

## **Leeward Community College Governance Policy (L1.201) Ad Hoc Committee Report**

**Purpose:** To review L1.201 (2003) and propose amendments that reflect “best practices” and strengthen our practices relative to representative and participatory governance.

### **Background**

As part of Leeward’s effort to fulfill the objectives of its Policy on the Policy Development Process (L1.101), the Administrative Team conferred with the Campus Council to examine its Policy on Shared Governance (L1.201.) Campus Council was deemed the appropriate body to facilitate the review process because L1.201 is a non-academic policy.

To begin the process of reviewing Leeward’s Policy on Shared Governance (L1.201,) the Campus Council chairperson recruited a representative group of constituents who came together as an ad hoc committee. The Campus Council chairperson served as facilitator and convener of these meetings which began in Fall 2017 and concluded in Spring 2018.

Before undertaking any discussion of revisions, the facilitator gathered all the documents related to the origins of the policy, namely, events that gave rise to drafting and adopting L1.201 in 2003. Also, the facilitator gathered the organizational documents for all campus stakeholder groups so that the ad hoc committee could easily ascertain how all representative bodies participate in Leeward’s governance processes.

The ad hoc committee was well served by the documentation that accompanied the original L1.201 policy: “Progress Report of the AIC (Accreditation Improvement Committee) on Campus Council Constituency Roles and Governance” dated April 11, 2003. The report clearly chronicled why L1.201 was adopted and the objectives it aimed to achieve.

From this AIC report, the ad hoc committee learned that the impetus for drafting and promulgating L1.201 arose from observations gathered by ACCJC’s visiting team during the College’s self-study process (2000.) The report specifically noted, *“Some on the Faculty Senate view their roles as guardian of academic issues to include personnel, budget and planning decisions. This view is in conflict with the representational organization of the Campus Council.”* Thus, the visiting team recommended that Leeward *“define the roles of all constituencies in governance,”* which resulted in the drafting and adoption of L1.201.

Because constituents in various parts of our campus community have asked how decisions are made and how they could “get involved,” the ad hoc committee considered that ACCJC’s recommendation (2001) may still be relevant in our present and future governance efforts.

## Members

Administration	James Goodman
Division Chairs	James West
Office of Planning, Policy, & Assessment	Della Teraoka
Faculty Senate	Lexer Chou
Campus Council	Aulii Silva
Student Government	Marc Earley
Accreditation Standard IV	William Albritton & Tracie Losch
Administrative, Professional, & Technical	Cori Wakamura
Administrative Support Group	Evelyn Kamai & Serina Makaiwa
Operations & Maintenance Group	Grant Okamura

## Methodology

Because L1.201 is now fifteen years old, the committee felt it important to learn how current stakeholders have experienced and/or perceived Leeward's contemporary shared governance processes. In Fall 2016, the College's Leadership Excellence cohort conducted an "Employee Satisfaction" survey which included several questions related to representation and participation in Leeward's governance processes (below).

- 1) Q7: I participate in the planning process for my division, department, unit. (68%\*)
- 2) Q11: The resources provided for my division, department, unit are adequate (74.5%\*)
- 3) Q13: My division/department/unit is adequately represented on Campus Council (59%\*)
- 4) Q14: Campus Council effectively carries out its role in campus governance. (36%\*)
- 5) Q15: Faculty Senate effectively carries out its role in campus governance. (55.5%\*)
- 6) Q19: "I feel that I can freely express my opinions." (66%\*)

\* Percentages reflect the sum of "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses

The strength of this survey was its currency, wide reach to full & part-time employees, and comprehensive nature of workplace satisfaction. The weakness was that it yielded a return of only 200 (37%) responses and that it did not reflect the views of a vital constituency: students.

## **L1.201**

**Approved Date:**

**Review Date:**

## **Leeward Community College**

**Policy Title:** Shared Governance Policy

**Introduction:** This policy seeks to articulate Leeward's campus about promoting and practicing shared governance.

p. 3 of the Accreditation Improvement Committee Report. "three key questions that must be addressed are: How does the college promote and practice shared governance? How do we know that? And how could we do it better?"

### **Related Policies:**

RP 1.210: Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making and Academic Policy Development

EP 1.201: Faculty Involvement in Academic Policy

EP 1.102: Authority to Manage and Control the Operations of the Campus

EP 7.101: Delegation of Authority Student Affairs

### **Policy**

1. All constituents have the right to participate in the College's planning, budgeting, and policy making through their representative bodies.

"Principles #5. Committee members and constituency representatives are responsible for keeping the people they represent informed."

2. Governance bodies are dually charged with facilitating communication between constituents and Administration and for providing recommendations reflecting constituents' views to Administration.

"Principles 5. Committee members and constituency representatives are responsible for keeping the people they represent informed."

“Clarifications #3. Shared Governance dictates that individuals will have an opportunity to participate in decision-making. Individuals may participate by voicing opinions, voting, making recommendations, investigating, writing reports, evaluating leaders, serving as consultants, leading forums, attending forums, serving on senates and councils and committees. This is not an exclusive list.”

3. Through Board of Regents’ policies, leadership responsibility for decision making regarding campus operational management and governance rests with the Chancellor.

“Clarification #1: Shared Governance does not take away the authority invested in decision-makers to make decisions.”

4. With a spirit of collegiality and aloha (Hawaii Revised Statute 5-7.5,) which promotes “think(ing) and emot(ing) good feelings to others,” Leeward CC constituents will work to fulfill the College’s mission in ways that regard each other as valued contributors toward student success.

n/a

## **Responsibilities**

1. Any individual or group of individuals on campus has the right to register their views on issues of importance to them.

“Policy #1. Any individual or group of individuals on campus has the right to provide views on any issue important to them”

2. The College’s representative and governance bodies shall educate their constituents on the nature of the business addressed at their meetings and will refer them to the governance bodies which are the most appropriate to vet their suggestions, questions, and concerns.

“Policy #1. The college shall educate the faculty and staff of this right (to provide their views) and provide opportunities for faculty and staff to provide input.”

3. Administrators shall demonstrate collegiality and aloha for all campus constituents in their decision making by placing considerable weight on the recommendations made by campus governing bodies.

“Policy #2. Administrators shall demonstrate a willingness to incorporate a large amount of faculty and staff input into decision-making especially related to academic policies, academic procedures, and financial and budgetary matters.”

“Principles #8. The Campus Council and Faculty Senate’s recommendations on budgetary priorities should be given heavy weight in administrative decisions related to those matters.”

4. In the event that Administrators’ decisions are contrary to the recommendations of the governing bodies, they shall present their reasons directly to the group, preferably in person, at their subsequent meeting.

“Policy #3. Administrators and other decision makers shall provide reasons for decisions that are contrary to the wishes of constituency groups and other recommending bodies.”

## Definitions

**Shared Governance:** “The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.” (*Joint Statement by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1966*)

“Definition #2. Shared Governance is the act of collegial decision making.”

**Representative bodies:** organizations that provide a forum to promote communication amongst members of a collective bargaining group and to facilitate that constituents’ participation in the College’s shared governance processes.

“Principles #5. Committee members and constituency representatives are responsible for keeping the people they represent informed.”

**Governance bodies:** organizations which serve a defined purpose within the College’s governance structures and are called upon to vet, discuss, evaluate, and summarize its priorities and recommendations to Administration.

“Clarification #4. Committees, senates, councils, divisions and constituents groups are a mainstay of shared governance. These groups are empowered by shared governance. These groups are empowered by shared governance to make formal recommendations on issues before them.”

**Constituents:** all internal individuals and groups connected to Leeward Community College -- either through employment or enrollment.

n/a

## **Approvals**



