2019

The Shocker Circle Summ

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019 WSU SHARED GOVERNANCE & THE CIRCLE PROCESS

In the fall of 2018 and the spring of 2019, the Office of Human Resources scheduled eleven Shared Governance discussion groups. Due to low registration, ten sessions cancelled. Eleven sessions hosted eighty-eight faculty and staff participation in the remaining eleven sessions. The seventy-eight (78) participants included twenty-four faculty and fifty-four staff. Based on the group discussions, three key areas of opportunity rose to the top: communication, transparency, and involvement/input.

Shortly after, the Office of Academic Affairs and the Strategic Planning Steering Committee sought out six volunteers to with contract consultants from the Kansas Institute for Peace and Conflict Resolution (KIPCOR) to learn more about an engagement process. The intention of the process was to build campus-wide involvement in movement toward a trustworthy process for decision-making and responsible transparency. Those volunteers came together and began meeting in Febr 2019. The volunteers dubbed as "the reference team," was comprised of a faculty member and four university staff members (UP staff) from different areas on campus (human resources, academic affairs, student affairs, service area, and the office of institutional equity and compliance). The team learned more about the circle process. The circle process would serve as the meeting used to host future shared governance meetings offered campus-wide. After several meetings, the reference team began their solicitation for volunteers. Those volunteers would train alongside the team in becoming circle leaders. The circle leader serve as the guide/host of the Shocker Circles. Thirteen volunteers joined and participated in a full day training on July 25th. Those volunteers included three full-time students and ten staff members (three of those staff members are also WSU students). Following the training the Reference Team and the new volunteers were dubbed, The Shocker Circle Keeper

The work to share the future Shocker Circles began with the website, news releases, flyers, digital TV, 21.6 (i)3

Each Circle Keeper asked the same three questions in each session:

1. What is something that you value about the current decision-making process at the University?
2. What can the University do to demonstrate respect, trust, and transparency in the decision-making process?
3. How can the University best solicit input from staff, faculty, students, and administrators?

All but one of the forty participants provided feedback to the three questions asked. The anonymity of each was respected and identity was only shared by category (e.g., administrator, dean, faculty, staff and/or student). The participant chose which of the five categories represented them the best. In other words, a staff member who may also be attending school part-time presented themselves as staff.

Below you will find the full set of responses to the questions with no priority given to a session or participant.

Q1: What is something that you value about the current decision-making process at the University?

- Very happy with the process at the lower levels, individually within the department. There's a responsiveness in going up and down the chain of command much better than it has been in the past. Things are being heard, brought forward, run up the chain of command and addressed. Not sure what's going on beyond the student affairs terms of leadership. Not sure if the division is represented on the President's Executive Team. Try to do things like Circles to see how the water is in other areas.
- Seems like there's more stability in the last two years for leadership positions on campus like deans. Speaks to a positive forward motion if people aren't tipping ship. Lots of things have come out of that turmoil where the University is trying to make a statement that they care, they see the mistakes, and they're trying to recalibrate.
- Interdisciplinary and cross-discipline academic programs helps to keep us [illegible]

QR1: What is something that you value about the current decision making process at the University?

- I believe there is an intent with Academic Affairs to make this happen. Faculty are trying to follow up on the inten in the plan. Not always true at the college or department level.
- I appreciate the effort to incorporate more voices into the communication and decisions being made.
- Professionally satisfying. Having opportunities and not having constraints has been good.
- Decisive is the word I would use. The decisions result on more actions.
- Likes the curriculum change process. Keeps people from being railroaded.
- Most decisions are made from the strategic goals. I like that.
- What we have seen in leadership has been exceptional. The process is more open and can see what is taki Would like to see that continue. Hope we can feel the sense of openness.
- Poverty in this world is very sad. University needs to be involved in meeting needs.
- Culture of Yes. As long as you have thought the idea out, it is normally a "yes."
- "Yes if" and a "no because" that allows you to think from a place of possibility.
- Excited about the possibilities.
- Faculty has been pushing for this conversion for the past 7 years. Things are finally starting to move and ar happy/curious of where the university is heading.
- More effort of transparency.
- Not enough knowledge about decision making. Wishes they could be more involved or aware of this process.
- Not necessarily aware of all the things and decisions that occur or how to get involved.
- Values that everyone has a chance to participate.
- As being part of it, they value the efforts of weekly briefings, WSU Today, and seeing that there is a lot of th behind things.
- Making efforts to be more transparent for students, staff and faculty
- Effort that has started and will hopefully continue on shared governance
- New process of ways to input to the process
- Value opportunity for peopole to contribute regardless of their position
- Ditto: Value opportunity for people to contribute regardless of their position
- Not standing still and are moving forward
- B81 Economic and business approaches that are being considered in the process and communicated from other univ and other places
-

QR1: What is something that you value about the current decision making process at the University?

- I think its good that the university asked what students wanted to be done; think the advertisement to be done; it online, posters and advertisement, the effort and resources to gain voices was done well
- I value the transparency of who is being hired for the experience and feedback that the university uses all the students voices from
- I get details from UP senate on decisions and what is happening, I appreciate the run down and summary
- I love all of the university library special collections, tons of improvements and connections
- I like the faculty senate; its deliberative, I like that they take it to pieces; it could be postponed but the deliberation that, I value
- I came from advisory council, the internship and we invited the students, listening to students tell us what dire would; the organization is moving without a president.

QR2 What can the University do to demonstrate respect, trust, and transparency in the decision process? (Continued)

- On trust, going back to the mission statement and changes are being made. If multiple depts being affected by a change, they need to take ownership so that we can trust people have the tools they need to change their j depts didn't realize that Chrome River training was important and that cardholders and travelers need to be requ attend. Can we trust that once we're involved, will we even be told that the change happened? Heard from m people that a secondary change occurs and they never hear about it. Accountability would create more trust wit management and between depts. Lots of people say their job is redoing work that was already done because of changes.
- I wish we had the talking point written down somewhere. Is that part of the process? Pass
- Remember many of these issues, even when Barack was going through the interview process understanding was that he wasn't most people's first choice, so there was surprise when he was hired that's why it's a closed process this time around. Seems to be a little better, and give credit to the S for making waves.
- Feel privileged as a faculty member to have the flexibility to attend things like this – feels like voice is heard in dept. Dean has monthly meetings for everyone to share thoughts, agenda items. Can easily see that the U needs to work hard at being transparent, because not every college or dept has the same kind of direct line to the Dean. Not even sure if every dept has meetings with their chairs; there are lots of ways to miss faculty and staff. Opportunities this are important, and would hope that upper administration strongly encourages dept heads to make it work for people to attend.
- University could do a better job of admitting mistakes and coming absolutely clean, rather than trying to smooth it when it's clear to everyone that a mistake was made. This has lost a lot of trust on campus for claims about enro numbers and decisions made. It's easy to lose respect for leadership when they can't admit the mistake and exp happened. Agree that often the decision has been made, and then input is requested – this is frustrating, because even when you get input, it doesn't matter. Having vote after vote until it goes their way. This burns the bridge, lows ra

QR2: What can the University do to demonstrate respect, trust, and transparency in the decision making process? (Continued)

- Only in the last few years have I engaged. President Bardo was not always open and transparent. We have to recognize history. If we make changes, some of that will not go away. Weekly briefings helps with this instead of it hitting the Bpeaul7 ( )]TJy41. WBapeio0.7 ((on)71.4n(r)-6.9 (e)-7.n(v)-1.4)- (gef0h)-16 (r)-7 (N(s3o-2.ef0h)-1)7 (gof.9 (9 (

QR2: What can the University do to demonstrate respect, trust, and transparency in the decision making process? (Continued)

- It's uncomfortable to talk about. There is a lot of faculty, but doesn't seem like we have a voice.
- Availability would be something the university can do better. There is no connection or sense of connectedness. There is no open/honest communication and everything seems scripted.
- Accountability would be a value the university could do better with. People aren't held accountable when they're events, etc and things aren't equal.
- Transparency begins with a sense of shared mission. People at every level need to feel part of the success as a we have this shared mission and can communicate better - the value of the university will be richer. There needs to be feedback and everyone needs to have a voice.
- Some people don't feel like they are part of the process if they are not in Morrison. They are attempting to give a time to share and feel like they are part of the process but people still feel like not being heard. Have people feel more part of the process. Hearing things through the grapevine and communicating in advance where people ha to think and process before needing to provide input. Finding a way to communicate more timely effec
- I try really hard not to read the comments on WildState social media but many of the comments are just so negative from the students and that is just so hurtful to see that the students feel like they are not getting what they wan students are mad and not having a voice and the whole referendum thing did not go over well. I would really like to more action that we are student focused and not lip service that we are student focus. There is so much focus business side and we really need to be more focused on the students and the support for them. We get emails fro administration or our dean does and sometimes it is hard for it get it to the masses. Some people are better than with cascading of information. It raises defenses and it feels like people are being dishonest when you find out

QR2: What can the University do to demonstrate respect, trust, and transparency in the decision-making process? (Continued)

- My big question is Why? I don't have to be part of all the decisions and all the hiring that has taken place. If w hired them then we should trust their decision making, However if there are issues and decisions to be made that effect the university or a department and you are making big decisions tell us up front. If I like it or not I will to live with it but I was communicated with
- There are big things communication is one of them

QR3:How can the University best solicit input from staff, faculty, students, and administrators?

- Free food! People will go anywhere for free food! Open line of communication constantly available at social engagements, places where people will go for social interaction, but may be willing to give more casual input. G

The next steps will be determined based on the content of the responses provided in the circle process. In the sp
transparency, a compilation of the circle process responses will be posted to the Shocker Circle Keepers website
(https://www.wichita.edu/academics/academic_affairs/shocker_circle_keepers.php) when a format is finalized.

Following a review of the responses listed above (e)0.9 (v)2.6 (a([o)-1.9 (w)22cF[,]o)-3.5 (ere f EMC a)15.7 (d)-3 (01 Tc -0

6. Would you like to see the circle process repeated on a wider scale in the future? Would you parti in such a process?
7. Please share any additional feedback regarding your participation.
8. What would you most like to see changed in the training and why?
9. Other comments or important insights gained from this training. Please use the back of this pa you need more room.

At the time of this report, a copy of the survey results were not available.

In closing, the Reference Team agreed that the top three themes found in the spring of 2019 Shared Governance discussi remain communication, transparency, and involvement/input. Following a recent General Meeting with the UP & USS s it was discussed from there that the Reference Team could work in tandem with the Senates to share the information gat to assist in their next steps of Shared Governance. The goal is that all those who have contributed to work on Shared Governance throughout 2018-2019 continue to build along with the Senators the future of communication, transparency, and involvement/input.

Contributors to this report are the Shocker Circle Reference Team (Shameika Fisher, Jay Price, Sheryl Propst, Lydia Santiago and Christine Taylor)