



2016-2017 Distance Learning and Technology Committee Governance Survey Results

In order to support a culture of continuous quality improvement, Coastline conducts annual surveys across all shared governance committees as means to provide information to facilitate the development of strategies to strengthen committee effectiveness in the following year. The subsequent information provides a summary of the 2016-2017 survey results.

<i>Table 1: Committee Effectiveness Behaviors</i>	Almost Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom
COLLABORATIVE: Sharing, inclusive, open to input, respectful of diverse opinions, characterized by meaningful dialogue	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TRANSPARENT: Open, easy to understand, clearly defined, characterized by effective and meaningful communication with the College community	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
EVIDENCE-BASED: Reliant upon relevant, accurate, complete, timely qualitative and/or quantitative information, not based solely on assertions, speculations, or anecdotes	58.3%	16.7%	16.7%	8.3%
EFFECTIVE: Working properly and productively towards the committee's intended results	63.6%	18.2%	18.2%	0.0%
EFFICIENT: Performing well with the least waste of time and effort, characterized by serving the committee's specified purposes in the best possible manner	58.3%	25.0%	16.7%	0.0%

Participation Rate was 66.7% of the 18 members

Table 1 indicates that 61.0% of the time the committee almost always exhibits effective committee interactive behaviors with the highest category being collaborative (75.0%). The majority of participants felt that all interactive committee behaviors are exercised almost always or often.

Over 80% of the committee members that participated indicated:

- They felt comfortable contributing ideas, felt that they were treated with respect and have sufficient opportunity to provide input.
- The quality of communication within the committee was rated favorably (good/very good).
- The quality of the meeting space location and resources to conduct the committee were rated highly favorable (good/very good).

Over 25% of the committee members that participated indicated:

- The quality of information flow from constituency groups to the committee is poor.
- The quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a whole is poor.
- Access to information needed for deliberations is poor.

The highlighted **accomplishments** included creating a Canvas subcommittee and process to approve non-course uses of Canvas. There were no **suggestions for improvement**