



## College Council Self-Evaluation Instrument – Participatory Governance Effectiveness Rubric

### Institutional Communication

	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Discussion Involves Stakeholder Feedback</b>	Stakeholder feedback has been gathered through structured meetings, surveys, or other formal means. Reports back from representatives reflect stakeholder consensus or debate that is reviewable in minutes or other evidence. Information provided to stakeholders for getting feedback is the same thorough, judicious documents presented to College Council.	Stakeholder feedback has been gathered mostly or entirely through informal means. Reports back reflect representative's impression of their constituents' predominant feeling. Evidence is absent. Information provided to stakeholders for feedback is in some kind of informal summary form.	Stakeholder feedback may be indistinguishable from representative's own view. The representative may provide no feedback whatsoever. No evidence exists that feedback was sought or obtained, whether formally or informally. No information was provided to stakeholders.
<b>Discussion Is Informed</b>	Information provided for discussion is thorough, judicious, and posted to the group not less than 72 hours ahead of the meeting. Committee members have read the material thoroughly, mastered it, and come prepared with insightful questions and comments. Discussion is modulated and productive.	Information provided for discussion is not always complete or well-chosen (too much or too little) and may occasionally be posted to the group less than 72 hours ahead of the meeting. Committee members are familiar with documents to be discussed but demonstrate little grasp of particulars. Discussion is courteous even if occasionally strident.	Information provided for discussion may be absent when necessary or one-sided. Items may be posted on the same day as the meeting or not posted at all. Committee members engage in discussion more to guard turf or defend entrenched positions than seek productive resolution.



## College Council Self-Evaluation Instrument – Participatory Governance Effectiveness Rubric

<p><b>Discussion Is Professional</b></p>	<p>Committee members treat each other and each other’s contributions with respect. Goodwill predominates even in disagreement. Members are always attentive.</p>	<p>Committee members listen to each other politely. Kindness and professionalism predominate. Members are often attentive.</p>	<p>Committee members may talk over the top of one another, be dismissive in words or gestures, or make disagreements personal. In extreme cases, bullying or baiting may be evident.</p>
<p><b>Meetings Are Effective</b></p>	<p>Topics on the agenda are those central to the mission and effectiveness of the college. Meetings always begin and end on time. Time during the meeting is used on meaningful discussion; unrelated topics and discussion are quickly refocused.</p>	<p>Topics on the agenda are mostly those central to the mission and effectiveness of the college. Meetings usually begin and end on time. Time during the meeting is mostly used on meaningful discussion; the committee may spend more time than necessary on unrelated topics and discussion</p>	<p>Topics on the agenda sometime include agenda items that do not clearly relate to the charge of the committee. Meetings rarely begin and end on time. Time during the meeting too often strays into unrelated topics and discussion that takes considerable time to refocus.</p>
<p><b>Action is Accomplished</b></p>	<p>Discussion items are brought quickly to resolution or referred decisively for further action. Action items are assigned to the right person. Effective deadlines are determined in a way that moves decision-making forward. Action is always resolved by deadlines.</p>	<p>Discussion items may remain on the agenda longer than necessary before being brought to resolution or referred for further action. Action items are assigned. Deadlines are appropriate. Action items are mostly resolved by deadlines.</p>	<p>Discussion items often linger on the agenda for several meetings. Action items are unassigned or assigned to the wrong person. Deadlines are absent or allowed to slip from meeting to meeting. Action items are mostly unresolved.</p>