

Spring 2016 Committee Effectiveness Self-Evaluation Survey – Summary

The Committee Effectiveness Self-Evaluation Survey was sent out to GWC faculty, staff, and students serving on campus committees to evaluate all committees in which they are a member of in the 2015-2016 academic year. The questions on the survey asked committee members their meeting attendance and which statement they felt best described the committee they were evaluating from the following categories: results achieved by the committee, ownership/morale, clarity of committee’s charges and mission, team processes, communication, leadership sharing, administrative support, and structure of the committee.

In total, **50 individuals responded to the survey** and evaluated at least one GWC committee for which they were a member (Table 1). Furthermore, of these individuals, 18 evaluated at least two committees and 17 evaluated between 3 and 7 committees.

Table 1. Number of committees each respondents evaluated.

No. of committees	N	%
1	50	58.8%
2	18	21.2%
3	6	7.1%
4	4	4.7%
5	4	4.7%
6	2	2.4%
7	1	1.2%
Total	85	100.0%

Altogether, **12 committees were evaluated**: Academic Issues Council, Academic Senate, Associated Students of Golden West College (ASGWC), Campus Life and Support Services (CLASS), College Technology Committee (CTC), Council for Curriculum & Instruction (CCI), Council of Chairs and Deans (CCD), Facilities, Safety, Land Development (FSLD), Institute for Professional Development (IPD), Institutional Effectiveness (IEC), Planning and Budget (P&B), and Recruitment to Completion Committee (RCC), Table 2. **Each committee had a minimum of 2 evaluations.**

Table 2. Number of responses collected for each committee.

Committee Name	N	%
Council of Chairs and Deans (CCD)	12	14.1%
Academic Senate	11	12.9%
Facilities, Safety, Land Development (FSLD)	11	12.9%
Institutional Effectiveness (IEC)	9	10.6%
Recruitment to Completion Committee (RCC)	8	9.4%
Campus Life and Support Services (CLASS)	7	8.2%
Institute for Professional Development (IPD)	7	8.2%
Planning and Budget (P&B)	6	7.1%
Council for Curriculum & Instruction (CCI)	5	5.9%
Academic Issues Council	4	4.7%
Associated Students of Golden West College (ASGWC)	3	3.5%
College Technology Committee (CTC)	2	2.4%
Total	85	100.0%

For the remainder of the survey, responses were combined for all committees because the sample size for some committees were small and could result in less meaningful analysis. Disaggregate data by individual committee are available in the appendix section.

Sixty-six percent of committee members always attended committee meetings (Table 3). Nine individuals wanted to express more on their attendance. Three stated that they only missed meetings if it conflicted with another meeting or other urgent events in their schedule, two stated that they attended meetings twice a month, two missed two or fewer meetings, one never missed any meetings but was occasionally late due to teaching conflict, and one stated that they missed a few meetings here and there.

Table 3. Attendance rate.

	N	%
Always	56	65.9%
Often	16	18.8%
Other	9	10.6%
Sometimes	3	3.5%
Did not response	1	1.2%
Total	85	100.0%

In the following section, respondents were asked to choose the statement which best described the committee they were evaluating from the following categories: results, ownership/morale, clarity of committee’s charges and mission, team processes, communication, leadership sharing, administrative support, and structure of the committee.

The majority of respondents (44%) rated that their committee achieved good results (Table 4). Good results meant that the committee solved significant problems resulting in substantial improvement of program efficiency and/or major impact on college mission and goals. The committee was comfortable with making decisions/recommendations. Less than 3% of respondents thought that their committee achieved no results.

Table 4. Ratings of committee’s results.

	N	%
Excellent results. The committee has a history of solving major problems and is on its way to being self-directed.	29	34.1%
Good results. The committee has solved significant problems resulting in substantial improvement of program efficiency and/or major impact on college mission and goals. The committee is comfortable with making decisions/recommendations.	37	43.5%
Minor results. The committee has achieved minor success with problems that have resulted in small improvement of program efficiency and/or minor impact on college mission and goals. The committee is beginning to tackle problems of more significance.	14	16.5%
No results. The committee has achieved no measurable results. Committee members have a difficult time solving the simplest of problems.	2	2.4%
Did not respond	1	1.2%
No opinion	2	2.4%
Total	85	100.0%

Slightly more respondents (38%) rated that their committee had ownership of the committee (Table 5). Committee members felt a growing sense of teamwork and self-confidence as they learn to work together. Most committee members were involved in team activities. Additionally, 37% of respondents rated that their committee had high ownership.

Table 5. Ratings of committee’s ownership/morale.

	N	%
High ownership. All committee members believe in the team concept and are involved in team activities.	31	36.5%
Ownership. Committee members feel a growing sense of teamwork and self-confidence as they learn to work together. Most committee members get involved in team activities	32	37.6%
Some ownership. Some committee members believe in the team concept, while others remain negative about working together as a committee.	16	18.8%
No ownership. There are feelings of frustration and dissatisfaction among committee members. Committee members refuse to get involved in team activities or refuse to attend meetings.	3	3.5%
No Opinion	3	3.5%
Total	85	100.0%

More than half of respondents (52%) rated that their committee was focused on the clarity of the committee’s charges and missions (Table 6). The mission and charges of the committee were clear to most committee members. Most committee efforts were focused on accomplishing the committee’s mission.

Table 6. Ratings on committee’s clarity of its charges and missions.

	N	%
Highly focused. Each member appears to know the mission and charge of the committee. All the committee’s efforts are focused on accomplishing the committee’s mission.	29	34.1%
Focused. The mission and charges of the committee are clear to most committee members. Most committee efforts are focused on accomplishing the committee’s mission.	44	51.8%
Unclearly focused. It is not clear if committee members understand the mission or charges of the committee	6	7.1%
Not focused. Members do not understand or do not agree on the mission or charges of the committee and their individual responsibilities.	5	5.9%
No Opinion	1	1.2%
Total	85	100.0%

Forty-two percent of respondents rated that their committee had good team processes (Table 7). The committee meetings were effective. Use of meeting roles and tools was evident. Committee members were fairly engaged in solving problems and making decisions.

Table 7. Ratings on committee’s team processes.

	N	%
Excellent processes. Meetings are extremely effective; every committee member is highly engaged in solving problems, making decisions, and reaching consensus.	31	36.5%
Good processes. The committee meetings are effective. Use of meeting roles and tools is evident. Committee members are fairly engaged in solving problems and making decisions.	36	42.4%
Emerging processes. Little is accomplished at committee meetings. Members are beginning to use problem solving and decision-making tools.	9	10.6%
Poor team processes. Committee meetings are for information sharing only. The committee does not use formal problem solving or decision-making tools.	7	8.2%
No Opinion.	2	2.4%
Total	85	100.0%

Fifty-three percent of respondents rated that their committee had good communication (Table 8). Committee members were tactful and express themselves openly and honestly. Members listened to each other, express concern and understanding, and demonstrate respect for each other.

Table 8. Ratings of committee’s communication.

	N	%
Good communication. Committee members are tactful and express themselves openly and honestly. Members listen to each other, express concern and understanding, and demonstrate respect for each other.	45	52.9%
Emerging communication. Most committee members share ideas and are supportive of one another, and typically deal with conflict respectfully.	30	35.3%
Cautious communication. Committee members seldom demonstrate active listening skills. Discussions are usually guarded and conflict is not handled well.	6	7.1%
Poor communication. Committee members do not demonstrate active listening skills, and conflict is avoided and/or goes unresolved.	2	2.4%
No Opinion	2	2.4%
Total	85	100.0%

Forty-one percent of respondents rated that their committee had shared leadership (Table 9). Committee members themselves assumed leadership responsibilities without depending on the committee leader.

Table 9. Ratings of committee’s leadership sharing.

	N	%
Shared leadership. Committee members themselves assume leadership responsibilities without depending on the committee leader.	35	41.2%
Emerging leadership sharing. Many committee members share the leadership function, and the committee is becoming less dependent on the committee leader.	25	29.4%
Minimal leadership sharing. Committee members are hesitant to accept leadership responsibilities; they still rely heavily on the committee leader.	14	16.5%
No shared leadership. Only the committee leader performs most of the tasks for the committee.	7	8.2%
No Opinion	3	3.5%
Total	85	100.0%

Forty-six percent of respondents rated that their committee had strong administrative support (Table 10). The committee’s contribution was valued and recognized by management. The committee received all the resources required.

Table 10. Ratings of committee’s administrative support.

	N	%
Strong support. The committee’s contribution is valued and recognized by management. The committee receives all the resources required.	39	45.9%
Increasing support. The committee receives strong support and resources from management. Many of the committee’s recommendations are implemented. Recommendations that are not implemented are discussed with the committee by management.	27	31.8%
Minimal support. The committee receives verbal support but only minimal resources from management. Very few of the committee’s recommendations are implemented.	11	12.9%
No support. The committee receives no help or gets no resources from management. Committee duties are seen as impediments to employees completing their primary duties.	2	2.4%
No Opinion	6	7.1%
Total	85	100.0%

Forty-six percent of respondents rated that their committee was effectively structured (Table 11). Campus representation on the committee was ideal for the optimal accomplishment of the committee’s mission and goals.

Table 11. Ratings of committee’s structure.

	N	%
Effectively structured. Campus representation on the committee is ideal for the optimal accomplishment of the committee’s mission and goals.	39	45.9%
Adequately structured. Campus representation on the committee is appropriate for the accomplishment of the committee’s mission and goals.	33	38.8%
Partially structured. The committee does not have the appropriate representation and/or the committee’s size is unmanageable and inappropriate for the committee’s mission and goals.	6	7.1%
Poorly structured. The committee lacks the appropriate campus representation and composition (students, classified, faculty, and management). The committee’s size is unmanageable and/or inappropriate for the committee’s mission and goals.	4	4.7%
No Opinion	3	3.5%
Total	85	100.0%

Lastly, 22 people commented on the committee for which they were a member. **Close to half of the comments were positive assessments of the committee.** Many stated that they thought their committee was welcoming, committee members were supportive and worked well together. A few others thought that the structure of their committee/the meetings need to be improved so that committee or meetings are productive, focused, and ends in a timely matter. Additionally, low attendance by members and lack of representation by all departments were noticed and noted by a few respondents.

SUMMARY

Fifty people responded to the Spring 2016 Committee Effectiveness Self-Evaluation Survey. Altogether, 12 committees were evaluated: Academic Issues Council, Academic Senate, Associated Students of Golden West College, Campus Life and Support Services, College Technology Committee, Council for Curriculum & Instruction, Council of Chairs and Deans, Facilities, Safety, Land Development, Institute for Professional Development, Institutional Effectiveness, Planning and Budget, and Recruitment to Completion Committee. Sixty-six percent of respondents indicated that they always attended committee meetings. Those who were not at each meeting stated that they missed meetings if it conflicted with another meeting or other urgent events in their schedule, some missed a few meetings here and there, and another stated that they usually arrived at meetings late due to their teaching schedule.

When asked to choose the statements which best described the committee respondents were evaluating from the following categories: results, ownership/morale, clarity of committee’s charges and mission, team processes, communication, leadership sharing, administrative support, and structure of the committee, most rated their committee(s) positively. Comments from respondents regarding their committee was positive too. Some noted that the structure of the committees needed to be improved while other noted the low attendance rate as something that they would like to see improved.

APPENDIX

This section contains supplemental data from the survey disaggregated by individual committees. Table 13 is disaggregated data of meeting attendance rates. Tables 14 through 21 are ratings statement which respondents selected that best described the committee they were evaluating from the following categories: results, ownership/morale, clarity of committee’s charges and mission, team processes, communication, leadership sharing, administrative support, and structure of the committee. Bolded results indicate groups with the largest representation.

Table 13. How often individuals attended committee meetings.

Attendance Rate	Academic Issues Council		Academic Senate		Associated Students of Golden West College (ASGWC)		Campus Life and Support Services (CLASS)		College Technology Committee (CTC)		Council for Curriculum & Instruction (CCI)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	4	100.0%	9	81.8%	3	100.0%	3	42.9%	1	50.0%	2	40.0%
Often	--	0.0%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	2	28.6%	1	50.0%	1	20.0%
Other	--	0.0%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	1	14.3%	--	0.0%	1	20.0%
Sometimes	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	14.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
Did not response	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	20.0%
Total	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	3	100.0%	7	100.0%	2	100.0%	5	100.0%

Attendance Rate	Council of Chairs and Deans (CCD)		Facilities, Safety, Land Development (FSLD)		Institute for Professional Development (IPD)		Institutional Effectiveness (IEC)		Planning and Budget (P&B)		Recruitment to Completion Committee (RCC)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	8	66.7%	5	45.5%	4	57.1%	8	88.9%	4	66.7%	5	62.5%
Often	3	25.0%	4	36.4%	1	14.3%	1	11.1%	--	0.0%	2	25.0%
Other	--	0.0%	1	9.1%	2	28.6%	--	0.0%	2	33.3%	1	12.5%
Sometimes	1	8.3%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
Did not response	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
Total	12	100.0%	11	100.0%	7	100.0%	9	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%

Table 14. Rating on results achieved by each committee

Excellent results: The committee has a history of solving major problems and is on its way to being self-directed. *Good results:* The committee has solved significant problems resulting in substantial improvement of program efficiency and/or major impact on college mission and goals. The committee is comfortable with making decisions/recommendations. *Minor results:* The committee has achieved minor success with problems that have resulted in small improvement of program efficiency and/or minor impact on college mission and goals. The committee is beginning to tackle problems of more significance. *No results:* The committee has achieved no measurable results. Committee members have a difficult time solving the simplest of problems. *No opinion.*

	Academic Issues Council		Academic Senate		Associated Students of Golden West College (ASGWC)		Campus Life and Support Services (CLASS)		College Technology Committee (CTC)		Council for Curriculum & Instruction (CCI)		Council of Chairs and Deans (CCD)		Facilities, Safety, Land Development (FSLD)		Institute for Professional Development (IPD)		Institutional Effectiveness (IEC)		Planning and Budget (P&B)		Recruitment to Completion Committee (RCC)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Excellent results	1	25.0%	9	81.8%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	4	80.0%	1	8.3%	2	18.2%	5	71.4%	6	66.7%	--	0.0%	1	12.5%
Good result	2	50.0%	1	9.1%	3	100.0%	2	28.6%	1	50.0%	1	20.0%	3	25.0%	7	63.6%	2	28.6%	3	33.3%	6	100.0%	6	75.0%
Minor results	1	25.0%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	2	28.6%	1	50.0%	--	0.0%	6	50.0%	2	18.2%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	12.5%
No results	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	2	16.7%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
Did not respond	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	14.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
No opinion	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	2	28.6%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	3	100.0%	7	100.0%	2	100.0%	5	100.0%	12	100.0%	11	100.0%	7	100.0%	9	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%

Table 15. Ratings on ownership/morale by each committee.

High ownership: All committee members believe in the team concept and are involved in team activities. *Ownership:* Committee members feel a growing sense of teamwork and self-confidence as they learn to work together. Most committee members get involved in team activities. *Some ownership:* Some committee members believe in the team concept, while others remain negative about working together as a committee. *No ownership:* There are feelings of frustration and dissatisfaction among committee members. Committee members refuse to get involved in team activities or refuse to attend meetings. *No Opinion.*

	Academic Issues Council		Academic Senate		Associated Students of Golden West College (ASGWC)		Campus Life and Support Services (CLASS)		College Technology Committee (CTC)		Council for Curriculum & Instruction (CCI)		Council of Chairs and Deans (CCD)		Facilities, Safety, Land Development (FSLD)		Institute for Professional Development (IPD)		Institutional Effectiveness (IEC)		Planning and Budget (P&B)		Recruitment to Completion Committee (RCC)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High ownership	2	50.0%	8	72.7%	1	33.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	2	40.0%	1	8.3%	2	18.2%	6	85.7%	6	66.7%	1	16.7%	2	25.0%
Ownership	--	0.0%	3	27.3%	2	66.7%	4	57.1%	1	50.0%	3	60.0%	2	16.7%	6	54.5%	1	14.3%	3	33.3%	4	66.7%	3	37.5%
Some ownership	2	50.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	14.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	6	50.0%	3	27.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	16.7%	3	37.5%
No ownership	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	3	25.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
No Opinion	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	2	28.6%	1	50.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	3	100.0%	7	100.0%	2	100.0%	5	100.0%	12	100.0%	11	100.0%	7	100.0%	9	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%

Table 16. Ratings on clarity of committee’s charges and mission by each committee.

Highly focused: Each member appears to know the mission and charge of the committee. All the committee’s efforts are focused on accomplishing the committee’s mission. *Focused:* The mission and charges of the committee are clear to most committee members. Most committee efforts are focused on accomplishing the committee’s mission. *Unclearly focused:* It is not clear if committee members understand the mission or charges of the committee. *Not focused:* Members do not understand or do not agree on the mission or charges of the committee and their individual responsibilities. *No Opinion.*

	Academic Issues Council		Academic Senate		Associated Students of Golden West College (ASGWC)		Campus Life and Support Services (CLASS)		College Technology Committee (CTC)		Council for Curriculum & Instruction (CCI)		Council of Chairs and Deans (CCD)		Facilities, Safety, Land Development (FSLD)		Institute for Professional Development (IPD)		Institutional Effectiveness (IEC)		Planning and Budget (P&B)		Recruitment to Completion Committee (RCC)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Highly focused	1	25.0%	6	54.5%	1	33.3%	1	14.3%	--	0.0%	4	80.0%	1	8.3%	2	18.2%	6	85.7%	4	44.4%	2	33.3%	1	12.5%
Focused	3	75.0%	5	45.5%	2	66.7%	2	28.6%	1	50.0%	1	20.0%	6	50.0%	7	63.6%	1	14.3%	5	55.6%	4	66.7%	7	87.5%
Unclearly focused	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	14.3%	1	50.0%	--	0.0%	3	25.0%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
Not focused	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	2	28.6%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	2	16.7%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
No Opinion	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	14.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	3	100.0%	7	100.0%	2	100.0%	5	100.0%	12	100.0%	11	100.0%	7	100.0%	9	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%

Table 17. Ratings on ownership/morale by each committee.

Excellent processes: Meetings are extremely effective; every committee member is highly engaged in solving problems, making decisions, and reaching consensus. *Good processes:* The committee meetings are effective. Use of meeting roles and tools is evident. Committee members are fairly engaged in solving problems and making decisions. *Emerging processes:* Little is accomplished at committee meetings. Members are beginning to use problem solving and decision-making tools. *Poor team processes:* Committee meetings are for information sharing only. The committee does not use formal problem solving or decision-making tools. *No Opinion.*

	Academic Issues Council		Academic Senate		Associated Students of Golden West College (ASGWC)		Campus Life and Support Services (CLASS)		College Technology Committee (CTC)		Council for Curriculum & Instruction (CCI)		Council of Chairs and Deans (CCD)		Facilities, Safety, Land Development (FSLD)		Institute for Professional Development (IPD)		Institutional Effectiveness (IEC)		Planning and Budget (P&B)		Recruitment to Completion Committee (RCC)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Excellent processes	2	50.0%	9	81.8%	1	33.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	3	60.0%	1	8.3%	2	18.2%	6	85.7%	6	66.7%	--	0.0%	1	12.5%
Good processes	2	50.0%	2	18.2%	2	66.7%	3	42.9%	1	50.0%	2	40.0%	3	25.0%	6	54.5%	1	14.3%	3	33.3%	6	100.0%	5	62.5%
Emerging processes	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	14.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	5	41.7%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	2	25.0%
Poor team processes	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	2	28.6%	1	50.0%	--	0.0%	3	25.0%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
No Opinion	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	14.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	3	100.0%	7	100.0%	2	100.0%	5	100.0%	12	100.0%	11	100.0%	7	100.0%	9	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%

Table 18. Ratings of communication by each committee.

Good communication: Committee members are tactful and express themselves openly and honestly. Members listen to each other, express concern and understanding, and demonstrate respect for each other. *Emerging communication.* Most committee members share ideas and are supportive of one another, and typically deal with conflict respectfully. *Cautious communication:* Committee members seldom demonstrate active listening skills. Discussions are usually guarded and conflict is not handled well. *Poor communication:* Committee members do not demonstrate active listening skills, and conflict is avoided and/or goes unresolved. *No Opinion.*

	Academic Issues Council		Academic Senate		Associated Students of Golden West College (ASGWC)		Campus Life and Support Services (CLASS)		College Technology Committee (CTC)		Council for Curriculum & Instruction (CCI)		Council of Chairs and Deans (CCD)		Facilities, Safety, Land Development (FSLD)		Institute for Professional Development (IPD)		Institutional Effectiveness (IEC)		Planning and Budget (P&B)		Recruitment to Completion Committee (RCC)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Good communication	2	50.0%	9	81.8%	1	33.3%	3	42.9%	1	50.0%	3	60.0%	3	25.0%	6	54.5%	6	85.7%	7	77.8%	1	16.7%	3	37.5%
Emerging communication	2	50.0%	2	18.2%	2	66.7%	2	28.6%	--	0.0%	2	40.0%	3	25.0%	4	36.4%	1	14.3%	2	22.2%	5	83.3%	5	62.5%
Cautious communication	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	14.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	4	33.3%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
Poor communication	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	2	16.7%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
No Opinion	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	14.3%	1	50.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	3	100.0%	7	100.0%	2	100.0%	5	100.0%	12	100.0%	11	100.0%	7	100.0%	9	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%

Table 19. Ratings on leadership sharing by each committee.

Shared leadership: Committee members themselves assume leadership responsibilities without depending on the committee leader. *Emerging leadership sharing:* Many committee members share the leadership function, and the committee is becoming less dependent on the committee leader. *Minimal leadership sharing:* Committee members are hesitant to accept leadership responsibilities; they still rely heavily on the committee leader. *No shared leadership:* Only the committee leader performs most of the tasks for the committee. *No Opinion.*

	Academic Issues Council		Academic Senate		Associated Students of Golden West College (ASGWC)		Campus Life and Support Services (CLASS)		College Technology Committee (CTC)		Council for Curriculum & Instruction (CCI)		Council of Chairs and Deans (CCD)		Facilities, Safety, Land Development (FSLD)		Institute for Professional Development (IPD)		Institutional Effectiveness (IEC)		Planning and Budget (P&B)		Recruitment to Completion Committee (RCC)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Shared leadership	2	50.0%	8	72.7%	1	33.3%	2	28.6%	--	0.0%	1	20.0%	1	8.3%	5	45.5%	5	71.4%	6	66.7%	2	33.3%	2	25.0%
Emerging leadership sharing	1	25.0%	2	18.2%	2	66.7%	2	28.6%	1	50.0%	2	40.0%	2	16.7%	2	18.2%	2	28.6%	2	22.2%	1	16.7%	6	75.0%
Minimal leadership sharing	1	25.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	2	40.0%	6	50.0%	2	18.2%	--	0.0%	1	11.1%	2	33.3%	--	0.0%
No shared leadership	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	2	28.6%	1	50.0%	--	0.0%	2	16.7%	2	18.2%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
No Opinion	--	0.0%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	1	14.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	16.7%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	3	100.0%	7	100.0%	2	100.0%	5	100.0%	12	100.0%	11	100.0%	7	100.0%	9	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%

Table 20. Ratings on administrative support sharing by each committee.

Strong support: The committee’s contribution is valued and recognized by management. The committee receives all the resources required. *Increasing support:* The committee receives strong support and resources from management. Many of the committee’s recommendations are implemented. Recommendations that are not implemented are discussed with the committee by management. *Minimal support:* The committee receives verbal support but only minimal resources from management. Very few of the committee’s recommendations are implemented. *No support:* The committee receives no help or gets no resources from management. Committee duties are seen as impediments to employees completing their primary duties. *No Opinion.*

	Academic Issues Council		Academic Senate		Associated Students of Golden West College (ASGWC)		Campus Life and Support Services (CLASS)		College Technology Committee (CTC)		Council for Curriculum & Instruction (CCI)		Council of Chairs and Deans (CCD)		Facilities, Safety, Land Development (FSLD)		Institute for Professional Development (IPD)		Institutional Effectiveness (IEC)		Planning and Budget (P&B)		Recruitment to Completion Committee (RCC)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strong support	2	50.0%	7	63.6%	2	66.7%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	3	60.0%	3	25.0%	7	63.6%	5	71.4%	2	22.2%	3	50.0%	5	62.5%
Increasing support	1	25.0%	2	18.2%	1	33.3%	1	14.3%	2	100.0%	2	40.0%	2	16.7%	3	27.3%	2	28.6%	5	55.6%	3	50.0%	3	37.5%
Minimal support	1	25.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	4	57.1%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	5	41.7%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	11.1%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
No support	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	8.3%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
No Opinion	--	0.0%	2	18.2%	--	0.0%	2	28.6%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	8.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	11.1%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
Total	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	3	100.0%	7	100.0%	2	100.0%	5	100.0%	12	100.0%	11	100.0%	7	100.0%	9	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%

Table 21. Ratings of committee’s structure by each committee.

Effectively structured: Campus representation on the committee is ideal for the optimal accomplishment of the committee’s mission and goals. *Adequately structured:* Campus representation on the committee is appropriate for the accomplishment of the committee’s mission and goals. *Partially structured:* The committee does not have the appropriate representation and/or the committee’s size is unmanageable and inappropriate for the committee’s mission and goals. *Poorly structured:* The committee lacks the appropriate campus representation and composition (students, classified, faculty, and management). The committee’s size is unmanageable and/or inappropriate for the committee’s mission and goals. *No Opinion.*

	Academic Issues Council		Academic Senate		Associated Students of Golden West College (ASGWC)		Campus Life and Support Services (CLASS)		College Technology Committee (CTC)		Council for Curriculum & Instruction (CCI)		Council of Chairs and Deans (CCD)		Facilities, Safety, Land Development (FSLD)		Institute for Professional Development (IPD)		Institutional Effectiveness (IEC)		Planning and Budget (P&B)		Recruitment to Completion Committee (RCC)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Effectively structured	2	50.0%	9	81.8%	1	33.3%	1	14.3%	--	0.0%	5	100.0%	1	8.3%	4	36.4%	6	85.7%	6	66.7%	2	33.3%	2	25.0%
Adequately structured	2	50.0%	2	18.2%	2	66.7%	2	28.6%	1	50.0%	--	0.0%	8	66.7%	5	45.5%	1	14.3%	3	33.3%	3	50.0%	4	50.0%
Partially structured	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	2	28.6%	1	50.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	16.7%	1	12.5%
Poorly structured	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	14.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	3	25.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%
No Opinion	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	14.3%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	9.1%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	--	0.0%	1	12.5%
Total	4	100.0%	11	100.0%	3	100.0%	7	100.0%	2	100.0%	5	100.0%	12	100.0%	11	100.0%	7	100.0%	9	100.0%	6	100.0%	8	100.0%