I. Purpose and Vision

This new approach to shared governance both honors and diverges from Los Medanos College's past efforts. The long history of participation by all of the college constituencies is a foundational characteristic of the Los Medanos eCollege (LMC) and this shared governance model. Los Medanos College's LMC's participatory governance history, our immediate challenges and our future opportunities require us to engage in effective and collaborative governance. This Shared Governance Model gives the college a structure for creating its vision with the guiding question: what does this issue, decision (etc.) mean for us as a college?

Shared governance - in its broadest sense, a participation of and mutual deliberation by the college Senates, Associated Students, the President, and the management team - must be mindful of and defer to the particular legal rights and responsibilities granted to the Governing Board, Chancellor, President, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Associated Students, and collective bargaining units. It is very important to note that neither the rights (primarily rely or mutually consent) nor the responsibilities of the Academic Senate in academic and professional matters noted in legislation and law are abridged, challenged or limited by this model. Similarly, the obligations and rights of the President, Classified Senate, Associated Students, and college administrators Management Team remain unchallenged.

This paper aims to address historical criticisms of the shared governance process. While previous accreditation teams and members of the college community have noted that we too frequently sacrificed outcomes for process, tThis is a model that aspires to continually move us toward forward_-looking decision_-making, with an to emphasis on equitable outcomes rather than and processes. Theis model assumes that plans_and resource allocations affecting the college as a whole will be reviewed and approved (if necessary) by the representative Shared Governance Council and not be approved at less comprehensive levels of the institution, thus benefitting from a focus on collective interests and from the coalescing of diverse perspectives contributed by all constituency groups. Presidential participation in the Shared Governance Council and evaluation are noted as key elements of this model; sections of this document appropriately cover these issues.

Los Medanos College's <u>evidence-based</u> planning efforts <u>and</u>_in particular, its Educational Master Plan (Master Plan) <u>and Strategic Plan</u> should be the driving force for key decisions. The college's governance must be inextricably tied to the important issues and the professional thinking imbedded in <u>the Master Plan these</u> <u>plans</u>, which will guide the Council members in all facets of their work. The governance model that follows is a means for implementing <u>college-wide planning</u>, a means subject to thoughtful and timely recalibrations that serve the interests of the college as a whole. The Shared Governance Council as described in other sections of this document will be expected to act as the "Keeper of the Plan" for the college.

1

3/21/03

LMC Shared Governance Council – Position Paper Adopted: March 2003 Under revision: Fall 2014 Formatted: Footer distance from edge: 0.3"

<u>ITEM #1</u>: Is it necessary to note "Presidential participation" and reference subsequent sections of the position paper?

Formatted: Highlight

<u>ITEM #2</u>: Is the governance model "a means for implementing college-wide planning" or college-wide decision-making? Both? Or something else?

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Right

The Shared Governance Council will-spends its time and energy on high level issues that could may include, but are not limited to: future regional needs, new program commitments and initiatives, existing program contractions, program eliminations, and financial planning. Additional examples of significant issues include approval and modification of the Master Plan and LMC Foundation's relationship to the college.

The following flow chart illustrates the relationship of the Shared Governance Council, Senates, Associated Students, Management Team, and President in relation to the movement of recommendations through the CouncilSGC.

ITEM #3: Is it necessary to list "additional examples of significant issues"? If so, should anything else be listed instead of/in addition to "approval and modification of the Master Plan" (e.g. Accreditation, Mission Statement, etc...)?

Formatted: Highlight



II. SENATES, ASSOCIATED STUDENTS, AND SHARED GOVERNANCE

Formally noting the relationship among the Senates and the Associated Students and the Shared Governance Council is a new development in the trajectorykey element of participatory governance at Los Medanos College. The success of this shared governance model is predicated on the nexus of informed and effective Senates and a collaborative management philosophy. Responsible and ethical representation is critical.

The Senates and the Associated Students, in partnership with the President, will act as a check and balance for the Shared Governance Council. The Senates and Associated Students choose their representatives on the Shared Governance Council. The President selects the management representatives. This model acknowledges in a redundant fashion throughout this paper that the Shared Governance Council cannot abrogate the Academic Senate's rights in academic and professional matters; but it may offer recommendations or comments on particular issues of importance. It is understood that the Associated Students, the Classified Senate, and the Academic Senate may bring recommendations directly to the President. The Shared Governance Council maintains the right to send an accompanying recommendation or comment.

While any college constituency or group can initiate and recommend policy or program changes, the Council will-normally reviews all such proposals. A distinction will-is_be-made among Senate and the Associated Students recommendations, Presidential recommendations, and recommendations from shared governance committees covered by this model. Senate and Associated Students recommendations will beare discussed and reviewed by the Shared Governance Council. The Council may express their own concerns about Senate and Associated Students and to the college President, if the members feel implementation of the proposal would adversely affect other college constituencies or operations.

The Council <u>will</u> forwards the recommendations from any Senate or the Associated Students to the voting members of the other groups for the purpose of generating input and facilitating discussion. This is done in an attempt to ensure a wide array of input and to identify potential conflicts before formal presidential approval.

III. SHARED GOVERNANCE COUNCIL

a. Role

What does this new Shared Governance Council mean for LMC and its decision-making history, culture, and experience? This Council is ultimately the keeper of the college's plan and vision for itself. The Shared Governance Council is charged with promoting and facilitating

3

3/21/03

LMC Shared Governance Council – Position Paper Adopted: March 2003 Under revision: Fall 2014 Formatted: Font: 8 pt Formatted: Right collaborative decision-making at LMC. It is expected to devotes itself to the college's most significant issues and challenges. The role of this Council is not to micro-manage, but rather to focus on broad, high-level policy concerns.

The Council is a key body in the formation of strategic goals as an expression of the Master Plan. First, the Council will lead the implementation and evaluation of the annual planning cycle by directing the activities of all Shared Governance Committees, and by reviewing all new policies and allocation processes proposed by the Shared Governance Committees, the Senates, Associated Students and the College President. Planning, and policy making linked to planning, should be the major focus of shared governance and its organizational components.

Role of SGC with RAP, as college budget committee, etc.

The Shared Governance Council works with policy in a multi-faceted way, including its creation, incremental development, maintenance, and periodic evaluation/review. While policy initiation and recommendation can occur within numerous constituencies in the college, the Council <u>should beis</u> the most appropriate and formal step in final policy review and recommendation to the President. The Shared Governance Council is not intended to be an obstacle on the way to recommendations to the President but rather a collective review forum where representative leaders validate the support and integrity of recommendations. The Shared Governance Council derives its authority from its representative nature not its superior status.

The Shared Governance Council is a coordinating group for multiple and diverse efforts (new and old) that occur college_wide and within the various departments and programs of the college. The Council is expected to assists with the synthesis of deliberation and planning across operational units of the college to whatever degree required. This may occasionally require the Council to engage in conflict resolution among competing interests and processes. Operation units and the management team will remain the primary implementers of college policy and agreed upon unit initiatives.

The Shared Governance Council is the locus and coordinator of collegewide communications. The Shared Governance Council facilitates <u>bi-</u><u>directional</u> communication among the various college constituencies, particularly between the Senates and the Associated Students, regarding policy matters of importance to the entire college community. As reliable and accessible written communications are key to institutional coherence and employee morale, the Council will promulgate recommendations of college_wide importance. These communications can take many forms, but

4

3/21/03

<u>ITEM #5</u>: Does this statement accurately reflect SGC's relationship to the "formation of strategic goals"? If so, would the same apply for the Strategic Plan?

Formatted: Highlight

<u>ITEM #6</u>: Is the "implementation and evaluation of the annual planning cycle" something that is now the role/charge of the Planning Committee?

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0"

<u>ITEM #7</u>: It seems an overview/description of SGC is incomplete without information about RAP. This seems like a good place to insert a reference to the Council's role in resource allocation.

Formatted: Font: 8 pt Formatted: Right

LMC Shared Governance Council – Position Paper Adopted: March 2003 Under revision: Fall 2014 they should be constant, consistent and pervasive. <u>SGC develops the</u> <u>"Monday Meeting Calendar," which includes multiple College Assembly</u> <u>sessions each semester. These all-college Assembly meetings consist of</u> <u>program/institutional/district information and updates and create</u> <u>opportunities</u>. For example, public hearings sponsored by the Shared Governance Council should be held once every semester or as needed for broad discussion and input. Electronic means of communications ranging</u> from email to chat rooms (and technologies not yet envisioned) have to be employed with the expectation that everyone will be responsible for reviewing the messages in these media. Reliable and accessible written communications are a key to governance success and should include clear information on timelines and processes.

Additional activities that befit the energy and attention of the Shared Governance Council are assisting the President in assessing unforeseen or quickly developing opportunities for and threats to the college, and developing intervention strategies to address these. The Shared Governance Council also coordinates sub_committees and ad hoc task forces including oversight of the Financial Planning Model. (See COMMITTEES and TASK FORCES.)

b. MEMBERSHIP

The Council shall have three voting members from each major constituency (Classified Senate, Academic Senate and Associated Students). These voting members will be elected and ratified by their respective Senates and the Associated Students, for terms to be determined by the Senates and the Associated Students (but no less than one year). The representative members are selected by the criteria chosen by the respective constituency. The Senates and the Associated Students will annually give the President the names of their appointed members, preferably in the Spring semester in anticipation of the next academic year. The President will select the management representatives and notify the Associated Students and the Senates.

COUNCIL MEMBERS: The Council has only nine voting members, with equal representation from each non-management constituency. The President (or the President's administrative-designee) will be the chair and meeting facilitator of the Council.

This model envisions that students may be paid and/or participate in a leadership class(es) for credit. To facilitate Council deliberations various "experts" from within and outside the college community may beare called in to attend meetings and provide input and insight. Such experts may, for example, include governance committee chairs, program/department leads,

3/21/03

<u>ITEM #8</u>: Is it necessary to retain this reference? The preceding text describes the need for bi-directional communication that "can take more forms."

Formatted: Highlight

<u>ITEM #9</u>: Does this example ("oversight of the Financial Planning Model") need to be kept? If so, should it be updated to reference RAP?

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

<u>ITEM #10</u>: Should this practice (managers as nonvoting members) continue? Does this model demonstrate "shared" governance, with all constituencies having "full voice" and participation in addressing institutional issues, if one group does not have the same voting rights as the other three?

Formatted: Highlight

<u>ITEM #11</u>: Should student representatives be compensated for serving as SGC members?

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Right

5

LMC Shared Governance Council – Position Paper Adopted: March 2003 Under revision: Fall 2014 <u>ITEM #12</u>: Are there circumstances under which "union representatives" would be asked to "provide input and insight" on items coming before SGC?

union representatives, or the college research director. These experts will do not have voting rights on the Council, but will beare key to informed discussion and decision-making.

*The Curriculum Committee liaison is expected to share information on course and program issues that could affect planning and resource decisions now or in the future.

POSITION	DURATION	VOTE
President or designee	Perennial	Chair -
		Nonvoting
Exec dean or President's	Perennial	Facilitator
designee		Nonvoting
3 students (min)	As appointed by AS	VOTING
3 faculty	As appointed by Academic	VOTING
	Senate	
3 classified	As appointed by Classified	VOTING
	Senate	
<u>3</u> 2 managers	As appointed by President	Nonvoting: President
		can designate as
		facilitator
Curriculum rep*	As appointed by Academic	Nonvoting
	Senate	

*The Curriculum Committee liaison <u>is expected to</u> shares information on course and program issues that could affect planning and resource decisions now or in the future.

c. MEETINGS

The Council meets regularly, generally twice each month during the academic year, to formulate charges for governance committees and evaluate recommendations and ongoing college initiatives for feasibility, effectiveness, and concordance with the Master Plan. SGC holds open meetings and adheres to the provisions of the Brown Act. Council discussions are open and meeting outcomes and Council decisions are communicated quickly and effectively to the entire college community.

d. VOTING

The Shared Governance Council has only nine voting members, with equal representation from each non-management constituency. When voting is necessary, the members of a constituency in attendance can cast all of the votes for that constituency e.g. the three classified votes can be cast by the one and only representative in attendance on any given day. The same rule applies to the Associated Students and Academic Senate members. The

6

3/21/03

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Strikethrough

ITEM #13: (see item#10 re: voting rights on SGC)

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: 8 pt Formatted: Right

<u>ITEM #14</u>: Now that SGC has been designated as a Brown Act committee, it seems this practice can no longer continue.

LMC Shared Governance Council – Position Paper Adopted: March 2003 Under revision: Fall 2014 attending representative(s) may cast a total of three votes whether one, two, or three representatives are in attendance. Votes are recorded by the name of the voter/Shared Governance Council member – including those cast in absentia by another Council member.

The Council votes on all recommendations from shared governance committees, and takes advisory votes on Senate and Associated Students recommendations. The advisory votes are on whether to forward additional commentary to the President on the Senate or Associated Students recommendations. As noted above, the Council may not vote down any Senate or Associated Students recommendation, as these are automatically forwarded to the college President.

e. MANAGERS on the COUNCIL

A departure from our Shared Governance history is the introduction of administrators on the Shared Governance Council as non-voting participants. The model identifies the President as the chair of the Council and the Executive Dean of Planning or the President's designee as the meeting facilitator. Administrators bring their expertise by role and function to the issues at hand and attend as needed.

Administrators will act as engaged participants with "full voice" and an obligation to clearly and regularly share their professional judgment, opinions, and concerns. Exercise of the administrative "voice" and the obligation to offer input, are appropriate throughout any shared governance deliberation. The responsibility for much of the college's policy implementation belongs to the management team.

f. PRESIDENT on the COUNCIL

The President makes every effort to be present at meetings <u>serves</u> as the chair and meeting facilitator. In the event that this is not possible, the Vice President, the Director of Business Service, or the Executive Dean are present at meetings as the chair and as the President's designee. <u>However</u>, **T**the President may delegate the role of meeting facilitator to promote her/his unencumbered and active meeting participation. The President does not vote at meetings but participates freely in the deliberations. The President receives recommendations from the Shared Governance Council.

Presidential proposals for college action are first offered to the Shared Governance Council for review. This may be an informal notice. This model acknowledges that the pre-notification of the Council regarding decision-making is best, but notes that emergency decisions are warranted

7

3/21/03

LMC Shared Governance Council – Position Paper Adopted: March 2003 Under revision: Fall 2014 Formatted: Highlight

<u>ITEM #15</u>: As members of SGC, administrators should be expected to actively participate in all meetings, and not just "attend as needed."

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

<u>ITEM #16</u>: Does this need to be articulated? Isn't the expectation that all SGC members "act as engaged participants with 'full voice' and an obligation to clearly and regularly share their professional judgement, opinions, and concerns"?

Formatted: Font: 8 pt Formatted: Right in some circumstances. In these cases, a post-decision briefing is warranted. The $\frac{P}{P}$ resident communicates with the entire college as needed.

The President should also evaluate the Shared Governance Council's effectiveness on a regular basis, including a review of its processes and outcomes and actively work with the Shared Governance Council to set goals, review outcomes, and archive the agreements, policies, and decisions that emanate from the Council.

IV. COMMITTEES and TASK FORCES

The Shared Governance Council authorizes the creation and the charges of Shared Governance committees and Shared Governance task forces needed to complete the Council's work on an annual basis. Committees and task forces created by position paper or other shared governance bodies must be reauthorized and charged by the Shared Governance Council. (Excluded are subsets of the Senates and Associated Students and operational team meetings).

As part of the annual authorization process for Shared Governance task forces or Shared Governance committees, the Council maintains a list of authorized committees, their charge(s) and function(s), planned outcomes, and duration of authorization (sunset dates). The charges are accompanied by proposed evaluation criteria. All work completed by the Council's authorized committees and task forces and their recommendations are submitted to the Council for evaluation and review. Governance committee recommendations should/must include projected costs to the college (if applicable), timeframe for implementation, and evaluation criteria that may be used by the Council to determine the effectiveness of the recommendation over time. Many committee recommendations involve new processes or procedures, and the Council would expect these to be detailed in the recommendation. One of the first tasks of the Shared Governance Council is to review the recent activities of all existing shared governance committees on campus. After this review the Council may decide to disband moribund committees, to form new committees, or to consolidate the activities of many separate committees into one.

V. EVALUATION

The Council members should undertake an annual written self-evaluation. This includes a statement of basic college goals and major initiatives the Council intends to promote and discuss during the coming academic year, and then, at the end of the year, a brief summary of all major recommendations reviewed (and all votes taken) during that year. The Council makes its self-evaluation reports available to the Senates and the Associated Students and to the management team for external review.

8

3/21/03

ITEM #17: Should SGC conduct a self-evaluation annually?

LMC Shared Governance Council - Position Paper

Adopted: March 2003 Under revision: Fall 2014 Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Right

Another departure from our past is the call for ongoing evaluations of outcomes, process, and the governance model itself. As part of the college's commitment to continuous improvement, Tthe Shared Governance Council and this model must be the objectare subject to of self-evaluation and planned external critique, The evaluation must, which include identification and analysis of accomplishments and missed opportunities.

The initial recommendation is that the Shared Governance Council links regular review of its effectiveness to some element of the Educational Master planning cycle (e.g. strategic goal setting). The President, in collaboration with the administrative team, should evaluate the Shared Governance Council's effectiveness on a regular basis. This may include a review of its processes and outcomes. It is expected that the Senates and the Associated Students do the same. Senate, Associated Students and Presidential evaluation of the model should occur at least every two years and include proposals for improvement <u>in the Research</u> Office of Planning & <u>Institutional Effectiveness</u> assists with this. A reauthorized existing committee, a subgroup of the Council or a new committee can be charged with evaluation of the Shared Governance Council and the new-model's effectiveness. An administrative office will issue a periodic report to the constituencies on the review findings.

Another aspect of evaluation identifies the Shared Governance Council as an evaluator for the work of committees and task forces. While evaluation has to be continuous, it is particularly needed at the end of major recommendation processes. For evaluation to be meaningful, measurable performance criteria for new projects and charges should-must be identified in the planning stages prior to implementation.

VI. HOPEFUL SUMMARY IN CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we want to underline the opportunity that this new shared governance presents for the college. It-The Shared Governance Council is a central place where all constituents can be at the table for college-<u>planning dialogue and decision-</u><u>making</u>. It presents a new Presidential-collaborative, bi-directional relationship wherein the two senates and the associated student body talk directly to each other with the President participating and listening. It provides for timely public management input on major issues and discussions. It represents the central place where evaluation of all programs that guide our future will occur. It is, at last, a central place where synthesis can occur and where what we say we are going to do is not only discussed but communicated college-wide.

9

<u>ITEM #18</u>: How is/should SGC's review of its effectiveness linked to the Educational Master planning cycle?

<u>ITEM #19</u>: How should the President/administrative team and Senates evaluate SGC's effectiveness? And, is this separate from any campus-wide evaluation (i.e. survey) conducted?

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

<u>ITEM #20</u>: Would this "administrative office" be the Office of Planning & Institutional Effectiveness?

<u>ITEM #21</u>: Is SGC the "central place where evaluation of all programs that guide our future will occur"? Is this supposed to be a reference to SGC's consideration of "future regional needs, new program commitments and initiatives" and "broad, high-level policy concerns"?

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight Formatted: Highlight

ITEM #20: Keep, omit, or re-word this language?

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Formatted: Right

3/21/03

LMC Shared Governance Council – Position Paper Adopted: March 2003

Under revision: Fall 2014