



**LIBI**

LONG ISLAND  
BUSINESS INSTITUTE

# DECISION-MAKING AND PLANNING

**JANUARY 2021**

“

It is not hard to make decisions when you know what your values are.

Roy Disney

”

## INTRODUCTION

For us to make progress as an institution, we must make effective decisions. Our decisions, in the wise words of Mr. Disney, don't have to be difficult to make if **we are clear about the values we hold as an institution.**

This document aims to remind us of what should guide our decision-making and how we ensure that everyone at the college has significant opportunities to contribute their opinion to meaningful collaboration and institutional decision-making.

Philosophically, LIBI is organized to reduce bureaucracy with the aim of enabling innovation and maximizing student success. Our students, and doing **what is right for our students**, are always the central tenets of decision-making at LIBI. This, coupled with LIBI's flat administrative structure, creates great opportunities for faculty, staff, administration and members of the Board to form an institutional partnership rather than a siloed top-down, overly compartmentalized organization. Structurally, LIBI is organized to organically provide opportunities for diverse voices and interests to be represented in decision-making; however, the formal structure for decision-making and planning must be in place to prevent the dominant voices from disenfranchising those members of our community that are less vocal.

Central to our shared governance and decision-making, are **transparency, trust, and teamwork.** Along with **collegiality and constructive participation** by each constituent group, we can present, discuss, and decide important items that help us make institutional progress. For this to occur successfully, it is essential to understand the structure of each governing body and their relationship to one another; it is also important to understand the role each group plays in our institutional decision-making process so that we can respect the authority each holds and be mindful of boundaries.

This is a living document subject to changes necessitated by institutional assessment, regulatory changes, and continuous improvement efforts. The Board of Directors, the president, the provost, the Faculty Governance Council (FGC), or any other committee or ad hoc work group may recommend changes if those recommendations are a result of assessment done by that entity.

# SECTION I

## INSTITUTIONAL VALUES

- We live by our mission.
- We do what is right for our students.
- We follow regulatory mandates and laws as written; if we are not sure about something, we always seek help and clarification. Asking questions and getting help is a sign of strength (SOS).
- We are dedicated to educating a diverse body of students who come from underserved communities and require the college to provide an inclusive, **supportive**, holistic educational experience (“positive and empowering learning environment”).
- We create opportunities for all underserved students, so they can overcome disadvantages and find new life chances.
- We provide equal opportunities to all students to develop valuable skills and knowledge.
- We provide **access** to high-quality education with no to minimal student loan debt.
- Giving **access** does not end at admission – that is where our work begins.
- We have honest and open, at times very difficult, conversations between the constituent groups, but we do so respectfully and without malice and always with an eye to creating solutions not roadblocks (transparency, collegiality, and teamwork).
- Our work is not easy. We must respond to challenges quickly, and we have no time for hidden agendas. All constituent groups must say what they mean and mean what they say while also being prepared to do what is necessary (including extra work) to get to a solution (constructive and collegial participation).
- No matter what our differences may be at the moment, we are first, foremost, and always one team.

It is these values that form the basis for our institutional decision-making process. We look to these values to guide us when the path to agreement among constituents is not clear.

## **BASIC PRINCIPLES**

Of key importance to effective institutional governance and decision-making is a clear understanding and appreciation of the different roles and responsibilities of the constituent groups involved in this process. All groups are guided in their decision-making by our institutional mission and our institutional values.

For all constituent groups to work together in a meaningful way that furthers the mission of the college, the following principles must be respected by all participants:

- Accept appointments on committees whose work interests you or is important to you. Participation in shared governance is voluntary; if you are voted or selected to be on a committee you do not wish to be on, you must make that known before your term of service begins. It is disruptive to replace members who knew they didn't wish to serve.
- Accountability builds trust. Members of each constituent group must take responsibility for and support decisions that are agreed to and made by the group. Those responsible for implementing the decision must ensure follow through.
- Clear communication respectful of participants' time – communication follows a process. Agendas are prepared so that the meeting has a "compass," and the group can get back on track when needed. If meetings involve follow-up items, participants should come with prepared points they wish to discuss. At the end of the meeting, participants should leave knowing exactly what they need to do, how they need to do it, and when it needs to be done.
- Collegiality mandates that all interactions and dialogue will be respectful of differences. Contradictory views should be given a fair and respectful platform.
- Constant agreement does not always create constructive participation, diversity of views helps create effective solutions. Participants who hold divergent or unpopular views are protected from retaliation and retribution.
- Disrespectful or needlessly combative behavior toward other constituents is counter to our shared governance goals; consistent disrespectful behavior may result in a suspension of appointment. There is a big difference between sincerely held divergent views that cause discord and belligerent and disrespectful behavior.
- Diversity of views that cause ongoing prolonged disagreement that prevents the group from moving forward with the work at hand should be brought to a neutral facilitator to assist with reframing the issue with the aim of furthering mutual understanding and reopening the dialogue.

- Process is goal-oriented, timely, and transparent; timelines and parameters are clearly defined.
- Roles and responsibilities are unambiguous, well communicated, and understood by internal members and other constituent groups.
- Trust is a critical component to the ultimate success of any shared decision process. Higher degrees of trust affect attitudes toward the project or process, and in turn attitude affects performance outcomes, including quality of group decisions. Come to the table with goodwill.

## SECTION II

### DECISION-MAKING MEETINGS BASIC PROTOCOLS

Goals of our meetings should be to start them on time and to end them with action plans.

Some basic things that signal respect for the decision-making process; and by extension, our shared-governance endeavors include:

- Respect your colleagues and be on time.
- Respect the process and come prepared.
- If you have been assigned follow-up work, please make time to complete it and come prepared to share with your colleagues. If you foresee having a problem meeting the deadline suggested, say so.
- Active participation means lending your experience and taking part in discussions. Silence is not participation nor is it a form of consensus. Silence is silence.
- Being silent during the discussions and deliberations but subsequently voting against the proposal or decision, is unprofessional and unfair to the other members. Objections must be raised during the appropriate and designated time within the process. If no objections are raised during the designated times, the chair will interpret that as consensus and call for a vote. A surprise vote raising an objection will create needless bureaucratic processes and likely not gain you many allies.
- Some committees, and certain decisions, require a full-committee vote. Being absent for the final vote without communicating with the chair before the meeting is inconsiderate. Please communicate with the chair as soon as it becomes apparent that you may have a time conflict so that the chair can make alternate arrangements.

- Unanimous votes are generally not required, except for some rare situations. If you are unhappy with the decision made by your peers, and you feel you have already been given a fair platform to discuss your views, the formal mechanism is to submit a dissenting opinion to be attached with the committee's final decision.

## GETTING TO CONSENSUS (OR AT LEAST A RESPECTFUL DIALOGUE)

We already know that we need to be guided by our institutional values when determining the right course of action (**decision-making**); however, consensus is never guaranteed when difficult decisions must be made.

The following establishes an organized method that emphasizes **accountability** for evaluating new proposals, discussing options, and working toward clear, **value-based decisions**. By using this process, we link our mission and our articulated values to our institutional operations.

Always ask two essential questions:

- Is the proposed action compatible with our mission?
- Will this proposal advance the mission in any significant way?

Remember, one of our fundamental institutional "allergies" is bureaucracy. We don't have the level of staffing that would allow for protracted processes, so we need to aim at getting to the essence of all new items proposed for consideration.

Deliberations should follow these basic steps as a set of predetermined procedures:

1. Presentation of the issue and background information. Sufficient detail and data, such as a problem statement, recommendation, risks, if applicable, and alternatives should be distributed to participants (preferably for review prior to the meeting).
2. Discussion of the issue should be managed by the chair or a designee.
3. Before a major decision is taken, members should have sufficient time to produce a rationale and factors influencing their individual decision (next meeting, the following week if the matter is urgent and time sensitive, etc.).
4. Adequate time should be scheduled for the following meeting to allow each member to individually express opinions and their rationale.
5. An orderly discussion of the options should take place. Any dissenting voices should be given time to present their concerns for group discussion. A common ground should be sought at this juncture.

6. A “soft vote” or “temperature check” should be taken on adoption of the recommendation. Dissenting voices, if any, should be given an opportunity to voice concerns for further discussion. Additional brainstorming sessions may need to be scheduled where additional questions and suggestions can be considered with the aim of establishing consensus.
7. A formal vote should be taken so that a decision can be made.
8. The group will determine who will communicate the decision to the stakeholders and who will follow through and begin carrying it out. A member is appointed to track progress.
9. The chair will recheck the steps taken to ensure integrity to the process.

When stuck between #5 through #7, members should consider institutional values previously delineated in this document. If that does not yield any further consensus, members should consider the following:

- How will this decision affect the group’s responsibility to the college community?
- How will this decision affect each stakeholder group to which LIBI is accountable?
- How will this decision affect LIBI’s ability to improve?

## SECTION III

### ROLES OF CONSTITUENTS

At LIBI, committees work closely with the executive staff to ensure that diverse voices are represented in decision-making. Institutionally, we value the principles of shared governance, and we actively work to ensure that no constituent group or internal stakeholders are disenfranchised or discounted.

As a small institution, we frequently feel we can just email the executive staff or walk into their offices to discuss something that should be considered or changed. This informal system, although it expedites getting to the issues, is not the way things work in an inclusive, cohesive institution.

## **THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

The Board establishes the policies of the college, works to support its academic achievements, oversees its finances, authorizes and supervises the expansion of programs, and consults with and advises the president of the college. The Board delegates to the president all powers and authority required for the orderly management and operation of LIBI, apart from those powers specifically reserved to the Board of Directors. The Board has the discretion to delegate some or all its powers to the president in an emergency depending upon the facts and circumstances of each case.

Members of the Board of Directors are selected based on their interest in the college, their areas of expertise, and their commitment to participating on the Board to enable LIBI to fulfill its purpose and mission.

Among its duties, the Board appoints the president of the college and sets student tuition and fees with a view to making college education available to all qualified individuals at a reasonable cost. The Board defines the role and mission of the college and establish institutional objectives.

The Board also monitors existing policies of the college to ensure their currency and updates policy as necessary and appropriate. If the Board or president proposes new or modified policies, the president will notify the appropriate college governance councils or committees of impending changes to existing policy, proposed new policy, or retired policy and where appropriate, seek input. The Board delegates to the president the responsibility (and the president is required) to develop, implement, propose, and modify procedures as necessary to carry out the Board's policies and actions. The President will seek input from stakeholders in the formulation of procedures.

### **Chairperson of the Board**

The chairperson works with the president in defining the Board's responsibilities and setting the strategic direction for LIBI. The Board chair is expected to know and understand the policies and to make sure that the Board operates on a policy level. The chairperson serves as a liaison between the Board and the president outside of regularly scheduled Board meetings. The Board is responsible for strategic planning and oversight of the president, who is responsible for carrying out the plans of the Board.

Under the leadership of the chairperson, the Board offers advice and counsel to the president. The Board is responsible for reaffirming/approving the college mission, strategic goals and objectives, and establishing policies related to programs and services. The Board reviews and adopts an institutional budget, periodically reviews fiscal progress, hires external auditors, and reviews the findings of audits.



The Board has the responsibility of overseeing the president. In turn, the president delegates to executive management duties and powers necessary for the proper functioning of the college.

It is the responsibility of the chair to ensure that the Board refrains from interfering in the day-to-day administration or activities of the college.

### **The President**

LIBI's president is also our Chief Executive Officer, CEO. The president works very closely with the chairperson of the Board. The president is responsible for the administration of our programs and activities at the institution. In conjunction with the Board, the president makes policy recommendations on all matters that affect the college, including additions or changes in personnel and personnel policies. The Board gives the president broad guidelines for running the college, but the president has the authority to make most decisions according to personal discretion. *(Please refer to Employee Handbook, Section 2.4.2, Executive Staff, P. 24).*

### **The Provost**

LIBI's provost is also the Chief Academic Officer of the college. The provost works closely with the president and academic leaders and has the responsibility for administering all academic policies of the college. The provost oversees the academic budget. The provost also oversees all academic programs and the members of the faculty. The provost in consultation with faculty sets the standards for admission to the college and interprets student learning outcomes, shares the results with all constituent groups, and signals when existing academic policies need to be reviewed or when new academic policies need to be established. For detailed description of the rights and responsibilities of the provost, please refer to the Employee Handbook *(Please refer to Section 2.4.2, Executive Staff, P. 24).*

### **The Faculty**

LIBI's faculty have the authority to review the conditions for general admissions to the college and to set specific requirements for degrees and programs as they see necessary or appropriate. They are responsible for writing, approving, and assessing curriculum, both on the course and program level. The faculty have full control of grading policies and through the Faculty Governance Council (FGC), they have the power to revoke degrees. Through the Conduct Committee, the faculty have the responsibility of setting academic conduct policies; and through the conduct hearing process, they have the authority to enforce those policies. The Board, the president, and the provost rely on the faculty for developing recommendations that have or will have a signifi-

cant effect on them. Through the FGC, the faculty have the authority to participate in any policy making or changes that affect their terms of employment, evaluations, and professional development. The faculty also have the responsibility to recommend the resources needed to support the curriculum and their work in the classrooms. Through the FGC, the faculty provides feedback on the performance of administrators and the shared governance processes. Detailed information about the rights and responsibilities of the faculty are available in the Faculty Handbook (*Please refer to Section 1.2, Faculty and the College Structure, P. 15*).

## **The Staff**

The level of authority and the areas of responsibility of staff are determined through their job descriptions.

Mid-level managers carry the highest level of responsibility, and they make most impactful daily decisions throughout the college. Mid-level managers are individuals with the titles of Director, Associate Director, Registrar, etc. Frequently referred to as administrators, these individuals are expected to provide leadership and overall supervision for their units, including in the operations of the units or departments, staffing, staff management, financial planning and policies for their respective units. Please refer to the Employee Handbook (*Section 2.4, Job Functions, P. 26*).

## **GOVERNANCE GROUPS**

LIBI's governance is best described as participatory and representative. This section describes the primary roles of each group. Each group has its internal policies on membership terms, voting, and internal workflow processes.

Responsibilities of Members:

- Individuals appointed/elected to the governance groups have the explicit responsibility to share the views and feedback of their constituents with the members of the governance groups.
- They also have the same responsibility of sharing information about the work being done and the issues being considered in these groups with their constituents. When properly done, this system ensures broad involvement from the community.
- It is, therefore, imperative that those who serve on governance groups be willing and have the time to devote to the proper execution of their posts.

Governance groups derive their authority from the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors has also delegated said authority to the president.

## **Faculty Governance Council (FGC)**

The Council is composed of faculty elected to their posts and represents both full-time and adjunct members of the faculty. The FGC is the most senior and broadly reaching governing body representing the faculty. The Council members are elected for two-year terms and may serve multiple terms, if re-elected. The provost and the dean serve ex-officio.

The Council considers various policies, not just specifically academic ones, in detail for recommendations back to the executive staff and the Board. It is through the Council that the faculty have the direct opportunity to express their opinions and thoughts with the explicit assurance that those will be discussed and shared with the executive staff and the Board. The FGC ensures that faculty views and opinions are given every reasonable consideration.

Because the scope of the FGC's authority is very wide, the Council appoints ad hoc committees when an item or policy will require more voices. Instances where that will happen are:

- Faculty disciplinary proceedings. The provost will request that a confidential hearing be held to determine whether wrongdoing has occurred. The FGC members will determine if there is any conflict of interest, and then will appoint a chair of the hearing committee from among the members. If no member feels that they can chair the committee, they will appoint a neutral senior member of the faculty (not from the campus where the alleged wrongdoing took place). The FGC will then proceed to appoint the rest of the hearing board. Once a list is compiled, the respondent will have the opportunity to reject any members.
- New faculty mentorship. The FGC, as an extension of its responsibilities to represent the faculty, appoints, in consultation with the dean or provost, members of the mentorship committee.
- Sanctioning a faculty member. After undergoing a deliberative process, the FGC may appoint an ad hoc committee whose job will be to weigh whether an imposition of a sanction is necessary to protect the integrity and effective operation of the college or departments, faculty, staff, or students. The ad hoc committee will report back to the FGC for a final decision and vote.
- Policies for faculty professional development activities. The FGC approves policies regarding professional development requirements for faculty. The FGC, in consultation with the provost, directs funds to professional development activities. The Council has the authority to appoint ad hoc professional development committees, including a Convocation Planning committee.
- Faculty roles and involvement in the accreditation process, including the Institutional Effectiveness Plan (IEP) and self-studies. The Council has the authority to appoint ad hoc assessment committees, accreditation committees, and IEP committees.

The FGC has the responsibility for:

- Engaging with administration on all policies that relate to faculty, including employment and evaluation-related policies.
- Academic resource planning.
- Regular review of college mission and vision.
- Working with the provost to develop strategic academic planning goals, objectives and strategies.
- Working with the Curriculum Standards Committee, evaluating and recommending to the president and the Board new programs and program closures.
- Faculty conduct violation reviews.
- Overseeing the official evaluations of college administrators by the faculty.
- Engaging in the self-evaluation process and responding to the needs of the constituents the members represent.

The FGC may assume additional responsibilities and perform additional functions as may be delegated to it by the Board of Directors or the president. The rights and responsibilities of the FGC delineated above cannot be altered or changed without the direct involvement of the Board.

The FGC retains the right to meet with the Board of Directors with respect to the views, recommendations, or proposals.

### **Curriculum Standards Committee (CSC)**

The Curriculum Standards Committee (CSC) assumes primary responsibility in the areas of curriculum and academic standards. This Committee draws its authority from the Board of Directors.

Each department elects two representatives to this committee. The provost and dean are ex-officio members. The CSC appoints the General Education Sub-Committee.

Members of the committee:

- Establish admissions criteria for programs.
- Set standards regarding student preparation.
- Establish graduation requirements.

- Establish degree requirements.
- Establish prerequisites.
- Place courses within disciplines.
- Determine grading policies.
- Set processes for program reviews.
- Consider program discontinuance proposals.
- Recommend program deactivations.
- In the event of program closures, develop alternatives for affected students.
- Consider program realignment proposals.
- Recommend new programs for consideration by the president.
- Approve curriculum updates.
- Recommend resource allocation to support teaching and learning.
- Recommend program-specific resources to support student learning.
- Recommend long- and short-term academic goals in line with the mission of the college.
- Propose/establish new academic policies and updates to policies dealing with curriculum, assessment, grading, and new standards.
- Identify common areas of concern that require further study and forward these to the appropriate governance group.

### **Safety and Security Committee (SSC)**

Members of the Safety and Security Committee (SSC) draw their authority from the Board of Directors. This committee is always chaired by a member of the faculty, and by mandate, at least half of this committee must be comprised of female members.

The SSC's work culminates in the production of the Annual Safety Report (ASR) and the Alcohol and Other Drugs (AOD) report distributed to the LIBI community by October 1st of each year. The SSC also conducts the biennial review of LIBI's alcohol and drug prevention programming. This committee allocates funding to safety programming for the members of the college community and ensures that faculty and student voices are prominently represented in safety policies. This committee originates and updates safety and security policies and works closely with the Conduct Officer and the Conduct Committee to draft student and employee conduct policies as they relate to the safety of the campus, the Clery Act, and NYS Enough is Enough legislature.

Members of the SSC:

- Have the authority for the overall safety and security policies at the college.
- Work closely with the Conduct Officer and the Conduct Committee to ensure that college conduct policies reflect the work of the SSC.
- Conduct assessment in the form of climate surveys and release the findings to the community.
- Compile ASR and AOD reports and release them to the community.
- Conduct a biannual review of LIBI's drug and alcohol prevention efforts.
- Allocate funding to safety related programming.
- Work with HR to ensure employee onboarding contains important safety and security information.
- Designate response teams in case of emergency situations.
- Work closely with the president during emergency situations.

### **Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC)**

This committee's focus is providing data to the executive staff and the Board of Directors for the purposes of strategic planning and strategies.

The Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC) works to ensure that LIBI broadly disseminates the results of its assessment and evaluation activities. Assessment is a key factor in how we make decisions at LIBI; in fact, it is the driving factor for our decision-making. Assessment gives us a shared understanding of our strengths and weaknesses, and it compels us to face truths we may not always want to hear; but it is the process that allows us to set appropriate priorities based on the circumstances, whether good or not so good, that we find ourselves in. Philosophically, the college views data not as "good" or "bad," but as a barometer of where we are in relation to where we want to be. Assessment allows us to plan our institutional budgets and to place resources where we feel they are most needed based on what the data tells.

Members of this committee monitor the development and assessment of student learning outcomes.

The IAC recommends and makes provisions to provide training for faculty, staff, and administrators related to the development and assessment of student learning outcomes and institutional improvement.

Data is shared first with the appropriate committee that has jurisdiction over the area under review. Once data have been validated by that constituent group, arrangements are made to distribute the results community-wide.

This group has primary responsibility for producing and distributing the annual Institutional Effectiveness Plan, which forms the basis for institutional planning and budgeting.

This committee also assists faculty and the Curriculum Standards Committee with labor market research information for curriculum development. Working with academic departments this committee helps conduct research in fulfillment of the Pathway Program and Gainful Employment requirements.

**Members of the IAC include:** the faculty and administrators, including the president and the provost, as well as the director of operations, and the institutional liaison.

### **Conduct Committee (CC)**

The Conduct Committee (CC) derives its authority from the president, who is the person designated by the Board of Directors, to have this right.

Diversity is one of the strengths of our institution. Respect for the differences each of us brings to LIBI is essential so that everyone can thrive here. Embedded in our commitment to our mission and to creating a caring and culturally dynamic community is our commitment to adhering to standards of behavior that assure a safe environment where students and employees hold themselves accountable for their actions. In addition to the local, state, and federal laws that must be followed by the LIBI community, students and employees are expected to follow the codes of conduct the Board of Directors has approved for each constituent group, and which form the basis for creating a safe, respectful, and caring community.

Deeply rooted in LIBI's mission and vision is the belief that a holistic approach to education is necessary to help our students develop as individuals, as contributors to society, as parents and partners, and future employees. It is with this in mind that we have constructed our student conduct policies and processes. Our conduct processes and procedures aim to educate students and to help further instill in them the values of education, responsibility, and accountability. This is not to mean that students are given "a pass" for violating the code of conduct; in fact, it is quite the opposite. Our approach is developmental; therefore, we aim to help students understand what they have done, to **learn** from their behavior, and to accept accountability.

The conduct process is managed by the conduct officer and the CC.

The responsibility of the CC is as follows:

- Periodically review the Student Code of Conduct to ensure that old policies have been deleted from published materials and updates have been distributed.
- Serve as the lead group in drafting new student conduct-related policies.
- Serve as a lead group for drafting policy revisions related to student conduct.
- Engage, in a participatory role, in drafting new employee conduct policies.
- Take part, in a participatory capacity, in revising existing employee conduct policies.
- Assemble a hearing board, free of any conflict of interest, that is responsible for reviewing cases of students who have been sanctioned by the conduct officer for violations of the Student Code of Conduct.
- Assemble an Academic Integrity Board (AIB) if the reported transgression involves an academic integrity matter, such as cheating, turning in a paper or an assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else, plagiarizing, or any other academic dishonesty prohibited by the college.
- Determine conduct transgression sanction levels (warning to dismissal).
- Determine appropriate educational sanctions (anger management workshops, counseling, community service, research papers, etc.).
- Ensure that students' rights of institutional due process are applied fairly, consistently, and effectively.
- Collaborate with college constituents to address student behavioral issues.

Upon receiving a report of an alleged conduct violation, the CC convenes to review the available documentation and to make a decision on whether the case qualifies for a review, and whether or not LIBI's conduct policies were violated. If the CC determines that a violation has occurred, the members assemble a hearing board that will be free of any conflict of interest (faculty members who are teaching the student at the time of the alleged transgression are automatically disqualified, even if the incident did not take place in their course). The selected members of the ad hoc hearing board will meet with the chair of CC to be given all documentation pertinent to the case. The chair will help the ad hoc board identify the areas of the conduct that have been violated and advise them on the range of sanctions available for the level of transgression should the student be found responsible. The ad hoc committee conducts a hearing process and selects a chair to produce a written decision. The written decision is given to the CC for review. The CC is responsible for ensuring that all protocols were followed as written. If the CC is satisfied that all steps were followed, they will submit everything to the conduct officer who will notify the student of the decision. The CC has the authority to meet with the student before and/or after the hearing.



If the allegation is an academic integrity violation, the CC will follow a similar format, but will, instead, assemble members who have received training on academic dishonesty. These members generally come from the Curriculum Standards Committee (CSC).

The CC works closely with the members of the Safety and Security Committee (SSC) to draft and revise all conduct policies related to transgressions under the Clery Act, VAWA, Enough is Enough, and Title IX. The CC also works with human resources staff in a consultative role when employee conduct policies in these areas are being drawn up or amended.

Both the members of the CC and the SSC work closely together when conduct cases related to parts of the Clery Act, VAWA, Enough is Enough, or Title IX are brought to the CC.

**Members of the CC include:** Standing members of the CC include faculty and staff. Because the CC must have a roster of available members to appoint to the ad hoc conduct boards, the members of the CC sponsor regular training sessions for those interested in serving in that capacity. Serving on a hearing board involves attending at least one formal training session and being familiar with the code of conduct. Specialized hearing boards (AIB and the sexual violence conduct boards) have additional training requirements.

This committee has the authority to change conduct policies by following the shared governance processes.

### **Technology Committee (TC)**

The Technology Committee (TC) derives its authority from the president, who is the person designated by the Board of Directors, to have this right. The TC works closely with the Curriculum Standards Committee (CSC) and the Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC).

This committee assesses the current state of technology utilization across the college and recommends areas where expansion is needed to enhance instructional delivery, academic programs, and more efficient operations of the college. The TC collects data across the institution and utilizes the data collected by the IAC to evaluate, prioritize, and recommend technology proposals for implementation. This committee drafts technology proposals to be included in LIBI's strategic plan.

Specifically, this committee engages in the following activities:

- Members of the TC identify, recommend, and implement where possible, both on-going and specialized, training needs to ensure available technology resources are utilized across the institution.

- The TC also works with various departments to help identify areas of underutilization of available technology that results in inefficiencies, creates backlogs, or hinders data collection for the purposes of institutional improvements.
- Using assessment data, the TC looks for new ways to support faculty and student technology needs.
- Using the priorities identified by the institution through the recommendations of other college committees, the TC engages in review of proposed software and beta tests proposals as necessary.
- The TC identifies immediate priorities for institutional technology spending and sends their recommendations to the executive staff.
- Using assessment data and input from the CSC and the IAC, the TC drafts technology proposals for inclusion in strategic planning.

**Members of the TC include:** Associate Dean of Instruction, Faculty, Director of Operations, and Program Coordinator for Institutional Technologies.