The board of education shall evaluate the governance system based on its: From BP 325

1. Clarity;  
2. Wide and explicit communication;  
3. Effectiveness;  
4. Efficiency and timeliness;  
5. Processes that encourage employee and student participation in problem solving and  
decision making;  
6. Processes that assure that decisions are made at the appropriate level, by the appropriate  
group with the needed expertise; and  
7. Recognition of the support needed for employees and students to participate and contribute  
meaningfully.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| BP325 Criteria | 17-18 | 18-19 |
| 1. Clarity | Lack of understanding of council roles across the institution.  CH: We frequently used our charter to guide our scope and role within governance. The charter delineates indicates Learning Council develops and evaluates policy in “instruction”, “instructional support”, and” learning support”. We experienced a general lack of clarity and dissonance around how “learning support” and “instruction” are distinguished from “teaching and learning”.  CH: We worked to provide additional clarity to the role of a Learning Plan by codifying Learning Plan principles that explicitly connected instruction and instructional support to broader constructions of teaching and learning in an effort to align the scope and role of Learning Plan development to the institution’s mission and values. These were difficult and important conversations, as elevating teaching and learning as a focus of the Learning Plan was perceived by some as stratifying the work of faculty toward student success as more important or valued than the work of other councils, staff, and non-academic programming (e.g. continuing education).  CH: The Learning Council did develop clearer principles of the “why” behind a Learning plan, yet this did not translate to a shared understanding at the college as to “why” Lane needs a learning plan. I see this as a symptom of stakeholders not seeing or experiencing plans connecting to operationalized priorities or coherence in shared outcomes.  CH: There was no structural mechanism to coordinate planning with other councils or to see how/if the plans were used to set operational and resource priorities. Other councils (e.g. Technology, Facilities) communicated expectations to work from a Learning Plan to guide their work, yet there was little guidance or shared understanding of how the Learning Plan would be situated and utilized in institutional plans.  CH: There was little clarity in policy oversight and development. The Learning Council repeatedly raised barriers to the executive team and College Council including: 1) no centralized policy index, 2) no means to determine who at Lane revised a policy and if that occurred with council knowledge, 3) internal disagreement about what should be Learning Council policy and what is procedure. The Learning Council did work on reviewing all policy/procedures and made progress through 2017 (see [Tracking Documen](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Qd6cvHmq63oqt1hCT6xOZeG-YwU7xijmCHjK4yeSCkU/edit)t) | There continues to be a lack of understanding of council roles across the institution.  Overall the charge and purpose of the council is understood by its members.  There is a lack of direction and confusion over the development of the Learning Plan or Strategic Plan. Some clarity was reached once the Facilities Master Plan was underway. This raised the awareness that the Learning Plan needed to be completed.  Ownership of the Strategic Learning Plan is still in question. Learning Council believes it should be given back to them.  Membership turnover is a barrier to clarity. |
| 2. Wide and explicit communication | There should be systems in place where councils can be easily informed of the collective work and shared efforts.  CH: The Learning Council regularly reviewed, approved, and posted minutes on the website. During the Learning Plan development process, I met with each of the councils to get information about what was needed in a Learning Plan. We held campus conversations and developed visual aids to help inform the college about how a Learning Plan would (presumably) be situated within the colleges strategic planning and implementation. I made attempts to collaborate and seek direction from college leadership.  CH: I believe the college community at large is completely unaware of the Learning Council and why such a council is needed at Lane. I feel this sentiment and lack of value and awareness within the college’s stakeholders is a shared experience in all the councils with the exception of Faculty Council. I do not believe that stakeholders, in the broadest sense, see the councils as meaningful policy and planning bodies. | There has been good communication around the Learning Plan. There have been numerous forums, listening sessions with various stakeholders, a communication subcommittee formed around the LP development process, print materials and other resources were developed and disseminated.  The web/college information versus institutional history creates some confusion and don’t always align. |
| 3, Effectiveness | Governance sustainability and leadership succession planning is a major barrier to moving work forward.  There continue to be systematic barriers to collaboration within and across councils based on capacity, meeting schedule, and a lack of understanding of council roles across the institution.  There is an imbalance of expectations given the leadership expectations within governance  College Council, or whatever structure emerges from the governance subcommittee, should take active steps in examining its intracouncil effectiveness, specifically how it supports the effectiveness of governance as a whole, and what are the barriers to doing so.  CH: I feel the Learning Council was somewhat effective in elevating “teaching and learning” as an important component of student success. Difficult conversations within the council allowed us to consider our identity as an institution of higher education and our responsibility to understand the needs of students and best practices for quality education and a quality instructional environment.  CH: I experienced very little meaningful decision-making as a council member. We made decisions about language and held good discussions, yet I do not feel our work led to improving the direction and work at the college. I do feel that the act of holding these conversations and working toward an ideal to the best of our ability was effective in developing personal leadership skills and institutional fluency.  CH: We did not create a learning plan, nor did we have a learning plan to evaluate. Even the prompt for this question is evidence of conflating the role of governance, as it cites “academic plans”, and yet there is no institutional definition of an academic plan, and there is no charter language in any council that sets the expectation that councils will measure their effectiveness based on an academic plan.  CH: We received little to no feedback from College Council on our work plans or annual work reports. We received no communication from College Council on the scope of their work and opportunities to collaborate. When all council meetings were held, we reported our work and challenges, yet never received a substantive report back. It was difficult to sustain energy in plan development and general council work when requests for feedback were unanswered. | There continue to be systematic barriers to collaboration within and across councils based on capacity, meeting schedule, and a lack of understanding of council roles across the institution.  We have had good focus on the Learning Plan, but since it has been moved from our purview it leaves us questioning our purpose.  We are charged with policy review, however, many former policies have been changed to procedures which leaves them out of our review. There are currently only three COPPS policies under our purview and it is hard to be effective with only three policies. This needs to be addressed and is in our 2018-2019 work plan.  Lane has been sanctioned for accreditation standards 2 and 4, which fall within LC responsibility.  We still have work to do and would like a rubric to evaluate work and effectiveness. |
| 4. Efficiency and timeliness | It may benefit the institution to develop a process where current and proposed initiative about teaching and learning connected to ad-hoc groups to Learning Council in more intentional and explicit ways, so that that aims and goals of work is integrated into broader college visioning and directions that support a quality educational environment.  CH: I consistently sent out an agenda and prior minutes in advance of meetings and tracked action items according to our work plan. I started meetings on time and ended on time. We aimed to use Robert's Rules in decision-making and at times needed redirection to maintain decorum practices consistent with conducting a governance meeting.  CH: We were inconsistent in having a quorum, which significantly affected decision-making. Council members were asked to confirm ability to attend in advance, with fluctuating consistency in members meeting attendance commitments. There were several years where appointees attended 1 or 2 meetings a year. We did form work groups that made commitments to one another, but these commitments were not consistently honored, which resulted in stalled work. Scheduling barriers, leadership barriers, and the voluntary nature of council work are all factors that challenge efficiencies.  CH: Interpersonal dynamics challenged effectiveness at times. I made my best effort to keep the scope of discussion to the agenda, but this proved challenging on more than one occasion. There is value in having difficult conversations, as there is value in seeking solutions. It was difficult to move conversations forward within the council and as the chair without advertently or inadvertently silencing conversations. At times, members used their position as a means to be heard, and to air grievances, or to challenge others. This can be part of any leadership body and can be a means to disrupt the status quo and provoke change. It can also create a climate where others feel unwelcomed, dismissed, or disrespected. I view the latter as a symptom of frustration about personal and/or institutional burnout, and it manifests as a negative effect on efficiency and timeliness.  CH: Students had limited expertise in broad constructs such as learning plan and academic policy development and often brought in issues relevant to their personal student grievances. I feel we allowed time and space for these student conversations, and worked hard to avoid provoking adversarial stances. Student attendance was marginal and I could have worked to be more effective in helping students feel and be engaged outside of attending a formal meeting. | Two policies were evaluated, two have been moved forward.  A lot of time is spent on process with very little time on product.  There is confusion over policy or procedure and who is in charge of them all which makes the efficiency of LC slower.  LC did make an endorsement for involvement in Guided Pathways. |
| 5. Employee and student participation | When managers, faculty, and staff are engaged in multiple initiatives, and when those initiatives have imbalances in resources, we can expect differences in meeting benchmarks, milestones, and sustaining general momentum for institutional-level work.  CH: Students had limited expertise in broad constructs such as learning plan and academic policy development and often brought in issues relevant to their personal student grievances. I feel we allowed time and space for these student conversations, and worked hard to avoid provoking adversarial stances. Student attendance was marginal and I could have worked to be more effective in helping students feel and be engaged outside of attending a formal meeting.  CH: I feel that the voluntary nature of the work, a mismatch of accountability within the membership, the absence of any institutional Learning Plan over ten years created a situation where there was a dearth of deliverables that one would expect from a college governance committee. It is difficult to recruit members for voluntary work when there is no tangible reference to what that council has been able to produce in support of a shared vision. It is not clear to me how the representative groups outside of LCCEA recruit and select its members based on the needs of the council. At times appointees report they have been told that they are their to represent the union and its interests, which may result in intentional or unintentional exclusion of prospective members. | Student government engagement remains high. LC is one of the most popular assignment for students. There is good interest, but not sure of consistent attendance.  We are not sure if faculty engagement with LC is more or less than other committees.  Employee participation is dependent on seeing the value of their time spent, having valued and respected decision making. People have a lot going on and need to be selective in what they join and how much impact they will have.  LC needs better clarity of value and respect of input from students and employees.  Participation by faculty is solicited by LCCEA and Faculty Council.  There was a large turnover in membership this year, leadership changes, faculty turnover. Historically there has not been as much turnover. This may also coincide with the Learning Plan issue. |
| 6. Decisions are made at the appropriate level, by the appropriate group with the needed expertise | In the case of the Learning Plan development, input was often requested from others to give guidance in areas of their expertise. For example Ian Coronado was brought on for the technology perspective and is now a member of LC.  CH: My experience as a council member and chair was a learn-as-you go. I was offered council and mentorship by the previous chair and did engage in some self-study about governance to help develop my skills as chair within that context. I agree that the Learning Council should have a strong faculty membership roster, both in breadth and depth. It was helpful to have LCCEA appointees on the council, particularly to prevent policy-making discussions that is the responsibility of Faculty Council (e.g., grading policy, instructor hours on campus). It was helpful to have a Faculty co-chair on the Learning Council, as it allowed for collaboration, and provided an opportunity to share our work in Faculty Council discussions. | Policy review and revises have been moved to Faculty and College Councils for review. This work came out of COPPS subcommittee work. Members of the subcommittees were solicited from volunteers across campus. |
| 7. Employees and students are supported to participate and contribute meaningfully | There are marked disparities in resource allocation, which drive differentiated progress within stakeholder groups that play a role in setting direction for teaching and learning at Lane:   * Academic Program Review – Faculty lead and staff project coordinator with associated workload assignments. * Achieving the Dream – ASA co-chair and faculty co-chair and core team with associated workload assignments. * Assessment Team – Faculty lead and CLO faculty coordinator with associated workload assignments * Learning Council – Faculty chair with stipend and no associated workload assignment.   The lack of sustained human resource is most evident in Learning Council: all three appointed faculty members will release their position entirely, or serve in a new role (e.g. faculty to LCCEA President) on the council.  CH: I offered public acknowledgement and appreciation of the work of our council members and I was offered the same by members and leadership. I recognize that volunteers should feel authentic appreciation for the time and care they put into their service work.  CH: There was limited resource support for the work of the Learning Council. We did receive some administrative support in developing the Learning Plan Conversation Kit. Jennifer Steele in her planning role collaborated to develop forums and visual materials to help with increasing college awareness of the Learning Plan and was responsive to feedback from the council. Other administrative work was largely the role of the chair and compensated with a $1500 annual stipend.  CH: In any volunteer organization, you need to rely on the energy of those in your committee. Lane was in a state of significant leadership change and the general working conditions (instability, threats of program cuts, fluctuating support from managers for staff to engage, labor disputes, and a demanding academic calendar) adds to feelings of frustration and burnout. Fostering engagement takes resources, and as chair, there was a limit on what I was able to provide to improve the meaningfulness of the work and meet my primary faculty role and coordinator commitments.  CH: As I think about what could be done differently, I feel people will meaningfully contribute in the future if: 1) there is a shared vision and goal(s), 2) there are opportunities to take action, 3) multiple points of view are respectfully heard and considered, 4) decision-making processes are clear, and 5) people can see evidence of their efforts in the work of the college. | There are marked disparities in resource allocation, which drive differentiated progress within stakeholder groups that play a role in setting direction for teaching and learning at Lane:   * Academic Program Review – Faculty lead and staff project coordinator with associated workload assignments. * Achieving the Dream – ASA co-chair and faculty co-chair and core team with associated workload assignments. * Assessment Team – Faculty lead and CLO faculty coordinator with associated workload assignments * Learning Council – Faculty chair with stipend and no associated workload assignment.   The lack of sustained human resource is most evident in Learning Council: all three appointed faculty members will release their position entirely, or serve in a new role (e.g. faculty to LCCEA President) on the council.  People are stretched thin already and find it hard to participate when they already have a lot of commitments.  This may lead to a committee of people willing to serve, but, may not be as informed as a more suitable person.  Having fewer full time faculty at Lane makes it harder to cover all committees adequately. This is probably a similar issue for classified staff. |