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INTRODUCTION

The College has a shared governance model that promotes a participatory and collaborative culture where employees are well informed and involved in policy development that match their areas of expertise. HCC’s shared governance model consists of cross-constituent groups. Governance groups that deal primarily with faculty issues have a majority of faculty members with representation by administration and staff. Administration and staff committees are comprised primarily of administrators and staff, with faculty representation. The Governance Council, which consists of representatives from all constituent groups, acts as a “ways and means committee” to monitor the health of the governance system.

GOVERNANCE COUNCIL

The Governance Council (GC), chaired by the President, is the clearinghouse for shared governance concerns and issues on campus. The Council consists of representation of all College constituencies (See Appendix A for 2010-11 membership). It helps ensure that concerns are addressed while making sure that committees are adequately staffed to study issues and make recommendations. With its focus on process, the Council assigns issues to the appropriate governance body or administrative unit if an issue is operational, as well as approves changes to the governance structure, such as naming sub-committees to work within a standing committee.

There is an annual meeting between the Governance Council and committee co-chairs. This year’s meeting was held in April 2010. Primarily the joint meeting is a progress update, but it is also very helpful in facilitating communication and in clarifying assignments. The co-chairs offer constructive suggestions for improving the governance system.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEES

STANDING COMMITTEES

Standing committees are created for a specific purpose or to study a particular issue. These committees provide a forum for the development of broad consensus and recommendations on college-wide matters. Standing committees are co-chaired by an administrator and a faculty member, and include representatives of all areas of the College. Faculty members on committees are appointed by the Faculty Assembly and non-faculty are appointed by the President.

Academic Standards, Assessment and Faculty Affairs Committee

The Academic Standards, Assessment and Faculty Affairs Committee (ASOAFA) considers and makes recommendations on policies that support and maintain high academic standards, assessment methodologies and systems with emphasis on student learning outcomes, and faculty affairs, though it does not address faculty personnel decisions. The committee is co-chaired by the Vice President of Academic Affairs and a faculty member.

The ASOAF Committee reviewed basic skills course placement criteria and developed the policy recommendation, which was approved by the Board in February 2010. The committee
also reviewed the current GPA policy, recommended that revision was unnecessary, and that language in the catalog be refined.

**Curriculum Development and Review Committee**

The primary task of the Curriculum Development and Review Committee (CDRC) is to review and recommend approval of new courses and programs of study at the College. It does not oversee matters relating to the rigor of courses or programs, which is the responsibility of appropriate faculty and academic officers. The CDRC is co-chaired by the Vice President of Academic Affairs and a faculty member.

Curriculum review assures that new programs and courses meet college and state standards, such as general education requirements, compliance with the official course syllabi format, or disputes of discipline coding of courses. This task is very time-consuming and requires most of the meeting time.

**Teaching and Learning Committee**

The Teaching and Learning Committee considers and makes policy recommendations regarding the College’s environment in support of excellence in teaching and learning, particularly in academic support services such as learning technologies, distance learning, tutoring services, workplace learning, and career development services. The Teaching and Learning Committee, which reports to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, is co-chaired by the Director of Instruction and a faculty member.

The Teaching and Learning Committee discussed information literacy throughout FY 10. It will recommend to the Governance Council in Fall 2010 whether there is need for a policy related to that topic.

**Administrative and Information Technology Services Committee**

The Administrative and Information Technology Services Committee considers and makes recommendations on policies regarding services and activities that support, enhance and maintain the quality of services and facilities for students and staff. It facilitates coordination of activities related to health and safety issues, facilities, and auxiliary services, as well as institutional issues related to IT applications, computer networks and telecommunications. The committee, co-chaired by the Vice President of Administration and Finance and a faculty member, reports to and makes recommendations to the President.

The committee drafted the free speech and demonstrations policy, which is currently undergoing legal review. Two policies were recommended by the committee received Board approval – the Parking and Traffic Policy and the Free Speech and Demonstrations Policy.

**Human Resources Committee**

The Human Resources Committee (HRC) considers and makes recommendations on personnel policies, including conditions of employment, staff and faculty diversity, human resources procedures, health insurance, benefits, leave and retirement, and professional
development. The committee does not address matters of employee evaluation, tenure, promotion, dismissal, or salary and benefits administration. The Human Resources Committee, co-chaired by the Director of Human Resources and a faculty member, reports to and makes recommendations to the President.

**Student Affairs Committee**

The Student Affairs Committee (SAC) considers and makes recommendations on policies regarding services and activities that support, enhance and maintain the learning process and student achievement. Much of the committee’s meeting time in FY 09 was spent researching and developing the communicable disease policy approved by the Board in April 2009. The Student Affairs Committee, which reports to the President, is co-chaired by the Dean of Student Affairs and a faculty member.

The Board in FY 10 approved two policies, the Anti-Discrimination Policy and the Involuntary Student Course Withdrawal Policy.

**HIGHLIGHTS OF THE HCC GOVERNANCE SYSTEM IN FY 10**

- Committees are taking more time to research topics/assignments, often collaborating with other governance groups or seeking information from other Maryland community colleges. Though this may lengthen the time it takes to bring an assignment to completion, ultimately, a more thorough review of the topic and subsequent recommendations result.
- The Board approved five policies developed by governance committees, as well as two administrative polices.
- Joint meetings between the Governance Council and co-chairs facilitate communication and clarify assignments.
- Committee minutes are posted to the Intranet upon receipt in the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness.
- There is a feedback process for informing the College community of policies approved by the Board of Trustees. The administrative co-chair of a committee is responsible for reporting to the College community via e-mail the status of recommended policies once they are presented to the Board. In addition, an approved policy is posted on the shared governance website on the Intranet.

**CHALLENGES/PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS**

- Charges/assignments given to governance committees are sometimes not detailed enough to build policy upon.
  - *Strategy for Improvement*: A context/framework for assignments would help shape committees’ work. Committees would like for the President to include key points to address and consider.
• The review process for recommended policy often takes what is deemed as too much time. Committees are frustrated by “paralysis of analysis.”
  ○ *Strategy for Improvement:* The co-chairs request that when a policy recommendation moves out of committee, the steps for review outlined in the governance guide be followed in a timely manner.

**POLICY DEVELOPMENT WORK BY COMMITTEES IN FY 10**

The following list is a summary, by committee, of policies recommended, reviewed and/or updated and approved through the shared governance model from July 2009 – June 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDING GOVERNANCE COMMITTEES IN 2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards, Outcomes assessment &amp; Faculty Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and IT Services Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and IT Services Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administrative Policies**

| COMMITTEE | POLICY | BOARD ACTION |
| Vice-President of Finance and Administration | Debt Policy | Approved by Board, 12/15/09 |
| President | In-County Resident Status for Students Displaced by Natural Disasters (revision) | Approved by Board, 11/13/09 |

The President creates ad hoc committees for a specific purpose or to study a particular issue. Such committees typically disband after recommendations have been made to the body or individual assigned within the charge statement. The President gives each ad hoc committee its charge or mission in writing, including expected outcomes and a timeline for completion of the study. The following chart highlights topics assigned to ad hoc committees in 2009 – 2010.
INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE

The Governance Council is committed to evaluating the organizational climate regularly. In Spring 2010, HCC participated in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*’s “Great Colleges to Work for Program” (hereafter Great Colleges survey), a program designed to recognize institutions that have built great workplaces. In 2010, 275 schools competed for recognition, with participants 221 four-year colleges/universities and 54 community colleges as participants. The ModernThink Higher Education Insight Survey instrument used by the Chronicle assesses workplace quality at institutions of higher education. Survey statements measure critical organizational dynamics and managerial competencies. Additionally, the instrument provides insight into the quality and health of various relationships that ultimately have direct impact on the institution's culture and the daily experience of employees. Twelve of the recognition categories are based on the 15 survey dimensions that are core components of campus life. Representative examples include the following: collaboration, professional/career development; teaching environment (faculty only); compensation & benefits; facilities, workspace and security; and job satisfaction. A full listing of survey categories is found in Appendix A. Others tie to the responses to the benefits satisfaction component of the survey.

ModernThink distributed the survey electronically to all full-time employees (259 individuals). Responses were compiled by employee classification: faculty, administration, exempt professional staff and support staff, as well as overall numeric score. Responses were reported based upon a five-point scale, ranging from a rating of “strongly agree (5); agree (4); sometimes agree/ sometimes disagree (3); disagree (2) and strongly disagree (1).” Additionally, responses were reported as the percentage of positive scores based upon the percent of employees who responded strongly Agree or Agree to a statement. For example, when responding to the statement of, “All things considered, this is a great place to work,” the overall score was 76.9%, meaning that that percentage of respondents strongly agreed or agreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE NAME</th>
<th>COMMITTEE CHARGE</th>
<th>STATUS OF WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad Hoc Multicultural Committee</td>
<td>Charged with promoting educational, cultural, and professional development programs to infuse diversity into the curriculum as well as promote student learning and appreciation of our differences and similarities</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Hoc Pride and Recognition Committee</td>
<td>Charged with initiating employee relations program designed to improve and maintain high employee morale</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AD HOC COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS IN 2009 - 2010
HCC’s response rate was 67% (173 respondents out of 259 employees), which is the highest rate since it began administering climate surveys in 2002 (Appendix A). An overall summary of both surveys follows.

**Benefits Survey**
Average of all 18 statements (169 responses) 3.54 out of 5 (58% positive responses)
Overall satisfaction with benefits (173 responses) 3.80 out of 5 (74% positive responses)

Statements that received at least 60% positive responses:
11 (61%) by all employee groups
8 (44%) by three groups

Statements that received below 60% positive responses:
5 (8%) by all employee groups

**Work Environment Survey**
Average of all 60 questions (173 responses) 3.74 out of 5 (65.4% positive responses)
Overall, good place to work (169 responses) 4.08 out of 5 (76.9% positive responses)

Statements that received at least 60% positive responses:
39 (65%) by all employee groups
13 (21%) by three groups

Statements that received below 60% positive responses:
12 (20%) by all employee groups
4 (6%) by three groups

The Governance Council has reviewed the reports from ModernThink. It is anticipated that the report will help HCC improve awareness and outcomes by understanding institutional strengths and weaknesses, as well as enhance strategic planning by benchmarking and comparing against peers. Positive responses to work environment tend to cluster around an individual’s work, use of skills and contribution to college mission, supervision and the department where one works. Negative ratings were given to areas of individual contributions/recognition/promotion and communication. Positive responses about benefits highlight insurance and paid time off while work/life balance and flexible work arrangements were of concern. The Governance Council will host a campus forum in October 2010 to highlight the findings and next steps based upon results of the forum.

The Governance Council analyzed seven similar questions from the Great Colleges survey and the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) administered to HCC employees by the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) in 2008. (Appendix A). Responses to both surveys were based upon a five-point scale. The 2010 results were more positive with the average of 3.74 as compared the PACE’s average of 3.51 to
similar questions. Also found in the appendix is a listing of areas of concern identified from both surveys, but, again, scores appear more positive in 2010. Communication and individual recognition/contributions were common concerns in both instruments.

LOOKING AHEAD

A summary of committee assignments for 2010 – 2011 follows.

**Academic Standards, Assessment and Faculty Affairs Committee**
- Investigate the need for a policy for “walk away” F grades
- Create a policy to accept IB credits

**Teaching and Learning Committee**
- Establish written credit to contact hour policy and standards for lecture, lab, clinical and other experiential courses, as well as independent study
- Explore HCC’s computer literacy requirement and need for a policy in this area

**Curriculum Development and Review Committee**
- Develop a policy regarding how HCC will accept credit from advanced high school work [advanced placement, International Baccalaureate (IB), etc.]
- Develop a checklist of steps for submitting curriculum to the committee
- Continue to review all College credit curriculum

**Student Affairs Committee**
- Develop a policy for individuals whose first language is not English
- Develop a policy for involuntary withdrawal policy

**Human Resources Committee**
- Develop a policy for utilization of sick leave for faculty and non-faculty
- Revisit, and refine accordingly, the College’s floating holiday policy

**Administrative and IT Services Committee**
- Develop a policy on commercial solicitation and proselytization on campus
- Develop a policy and guidelines for fund raising by campus groups
- Develop a policy for accepting and processing contributions/donated services
- In collaboration with the Technology Planning Council, develop a posting policy for messages and notices, both electronic and hard copy
- Determine need for a policy for the College’s use of social networking
APPENDICES
For reporting and analysis purposes, the 60 statements of the Great College to Work For survey instruments are clustered into 15 dimensions or themes, each representing an important component of campus life. These dimensions were determined and confirmed through a series of factor analyses and provide the basis for the program’s recognition categories. They include:

- **Job Satisfaction/Support**: provides insight into the satisfaction with job fit, autonomy and resources
- **Teaching Environment**: with a particular focus on faculty, this dimension consists of statements that address the balance between teaching, research and service; the support for advising/mentoring students; and recognition for outstanding teaching
- **Professional Development**: provides insight into the reported satisfaction with career/professional development opportunities; and for faculty, support for research and clarity of the tenure process
- **Compensation, Benefits & Work/Life Balance**: captures information about the perceived fairness of compensation and the effectiveness of the benefits and work/life balance programs
- **Facilities**: provides insight into the reported satisfaction with physical workspace, overall campus appearance and confidence in experiencing a safe and secure environment
- **Policies, Resources & Efficiency**: assesses the perceived effectiveness of various systems, policies and infrastructure
- **Shared Governance**: captures information about the perception of inclusion and cooperation as related to shared governance
- **Pride**: evaluates the sense of pride and connection faculty/employees report regarding their affiliation with the institution
- **Supervisors/Department Chairs**: provides insight into the relationship faculty/employees report with their department chair or supervisor and assesses critical managerial competencies
- **Senior Leadership**: measures the confidence faculty and employees report in the capabilities and credibility of senior leadership; senior leadership was defined as the most senior members of the institution (e.g., chancellor or president and those who report directly to him/her)
- **Faculty, Administration & Staff Relations**: provides insight into the quality of faculty, administration and staff relations with a focus on the perception of support, cooperation and collegiality
- **Communication**: assesses the quality of internal communications specifically as related to transparency, clarity and interactivity
- **Collaboration**: measures the perceived cooperation and collegiality within workgroups and across the institution
- **Fairness**: measures confidence in fair and consistent treatment, especially regarding performance management and issues of accountability
- **Respect & Appreciation**: provides insight into the degree to which faculty/staff feel respected and valued
# Work Environment Surveys Completed by HCC Employees 2003 - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great Colleges 2010</th>
<th>PACE 2008</th>
<th>Climate Survey 2006</th>
<th>Climate Survey 2005</th>
<th>Climate Survey 2004</th>
<th>Climate Survey 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Sent</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Completed</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Surveys Completed

![Surveys Completed Chart](chart.png)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparative Questions</th>
<th>PACE - 2008</th>
<th>Great Colleges 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This institution places sufficient emphasis on having diverse faculty, administration and staff</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in my department work well together</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the necessary requirements to advance my career</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor/department chair actively solicits my suggestions and ideas</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am giving the opportunity to develop my skills at this institution</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive feedback from my supervisor/department chair that helps me.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can speak up or challenge a traditional way of doing something without fear of harming my career.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average All Statements Above

| Average All Statements Above | 3.51 | 3.74 |

*Based on a 5 point scale

![Graph showing comparative data between PACE and Great Colleges 2008 and 2010]
## Top Ten Areas of Concern in PACE & Great Colleges Surveys*

### PACE 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which information is shared within this institution</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which this institution is appropriately organized</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which institutional teams use problem-solving techniques</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which this institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Great Colleges 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My department has adequate faculty/staff to achieve our goals</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is regular and open communication among faculty, administration and staff</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Leadership communicates openly about important matters</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions in my department are based on a person's ability</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this institution, we discuss and debate issues respectfully to get better results</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our orientation program prepares new faculty, administration and staff to be effective</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There's a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, administration and staff are meaningfully involved in institutional planning</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Scores based on a 5 point scale
APPENDIX B
FY 11 GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

Terms of office run July 1 - June 30, 2011 or July 1 - June 30, 2012. Term expiration date is in parentheses after committee member’s name. ** Denotes co-chair

GOVERNANCE COUNCIL

1. Guy Altieri, President **
2. Anna Barker, Vice-President, Administration & Finance
3. John Little, SGA President (2011)
4. Barbara Macht, Dean, Planning & Institutional Effectiveness
5. Joseph Marschner, Faculty Assembly Chair and Assistant Professor, Music and Drama (2012)
6. Joseph Mason, Associate Professor, Mathematics (2012)
7. Judith Oleks, Vice-President, Academic Affairs
8. Donna Rudy, Dean, Student Affairs
11. Spring Ward, Associate Professor, History & Political Science (2011)

TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE

1. Chris Baer, Academic Advisor (2011)
3. Mary Beth Chaney, Instructor, ECE & Psychology (2011)
4. Tom Crawford, Associate Professor, Mathematics and Business (2011)
5. Gerald Haines, Director, Instruction**
6. Rosemary Nickerson, Professor, Biology (2011)
7. Dawn Schoenenberger, Director of Developmental Ed. & Literacy Services (2011)
8. Tom Seward, Assistant Professor, Foreign Language (2011)**
9. Stephen Shank, Associate Professor, IST (2012)

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW COMMITTEE

1. Frances Cade, Division Chair, BSSB & Assistant Professor, Human Services (2011)
2. Ann Clark, Assistant Professor, English (2011)**
4. Sonja Kirchner, Instructor, Nursing (2011) [Lynn Drury in Fall 2010]
5. Mike Martin, Academic Advising Coordinator (2011)
7. Jim Niessner, Assistant Professor, Developmental Composition (2012)
8. Judith Oleks, Vice-President, Academic Affairs **
10. Nancy Thorpe, Associate Professor, Chemistry (2012)
ACADEMIC STANDARDS, OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT AND FACULTY AFFAIRS

1. LuAnne Fisher, Reference & Bibliographic Instruction Librarian (2012)
2. Trudy Gift, Trudy Gift, Professor of IST (2011)
3. Jennifer Haughie, Director of Admissions, Records & Registration (2011)
4. Terry Hughes, Assistant Professor, Management & Marketing (2011)
6. Melinda May, Associate Professor, English and Humanities (2012)**
7. Jeff Morgan, Assistant Professor, Administration of Justice (2011)
8. Judith Oleks, Vice-President, Academic Affairs **
10. Veronica Stein, Assistant Professor, Chemistry/Physical Science (2011)

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

1. Joan Bontempo, Assistant Professor, Art Appreciation/Art History (2012)**
2. Carolyn Cox, Director of Student Financial Aid (2011)
4. Donna Rudy, Dean of Student Affairs **
5. Support staff vacancy (2011)
6. Maggie Stone, SGA Vice-President (2011)
7. Patricia Williams, Assistant Professor, Nursing (2011)
8. Sharon Wilson, Accounting Associate (2011)

ADMINISTRATIVE AND IT SERVICES COMMITTEE

1. Anna Barker, Vice-President, Administration and Finance **
2. Craig Fentress, Director, Information Technology
3. Carolyn Hoover, Executive Assistant I (2011)
4. Gloria Hughes, Enrollment Assistant (2011)
5. Joe Marschner, Assistant Professor, Music & Drama (2011) **

HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

1. John Cavey, Coordinator, CVT (2011)
2. Susan Clutz, Professor of Nursing (2011)
5. Richard Gagliardi, Assistant Professor, Accounting (2012)**
6. Donna Marriott, Director, Human Resources **
7. Dawn Reed, Research Associate (2011)