
repetitive information. In large groups, difficult to voice concerns, can get political. Set-up a feedback loop after each meeting to enable feedback, not to expect an answer back, but give voice to those who might not want to voice it in the meeting.
Senate is mostly occupied with busy work and maintenance of ongoing processes. To add to that, the college has largely been responding to mandates from Sacramento, while local innovation and vision have really lapsed. As evidenced in so many different ways, we have become a top down institution.
So much of governance is like the Wild West. . .
Some constituent groups do not really communicate with other constituent groups when they make changes. The processes for data governance are not entirely clear.
Some governance committees are more efficient and effective than others. Some spend too much time talking about the same issues, or some venture off discussing scope that is tangential, and sometimes not related, to the scope of the committee. Training for chairs and committtee members along with shared accountability with how meetings are run and scope expectations could improve these areas.
Sometimes it seems like some folks are more involved than others (is the workload equitable??) Sometimes decision-making can be stalled due to so many different perspectives and resistance to change. Other times decisions get made quickly without the voices of some constituents.
Sometimes things take the backburner and never come around at all, or they are just very slow to get addressed.

Strengthening the "disconnect" between program review and decision making bodies.
The Classified Senate has essentially no power and can be overruled by administration at any time. While it is a convenient entity for occasional workforce-wide "negotiations", it does not seem to have any power or ability to advocate for or represent individual employees in discussions or conflicts with institutional leadership. It seems to function mainly as an activities committee, and otherwise is relegated to being an administrative space-holder to deflect and distract from the possibility of employees having an actual union with actual power to represent its members both collectively and individually.
The collaboration across constituent groups is depending upon the collaborative nature (or not) of the constituent group leaders. It always works best when trust, communication and collaboration oration are valued by faculty, staff, and admin leaders!
The current top-down style of administration does not result in a general consensus/agreement with decisions. MiraCosta has become more compartmentalized/siloed and divisions often work at cross purposes and don't share new information/changes outside of their divisions. Adding new layers of upper management takes away from resources that should be used for the people who are making it happen every day.
The system is inherently slow and conservative (in the sense of retaining long-held practices and making significant change challenging to achieve). An example might be changes to the academic calendar to enable more short term course sections and more flexibility. Seems like for years people have broadly agreed that this is important, yet it doesn't happen. So I think the biggest improvement would be more use of task forces that can be more focused on significant short-term defined work that is needed, outside of the inherent limitations of governance groups - especially Brown Act-conforming groups.
There are many committees at our college, sometime it seems like too many. It's hard to decide what the best model is, fewer large committees with workload broken out into task forces, or split off to a new committee for ongoing specific needs.
There are some policies needed to be defined clearly to better guide our college.
There is no central location to find all the information we may need to be able to provide meaningful feedback, see the big picture, and also understand the finer details.
There is no mentoring of new candidates to be coached into new posts that may seem overwhelming or intimidating. There should be a mentoring or shadowing phase for those that are willing to take up a challenge but are intimidated by the process.
There is too much emphasis on inclusion. Poor decisions are being made about curriculum, academic affairs, program review, etc. because people who should not have a say in the decisions, hijack the meetings and push an agenda. Dismantle the DeqCC. It pushes division and hate throughout the college. The committee tries to bully other committees and individuals to push a narrative that has no foundation in reality. It's shameful that the administrators go along with this. This kind of "progress" pushes students away at a time where we have been hemmoraging them. This school will go morally bankrupt (if not fiscally) very soon with ideology like this.
There should be more interactions/ designed collaboration between overlapping committees. it can be frustrating when a committee will work on an assignment/project -which is approved by the committee, but it can get overturned at a different level, possibly by only one person with a very loud voice.

This may be less about the governance structure and more about day-to-day decision-making and interactions at the college, but the question on the previous page did not specify - it just asked about decision-making. Within the governance structure, perhaps classified and all voices are heard and considered, but overall and in day-to-day work I would be more encouraged if I heard from and interacted more frequently with the college leadership (president, vps, deans) - do they know my name, do they know what my job title means and the work that I do, have they spent more than 2 minutes in our area to see how things operate? I feel like these are important pieces for leadership to know for their level of decision-making. It seems like CS Leadership has not always been effective in recent years as far as listening to its constituents and representing those voices well at the districtwide level.
To get rid of the “my way or the highway” attitude.
Top-Down Administration decisions are on the rise and seem to occur outside the governance process. Why are we not hiring more faculty and staff, but yet continue to hire more and more administrators? More inclusion is needed for all.
Transparency
Transparency in decision making process. It seems like classified are given less value than faculty
Treat the associates as equals.
Unpredictability with time requirements. When asked for input, it has felt abrupt and closed in a very short time period, making me wonder from time to time if the input request was done just for the show, or only knee jerk reactions are expected.
We get in our own way sometimes. Almost everyone believes that we need to shorten our semesters as we have the longest in the district, but we can't get everyone to agree so we keep kicking the proverbial can down the road. We need a few leaders who are willing to work through this process, hand-holding it through the various committees and groups, to get everyone's buy-in (or enough buy-in) to finally make the appropriate changes to our calendar.
We may need another round of streamlining as several committees (including those outside the governance structure per se) find themselves making work rather than doing absolutely necessary tasks. There are many college-level decisions that don't seem to include faculty input at all. This is frustrating in a college that values collegiality.
When a question/issue arises that falls outside normal operations or expectations, it can be difficult to get a response or produce a change (even when there seems to be an obvious answer). There is no clear 'exceptions' handling for when change for the good of the college needs to happen faster.
Workshops explaining the governance process should be offered a couple times a year.
You could give a f*** about associate faculty. We don’t have time to read up on what is happening, let alone participate. But I understand how checking boxes is more important than actual people.