



Standard 6

Governance and Administration

Overview

The current system of governance at Clark College has been in place for many years. With the growth of the College, both in size and complexity, it is evident that organization and decision-making structures must be examined. This standard has been written during a time of transition. The College will continue a study leading to adoption of a structure that is effective, efficient, and supportive of excellence in teaching and learning.

System of Governance

● Authority, Responsibilities, and Relationships

The system of governance at Clark College is clearly described in state statute, in Board and administrative policy, and by the College's organizational chart (Attachment 6.1) These documents delineate lines of authority, areas of responsibility, and relationships between and among the Board of Trustees, administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The governance system facilitates the successful accomplishment of College Mission and goals.

The responsibilities and duties of the College's five-member Board of Trustees are defined by RCW 28B.50.140 Community and Technical Colleges. (Exhibit 6.1) Further descriptions of the Board's governance and policy role are found in the *Clark College Board Policies and Administrative Procedures Manual (Policies and Procedures Manual)*. (Exhibit 6.2)

The Board also has adopted bylaws detailing their organization, method of defining Board officers, Board committees, information regarding meet-

ings, and miscellaneous categories. Adoption of these bylaws is required by state statute.

In 1996, the Board of Trustees formally approved adoption of the Policy Governance Model as their foundation for operation. The first step in moving toward implementation of this model was a comprehensive Mission, Vision, and Values review process. Following adoption of the new Mission, Vision, and Values statements, the Board, working with a consultant group and the Executive Team, adopted a set of Results Policies. (Appendix 6.1) These long-range broad goal statements serve as the foundation for institutional planning and goal setting. During the summer of 1998, the Board continued work on the Board goals that flow from the Results Policies.

Prior Board goal setting did not include the important information collection mechanisms reflected through current processes. During the past two years, the Board has systematically gathered input from community and campus groups. This input serves as the basis for current Board goals, making them more relevant and reflective of district needs.

Recommendations and Actions Taken

The Board will continue working on the three remaining areas of policy development: executive limitations, Board governance, and staff/Board linkages. Their work will entail reviewing current Board policies, establishing clear definitions for policy governance categories, and synthesis of existing policies within this new framework.

In order to ensure the goal setting and policy development work results in progress, the Board has established a three-step Board evaluation model (Exhibit 6.3). The first step includes self-evaluation, where each Board member evaluates his/her performance as a member of the Board. The second step in-

cludes establishment of clear Board goals, based on input from constituent groups (community, faculty, staff, and students). The final step in the process includes eliciting feedback from constituent groups related to relevancy of current goals, progress, and accomplishments that have resulted during the last year. Once feedback has been received and analyzed, Board goals for the following year will be established.

● Roles

The roles of trustees, administrators, faculty, staff, and students are clearly delineated in official documents, including the RCW 28B.50.140, Community and Technical Colleges; *Policies and Procedures Manual*, Clark College Association for Higher Education (CCAHE Agreement), Washington Public Employees Association (WPEA) contract, Association of Classified Employees (ACE) Constitution and By-Laws, and the Constitution of the Associated Students of Clark College.(ASCC). Frequent dialogue occurs between and among these groups, assisting in clarification of roles and responsibilities. With the adoption of the Policy Governance Model, campus groups will continue to receive additional information about how this model is organized and impacts operations of the Board.

Each campus group is represented at Board of Trustee meetings. Opportunities are provided for each representative to report to the Board and share perspectives. During the spring of 1998, the Board of Trustees established a regular meeting schedule with each constituent group, faculty, students, classified and exempt staff, to obtain feedback, acquire information, and answer questions.

The President works with the Board Chair to set the agenda for each Board meeting. This process is in keeping with the Policy Governance Model of board operation. Each of the three Vice Presidents is provided an opportunity to report to the Board at its monthly meeting, as are the presidents or representatives of the CCAHE, ACE, WPEA, and ASCC. Other faculty, staff, and students provide input on selected topics that are consistent with Board goals and areas of emphasis.

● Relationship to the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges

The authority of the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) and local district Boards of Trustees is clearly defined by RCW 28B.50 Community and Technical Colleges.

While there are clearly defined policies written at the system level, these policies may fail to address nuances of operation or needs at the local level. A great deal of effort is made to provide overarching guidelines that are equitable to all colleges, but this is a difficult task when "blending" 32 institutions. This situation is further complicated by the fact that many other state agencies and boards have a level of authority over local operations. These entities include the Higher Education Coordinating Board, Worker Re-Training and Education Coordinating Board, Department of Employment Security, Department of General Administration, Office of the Attorney General, Washington Personnel Resources Board, Office of Financial Management, State Treasurer, State Board of Education, and Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Recommendations and Actions Taken

With adoption of the new Policy Governance Model, clear definition of the respective roles of the Board, administration, and other representative groups is needed. The campus community lacks an understanding of the impact of Policy Governance on the institution and their respective roles related to this new model.

At fall 1998 Orientation, the Board Chair will present comprehensive information about the Policy Governance Model to the campus community. In addition, a Board brochure will be published that outlines the Policy Governance Model, clarifies Board evaluation and goal setting processes, and identifies Board goals for the current year. It is critical that the Board continues its annual goal setting process, providing a foundation for yearly institutional goal-setting activities.

Governing Board

● Responsibilities

Composition and organization of the Board is defined in Board of Trustee Policies 100.B00 and 100.C00 of the *Policies and Procedures Manual*. Each Board member is appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. Board members reside within the boundaries of the district and strive to represent a broad-based perspective. Terms of appointment are staggered, providing continuity of experience among Board members. A description of offices of the Board is contained in Board Policy 100.C00. The role of the executive officer (president) of the district is clearly stated in Board Policy 100.C60.

The Board of Trustees is ultimately responsible for the quality and integrity of the College. Duties, responsibilities, organizational structure, and operations of the Board are defined in Section 100 of the *Policies and Procedures Manual*. Ethical conduct requirements are set forth in the Public Ethics Law of Washington.

The Board acts as a group while delegating specific authority to the Chair. The Chair typically signs documents on behalf of the Board, sets meeting agendas, and represents the College at formal meetings and campus functions. As necessary, the Board seeks counsel from its Assistant Attorney General regarding specific legal actions.

● Selection and Evaluation of Chief Executive Officer

Following the resignation of Dr. Earl P. Johnson, in the spring of 1997, Dr. Tana Hasart, Dean of Students, was appointed Interim President for a period of 12 months while the College underwent a search for a new chief executive officer. The Board of Trustees, working with a consulting firm, commissioned a process for a national search to select a new president. As a first step, an environmental scan was conducted to identify the strengths and characteristics necessary to meet the needs of the College. (Exhibit 6.4). The Board then invited nominations from campus units and the community for members to serve on the Presidential Selection Advisory Committee.

The Board and included members from business/industry, labor, K-12, higher education, faculty, staff, and students made final appointments to the 18-member committee. The committee worked with the Board and consultants to develop mechanisms for operation.

Following a yearlong, comprehensive selection process, on June 2, 1998, the Board announced the selection of Dr. Tana L. Hasart as the next President of Clark College. A method of performance evaluation is currently under discussion between the Board Chair and the newly selected President.

● Mission and Program Review

The Board regularly reviews and approves the College's Mission. Standard 1 describes the Board's process for approval of the College's Mission statement, and Standard 9 provides details regarding its role in approval of policy. The Board approves all major academic, professional and technical programs, degrees, and certificates through formal adoption of the College Catalog.

● Board Evaluation

Recommendations and Actions Taken

As a result of learning that occurred from the self-study process, the Board of Trustees has developed a clearly defined evaluation process, analyzing its progress, the relevance of its policies, and the currency and accomplishment of its goals. This evaluation uses both quantitative instruments (self-evaluation) and qualitative data collection (constituent groups). The goal of this evaluation process is to determine the effectiveness of Board operations and to offer a framework for establishment of both Board policies and goals. The Board is currently working to bring into alignment its evaluation process, goal setting activities, and Board policies. It is expected that this work will be accomplished by the end of the 1998/99 academic year. (Exhibit 6.5 Annual College Planning and Goal Setting Calendar)

● Organizational Structure of College

At the beginning of the self-study process, it became evident that the complexity of the College necessitated a review of its structure and methods of operation.

Recommendations and Actions Taken

During Winter and Spring quarters of 1998, the College commissioned Dr. Patrick O'Rourke to conduct a study to: 1) define current organizational structure and decision-making processes of the College; 2) evaluate the effectiveness of these systems; and 3) make recommendations regarding changes that would improve College operations. Over 40 individual interviews were held and five group forums were conducted to elicit information. The results of this study were compiled and distributed to all members of the College community. (Exhibit 6.6)

Following opportunity for review of feedback, an implementation plan will be developed, incorporating relevant recommendations highlighted in the study. Every opportunity has been provided for input and feedback during the study. Since recommendations resulting from the O'Rourke Study may impact existing negotiated agreements; careful consideration is being made to ensure congruence between process and resulting change. The Board of Trustees will make final approval of organizational changes.

● Finances

The Board approves an annual budget for the College, usually in June, for the following fiscal year. Regular financial updates are provided during open Board meetings. The ASCC budget is approved, usually in June, at the recommendation of the administration. The Board Chair or designee attends all audit exit conferences. The Board receives a copy of the final audit report.

● Leadership and Management

The President (chief executive officer) provides leadership through the definition of College goals, establishment of priorities, and the development of plans which result in the achievement of the College's Mission and goals. The President is a full-time employee of the College with no other employment that detracts from fulfilling responsibilities of this role. The President may sit on boards of directors that serve interests of the College or community.

The administration and staff are organized to support the teaching and learning environment. Specific duties, responsibilities and ethical conduct of

the College's administrators are clearly defined in Section 200 of the *Policy and Administrative Procedures Manual*. Further details are available in College policies related to personnel.

Job descriptions and qualifications for administrative positions at the College are defined through administrative policy and personnel regulations. Administrative evaluations are conducted on an annual basis, with focused evaluations occurring every three years. See Exhibit 6.7. The Executive Team reviews the status of administrative evaluations to ensure compliance with policy and practice.

Recommendations and Actions Taken

The current method used to elicit feedback during the evaluation process for administrators should be reviewed to ensure relevant, non-biased perspectives are obtained. This review will take place during the 1998/99 academic year. In addition, professional development opportunities for mid-manager and senior administrators must be developed to ensure the highest possible opportunity is provided for satisfactory performance and skill upgrading.

● Institutional Decision-Making

The Executive Team, composed of the President, three Vice Presidents, two Associate Deans, Affirmative Action Officer, Director of Computing Services, and Director of College Advancement, and Director of Institutional Effectiveness, (Exhibit 6.8) meets weekly and makes decisions that support efficient and effective operation of the College. Divisions, departments, and unit groups meet regularly to conduct business and reach consensus around decisions.

The College Communication Council, a 25-member representative body, whose primary role is to provide planning, information, and policy input, meets on a monthly basis. (Membership list in Exhibit 6.9) The Management Team, composed of mid-managers, administrators and representatives from affiliate units (AHE, WPEA, ACE) meets three times a year. A membership list is shown in Exhibit 6.10.

Administrators maintain open and frequent communication with campus constituencies. Faculty

and staff bargaining unit representatives meet regularly with the President and administration. Feedback regarding proposed action is solicited from faculty, staff, and students.

Decisions are communicated to the campus through the Communication Council, affiliate units, *Run of the Mill* and e-mail.

Recommendations and Actions Taken

As a result of the self-study and as part of the re-organization plan, roles and responsibilities are being re-evaluated and redefined during the 1998-99 year. The role of the Executive Team will shift from operational decision making to policy and planning. Other decision-making systems will also be redefined.

● **Research and Planning**

The area of institutional research poses one of the most significant areas of concern for the College. Since Washington State began funding efforts in outcomes assessment in 1990, the College has devoted considerable resources to the improvement of teaching and learning. Information related to College-wide abilities, general education outcomes, professional/technical program outcomes, student learning objectives, and course syllabi has been gathered and widely distributed through faculty workshops, in-service days, division and department meetings, general campus mailings, and e-mail. In addition, individual departments and divisions have conducted research funded by outcomes assessment "mini-grants" and other College funding sources.

Information necessary for official reporting purposes has been collected by the Office of the Registrar and the Office of Instruction. The local, state and federal reports generated have been accurate and timely. IPEDS and MIS reports are just two examples of the effectiveness of mechanisms that support external reporting requirements.

A number of attempts have been made to address the issue of research and planning. In 1993, a Clark College Institutional Research Committee was appointed to bring together faculty and staff engaged in institutional research activities and to provide an information-sharing mechanism for assessment issues. An Institutional Resource File was established to provide a central location for

research and assessment data and to serve as a critical resource for institutional assessment, planning, and decision-making. More recently, the SBCTC has provided the College with an electronic data warehouse that includes basic institutional data in several categories.

While a great deal of data and information has been gathered through this variety of sources, no clear institutional research plan is in place. Mechanisms in support of analysis, synthesis, and application of the information obtained are unclear and uncoordinated. As the College attempts to respond to the increasing demands of accountability and assessment, it is clear that a common research agenda must be developed to coordinate accountability, quantitative research, outcomes assessment, and institutional effectiveness.

Recommendations and Actions Taken

During the self-study and organizational review processes, the issue of institutional research has been a constant focus of concern. By the fall quarter of 1999, a clearly defined method for linking institutional research with institutional effectiveness will be established. Funds have been allocated to support human and fiscal resource needs of the research unit.

● **Administrator and Staff Policies and Procedures**

Policies, procedures, and criteria for administrative and staff appointments, evaluation, retention, promotion, and/or termination are published, accessible, and periodically reviewed. The Board of Trustees adopts policies pertaining to a wide range of hiring procedures. These Board policies are recorded in the 600 section of the *Policies and Procedures Manual*. The Board conducts an annual review of hiring practices and hiring goals. The Executive Team uses these policy guidelines as the basis for their employee practices. These guidelines are currently under review to ensure compliance with the Board's Policy Governance Model.

Staff salaries and benefits are derived from the State salary schedule. Positions are evaluated upon vacancy to determine role and compensation are congruent. Legislative restrictions pertaining to the community college system pose barriers to salary adjustments. Both the K-12 and four-year in-

stitution systems have a greater degree of flexibility with regard to compensation adjustments than does the community college system. At the request of the Washington State Legislature, the Community College Human Resource Commission is studying this issue and will provide recommendations for improvement.

Recommendations and Actions Taken

Administrative salaries at Clark College currently are under study. A systematic review of administrative positions and compensation is being conducted to ensure congruence with responsibilities. In addition, the College will set compensation at a level to attract highly qualified candidates when positions are advertised.

● Institutional Advancement Activities

Clark College has an extensive range of advancement activities that provide a broad range of financial support. The result of this exceptional level of support has brought the College a margin of excellence. At the direction of the Attorney General, the Clark College Foundation is a distinct and separate entity from the College. While the Director of College Advancement also serves as the President of the Clark College Foundation, duties and responsibilities associated with each assignment are clearly delineated.

The Foundation Board has a clearly developed mission and method of operation that supports the Mission and Values of the College. Their efforts are congruent with those of the College, while maintained as separate and distinct as befitting the Foundation's role. (More information regarding Foundation operations and fiscal status is found in Standard 7.)

A sub-committee of the College Communication Council, the Foundation Funds Allocation Committee, has developed a tentative process for distributing expenditures from restricted and non-restricted funds in a manner that clearly relates to the College's Mission. Early in the foundation funds allocation cycle, campus members are asked to submit projects and requests for funding. These requests require signatures at the division and major unit level, ensuring the requests are consistent with established goals and activities. A representative committee reviews each request, gathers rele-

vant information, and then makes a final recommendation for funding to the College Communication Council. The recommendation of the College Communication Council is forwarded to the President for action.

While the procedure for Foundation funds allocation is relatively new and undergoing refinement, the campus community has expressed their support of this open, collaborative model for decision-making. The model is undergoing study to determine which elements might improve the over-all institutional budgeting procedure.

The funds forwarded from the Clark College Foundation are making a positive impact on the enhancement of teaching and learning. Exhibit 6.11 provides additional details related to the Foundation funds allocation process and allocations made for the 1997/98 and 1998/99 academic years. It should be noted that the 1998/99 allocations included tying requests to the Mission, Vision, and Values of the College. The 1999/2000 process will further link requests to the goals of the College.

Another important recent undertaking of the Clark College Foundation includes establishment of an ongoing alumni group. Connected to the 65th anniversary of the College and the 25th anniversary of the Foundation, (scheduled for celebration in Fall 1998) this process includes formation of a core group of alumni who will recruit additional members and plan support activities that honor the history of the College and enhance its potential for excellence. While alumni activities have been encouraged in the past, this formal, supported endeavor will prove a stable basis for connection to the College.

Faculty Role in Governance

Clark College supports the faculty role in governance in several ways. (See also Standard 4).

First, faculty are included on all major campus committees. ((Exhibit 6.12) AHE assists in appointing of faculty members to major campus committees. These committees include the Instructional Advisory Council (five faculty members) and the Curriculum Committee (five faculty members). These appointments ensure a strong faculty

voice is reflected in curricular and program decisions at the College. In addition, the Professional Placement and Advancement Committee (PPAC), which determines initial placement on the salary scale and advancement units for faculty, consists of eight faculty members broadly representing the instructional divisions.

Faculty are represented on campus committees charged with planning, budgeting and policy development. The method for selection of divisional leaders is stipulated by the CCAHE Agreement. The College supports this process and serves to ensure that faculty have a strong role in major decisions related to planning, budgeting, and policy on the campus.

At times, committee members have felt they were reactive to decisions rather than being part of them. As a result of this, some faculty members hesitate to serve on committees because they feel their participation fails to shape the decision-making process in a "real" way. This factor makes recruitment for campus committees difficult.

One exception is the Foundation Funds Allocation Committee, which deals with allocation of unencumbered funds. This committee is composed of a broad cross-campus constituency. Representatives from the administration, Clark College Foundation, and AHE formed this sub-group of the College Communications Council in 1997 as a collaborative effort. Members of this working group have clarified the role of the committee, developed definitions, and created operational guidelines. While the committee operation is still quite new (in its second year), this model presents a new way of "doing business" that could serve to revitalize committee operation on campus.

A recent area of concern has been the process for selection of committee members for the Presidential Search. Concern centered around the low ratio of faculty representation on the committee. Four faculty members were invited to serve on the committee. There were five committee members from outside the College and eighteen members in total. While the AHE was asked to forward nominations, some concern was voiced because the Faculty Senate was not allowed to choose the faculty committee members directly. The Board of

Trustees made the final selection of faculty representatives.

The President of the AHE Faculty Senate represents faculty interests by attending Board of Trustee meetings, quarterly meetings with the Management Team, and weekly meetings with the Vice President of Instruction and President of the College. The Faculty Senate invites administrators to meetings to facilitate faculty input regarding areas of interest and concern. Faculty use campus e-mail to discuss issues related to budgeting and policy.

Faculty are actively involved in planning and implementation activities focused on assessment of student learning, Mission review, and accreditation. The Outcomes Assessment Committee, composed of faculty representing each division as well as administrators from areas related to student learning and assessment, has led the campus initiative to identify College-wide abilities, integrate the abilities into the curriculum, and revise all course syllabi to reflect student learning outcomes.

Recommendations and Actions Taken

While the AHE Senate represents approximately 17% of the total faculty, a strong, collective faculty voice is essential to ensure oversight of curriculum and instructional issues. During the campus re-organization, the faculty decision-making role is also being re-evaluated.

Student Role in Governance

All students enrolled in college credit (or credit equivalent) courses at Clark College are members of the Associated Students of Clark College (ASCC). The Board of Trustees recognizes the ASCC Executive Council as the sole representative body of Clark College students. Officers are elected in the spring to serve the following year. There are currently five (5) positions on the ASCC Executive Council: President, Vice President of Finance, Vice President of Activities, Vice President of Elections and Appointments, and Director of Public Relations (appointed).

Each officer serves on College committees as a student representative; the President of ASCC is the official liaison and representative between the

ASCC and the Clark College Board of Trustees, the College, and the community. The officers gain valuable executive-level experience through leadership training, decision making, fiscal management, and issues resolution experiences during intensive summer sessions. These sessions are facilitated by the Director of Student Programs and various faculty, staff, and administrators from across the campus.

Students are responsible for management and decision-making processes for a \$600,000 Services and Activities fees budget. Student government also keeps students informed about administrative or legislative policies that directly affect the student body, such as tuition increases, program changes, and grievance procedures, through the student newspaper and specialized printed and e-mail publications.

Students are represented on thirteen of the 25 campus committees. Any student is eligible to participate in the various committees and may request to be nominated by ASCC as a member of a committee that has student representation.

Recommendations and Actions Taken

- **As part of the organizational decision-making process review, a study will be conducted to determine whether student representation on committees is adequate to ensure a strong student voice in decision-making processes.**
- **The current student government structure of ASCC was developed in 1973 when Clark was a relatively small college. Today, the structure fails to provide adequate representation for the nearly eleven thousand students who attend Clark and are members of the ASCC. The structure should be re-aligned to provide adequate representation from all populations served at Clark College.**
- **While information about opportunities for involvement in student government and campus committees at Clark College is available in a variety of publications, a more comprehensive plan for providing information to students and identifying potential student leaders needs to be developed. New students could be provided this information during admission, registra-**

tion, orientation, and faculty members could make referrals to ASCC.

- **In addition, comprehensive leadership programs should be developed to assist College student leaders in increasing their skills and understanding the level of their importance in being involved in College governance.**
- **A strong leadership outreach program should be considered to identify, recruit and train juniors and seniors in high school to become involved in student leadership at the College level.**

● **Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination**

In 1989, the Accreditation Team recommended that the College include a more visible reminder in the hiring process about affirmative action and access the low level of concern about sexual harassment. (*Evaluation Committee Report*, October 3-5, 1989, Page 5) In July 1994, the College's *Interim Report to the Commission on Colleges for Reaffirmation of Accreditation* addressed those recommendations.

- The Affirmative Action Officer makes annual reports to the Board of Trustees regarding the results of GAAP Com's review of the annual Affirmative Action Plan Updates, and periodic reports on the College's progress toward affirmative action goals. The Board Chair annually reviews and signs the College's Affirmative Action Policy Statement.
- In addition, the AA Officer makes additional reports to the Board of Trustees regarding affirmative action trends in the State and the nation.
- The Affirmative Action Officer sits on the College's Executive Team, to share policy information, as well as to ensure the consideration of affirmative action and diversity in Executive Team actions.
- In an effort to promote the Board's Policy on Cultural Pluralism (300.E00), a variety of steps have been taken to ensure that the College environment reflects diversity and varied cultures. A series of diversity posters have been placed in the rotunda of the Baird Administration Building, where they are in clear view of all students and visitors to the College. The erec-

tion of an authentic Native American totem pole on campus sends a strong positive message regarding the College's appreciation for all cultures.

- The 1997-99 College Catalog is based on the theme of harmony and diversity. The front cover of the Catalog features the totem pole, and the back cover and inside photographs feature people from a variety of diverse ethnic backgrounds.
- The affirmative action function was separated from the Personnel Services office in July 1995. This change was made to ensure that at least .5 FTE of administrative effort is devoted to affirmative action and equal opportunity. In addition, a permanent 75% position as Office Assistant III was created; 50% of that position's effort (.375 FTE) is devoted to assisting the Affirmative Action Officer. This staff support has resulted in enhanced ability to promote and publicize affirmative action issues.
- Combining the AA Officer role with that of Director of Personnel Services resulted in a dilution of the amount of administrative effort available for affirmative action and equal opportunity matters. Further, the nature of matters that are sometimes investigated through the formal or informal discrimination/harassment grievance procedure, for which the AA Officer is responsible, could possibly be construed as conflict of interest when personnel practices and policies are questioned.
- The College has received enthusiastic approval from the Governor's Affirmative Action Policy Committee (GAAP Com) on the 1993 Affirmative Action Baseline plan and the subsequent 1994, 1995, and 1996 Updates. The 1997 Update will be reviewed by GAAP Com during the summer of 1998; results of that review will probably not be available until early 1999.
- College representatives have attended the California Community College Affirmative Action Job Fairs on three occasions and actively identified targeted advertising opportunities to attract applicants in the College's affirmative action goal categories. While this problem may not be unique to Clark College, we are concerned at this gap in the College's workforce profile, and are actively seeking advice and assistance from a variety of sources, including the GAAP Com Representative and members of the local community.
- The Interim President, Vice President of Instruction, Director of Personnel Services, and the AA Officer met to discuss the composition of the 1998 faculty screening committees, to ensure that the composition of the committees reflects the diversity we are trying to promote on campus. Faculty screening committee members receive training not only on personnel selection practices, but also on affirmative action initiatives and the value of a diverse faculty. Similar training will be provided to administrative search committees as vacancies occur.
- Fall Orientation, September 10 & 11, 1997 Dr. Lois Price-Spratlen, University of Washington Ombudsman and Ombudsman for Sexual Harassment was invited to speak separately with faculty, administrators, and staff on issues of sexual harassment and perceived workplace mistreatment. Attendance at the sessions was mandatory for all permanent College employees. As a result of the issues raised, and at the request of employees, Dr. Price-Spratlen was invited back to the College in February 1998 to conduct follow-up sessions with smaller groups (composition determined at random) to focus techniques for developing and maintaining a positive campus environment.
- The Discrimination and Harassment Grievance Procedure has been revised extensively and put into WAC, with new provisions for dealing with frivolous complaints, clarifying the rights of the person(s) accused of discrimination or harassment, and compliance with WAC regarding brief adjudicative procedures. The new Procedure has been placed in the *Policy and Administrative Procedures Manual*, and distributed widely as a brochure. (Exhibit 6.13).
- A "Complaint Referral Guidelines" brochure has been developed to ensure clear sources of assistance for persons dissatisfied with College practices. The brochure is designed not only to clarify procedures for potential complainants, but also to enable College employees to expect

dite the referral of complainants to the appropriate office or person.

Recommendations and Actions Taken

In order to move closer to realization of affirmative action goals, especially pertaining to faculty and administrative positions, thought should be given to mechanisms that would provide internship experiences for persons of color. By working with a faculty or administrative mentor, in a fully funded position, the result can provide Clark College with a greater percentage of qualified applicants of color when recruiting. Plans are underway to establish a funding base for this effort.

● **Collective Bargaining**

AHE and WPEA collective bargaining practices help to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the College. Both the faculty and classified staff agreements promote a positive and fair campus environment by addressing such issues as due process, grievance procedures, benefits, and other issues of importance to members. The CCAHE agreement stipulates that faculty will have input in campus policy and decision making, stipulates the procedures to be followed in the hiring and tenure process for new faculty members. Classified staff representatives of the bargaining group are members of committees on campus including the College Communication Council.

The CCAHE Agreement includes language regarding funds available for such activities as attending conferences, subscribing to professional publications, and purchasing books, software training materials, etc. This has helped faculty keep current in their disciplines, thereby enhancing the quality of instruction.

The WPEA contract serves to define issues regarding working conditions for maintenance, grounds, custodial, and technician support personnel. The (ACE) and Classified Staff Education and Training (CSET) Committee represent other classified staff interests. Members of these units are selected to participate on campus committees and meet at least quarterly with the administration. Several avenues are provided to elicit input and encourage

participation by classified staff members of the campus community.

The AHE Faculty Senate is a representative body whose primary goal is that of advocating in support of faculty. The AHE Senate serves as a communication link between the faculty, the administration, and the Board of Trustees of the College. The Senate is represented at Board of Trustees meetings and recommends members for appointment to campus committees. The Senate is composed of representatives from 10 instructional areas, including adjunct faculty. The role of the Faculty Senate is congruent with promoting a positive environment on campus, providing a quality education to our students, and providing support for faculty to pursue new and innovated instructional methods and technologies.

The AHE Faculty Senate specifically strives to:

1. Provide a means for faculty voice to be heard.
2. Furnish a forum for faculty to discuss issues.
3. Afford an avenue for faculty to address and solve problems.
4. Offer mediation between the administration/division chairs and faculty members.
5. Identify potential problems related to the faculty and address them proactively.
6. Advocate for faculty participation in campus decision making processes.
7. Support changes that benefit the faculty and support quality teaching and learning.

The role of the Faculty Senate specifically relating to AHE Bargaining Unit responsibilities is to:

1. Conduct contract negotiations with the administration
2. Manage problems related to contract disputes and issues.
3. Advocate for faculty interests during regular meetings with administration.

The Faculty Senate has drafted proposed goals and will evaluate itself on the basis of those goals, once adopted.

Attachments

- Attachment 6.1 Organization Chart
(see also individual standards for
unit organization charts)
- Attachment 6.2 Board of Trustees Membership
and Term of Office

Appendix

- Appendix 6.1 Clark College Board of Trustees
Results Policies

Materials Available in Team Room

- Exhibit 6.1 RCW 28B.50.140
- Exhibit 6.2 *Clark College Board Policies and
Procedures Manual*
- Exhibit 6.3 Clark College Board of Trustees
Evaluation Policy
- Exhibit 6.4 Summary of 1997 Presidential
Search Environmental Scan
- Exhibit 6.5 Clark College Planning and
Goal-setting Calendar
- Exhibit 6.6 O'Rourke Report
- Exhibit 6.7 Evaluation of Administrators/
Exempt Staff
- Exhibit 6.8 Clark College Executive Team
Members

- Exhibit 6.9 Clark College Communication
Council Membership List
- Exhibit 6.10 Clark College Management Team
List
- Exhibit 6.11 Foundation Funds Allocation
Process
- Exhibit 6.12 Faculty Committees List
- Exhibit 6.13 Grievance Procedure
- Exhibit 6.14 Board of Trustees Agenda and
Minutes 1995-1998
- Exhibit 6.15 Constitution and By Laws of
Association for Classified
Employees
- Exhibit 6.16 Board of Trustees Agenda and
Minutes
- Exhibit 6.17 Administration and Staff Salary and
Benefits Data
- Exhibit 6.18 Clark College Association for
Higher Education Agreement
- Exhibit 6.19 Washington Public Employees
Association Agreement
- Exhibit 6.20 Constitution of Associated
Students of Clark College
- Exhibit 6.21 Affirmative Action Plans and
Updates, 1993-1997 (Compiled
1994-1998)

Attachment 6.1 – Organization Chart

Attachment 6.2**● Clark College Board of Trustees - 1998-99****Charles W. Fromhold, Chair**

- Appointed 1994
- Term expires September 30, 1999
- President, Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce

Sally Schaefer, Vice Chair

- Appointed 1987
- Re-appointed 1990 and 1995
- Term expires September 30, 2000
- Board Chair 1989-90
- Civic leader

Sue Fratt, Trustee

- Appointed 1997
- Term expires September 30, 2001
- Unit Services Director, American Cancer Society

Holly Echo-Hawk Solie, Trustee

- Appointed 1992. Re-appointed 1997
- Term expires September 30, 2002
- Board Chair 1997-98
- Regional Vice President, Children's Home Society

Victor Clausen, Trustee

- Appointed 1992
- Reappointed 1994
- Term expires September 30, 1998
- Board Chair 1992-93 and 1996-97
- Retired General Manager, Linear Products Division and Vice President of H.B. Fuller Company

Kim Peery

- Mr. Peery has been appointed to the Board of Trustees
- to replace Victor Clausen, whose term expires September 1998
- Mr. Peery's term will expire September 30, 2003
- Owner, Kim Peery and Company, a public affairs consulting firm