

STANDARD IV

LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

The Los Angeles Community College District, although only just over 35 years in existence, is one of the country's, if not the world's, largest community college districts. Its complexity and operation are understandable in light of its nine-college responsibility, even with local governance in operation. Both the district and Los Angeles Southwest College cannot function well without effective leadership at both entities. Active participation by district and campus leadership, faculty and staff collective bargaining agents, the District Academic Senate, and all the individuals who make up the district's employees creates a constituency-based partnership for dialogue in ideas and decision-making. Eighty-three percent (83%) of LASC faculty and staff who completed a recent survey stated they had participated in campus meetings during the previous 12 months. In addition, 68 percent of the respondents felt their participation in campus meetings helps to improve the college. Thus, integrity and honesty with internal and external agencies of the campus and district will assure the common goal of effective student learning. The college meets this standard. However, in order to comply more fully with some subsections of this standard, the college proposes a planning agenda to improve communications among the campus and throughout the community.

IV.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.

IV.A.1. 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.

DESCRIPTION

Los Angeles Southwest College (LASC) has expended a great deal of effort in creating a collegial environment and has had positive, productive results. The 2000 accreditation visit left a recommendation that the college must work toward creating an environment of trust and looking forward. The accreditation team suggested that the college develop a mechanism of trust. Following this visit, the college held a series of campus-wide forums and workshops and developed its core ideology: "Enriching Lives." By spring 2001, the college had developed the following strategic values:

- Serving Student Needs
- Quality Education
- Commitment to Students and Community
- Leadership

Part of the effort to create a more positive environment was to encourage and ensure

that faculty, administrators, and students are part of major campus committees. One of the major achievements was the creation of the Strategic Planning and Budgeting Committee (SPBC), which leads the college through the planning process, recommends annual and strategic goals, and formulates resource recommendations to the President. The planning process led by the SPBC enables all college units to participate in planning, tie the various planning processes together (program review, unit plans, division plans), and outline their respective goals and resource needs for the following academic year. In May 2005, the SPBC held a one-day retreat to discuss and finalize the *Strategic Plan*. This plan was built on the strategic values created in 2001. The *Strategic Plan* will guide the college's course for the next two years.

EVALUATION

The college has had a challenge with putting in place a centralized decision-making committee model such as the traditional College Council or a President's Advisory Committee. Although the college outlined the College Council purpose and this council met for over two years, it was not able to realize its potential. In an effort to move the college forward, the constituencies' leadership agreed to rename the council to the Constituency Council, change the committee membership composition to the constituent's leaders rather than having appointees, and recommit to the purpose of "sunshining" issues and presenting items that impact the college, such as recommendations that need college-wide input. Despite the name change and the membership composition, the council's purpose remains uncertain.

Increased collaboration between faculty and administrators has reaped great benefits for

the college. Faculty worked with college administrators and developed a more inclusive program review process that increased the faculty participation and self-study completion rate. This innovation had college-wide implications as it provided the foundation for higher-level planning. The development and implementation of a revised program review process is one of the tangible demonstrations that the college is moving towards utilizing the tenets of commitment, open communication, respect, collaboration, and inclusiveness.

Although the college has made a great deal of progress in this standard, much work remains to be done. The most recent survey asked the faculty and staff on a scale of one to five (one being least positive and five being most positive) if they have the opportunity to provide input into the campus-wide decision-making process. The average score of 2.7 indicates the need for further improvement in this area. The processes for input are in place, yet some of the challenges are that faculty and staff members do not fully participate in the processes, information from the participatory governance committees is sometimes incomplete or the reporter may provide only one perspective, and the outcome is not accepted if it does not reflect a committee member's view or a constituency expectations. The college partially meets this standard and a planning agenda is included to enhance the college's efforts.

PLANNING AGENDA

- Increase college community's awareness of committees and their members' roles.
- Evaluate the participatory processes and make necessary modifications.

IV.A.2. 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.

IV.A.2a. 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.

DESCRIPTION

The college faculty, students, staff, and administrators have designated roles in the decision-making processes. The college provides numerous mechanisms and venues for input into college-wide decisions through its committees, constituency groups, task forces, and through the college reporting structures.

Four designated participatory governance committees and other committees and task forces provide avenues for faculty, staff, and administrators' participation. The goal is to encourage broad representation and participation that leads to the discussion and recommendation of ideas for improvement of programs and services. The *Planning Handbook*, developed in 2001, provides defined roles and activities for the designated participatory governance committees:

- Constituency Council which was formerly College Council
- Strategic Planning and Budgeting Committee (SPBC)
- Technology Steering Committee
- Facilities Planning Committee

In an effort to reaffirm the committees' and their members' roles, the *Planning Handbook* requires each committee to review its respective purpose at its first meeting each fall to determine who will take minutes, plan how the minutes will be distributed, determine a process on how to operate if a quick response is required and there is not time for the regularly scheduled meeting, create a guest protocol, and the committee's ground rules. Each committee reviews its attendance, active participation, and reporting processes to ensure that the recommendations forwarded to the President reflect the whole committee.

EVALUATION

Faculty and staff were asked on a scale of one to five (one being least positive and five being most positive) if administration encourages staff/faculty to share in the decision-making at the college. The average score of 2.7 indicates the need for further improvement in this area. In order for a college, such as LASC, to be a fully participatory, decision making institution, it needs more time and training to affect its goals. Although the written framework is in place, some areas still require more attention, such as proactive and committed committee participation and attendance at some non-voting meetings is not as robust as at voting meetings, which causes a breakdown in the process when critical information is discussed at meetings leading to a committee vote.

The college has made a lot of strives in improving communications. The President reviews committee recommendations and makes a final determination in writing if a recommendation is or is not accepted. In addition, the President disseminates information on decisions to obtain campus input through additional channels. The President sends regular email updates, for instance, on construction, parking, and other college-wide issues to the entire college community, with emails typically outlining an issue and its potential impact on the college. These communiqués are in addition to the president's weekly online newsletter *Tuesdays at LASC*.

In an effort to improve committee activities, the college is piloting a program in fall 2005 that provides a \$20 stipend for committee members willing to take minutes, distribute the draft minutes to the committee members for their review, and prepare the final draft for the next meeting. Another mechanism that is being tested is having the four participatory governance committee chairs attend the Constituency Council meetings, report on the committees, and pass their recommendations to the President. In addition, each constituency group will share what is happening in its group, and *Tuesdays at LASC* will distribute this information. The college partially meets this standard and a planning agenda is included to enhance the college's efforts.

PLANNING AGENDA

- Create a handout outlining all college-wide committees, their charge, their composition, frequency of meetings.
- Promote constituency participation and attendance at meetings.

- Provide mechanisms to facilitate how information is disseminated from committees to constituency groups; for example, publish this information on college website.

IV.A.2b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the Curriculum Committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

DESCRIPTION

The college relies on faculty to develop, revise, and recommend instructional programs and services through the Curriculum Committee, which has 11 voting faculty members representing each department and non-voting members including an academic affairs dean. All Curriculum Committee members receive the *LASC Curriculum Committee Handbook*. The committee meets monthly to review curriculum and proposals for new courses and programs.

In addition, Academic Affairs and Student Services work on other issues of planning for student learning programs and services and regularly bring the issues to department chair and unit manager meetings, Council of Instruction, student services director meetings, and the Enrollment Management Task Force.

EVALUATION

Faculty has primary responsibility for the curriculum. There are various college structures, comprised mainly of faculty, that work collegially to enhance student learning programs and services. A predominant faculty-led structure is the SLO Committee, co-chaired by a faculty member and

administrator. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.A.3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution's constituencies.

DESCRIPTION

Several governance structures, processes, and practices for the various entities to work together for the good of the institution are in place at the district level and at the college.

At the district level, these structures include the district governing board meetings, district board subcommittee meetings, district-wide budget committee, several district-wide committees for the oversight of the Prop A and AA bond project, district-wide administrative meetings for academic affairs, student services and administration, district-wide academic senate, and several collective bargaining agencies. Various meetings help ensure consistency and quality.

At the college level, these structures include the senior staff and administrative meetings, Council of Instruction, Council of Student Services, Administrative Council, Associated Students Organization, four participatory governance committees, faculty, other committees, various task forces, and the collective bargaining units.

EVALUATION

All of these committees encourage communication regardless of titles or any hierarchal organizational structure. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.A.4. 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.

DESCRIPTION

The college has complied with the accrediting commission standards, policies, and guidelines. In terms of disclosure, the self-study is available for individuals both on and off the campus.

EVALUATION

The college moved quickly to address the commission's recommendations left in 2000. Overall, the college feels that it has made marked progress toward each of the past recommendation and, as part of the self-study process, widely circulated the document that included narrative about the outcomes of each of the previous recommendations. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.A.5. 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.

DESCRIPTION

The premise of the college is that it is a learning institution, not only for the students but also for the staff; thus, the college leadership is constantly looking for ways to improve services and efficiency. When a decision results in dissention, the appropriate leadership reviews what occurred and puts in place mechanisms to minimize a repeat instance. In some cases, the issue simply may be the result of a communication error. Strategies used to correct the problems are the President taking leadership and involving others through an email survey, taking the issue to the constituency council, meeting with the constituency group involved with the issue to explore alternatives, and reviewing any related documents, such as participatory governance agreements or union agreements. On the other hand, if the issue is a lack of role clarification, then the leadership provides training for those persons unfamiliar with the structures. Recent training sessions include workshops on governance, administrators training in writing evaluations, supervisors' review of contracts, and sexual harassment policies.

EVALUATION

At the committee level, the college leadership review is ongoing but not systematic. As indicated earlier, the College Council was perceived as not working and, after an evaluation, it was restructured into the Constituency Council. Recommendations for improvement within the committee are easier to implement, as they do not require approval between the administration and faculty. The college partially meets this standard and a planning agenda is included to enhance the college's efforts.

PLANNING AGENDA

- Evaluate the effectiveness of the college's decision-making structure and processes.

IV.B: Board and Administrative Organization

In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

IV.B.1. The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.

IV.B.1a. The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

DESCRIPTION

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) Board of Trustees is elected by a district-wide vote to four-year terms. Trustee elections occur on a staggered basis, providing for continuity of board membership, with three or four seats being filled every two years. Board members elect a president and vice president to serve one-year terms during their annual organizational meeting. A district-wide

student election occurs annually to select a student member for a one-year term. The Board of Trustees is an independent policy-making body that acts collectively in making decisions regarding the governance of the district.

EVALUATION

The policy governance model allows the board to effectively advocate for the institution and to represent the public interest as an independent policy-making body. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.1b. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

DESCRIPTION

The Board of Trustees exercises oversight of the college's educational programs. It establishes policies that set standards for graduation, curriculum development, and detail the faculty's role in all educational matters. The Board recently adopted a series of new rules mandating program review, biannual review of vocational programs, program viability review, and program discontinuance processes at the college level. The board is directly responsible for monitoring the college's institutional integrity and financial health and, therefore, requests regular reports from the President on the college budget.

EVALUATION

The board's policy governance model delineates the board's responsibilities and powers; it includes vision statements that are consistent with the college's mission statement, and contains policies whose purpose is to maintain and improve student learning programs and services. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.1c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

DESCRIPTION

The Board of Trustees has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity. It monitors the educational quality of all LACCD programs through the activities of its committee on educational programs and student success, which addresses issues related to educational effectiveness, student achievement, and educational program support. Through district administrative offices, the board is also responsible for overseeing compliance with all federal, state, and local policies in relation to student financial aid and other special fiscal programs. The board's budget committee bears responsibility for monitoring all aspects of district and college finances.

EVALUATION

The Board of Trustees takes responsibility for quality of education matters that are legal and financial integrity of the college. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.1d. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

DESCRIPTION

The district publishes the board policies specifying the duties and responsibilities. The board reviews board rule and administrative regulation revisions and considers them for adoption during its regular monthly meetings. It relies on the Chancellor and the Presidents to implement uniformly and effectively all board rules and administrative regulations across the district.

EVALUATION

All board policies, procedures, and bylaws are published. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.1e. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

DESCRIPTION

According to the *Los Angeles Community College District 2000 Self-Study*, conducted in July of that year, the LACCD's own internal checks and balances have generally been effective in ensuring compliance with the board's externally and internally defined

duties and responsibilities. The Chancellor and General Counsel also play an important role in this monitoring process. Conducted as a one-day retreat, this self-evaluation workshop required board members to clarify their goals and objectives and discuss new directions and evaluate current district practices. Future self-evaluations will expand on this model and incorporate additional feedback on the board's performance.

EVALUATION

The board has a clear mechanism for revising its policies. The board regularly reviews and revises its policies. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.1f. The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

DESCRIPTION

Terms for board members are staggered to ensure continuity. Over the past two years, the board of trustees has instituted, through the Chancellor's office, an orientation process for new members. Board members have engaged in a series of daylong retreats devoted to self-evaluation and agenda setting. Involving the Chancellor, other key district personnel, and when appropriate, the college presidents, these retreats are intended to aid the board in the process of strategic planning and institutional goal setting.

EVALUATION

The staggering of terms and new member orientation are effective. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.1g. The governing board's self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

DESCRIPTION

According to the district's 2000 self-study, the LACCD's own internal checks and balances have generally been effective in ensuring compliance with the Board's externally and internally defined duties and responsibilities. The Chancellor and the General Counsel also play an important role in this monitoring process. The first board self-evaluation was undertaken in July 2000. Conducted as a one-day retreat, this self-evaluation workshop required board members to clarify their goals and objectives and to discuss new directions and evaluate current district practices.

EVALUATION

The board-adopted policies on self-evaluation are clearly defined and published, but are not regularly implemented. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.1h. The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

IV.B.1i. The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

DESCRIPTION

Over the past six years, the Board of Trustees created a subcommittee called the Educational Programs and Student Success Committee. This committee in concert with the district have had a very hands on approach to the accreditation process. One of the major commitments was the appointment of an Accreditation Liaison Officer who is a faculty member who is responsible for coordinating the accreditation efforts among the colleges and keeping the district involved. Some of the things that have come from the accreditation self-study liaison has been the sponsorship of several district-wide accreditation workshops for steering committees and accreditation standard chairs. Drawing on the expertise of past accreditation self-study chairs and key ACCJC staff members, day-long workshops brought team members together from all campuses undergoing self-study to share information and discuss the challenges confronted in the accreditation process. Accreditation Liaison Officers and faculty chairs from across the district have met under the auspices of the Educational Programs and Student Success Committee throughout the accreditation process to coordinate their efforts and to compare best practices.

The board works through its Educational Programs and Student Success Committee to ensure that past accreditation recommendations are addressed effectively

and appropriately at the college level. The Board of Trustees Educational Programs and Student Success Committee monitors the accreditation self-study processes of the nine colleges and reviews their final self-study reports. They receive regular reports on the progress of the accreditation process. Board members review and comment on college accreditation reports. Board members will also meet directly with accreditation visiting teams and respond to their questions and concerns. The Board of Trustees is reviewing a draft code of ethics and has a role in the oversight of the accreditation process.

EVALUATION

The board has taken a more proactive role in the college accreditation process. In response to accreditation recommendations arising from the last round of college site visits, the Chancellor created the position of “liaison for accreditation” in 2000 to coordinate activities and oversight in relation to all college accreditations. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.1j. The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.

In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

DESCRIPTION

The Board of Trustees bears primary responsibility for selecting and evaluating the performance of the Chancellor. The board shares responsibility with the Chancellor for hiring and evaluating the performance of district vice chancellors, college presidents, and the general counsel. Search committees for all of these positions involve representatives of all relevant constituencies, including faculty, students, and staff. Hiring committees for all CEO positions also include community representatives. The board evaluates the Chancellor's performance annually. The Chancellor conducts regular evaluations of the college presidents in accordance with board rules.

EVALUATION

The board adopted a process five years ago that mandates the hiring of an outside consultant to facilitate the evaluation of key administrative personnel by means of interviews with relevant college constituency groups. This process appears to have worked well. The board also adopted a similar consultant-led process for the periodic evaluation of the Chancellor. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.2. The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides

effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting, and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

IV.B.2a. The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

DESCRIPTION

The President plans, oversees, and evaluates the organizational structure of the college. Although the President has the ultimate authority over the operation of the institution, the President delegates authority and responsibility to appropriate administrators and others at various levels of the institution.

The President regularly assesses the administrative structure. Currently, the administration is comprised of one president, three vice presidents, and four deans on the college's budget, and three deans over the numerous specially-funded programs. This structure mirrors the administrative pattern in the district and at the other colleges. Each of the administrative job descriptions is now reviewed annually and changes in duties may be made in response to the changing needs of the institution. Administrators have authority to perform the duties their assignments require, including weekly senior staff meetings of the president and vice presidents, monthly administrator meetings and annual retreats with the president, vice presidents, and deans. Frequent training sessions have such topics as sexual harassment, evaluations, and contract compliance.

The President assesses staffing levels against current and future needs. One of the most significant changes to the organizational structure occurred in response to the college's need to have a balanced budget and the college went through many phases of review to find cost savings. Consequently, two years ago, the President reorganized the administrative structure. Six instructors on special assignment positions who managed several of the SFP/categorical programs changed to three dean positions. This change reduced the program overhead costs, thereby freeing up program funds to provide more direct services to students and helps increase program compliance. The savings from the overhead of these programs provided more resources for services for the students' activities, counseling, and tutors; more support for faculty, including software and training for unit planning and program review, technology, and workshops; and, finally, improvement in the college's reporting and compliance requirements. In response to the 2000 accreditation recommendation, the college hired a Dean of Institutional Planning and Research.

EVALUATION

A critical guiding principle for the President is cultivating an organization that is responsive to students and is efficient and effective in using college resources. As outlined in the President's scope of responsibilities, there have been a number of administrative structure changes over the past four years. The creation of three dean positions in 2003-04, however, did result in some controversy. The recent hiring of the Dean of Institutional Planning and Research was without controversy and has had a significant positive impact on creating a culture of evidence at the institution. Faculty and administrators now have

empirical data readily available to make informed decisions, and this has been especially critical in the areas of course scheduling. It is recognized that the college needs to have more team-building activities. The college partially meets this standard and a planning agenda is included to enhance the college's efforts.

PLANNING AGENDA

- Plan more team-building retreats and staff-building activities.

IV.B.2b. The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:

- **establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;**
- **ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;**
- **ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.**

DESCRIPTION

The President, with input of the college leadership, guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by soliciting, obtaining, and reviewing committee recommendations for decision making in all areas including curriculum, facilities, planning, budget, and technology. These specific leadership tasks include the President's request and support of processes such as program review, program viability, unit and divisional

planning, and assessing the health of the instructional programs and student services.

In addition, the President and senior staff meet regularly with the faculty leadership of the Academic Senate to discuss academic issues. The President meets with the Constituency Council to disseminate information that impacts them and the college as well as to be get feedback on college issues. The President uses college research and analysis as primary tools in the decision-making process and to provide evidence for supporting innovations to create a student-centered teaching and learning environment.

EVALUATION

The President is actively involved in the instructional programs of the college and focuses a portion of each of the senior staff meetings on mechanisms to better serve students and implement improvements to student success. With the input of the college leadership, the President guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment. The President regularly monitors program performance by reviewing program and student achievement data. In line with the program review and program viability process, two program viability assessments in 2003-04 for the PACE and nursing programs took place. In both cases, the President took an active role in implementing the recommendations, which ultimately resulted in programmatic changes both the in leadership and curriculum of both programs. In 2004-05, the President supported the faculty's program review efforts through the allocation of college funds, software, and training of personnel, and the funding of instructional equipment. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.2c. The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

DESCRIPTION

Reporting to the Chancellor, the President is responsible for implementing statutes, regulations, and governing board policies. One of the President's tasks is to review compliance reports submitted to the funding agencies. In an effort to ensure that new program and funding opportunities are well developed and planned, the President has established a process that requires senior staff approval at the onset. The new "intent to apply" process ensures that new programs or activities are aligned with the college's mission and strategic objectives.

In 2000, the district passed a bond that was augmented in 2003. One of the major roles of the President is to provide the leadership in the Propositions A and AA building campaigns. The President assures that the college maintains the aggressive timeline to build out the institution with these new capital revenues.

EVALUATION

Compliance with external agencies has improved through the administrative reorganization as measured by the program visits and reporting. The college works closely with funding agencies to ensure that actions comply with the various regulatory agencies. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.2d. The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.**DESCRIPTION**

The college had historically ended each academic year in a deficit. In 2001-02, the college ended with a \$3.5 million debt. Since 2003-04, the college has ended with a positive balance and established a reserve. The President led the college effort and improved fiscal stability by communicating the college's budget and FTES goals to the college and external communities on a regular basis. The President reviews all budget reports from the Vice President of Administrative Services and the district office to monitor program balances. In light of this review, the President requires all SFP and categorical programs to appropriately offset costs that had previously been absorbed by the college. In addition, the President implements the recommendations from the Budget Augmentation Task Force such as reducing staff, monitoring expenditures, reviewing high cost areas, and implementing a hiring freeze. Finally, the President advocates for the college with the district to have the college's past debt forgiven, based on over expenditures prior to 2002, and to secure additional funds.

Through the department chairs and the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the President ensures that course scheduling is tied to student demand.

EVALUATION

The college's transformation in the area of year end balance has been a major

accomplishment for the President and the institution. The college was on the district's watch-list for several years due to annual deficit of over \$3 million a year. The President has taken a hands-on approach to ensure that the college operates within its budget. This attention to the budget is one that has required the President to make some unpopular decisions in terms of hiring and spending patterns. For example, some constituents were frustrated when, funds were not allocated for permanent faculty hires for 2005-06, even though the college received a one-time augmentation of \$1.4 million to the budget with conditions tied to monitoring year-end expenditures, not to be spent on ongoing personnel, and specific enrollment targets. As the 2005-06 school year commenced, it was clear that the college, similar to many other colleges in the state, would not meet its enrollment target and any gain of the year before will more than likely not remain as part of the college's base. The college partially meets this standard and a planning agenda is included to enhance the college's efforts.

PLANNING AGENDA

- Improve college-wide communications about the college's budget.

IV.B.2e. The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.**DESCRIPTION**

The President attends regular community meetings including homeowner associations, civics groups, workforce investment boards, interfaith councils, and other external groups to promote a positive image for the college. The President directed the administrative staff to create and strengthen community

partnerships to provide outreach and collaborative opportunities for the institution. The President attends all college foundation meetings and activities. Community presence has increased markedly since the last accreditation visit given the passage of the two facilities bond measures. The President holds periodic college forums to discuss critical issues and obtain feedback from campus and community stakeholders.

EVALUATION

Communicating effectively both on and off the campus requires time and resources. Faculty and staff as part of a survey were asked on a scale of one to five (one being least positive and five being most positive) if they receive communication about the college on a regular basis. The average score of 3.2 indicates an overall positive rating for communication to faculty and staff.

The President, consequently, responds personally to requests from political and community leaders. The President's visibility with the external community, combined with meeting obligations with district officials, frequently requires the President to be away from campus. Some campus members have expressed the opinion that the President should be more visible to faculty and students. The college partially meets this standard and a planning agenda is included to enhance the college's efforts.

PLANNING AGENDA

- Host additional college and community meetings.
- Prepare quarterly newsletters for the internal and external community.

IV.B.3. In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. It establishes clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board.

IV.B.3a. The district/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.

DESCRIPTION

The Board of Trustees has a policy of partial administrative decentralization, which had the effect of shifting additional responsibility and accountability for planning and decision making to the local college level. The Board of Trustees formally adopted in December 1999 the principle of administrative decentralization that has since become the basis for efforts by the district office and the colleges to clarify and delineate operational responsibilities.

The LACCD is comprised of ten operational centers (the district office and the nine colleges). These operational centers have collective and individual areas of responsibility that are governed, both internally and externally, through legislative parameters, the education code, board rules, administrative regulations, current and past practices, and collective bargaining agreements. The *LACCD Functional Map*

outlines the responsibilities of the college and the district.

The Los Angeles Community College District participated in a pilot program organized by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges aimed at clarifying lines of accountability and authority in districts with multiple colleges. Known as the Multi-College Pilot Program (MCP), this effort involved representatives from Los Angeles Valley College, Los Angeles Pierce College, and Los Angeles Mission College, all of which participated in the self-study process during the 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 academic years. Over this period, members of the steering committees of each college's accreditation teams met independently, and on occasion with ACCJC representatives, to explore issues of District-wide authority and accountability. These meetings led to the creation of a "matrix" of 417 questions which was then submitted to the District Administration, the Board of Trustees, the District Academic Senate, and the leadership of the faculty bargaining unit. Answers to these questions helped the colleges define lines of responsibility and to respond more effectively to specific issues included in Accreditation Standards.

As the result of district-wide collaboration, two inter-collegiate meetings on accreditation were held during the 2001-02 to offer steering committee members an overview of the Accreditation process and a chance to review the "matrix" generated during the original MCP and the responses that it solicited. The second meeting, held on March 15, 2002 at LACC, featured presentations by former members of the original Multi-College Pilot Project and invited steering committees to raise questions in relation to the District's role in Accreditation. As a result of these District-

wide coordination meetings, the *Functional Map* was developed.

EVALUATION

The decentralization philosophy is a work-in-progress that will require periodic review and change. However, it does serve to provide a framework for understanding and implementation. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.3b. The district/system provides effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions.

DESCRIPTION

The district office's primary purpose is to provide operational and logistical support to the colleges. In this effort, the district office offers an array of support services to the colleges. The main services involve instructional and student services support, institutional research, human resources, business services, financial services, legal services, public and marketing relations, and information technology services. Collaborative procedures between the district and the colleges include the "Budget Allocation Model," the "Codes for Student Conduct," and implementation of board rules. The district assesses its effectiveness through self-study and audit reports.

EVALUATION

The district provides support services consistently and equitably to all colleges. Each college, through its funding allocations, determines specific operational and educational priorities, which may vary

from college to college. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.3c. The district/system provides fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the colleges.

DESCRIPTION

In 1998, the LACCD accepted a revenue-based model that mirrored the state community college funding model. This model is consistent with board policy, which prescribes that colleges receive those reviews that are consistent with the manner by which revenue is received by the district. Since the last round of accreditation visits in 2000, the district has revisited its budget allocation process. As part of this revision, the district restructured its budget committee to include additional faculty representation and expand both the AFT College Faculty Guild and faculty senate participation.

Under the state “program based funding” model, the district and, subsequently, the colleges receive revenues based on “work load measures,” including faculty, student head count, and FTES (full-time equivalent students). The district adopted this model because the previous expenditure-based model did not encourage effective resource management or fiscal restraint.

The District Budget Committee (DBC), which is comprised of the nine Presidents, faculty representatives from each college, the faculty senate, and bargaining unit representatives, developed the district’s allocation model. Periodically, the DBC reviews the allocation model and

recommends changes to the model when it perceives they are necessary as exemplified by how colleges receive growth and basic skills money, the appreciation of targets and growth ceilings.

In 2002, the committee revised the allocation model, adopting a “window shade” approach to the allocation of growth dollars to ensure that each college that grew to its “funded growth cap” would receive the dollars. The previous version of the model only assured that a college would receive its percentage of total growth FTES generated by the District.

In addition, the DBC recommended the creation of growth targets and ceilings, a mechanism designed to help the district and the colleges maximize FTES growth and basic skills revenue, while protecting colleges from expending resources to generate FTES for which they would not be funded.

In response to the situation of colleges such as LASC, that ended the year 2002 in deficit, the DBC instituted the “Budget Allocation Grant” concept. Under these procedures, a college that ended the year in a deficit could request the intervention of the DBC Allocation Grant Task Force. The task force, comprised of administrators, faculty, and staff from other colleges in the district, would first solicit a grant allocation proposal from the college, a fiscal “self-study,” in which the college would present its assessment as to why the college ended in deficit. Following a review of the grant allocation request, the task force members review all the pertinent college and district fiscal and other appropriate data. They then visit the college; meet with administrators, faculty, and staff, and subsequently issue a set of recommendations to help the college reach financial independence. If the college

follows these recommendations, the process allows a portion of the deficit to be offset with district funds from the contingency reserve.

EVALUATION

Over the past six years, the Board of Trustees, district administration, and faculty guild have worked together to address past accreditation concerns related to college funding and to secure the financial future of the nine LACCD colleges. An effect of this collaboration, for example, was the reconstitution of the district budget committee in 2003 to assure broader faculty and staff participation. Under its guidance, district revised allocation procedures and policies more accurately reflect the needs of each college's educational programs and their enrollments. District, board, and faculty guild cooperation has also resulted in positive ending balances and a growing district-wide contingency fund over the past six years, another result of the board's and the district's involvement in overseeing the fiscal health of the colleges. The maintenance of a significant contingency fund has allowed the district to minimize the impact of state budget cuts on local college programs, and it has also made it possible for "smaller" LACCD colleges to seek additional funding when needed to support educational offerings. Finally, two major bond measures passed since 2001 have provided more than a billion dollars for capital construction projects on all LACCD campuses that will directly benefit the district's instructional programs.

For LASC, the grant allocation process appears to have been a successful venture. The college's deficit has been reduced from \$3.5 million to \$1.2 million since the implementation of the grant allocation task force's recommendations. Despite the fact

that the college has aligned its spending with its budget, some believe that the college's FTES funding base does not adequately provide resources necessary to serve its community. The college, however, recognizes that meeting enrollment targets developed by the district with the colleges is critical to securing an appropriate funding base. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.3d. The district/system effectively controls its expenditures.

DESCRIPTION

Meeting on a monthly basis, the district budget committee, with administrative, faculty, and staff representation from all nine LACCD colleges, monitors all college budgets and expenditures. The committee tracks college budget projections, including reserve funds, from quarter to quarter. The district staff meets with college administrators as needed to address budget problems before they arise.

From an external standpoint, the district's outside auditor Price/Waterhouse and Cooper is the primary tool for the assessment of effectiveness of its financial management systems. Internally, the primary role of the district-wide budget committee is as an advisory council to the Chancellor and the board. In addition, the committee provides the board, presidents, and the public with periodic updates and presentations regarding the LACCD's financial state of affairs.

EVALUATION

The district has appropriately maintained at least a three percent contingency reserve fund every year since the reform of the district budget committee and the allocation formula in 2000. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IVB.3e. The chancellor gives full responsibility and authority to the presidents of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without his/her interference and holds them accountable for the operation of the colleges.

DESCRIPTION

Presidents undergo biannual consultant-administered evaluations conducted by the Office of the Chancellor. The Board of Trustees reviews and approves these evaluations.

EVALUATION

Since the adoption of administrative decentralization as the current approach to district/college relations, the President has expanded authority to make key decisions while being held accountable. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.3f. The district/system acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board. The district/system and the colleges use effective methods of communication, and they exchange information in a timely manner.

DESCRIPTION

Communication between the colleges and the district office is essential to the success of the LACCD and its colleges' educational and operational responsibilities. The district provides various reports pertaining to such areas as finance and personnel. District-wide committees at various levels meet and facilitate participation and sharing of information among the colleges and district including such groups as the Presidents' Cabinet, the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs Council, the Vice Presidents of Administrative Services Council, and the Chief Student Services Officers' Council.

EVALUATION

LACCD and LASC promote effective communication and efficiency of information exchange. The Chancellor conducts cabinet meetings and other meetings and other related sessions involving the college presidents and district office staff as necessary to maintain effective communication. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

IV.B.3g. The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

DESCRIPTION

The LACCD's policy for "identifying, considering and acting upon operation and policy matters" is contained in the "Chancellor's Directive Number 70 – District-wide Internal Management Consultation Process," issued on October 26, 1995. The directive addresses board rules and administrative regulations that are issued from the Office of the Chancellor. The policy engages the LACCD's three councils of vice presidents (the councils of academic affairs, administration, and student services), the chancellor's cabinet (the Chancellor and college presidents) in the policy development and review process. The policy allows for consulting, when appropriate, other district-wide committees and constituency groups in this process as well as including the District Academic Senate, the AFT Faculty College Guild, and the board's student affairs committee (the student trustee, the nine ASO presidents, and at least one board member).

In addition, as a regular part of the district's on-going accreditation self-study effort, the LACCD Board of Trustees Committee on Educational Programs and Student Success regularly reviews and revises the delineation of district and college roles and functions.

EVALUATION

Over the past three years faculty and staff from all nine district colleges have reviewed and revised the "functional map" that delineates district and college responsibilities. Most recently, the colleges slated for self-study in 2006 met in spring 2005 to revise the "functional map" and to discuss the integrity and effectiveness of key support and decision-making processes with district personnel. The college fully meets the standard.

PLANNING AGENDA

- None

**STANDARD IV :LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE
COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF EVIDENCE**IVA—Decision-Making Roles and Processes

2005 Annual Planning Retreat materials
Accreditation Recommendations from 2000
Campus Climate Survey
Division plans
Integrated College Operational Plan
LACCD Board Meeting minutes
LACCD Board Rules & Policies
LACCD functional map
LACCD Mission Statement
LASC Committee memberships draft document
LASC Curriculum Committee Handbook
LASC Mission Statement
LASC Shared Decision Making Process
LASC Strategic Plan
List of college wide forums on “Enriching Lives”
Minutes of Academic Senate and resolution establishing SLO committee
Minutes of EMP Committee
Minutes of Facilities Planning Committee
Minutes of SPBC
Minutes of Technology Steering Committee
Planning Handbook
Program reviews
SPBC ground rules
Tuesday’s Newsletters
Unit plans

IVB—Board and Administrative Organization

Accreditation recommendations from 2000
AGTF report
Allocation Grant Task Force
Audits of categorical and specially funded programs
Breakdown of unrestricted general budget
Business Office audits 2002-03 through 2004-05
Calendar for Academic Senate Executive-Board meetings with administration
Campus administrative organization chart
Campus Climate Survey
College computer inventory
Draft of LACCD Board Code of Ethics
Education Master Plan
Employment contracts
Facilities Master Plan
Functional Map
Integrated College Operational Plan
Job descriptions
LACCD 2000 Self-Study
LACCD Annual Audit 2002-2003
LACCD Annual Audit 2003-2004
LACCD Annual Audit 2004-2005
LACCD Board Policy on Governance Model
LACCD Budget Allocation Grant Concept
LACCD Chancellor's directive #70 regarding district wide internal management consultation process (issued 10/26/95)
LACCD functional map
LACCD phone directory
LACCD Programs of Self-insurance and Reserves
LASC budget from LACCD
LASC Mission Statement
LASC Strategic Plan
List of LACCD board members on accreditation sub-committees
List of regularly scheduled meetings that the president attends (Foundation, Homeowners, etc.)
Meetings and notes regarding budget deficit
Membership of LACCD Budget Sub-Committee
Monthly financial reports
New LACCD Board rules mandating program reviews, etc.
Planning Handbook
Presentation Materials from annual campus meetings
Quarterly financial reports
Request from President for VP to plan for no deficits in SFP
Response to Audit Exceptions
Technology Master Plan
Technology Replacement Plan

Three-year FTES Comparison by Section

Total Budgets for all Programs at LASC

Tuesdays Newsletters

Union contracts

Year End Closing 2001-02

Year End Closing 2003-04

Year End Closing 2004-05