A. DECISION-MAKING ROLES AND PROCESSES

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

IVA1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

The change from one college president to another always marks a new beginning and provides an opportunity for renewed commitment to empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. In 2010, for the first time in a decade, Harbor College welcomed a new College president; in 2011, for the first time in eight years, the presidency of the Academic Senate also changed hands. The 2011 Campus Climate Survey showed 75.8 percent of respondents agreeing that the College as an institution “maintains a self-reflective dialogue about the quality of its service”; 71.7 percent agreeing that the College “creates an environment where staff and faculty are able to provide feedback about policies/practices/operations; 55.1 percent agreeing that the College “encourages innovation and risk-taking in the workplace” – a figure we confidently expected new leadership will increase significantly.

College leaders have the advantage of a college with mechanisms in place that assure that the college community can participate effectively in discussion, planning, and implementation of policy.

The Harbor College Faculty Senate, one of the first in the state, dates from 1964, long before AB 1725 formally provided for shared governance of the College. In 1991, after the enactment of AB 1725, College governance structures and procedures were reformed to ensure the roles of all constituencies in governance and planning. Disagreements as to essentials of the resulting processes gradually developed, however, and the
DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY (continued)

2001 accreditation visitation team served the College with a recommendation to resolve these uncertainties. A new participatory governance document was proposed by the Academic Senate and concurred in by administration-as well as by student and classified representatives.

The College also committed itself to the formal values by which decisions at Harbor College are to be made and which are reflected in the consensus model of decision-making which ensures that the input of all constituencies is respected. This commitment is consistent with Board policies on the roles of faculty and students in shared governance.²

The structures and procedures involved have now been operative for nearly ten years. The decision-making process is all-inclusive. Every member of every campus unit is to be involved in preparation of annual unit plans. Proposals for incorporation into unit plans can be submitted by any member of the College community: administrators, faculty, classified staff, and students. The College Planning Policy and Procedures Manual prescribes the way in which the principal decision-making body, the College Planning Council (CPC), implements the College’s Educational Master Plan. Through its cluster committees on which all constituencies are represented, the CPC merges unit plans into cluster plans, prioritizing cluster activities and merging them into College wide priorities.³

The College data required for decision-making, including surveys and analysis, is distributed campus wide. Academic Senate and College Planning Council minutes are posted on the College Web site. College policy requires all committees to publish minutes via College wide email or post them on the College Web site.⁴

SELF EVALUATION

A major objective of the governance structure has been to secure effective representation for each of the four College constituencies: administration, faculty, classified staff, and students. This has required more than appropriate seating for each constituency on CPC and its main committees as well as a workable consensus process for ensuring each constituency a real “say” in the resulting decisions. It also has meant ensuring that the members of each constituency feel that they are effectively in touch with their representatives on these governance bodies. In particular, classified staff lack a single forum for the discussion of campus policies.

Results from the spring 2011 Campus Climate Survey indicate that College goals are widely understood and that they have appropriate access to College leadership, communication, and College policies. Yet as noted previously in this Report, respondents also feel they lack adequate input into College decisions and that these decisions are not sufficiently innovative.⁵
SELF EVALUATION (continued)  

A special meeting attended by a majority of the members of the ASO Senate voiced a number of concerns which student leaders now indicate are being addressed. The names of student leaders can be added to the College “listserv.” Long-standing ASO procedures assign student leaders to governance and planning committees, and students are attending these meetings with increasing regularity. While some student leaders perceive “a pervasive lack of awareness” of the workings of College governance, even on their own part, the College is addressing this by a new design for Political Science 285, focusing on the accreditation process, and student senators now make written submissions to the ASO Senate reporting on their attendance at shared governance meetings.  

A standardized Web template for posting meetings and agendas across campus is being developed, and all budget documents distributed at official shared governance meetings will be posted on the Web site with budget data in a format that is uniform, readily understandable, and easy to find. 

In addition to an informational approach for heightening awareness, a mentoring approach should be attempted to keep faculty, staff and students informed of College policies and procedures. The College could more effectively use Facebook pages comparable to those of Harbor’s EOPS and of other community colleges. Bulletin boards could be more effectively organized and systematically maintained. The College’s new interactive display panels could feature general information. One classified clerical person could also be designated to maintain all committee minutes, agendas and key supporting documents, and to see that these are posted and available campus wide. 

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN  

The College Planning Council will conduct a “communication audit” to pinpoint where aspects of the process have broken down and to propose solutions for Council action. 

IVA2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.
IVA2a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

**Taken together, two College agreements—the College Participatory Governance Document and the Planning Policies and Procedures Manual adopted pursuant to it—detail the roles of all constituencies in planning and budget development.** The Academic Senate Constitution delineates the responsibilities, structures, and procedures of the Senate.

The roles of the several constituencies in the development of District policy are delineated in Board Rules Chapter XVII, Article I—Academic Senate and Board of Trustees Shared Governance Policy; Article II Students and Board of Trustee Shared Governance Policy; and Chancellor's Directive No 70. The AFT/LACCD Collective Bargaining Agreement requires faculty representation on governance and planning committees and makes faculty participation on these committees a criterion in faculty evaluation.

The principal governance body of the College, the College Planning Council (CPC), is composed of six representatives from each of the four constituent groups—faculty (Academic Senate and Faculty Guild), classified collective bargaining agents, Associated Students Organization, and administration. Within each of its designated areas, the planning and allocation committees, also consisting of representatives of the four constituencies, develop operational plans. The Governance Document and the Planning Manual define the areas in which each constituency has involvement and authority. Upon receiving the operational plans from each of the committees, CPC is responsible for prioritizing and integrating them into the College Annual Plan. The Budget Committee then structures a budget to implement the CPC decisions. CPC's authority rests with its review and coordination of strategic planning for general campus policy issues.

Several Senate committees, including the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Hiring Priorities Committee, have extensive policy and procedural manuals of their own. As detailed previously in this Report, committees function in accordance with the Brown Act and proposals for College activities may originate at any level.

**SELF EVALUATION**

The 2006 Self Study committed the College to “give College Planning Council meetings the planning focus they need by completing cluster plans sufficiently functional to enable CPC to reach its decisions within the framework of the College plan and through the ongoing review of that
SELF EVALUATION (continued) plan.” There has been continuous improvement since then in focusing CPC agendas on the College Plan with reference to the cluster plans that it incorporates so that CPC decisions, wherever feasible, are made in the context of implementing or altering planning priorities. Increasingly, cluster and unit agendas are similarly structured, with decisions at the cluster and unit level, wherever feasible, made in the context of their respective plans. Fulfilling the institutional commitment to “enable the College Budget Committee to perform more fiscal analysis and evaluation functions,” the reports of the College Budget Committee and Office of Institutional Effectiveness made to CPC provide perspective on long-term trends. Due to strengthened provisions in the updated College Planning Manual, plans now indicate both current and intended priorities sufficiently to enable funding reductions when strategically necessary and increases when strategically possible, so as to address the commitment to plans “from which all educational, personnel, and facilities priorities can be directly derived.”

A significant step forward has been making the College wide advisory committee to the president on construction bond expenditures (CORE Group) an open meeting, but its recommendations should be regularly reported directly to CPC as a shared governance body.

The major challenge remains breaking through the disconnect between formal processes that are open at all levels and the perception of the minority of nonparticipants that the processes are not open to them.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN Governance and planning bodies will complete their “action-evaluation” loops for the 2011-2012 academic year by adapting the evaluation model initiated by the District Planning Committee in 2009.

IV2b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY The Academic Senate, within the role provided by Title 5 of the Education Code, retains primary control over all academic and professional matters. The Senate and administration mutually agree upon a process for developing planning and budgeting decisions in which the Academic Senate plays a significant role in determining the specific content of College plans and budget allocations through the planning and allocation structure. The participatory governance document, currently being updated, reaffirms the process of collegial consultation between the College president and the Academic Senate, delineating those areas where the president must rely primarily on the Academic Senate, and those areas where the president must reach mutual agreement with the Academic
The roles of College Curriculum Committees and Senates and the District Curriculum Committee and District Academic Senate are stipulated in Administrative Regulation E-64—Procedures for Development and Approval of New Educational Programs and Options; E-65—Curriculum Approval: Standards and Procedures. Curriculum is initiated in the academic division unit plans. Course outlines, now able to be updated on the recently instituted District wide Electronic Curriculum Development system, go through a rigorous review by the Curriculum Committee, under the auspices of the Academic Senate.19

The spring 2011 Climate Survey reflects an apparent contradiction between positive views on College leadership and policy and reservations about the effectiveness of bodies such as the Academic Senate. For example, positive responses to all answer options in the “Governance and Planning” section of the survey averaged 67.2 percent, yet 50.5 percent of respondents were unsure of the effectiveness of the Academic Senate.20

The College Planning Council will conduct a “communications audit” to pinpoint where aspects of the process have broken down and to propose solutions for Council action.
SELF EVALUATION (continued)

constituencies. But the spring 2011 Campus Climate Survey, like previous surveys, again shows the irony in the results. As was the case with the corresponding surveys in the past accreditation cycle, most respondents reported attending campus meetings, and two-thirds stated that they served on College committees while doubting whether they were effectively represented in the resulting decisions. New College leadership may be dispelling a sense on the part of a minority of respondents that decisions are made outside of the official processes.

Misperceptions about the process are fed by nonparticipation in it. Student involvement has been high, but a sense on the part of classified staff of not participating effectively remains quite strong. It has been reaffirmed repeatedly throughout the past twenty years that classified staff must be released from work to attend important committee or College wide meetings, while cutbacks in resources has made this more and more difficult to do. Yet ways must be found to enable staff to participate even when attendance at meetings may delay the completion of important assigned work.

In spring 2012, the College will institute an informal College Hour to facilitate meeting attendance and participation. The College remains committed to greater sharing of clearer information about the governance process and fuller participation in it by all members of the College community, particularly classified staff.

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Hold committee meetings to the shortest time possible.

IVA4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

Los Angeles Harbor College is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), and the College has demonstrated and continues to demonstrate its honesty and integrity in the self study process. As part of this process, the College uses the standards, policies, guidelines, and self study requirements stipulated by WASC to ensure that the College remains above reproach and in compliance with Commission standards.

The Board of Trustees Committee on Educational Programs and Student Success monitors College Accreditation processes, reviews all Accreditation
DESRIPTIVE SUMMARY

Self Study reports to assure that they comply with Commission guidelines, and monitors progress toward implementation of all accreditation recommendations.\(^2\)

SELF EVALUATION

Prior to the 2000 accreditation, visitations resulted in few recommendations and little sense of urgency in taking action to address them. Since the 2000 accreditation, however, the College’s responses to Commission recommendations have been far-reaching. The present Report document is itself a testament to the College’s commitment, as are the College’s proactive responses to each of the recommendations that WASC has made after previous self study review visitations.

IVA5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

DESRIPTIVE SUMMARY

The College’s Participatory Governance Document requires a review every two years. This biennial review is initiated by the Academic Senate, discussed at a College wide forum, and then negotiated by various constituencies in the College Planning Council. Finally the Senate and administration concur on the finished review.

SELF EVALUATION

The latest review and revision of the College Governance Document is soon to be completed.\(^3\)

ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

All constituency representatives on the College Planning Council will affirm the final document on a separate signature page to strengthen its credibility.

---
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