



---

# Defining Collaborative, Transparent, Evidence-Based, Effective, Efficient, and Inclusiveness: A Focus Group Study

---

Spring 2011

## Background

Educational Master Plan (EMP) Objective 6.1.5 states the following: “Ensure that planning processes and decision-making are collaborative, transparent, evidence-based, effective, and efficient.” One of the suggested actions for this objective seeks to establish criteria for “collaborative,” “transparent,” “evidence-based,” “effective,” and “efficient.” In addition, EMP Objective 2.1.3 states the following: Develop a common definition of inclusiveness among employees and students at CHC. Accordingly, the Crafton Council decided to use focus groups to define the terms listed in Objectives 6.1.5 and 2.1.3. The purpose of this report is to provide the Educational Master Planning Committee (EMPC) with the information derived from the focus groups in order to help facilitate the process of generating criteria and definitions for each of the six terms described above.

## Executive Summary

A summary of possible criteria and definitions for each of the six terms in the EMP derived from the constituency groups are illustrated below. The reason for providing the criteria is to help facilitate the process of the EMPC to develop a set of criteria for each term. The purpose of the summary provided here is not to suggest or recommend criteria; it is only intended to help facilitate the process of the EMPC developing its own criteria and definitions. Equally important, it is strongly recommended that the EMPC refer to the actual comments made by the focus groups during the process of establishing criteria and developing definitions for collaborative, transparent, evidence-based, effective, efficient, and inclusiveness.

## Collaboration

Effective collaboration might need to include the following criteria:

- Bottom-up style of communication
- Consistent communication
- An awareness of what others are doing
- The ability to receive disagreement well
- Working together cooperatively

## Transparency

Transparency might need to include the following criteria:

- Provide information in a timely manner and when changes occur
- Include people in decision making
- Keep people informed about decisions that are made
- Be clear
- Disclose the positive, negative, and the motivation behind a decision

### **Evidence-Based Decision Making**

Evidence-based decision making might need to include the following criteria:

- Evidence
- Research and Planning data
- Reliable information
- Data needs to be current
- Objectivity

### **Effectiveness**

Effectiveness might need to include the following criteria:

- Continuous assessment, evaluation, and improvement
- Evidence-based decision making
- Honest assessment of how well things are working
- Efficiency

### **Efficiency**

Efficiency might need to include the following criteria:

- Innovation
- Doing more with less
- A sense of caring
- Maximize productivity

### **Inclusiveness**

Inclusiveness might need to include the following criteria:

- Collaboration
- Including everyone
- Respecting everyone equally in decision-making
- Valuing the experiences of everyone
- Staff being motivated to participate and participating

## Methodology

Prior to conducting the focus groups a brief literature review was conducted to identify some best practices for conducting focus groups (Cooper & Schindler, 2001). Accordingly, in order to decrease the likelihood that the participants in the focus groups would feel like their opinion was not valued; four separate focus groups were conducted. Due to this, one focus group was conducted with faculty only, one focus group was conducted with classified staff only, one focus group was conducted with managers only, and one focus group was conducted with students only.

Each focus group had two facilitators, the Director of Research and Planning and the Research Assistant from the Office of Research and Planning. The Director and researcher took turns facilitating the discussion and taking notes on flip charts. Specifically, in each focus group the Director facilitated the discussion about collaboration, transparency, and evidence-based decision making and took notes on the flip chart. Conversely, the researcher facilitated the discussion for effectiveness, efficiency, and inclusiveness while taking notes on the flip chart. This was done in each focus group.

The focus groups took place during the Spring 2011 semester. Each facilitator introduced the topic and encouraged the group to discuss it among themselves (Cooper & Schindler, 2001). For each topic area the facilitator asked each group to answer the following three questions. 1) How do you know “insert term here” when you see it? 2) What are the behaviors associated with “insert term here”? 3) What does “insert term here” look like? If the discussion moved away from these questions or the conversation lagged then the facilitator steered the discussion back toward answering the questions. In all four groups none of the participants attempted to dominate the conversation.

## Sample

The Crafton Council consisting of the President, the Academic Senate President, the Academic Senate Vice President, the Classified Senate President, a CSEA representative; the Student Senate President, the Vice President of Instruction, the Vice President of Student Services, and the Vice President of Administrative Services reviewed the methodology for conducting the focus groups and for selecting each participant in the focus group. Accordingly, the Classified Senate, Student Senate, and Academic Senate were all asked to identify 4 – 6 people to spend approximately one to two hours participating in the focus group to define “collaborative,” “transparent,” “evidence-based,” “effective,” “efficient,” and “inclusiveness.” Equally important, the President of Crafton was also asked to identify 4 – 6 managers to participate in the focus group.

Accordingly, four managers were asked to participate in the focus group and two participated which was a 50% participation rate. Fourteen faculty were asked to participate and two participated, which was a 14% participation rate. Four students were asked to participate and two participated, which was a 50% participation rate. Finally, four classified staff were asked to participate and three participated, which was a 75% participation rate. In summary, two managers, two faculty, two students, and three classified staff participated in the focus group. One of the limitations of conducting well attended focus groups

was coordinating all of the schedules involved. It was difficult to find a time when everyone could attend the focus group.

## Analysis

The purpose of conducting the focus groups, as stated in the Educational Master Plan, is to develop criteria and definitions for collaborative, transparent, evidence-based, effective, efficient, and inclusiveness while including the perspectives from each of the four constituencies on campus. As a result, the focus of the analysis illustrated here is to find common meanings among all four constituency groups. At the same time, all of the responses in each focus group are also included because the information generated by the focus group might prove to be useful in developing collaborative, transparent, evidence-based, effective, efficient, and inclusiveness processes. In addition, a limitation of creating categories across the constituency groups is that each person reading the comments might categorize the comments differently.

## Collaboration

The two major themes identified across all four constituency groups were communication and teamwork. All four constituencies commented that good communication and teamwork are essential to collaboration (see Table 1). As an illustration, a classified staff commented that communication needs to occur from the bottom-up: “Bottom-up style management instead of top-down.” A Faculty commented that ideas need to be shared across disciplines: “Sharing ideas, how things are done (interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary).” In addition, as part of the communication process, a manager commented that disagreements need to be received well: “Articulate and receive disagreement well.” Finally, a student commented that everyone needs to be aware of what is happening at the college: “Effective communication - everyone knows and is on the same page.” According to the four constituencies collaboration also needs to include teamwork. Specifically, people need to work together, and according to one manager people need to find where they can work together: “Purposeful attempts to work together - look where [we] should work together and bring people together.”

In summary, effective collaboration might need to include the following criteria.

- Bottom-up style of communication
- Consistent communication
- An awareness of what others are doing
- The ability to receive disagreement well
- Working together cooperatively

**Table 1: Responses about Collaboration Categorized by the Communication and Teamwork Themes and by Constituency Group.**

Classified Staff	Faculty	Managers	Students
<b>Communication</b>			
bottom-up style management instead of top-down	Awareness of what other's are doing	Articulate and receive disagreement well	Effective communication - everyone knows and is on the same page
Circles interconnecting that include management, students, classified staff, and faculty	Communicating events and collaborating schedules	Communication	
consistency (Example: communication)	Sharing ideas, how things are done (interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary)		
Make it easier to suggest ideas. If had an idea who would I be able to suggest it to and how would it get processed			
may be a better approach for consultation to occur before decisions are made			
<b>Teamwork</b>			
interoffice and interdepartmental teamwork	Cooperative	Purposeful attempts to work together - look where should work together and bring people together	Happier people, more pleasant people
respecting diversity, understanding	Teamwork	Shared purpose/goal - need to define	Not being afraid to ask help from your peers
working together	Working with others for common purpose and/or benefit		

October 2011

Table 1A includes information from the focus groups that did not fit into a category. However, as mentioned before a different analyst might identify categories differently. Accordingly, all of the comments are included to help facilitate the process of developing criteria and a definition for collaboration.

**Table 1A: Miscellaneous Responses about Collaboration by Constituency Group.**

Classified Staff	Faculty	Managers	Students
<b>Miscellaneous Comments</b>			
departmental cross-training	Not necessarily agreement	Ability to separate point of view from role or personality	Easier to volunteer if delegation worked well less stressed out
more shared governance for students - participation		Can be messy and time-consuming	Easier transition to delegation [of tasks]
		Creates buy-in	Giving praise - everyone's friendly, if not praise people feel less appreciated (i.e. self-esteem)
		Make sure everyone who wants to be a part of is there. Motivation for selecting participants needs to be who is best, most appropriate, and who we can't work without	
		Nobody feels they are left out	
		Some sense of compromise - not always same group that compromises	
		Work group - project based- all the affected constituents are represented	

**Transparency**

The major theme identified for transparency across all four constituency groups was openness (see Table 2). As an illustration, a classified staff commented that information needs to be distributed to the campus in a timely manner: “Inform campus when changes occur.” A Faculty commented that people need to be included when decisions are made and that they need to be informed of the progress made on the decision: “Making decisions and include people and let them know the progress so there is no surprise.” In addition, a manager commented that both negative and positive information needs to be disclosed: “Disclose the good, the bad, and the ugly.” Finally, a student commented that information needs to be communicated clearly: “When someone says something it is not vague.”

In summary, transparency might need to include the following criteria.

- Provide information in a timely manner and when changes occur
- Include people in decision making
- Keep people informed about decisions that are made
- Be clear
- Disclose the positive, negative, and the motivation behind a decision

**Table 2: Responses about Transparency Categorized by the Openness Theme and by Constituency Group.**

Classified Staff	Faculty	Managers	Students
<b>Openness</b>			
having information available and given to you in a timely manner	Making decisions and include people and let them know the progress so there is no surprise	Disclose the good, the bad, and the ugly	When someone says something it is not vague
Inform campus when changes occur	Not hiding things	If sacred cow, need to say it is one (Like KVCR).	
	Open	Honest from the start	
	See through	Needs to not be a hidden agenda	
		Put all on table - motivation, where are you coming from	



Table 2A includes information from the focus groups that did not fit into a category. However, as mentioned before a different analyst might identify categories differently. Accordingly, all of the comments are included to help facilitate the process of developing criteria and a definition for transparency. One idea to improve transparency communicated by a classified staff was that there needs to be a manual of procedures: "Manual of procedures. Things are not written down and different people have different answers. Need basic procedures written down and available to everyone." In addition, one faculty member felt that transparency did not communicate anything: "Don't like the term transparency. Transparency doesn't say anything. Need to get rid of transparency. The word transparency doesn't communicate anything. The word transparency doesn't mean anything."

**Table 2A: Miscellaneous Responses about Transparency by Constituency Group.**

Classified Staff	Faculty	Managers	Students
<b>Miscellaneous Comments</b>			
Access to accountability - place to see how we are spending money.	Don't like the term transparency. Transparency doesn't say anything. Need to get rid of transparency. The word transparency doesn't communicate anything. The word transparency doesn't mean anything.	It is positive to admit that there is room for growth	Agree to disagree in a calm way
Anything subject of Brown act needs to be available. Need to find easily and be centralized.	no hidden agenda	Needs to be at all levels: lower, middle management, highest level of management	Be fair
Feedback	Not everyone should see everything: Needs to involve listening, filtering, postponing, and suspending judgment	Ok to say - "We aren't there yet." "There are things we can do better."	Be level-headed, especially when discussing something with someone. If you are passionate or emotional you may say something you regret. Excuse yourself if you become passionate or emotional.
Manual of procedures. Things are not written down and different people have different answers. Need basic procedures written down and available to everyone.	Transparency can hinder collaboration. To promote discussion cannot always be transparent	Political - good thing with no reason behind it	Be responsible for what you say
Open discussions about everything			Good communication
			Need to be specific with feedback
			Sense of on stage/off stage - what is appropriate in a given situation

### Evidence-Based Decision Making

The two major themes identified across all four constituency groups for evidence-based decision making were reliability and objectivity (see Table 3). As an illustration, a classified staff commented that we need to act on evidence: “Act on evidence that we see.” A Faculty commented that when we need to “[make] decisions based on reliable information.” In addition, a manager commented that information needs to come from one source: “Research, planning, and data.” Finally, a student commented that information needs to be grounded in sound methods: “Using graphs, surveys, charts, and solid statistics ensures you are making a logical decision.” According to the four constituency groups evidence-based decision making also needs to include objectivity. Specifically, according to one classified staff member decisions need to be based on evidence: “Before new courses/programs need evidence to support and then are created. Also need evidence to support deletion/modification of courses and programs.”

In summary, evidence-based decision making might need to include the following criteria.

- Evidence
- Research and Planning data
- Reliable information
- Data needs to be current
- Objectivity

**Table 3: Responses about Evidence-Based Decision Making Categorized by Reliability and Objectivity.**

Classified Staff	Faculty	Managers	Students
<b>Reliable Data</b>			
Act on evidence that we see	Considers evolution of students, time, etc.	Research, planning, and data	Graphs, surveys, charts, solid statistics on the table
	Hard data	Sound reasoning	Less bias
	Making decisions based on reliable information		Must be up-to-date facts
			Using graphs, surveys, charts, and solid statistics ensures you are making a logical decision
<b>Objective</b>			
Before new courses/programs need evidence to support and then are created. Also need evidence to support deletion/modification of courses and programs.	Need to evaluate information	Could have been best practice	Having something to back up your claims.
Don't do things because this is how we've done it - base on data instead	Not just anecdotal (intuitive) information	How people respond to data - needs to not be anecdotal or based on feelings alone.	
		Sometimes need to pilot program and include evaluation plan with criteria	

October 2011

Table 3A includes information from the focus groups that did not fit into a category. However, as mentioned before a different analyst might identify categories differently. Accordingly, all of the comments are included to help facilitate the process of developing criteria for evidence-based decision making. One idea contrary to the information presented above is that evidence-based decision making also needs to be subjective and based on intuition. All four constituencies commented that evidence-based decision making needs to be objective; however, one faculty and one manager also commented that evidence-based decision making needs to be subjective.

**Table 3A: Miscellaneous Responses about Evidence-Based Decision Making by Constituency Group.**

Classified Staff	Faculty	Managers	Students
<b>Miscellaneous Comments</b>			
Give us tools/resources needed to accomplish decisions	Also includes subjective information	Needs to include intuition	Make decisions in a timely manner so you can get things done.
Ideas thrown out for new ideas but needs follow through and needs to examine if will work on this campus with this community	Ask the questions, "Was the decision effective? Is it right for Crafton?"	Not enough research - need for bench marks	Receiving feedback from everyone. Everyone is helping to make a decision.
Not putting the cart before the horse (if writing grants make sure we can afford institutionalization)			Voice the minority concerns as well mutual consensus of everyone.
Overlaps with transparency: feedback, documentation, and accountability (referencing data, justifying, and measurable trends)			

**Effectiveness**

The three major themes identified across at least three constituency groups for effectiveness were continuous assessment, evidence-based decision-making, and efficiency (see Table 4). As an illustration, a classified staff commented that Crafton needs to continually assess how Crafton is doing in order to improve: “Creating good SLOs- not just for paper, but solid and meaningful outcomes that will bring us forward as an institution.” A faculty commented that effectiveness can be achieved by “looking at the broader picture.” In addition, a manager commented that everyone needs to work toward the big picture to achieve Crafton’s goals: “Everyone working toward the big picture with lofty goals based on a shared vision of leadership.” According to the four constituencies effectiveness also needs to include evidence-based decision making and efficiency. Specifically, according to a classified staff member decisions need to be based on evidence and made collaboratively: “Academic programs/classes should be created through a process that is evidence-based, collaborative, transparent, and based on community need rather than what the faculty wants to teach.” Finally, in order to be effective Crafton also needs to be efficient: “Effective and efficient are parallel- need both”

In summary, effectiveness might need to include the following criteria.

- Continuous assessment, evaluation, and improvement
- Evidence-based decision making
- Honest assessment of how well things are working
- Efficiency

**Table 4: Responses about Effectiveness Categorized by the Continuous Assessment, Evidence-Based Decision Making, and Efficiency Themes and by Constituency Group.**

Classified Staff	Faculty	Managers	Students
<b>Continuous Assessment</b>			
Creating good SLOs- not just for paper, but solid and meaningful outcomes that will bring us forward as an institution.	Looking at the broader picture.	Are we improving the lives of students?	
Document if students got what they need.	Objectives are clearly laid out	Everyone working toward the big picture with lofty goals based on a shared vision of leadership	
Good results (customer service, procedures, service and applications)	Overall, over-arching goal.	Goal establishment should include striving for excellence and driven by "the why"	
Measure effectiveness in other service areas. How do we know that students are getting what they need from a particular department?		Now. Not 5 years ago- Not stagnant. Continuous improvement	

(Table 4 continues on the next page!)

(Table 4 continued!)

Classified Staff	Faculty	Managers	Students
<b>Evidence-Based Decision Making</b>			
Academic programs/classes should be created through a process that is evidence-based, collaborative, transparent, and based on community need rather than what the faculty wants to teach.	Not quantifiable, more objective.	Evidence-based and use the evidence to support the effectiveness	
		Honest, willing to realize things change and that may cause something that was productive to not be effective any more	
		Resources should be allocated to what is effective. There should be reward potential for demonstrating effectiveness	
		There needs to be an evaluation piece. Not just feel good but have a productive result	
<b>Efficiency</b>			
	Effective and efficient are parallel- need both	If it's efficient- it works	Time management- reduces the amount of time it takes to get things done. Being on time

Table 4A includes information from the focus groups that did not fit into a category. However, as mentioned before a different analyst might identify categories differently. Accordingly, all of the comments are included to help facilitate the process of developing criteria and a definition for effectiveness.

**Table 4A: Miscellaneous Responses about Effectiveness by Constituency Group.**

Classified Staff	Faculty	Managers	Students
<b>Miscellaneous Comments</b>			
Model more CTE courses. In the community college system, we don't have a lot.	Asking other questions in our communications. Not just answering questions, but sharing what you know.	Continue to raise the bar	Answering questions- when questions are being answered- when you feel confident doing anything
	Completing what you set out to do.	The current benchmark for effective is not high enough. We tolerate mediocrity	collaboration, don't be afraid to ask others to help you out because you need help
	Cost-effective. Effective use of money		feedback from shared-governance reports
	Each discipline is autonomous and working toward a different set of goals. We need to have an overall, collective purpose.		Interaction with other clubs, senates, other students, everyone
			More things are being done with integrity
			When you are confident in your answers
			You can get a lot of things done- doesn't mean quality (ensure quality)

**Efficiency**

The four major themes identified across at least three constituency groups for efficiency were innovation, doing more with less, a sense of caring, and productivity (see Table 5). As an illustration, a classified staff commented that Crafton needs to be innovative to be efficient: “Innovation, technology and automation.” A Faculty commented that efficiency can be achieved by “using the resources available to work to our advantage and become better.” In addition, a manager also stated that Crafton needs to “be innovative [and] use resources to the fullest potential.” According to three of the four constituency groups efficiency also needs to include doing more with less, a sense of caring, and increased productivity. For example, a faculty member made the following comment: “Regardless of finances, budget, staff- ‘how can we take this negative and turn it into a positive?’ Make the most with what you have.” In addition, a manager stated that we need to achieve a sense of caring by “everyone working toward a shared vision.” Finally, according to a classified staff member, in order to be efficient Crafton also needs to be productive: “Maximize available resources so that everyone has 8 hours worth of work every day. Get the most out of all employees. Employees should have self-discipline.”

In summary, efficiency might need to include the following criteria.

- Innovation
- Doing more with less
- A sense of caring
- Maximize productivity

**Table 5: Responses about Efficiency Categorized by the Innovation, Do More with Less, A Sense of Caring, and Productivity Themes and by Constituency Group.**

Classified Staff	Faculty	Managers	Students
<b>Innovation</b>			
Innovation, technology and automation	Cost-effective	Are we using resources appropriately for improving the lives of students?	time management- allot enough time to get a task done without over-running your life
More services available on-line	Use the least amount of effort, time, and resources for the best result.	Be innovative- use resources to the fullest potential	
Turnaround time- process students quickly.	Using the resources available to work to our advantage and become better.	Good use of time	
		Technologically based- things are moving quickly and we need to keep up and have resources available for our students.	

(Table 5 continues on the next page!)



(Table 5 continued!)

Classified Staff	Faculty	Managers	Students
<b>Do More with Less</b>			
Create a way (campus-wide) to share responsibilities and help each other out. Communicate ways to save time which will allow others to do more work in their offices. (Example: posting classes in LRC.	Do more with less.	Do more with less because of accreditation and budget cuts	
Not passing the buck- "that's not my job"	Focus on what you CAN do.		
	Making the best decisions based on what we have and know. Be flexible as things change.		
	Regardless of finances, budget, staff- "How can we take this negative and turn it into a positive?" Make the most with what you have.		
<b>Sense of Caring</b>			
Productive, fast, attentive, positive. Not rushed- have a sense of caring and getting the right answer.	Taking a different approach. "How can we look at things differently?"	Everyone working toward a shared-vision	
<b>Productivity</b>			
Maximize available resources so that everyone has 8 hours worth of work every day. Get the most out of all employees. Employees should have self-discipline.		Elevate the standards of performance for our human resources. Mediocrity is not good enough anymore. The time it currently takes to complete tasks is too long.	
		Not tolerate mediocrity	
		Processes we are paying for at the District are completely inefficient. This is linked to their ego- they get to create processes rather than using common sense. Should be "yes we will" "we will find a way"	

October 2011

Table 5A includes information from the focus groups that did not fit into a category. However, as mentioned before a different analyst might identify categories differently. Accordingly, all of the comments are included to help facilitate the process of developing criteria and definition for efficiency.

**Table 5A: Miscellaneous Responses about Efficiency by Constituency Group.**

Classified Staff	Faculty	Managers	Students
<b>Miscellaneous Comments</b>			
Have what you need to fulfill the requests	More measurable-quantitative	Allow decisions to be made at the division level that is most appropriate. - Freedom.	Checking- producing things at a rapid rate doesn't mean they are right
		Continue to raise the bar	Getting their stuff done
			overlaps with effectiveness
			Timeliness- quality of lecture = retention

## Inclusiveness

The three major themes identified across all four constituency groups were collaboration, valuing employees, and participation (see Table 6). As an illustration, a classified staff commented that we need to be collaborative: “Collaborative- giving those who want a place at the table a place. Not just saying you are welcome to participate, but creating opportunities for classified staff by providing coverage.” A faculty commented that we need to “include everyone.” In addition, a manager commented that we need to “[make] sure everyone feels included and that they matter.” Finally, a student commented that in order to be collaborative Crafton needs to include students on committees: “Include us (students) on committees- this is very good. We are happy about that.” According to four constituency groups inclusiveness also needs to include valuing everyone. Specifically, according to a classified staff member Crafton needs to “value [the] experience and education of staff. Staff is treated as though we don't know what we are talking about because we aren't teachers. Some have equal experience and education and more frequent interaction with students.” Finally, two of the four constituency groups also felt that participation is important to inclusiveness. A classified staff member commented that Crafton needs to “create a culture where employees want to be involved and have the ability to be involved. Staff need to reciprocate to Administration's attempts to have us more involved.”

In summary, inclusiveness might need to include the following criteria.

- Collaboration
- Including everyone
- Respecting everyone equally in decision-making
- Valuing the experiences of everyone
- Staff being motivated to participate and participating

**Table 6: Responses about Inclusiveness Categorized by the Collaboration, Valued, and Participation Themes and by Constituency Group.**

Classified Staff	Faculty	Managers	Students
<b>Collaboration</b>			
Collaborative- giving those who want a place at the table a place. Not just saying you are welcome to participate, but creating opportunities for classified staff by providing coverage.	Including every one.	Feeling like you are "heard"	Include everyone
Effective leadership. Respect faculty and staff equally in decision-making processes and evolve as an institution.	More collaboration, takes into account the bigger picture.	Linked to collaborative	Include us (students) on committees- this is very good. We are happy about that.
Input should be valued. Those offering input should be validated and that input should be discussed, not just blown off. In general ideas from other sources (not just administration) should be genuinely accepted.	Not purposely excluding- on committees and in groups.	Making sure everyone feels included and that they matter	Keep everyone in the loop
There should be equal opportunity and representation amongst all constituencies.	Not separate into groups.		Making decisions together
	Not working in isolation.		
<b>Valued</b>			
Value experience and education of staff. Staff is treated as though we don't know what we are talking about because we aren't teachers. Some have equal experience and education and more frequent interaction with students.	When making decisions, take everyone into consideration. An attitude of general awareness.	People feel valued and trusted	Get each-other's feedback
		Shared knowledge, processes, and expertise	
<b>Participation</b>			
Create a culture where employees want to be involved and have the ability to be involved. Staff need to reciprocate to Administration's attempts to have us more involved.	There is currently a lack of cross-faculty involvement because everyone is so busy concentrating on their own area.		
	Willingness, it's an attitude.		

**October 2011**

Table 6A includes information from the focus groups that did not fit into a category. However, as mentioned before a different analyst might identify categories differently. Accordingly, all of the comments are included to help facilitate the process of developing criteria and definitions for inclusiveness.

**Table 6A: Miscellaneous Responses about Inclusiveness by Constituency Group.**

<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Managers</b>	<b>Students</b>
<b>Miscellaneous Comments</b>			
Currently an "us" versus "them" mentality exists amongst faculty and staff. We need to work together and have cooperation.	An awareness of everyone else on campus.	Be willing to not just continue with status quo	Asking questions
Need to include CSEA as a reviewer of new or desired positions and that input needs to be included for decisions. (specifically in reference to grants)	Inter-dependence.	Does not mean that everyone will get their way	example: police on campus make us feel safe
		Own up to the fact that there are "sacred cows" ex. KVCR	Feedback
			Finding out what others think
			Makes me feel like part of the Crafton Family
			Publicity- example: Health and Wellness center papers/flyers that said "let us help you"
			Trying to figure out the best resolution together

**Reference**

Cooper, D., & Schindler, P. (2001). *Business Research Methods*. McGraw-Hill Higher Education