

## **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.1.a. 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.**

### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) comprises nine related colleges, each of which is directly answerable to a seven-member board of trustees, in accordance with Education Code 70902. LACCD board members are elected for four-year terms district wide by voters in the city of Los Angeles and in neighboring cities without their own community college districts.

Semi-monthly board meetings are held year-round at the District's central office downtown and at each of the nine college campuses during the academic year. In compliance with the Brown Act, all meetings are publicized at least 72 hours in advance and are open to the public. The Board meets twice a month. Special meetings are sometimes called to handle business that cannot be dealt with at regular meetings. After a closed session, a public session is held to allow members of the community, employees, and students an opportunity to address the Board about their concerns. The college presidents, Educational Services Center (ESC) senior staff, and representatives of employee unions, the District Academic Senate (DAS), and students sit at a designated resource table and may participate freely in the discussion of issues.

### **SELF EVALUATION**

The Board represents the interests of a broad range of constituencies. An independent policy-making body, its members are elected at large across one of the most demographically diverse urban areas in the U.S.

Board members work together collaboratively to support the interests of the District. The trustees take an active role in advocating for the Colleges and the students served and in defending the Colleges from undue interference. For example, on several occasions board members have united to support local college master planning decisions that were made through sound shared governance processes, despite the opposition of special interest groups.

## **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

**IV.B.1.b. 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.**

## **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The Board has an established role in setting and updating policies in order to ensure the effective operation of the District. Oversight of the College's educational programs and services is accomplished by means of board rules and administrative regulations that establish standards for graduation, set policies for curriculum development and approval, and detail the faculty's central role in educational matters in accordance with the District's stated mission (IV.B-1). The Board must also approve or reject all changes to the curriculum that are brought before it from the District's Office of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness or the DAS.

The Board sets goals and provides a sense of direction for the Colleges through the District Strategic Plan (DSP) (IV.B-2). Part of overall planning efforts, the plan is derived from goals set by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. In spring 2010, the District Planning Committee (DPC) evaluated the then-current plan and issued a scorecard with suggestions for its revision (IV.B-3). In spring 2011, the District began another comprehensive district-wide strategic planning process to guide the District from 2012 to 2017 (IV.B-4). More than 40 focus groups, including input from faculty, students, staff, and administrators, were held in fall 2011 at each college and the ESC to identify district-wide strengths and weaknesses and offer suggestions for priorities and strategies, and in spring 2012, input was again solicited (IV.B-5). Vision 2017 (IV.B-6) is expected to be approved by the Board December 5, 2012.

The plan is also in line with Senate Bill 1456, the Student Success Act of 2012, the new state law that requires community colleges receiving state apportionment to post a student success scorecard to clearly communicate progress in improving completion rates for all students. The next step will be for the Colleges to revise their strategic plans to align with Vision 2017.

The Board also tasked the District with developing a Technology Strategic Plan (IVB-7) to set goals for technology-related expenditures. An Implementation Task Force, comprised of representatives of constituency groups from the Colleges, worked through spring 2012 to prioritize strategies to meet the plan's goals (IVB-8). The District is planning significant technology enhancements, including the addition of a fiber optic network that will prevent business disruption, with the primary emphasis of the plan on the implementation of the new Student Information System (SIS).

## SELF EVALUATION

Since the District began to partially decentralize in 1999, District administrators, the Council of Academic Affairs (comprised of the VPs), and the DAS have worked to streamline procedures for the approval of academic programs and courses. As part of this effort, administrative regulations have been revised to decentralize the curriculum approval process and empower local college faculty. In addition, the District has adopted a series of board rules mandating Program Review, biennial review of vocational programs, program viability review, and program discontinuance processes at the College level (IVB-9). These and other aspects of decentralization allow local college academic programs to be more responsive to local stakeholders.

The Chancellor, his executive assistant, and Board members regularly meet with state lawmakers and educational leaders to promote legislation and other initiatives intended to improve access for students and secure funding for special programs. The Board played a central role in promoting the Prop A, AA, and J bond initiatives passed in 2001, 2003, and 2008 that have provided more than \$5.7 billion in badly needed capital construction funds for projects on all the campuses; the District also accessed over \$300 million in State matching funds, bringing the total to over \$6 billion. These projects are directly benefitting instructional programs and expanding career/technical education program facilities.

In spring 2009, the District was honored by the Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges with an Excellence in Planning Award for its achievement in developing an effective framework for strategic planning in a multi-campus district (IVB-10).

## ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

No recommendations at this time.

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

## DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

The Board monitors the educational quality of LACCD programs through the following standing committees, which were restructured in 2010-11:

- The Institutional Effectiveness Committee addresses educational effectiveness, student achievement, and educational programs. It oversees the Colleges' accreditation self-evaluation efforts and requires annual college reports on progress made to reach strategic planning goals, including ARCC AB 1417 outcome measures and progress on the District's Core Indicators of Institutional Effectiveness.
- The Finance and Audit Committee recommends the tentative budget and annual audits for general operations of the District and the bond program and reviews financial reports, internal audits, bond financing issues, revenue-generating plans, public/private partnerships, and other financial matters.

- The Legislative Committee makes recommendations on legislative initiatives to benefit the District, reviews proposed state and federal legislation, evaluates lobbying efforts, and considers other related matters.
- The Capital Construction Committee provides policy guidance, oversight of the bond program, and approval of master plans and environmental impact reports.
- The Student Affairs Committee considers all matters that impact student life, including the teaching and learning environment, co-curricular and extracurricular activities, student services, etc. (IV.B-11).

In conjunction with the Chancellor's Office and the Office of General Counsel, the Board is apprised of and assumes responsibility for all legal matters associated with the operation of the nine campuses.

The Board bears responsibility for monitoring all aspects of District and college finances. An independent audit of the District's and the Colleges' financial statements and accounting practices is made annually by an outside agency. The Board, the College presidents, and the public are provided periodic updates and presentations regarding the LACCD's financial condition. The Board ensures the financial integrity of the District by approving an annual budget, reviewing its annual independent audit, and requiring at a minimum 5% reserve. The Board is directly responsible for guaranteeing the Colleges' financial health by requiring quarterly reports from the College presidents on their budgets and FTES targets. The Board is responsible for overseeing compliance with all federal, state, and local policies related to student financial aid and other fiscal programs through LACCD administrative offices.

To monitor the financial integrity of the District's capital construction project, the Board tightened its management by taking the following steps:

- Approved the creation and staffing of an independent Office of Inspector General that reports to the Chancellor and the Board and conducts ongoing review of performance, financial integrity, and legal compliance -- reports that have resulted in corrective actions
- Approved the creation of a Whistleblower Program for bond and non-bond related issues so that anyone may confidentially report on concerns needing investigation
- Instituted limits on the "multiplier" (or markup) that firms participating in the management of the building program can charge for employing program staff
- Strengthened the operation of the District Citizens' Oversight Committee, mandated by law to oversee the program
- Appointed an independent review panel of 10 distinguished citizens, which completed its examination of the program and recommended improvements of policies and processes
- Engaged the Office of Los Angeles City Controller Wendy Greuel in response to concerns raised about the process used to select the Inspector General
- Acted immediately to revise policies and procedures used in all RFP processes after the City Controller's Office concluded that the evaluation process for the selection of the Inspector General was flawed; the new process was used to hire a financial advising firm
- Approved the centralization of construction management under the purview of the Executive Director of Facilities (IV.B-12).

In fall 2011, in response to concerns expressed in a State Controller's Office audit, recommendations in a Building Program Review Panel report, a decrease in the District operating budget, and a significant decline in enrollment, the District instituted a moratorium on \$1.9 billion worth of planned building projects that had not started construction in order to conduct a thorough evaluation to determine whether the following criteria had been met:

1. The colleges could afford the costs of maintaining and operating the new buildings.
2. There was sufficient capital to build projects with currently authorized funds.
3. The facilities, some of which had been planned years ago, matched projected needs.

Based on reports provided by the Colleges, projects totaling \$1.7 billion have been released from the moratorium, leaving four projects (under \$170 million) still subject to further review by the Colleges (IV.B-13).

### **SELF EVALUATION**

The ultimate responsibility for policies and decisions impacting all nine colleges lies with the Board, which has significantly expanded its role in oversight of the quality of instructional programs. Annual college strategic planning reviews allow the Board to play a more direct role in assuring that the Colleges and the District are in sync by requiring the Colleges to demonstrate how their goals align with the District's. These reviews give the Board the opportunity to hold the Colleges publicly accountable for meeting quality assurance standards associated with their educational master plans and strategic planning efforts (IV.B-14).

As a result of repeat findings in the 2010-11 annual independent audit, college personnel from each of the areas with any deficiency were required to attend mandatory meetings with the Office of Budget and Accounting and the District's Internal Audit Department to discuss the findings and take immediate corrective action. The Internal Audit Department then conducted meetings with the responsible vice presidents in the areas with findings at each of the nine colleges to ensure that the Colleges were following their action plans. The District established a single point of contact at each college to collect and review responses, beginning with the assignment of a lead to take charge of each action, the setting of corrective actions with a timeline for implementation, and a request for documentation to prove that the corrective actions took place. This centralization has made the District more responsive to the audit findings (IV.B-15). In September 2012, the District held an Accreditation Summit with 70 administrators and two Academic Senate representatives. The session focused on audit findings, corrective action plans, and responsibility for the resolution of these audit findings (IV.B-16).

The Internal Audit Department has been tasked with working with all the Colleges to enhance and enforce current policies, procedures, forms, and monitoring controls to ensure that campuses are uniform and in compliance with all federal, state, and local regulations. Internal Audit has also been tasked with making sure that the corrections have been implemented by conducting follow up visits to all nine colleges.

The Board, District administration, college presidents, faculty, and staff spent considerable time and effort over the past year in discussions about the building moratorium and its impact on the

Colleges. The Chancellor requested the moratorium primarily to analyze and adjust to the impact of the state budget crisis, since state support for higher education has been reduced and building was outpacing enrollment. If the District had continued with the planned program, it would have added 3.8 million square feet at a time when FTES are declining, hiring is decreasing, and the ability to maintain and operate the new buildings was not guaranteed. The moratorium was a thoughtful approach to take a hard look at the remaining projects and decide whether adjustments were needed.

#### **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

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

##### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The duties and responsibilities of the board are defined externally by State Education Code, Section 70902, and internally by board rules (IV.B-17). The Chancellor and General Counsel also play an important role in monitoring board responsibilities. The bylaws and policies are published on the District's Web site (IV.B-18).

##### **SELF EVALUATION**

The LACCD's own internal checks and balances have ensured compliance with the Board's externally and internally defined duties and responsibilities.

#### **IV.B.1.e. 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.**

##### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The process for the adoption of board rules (policies) and the administrative regulations that support them (how to implement the policies) are outlined in a Chancellor's Office directive (IV.B-19). Board rules are adopted by the Board of Trustees, and Administrative Regulations are issued under the authority of the Chancellor. In addition, the District adopts other procedures, such as its Business Procedures Manual and Chancellor's Directives, to establish consistent standards.

In 2007, the board adopted a regulation stipulating the process for the cyclical, automatic review of all policies and regulations (IV.B-20). Rules and regulations are assigned by category to subject matter experts every three years. If they are in need of revision, the appropriate staff member prepares changes. To ensure compliance, the Office of General Counsel developed a form that requires the responsible ESC administrator to indicate the outcome of the review (i.e., no changes recommended at this time, changes recommended, or proposed changes vetted with

the appropriate shared governance group). The form must be signed and dated before being returned to the General Counsel (IV.B-21).

Suggested revisions are reviewed and considered at board meetings. Once policies are approved, they are posted on the LACCD Web site by General Counsel. Since April 9, 2010, the Board has adopted 11 new board rules and updated 34 existing ones. The Board relies on the Chancellor, the College presidents, and ESC executive and senior staff to ensure that all rules and regulations are implemented uniformly and effectively across the District.

### **SELF EVALUATION**

The trustees act in accordance with established policies. The rules and regulations established through the consultation process are subject to regular review and revision by LACCD administrative staff to ensure that they are appropriate and effective. When constituents or ESC personnel bring issues in need of revision to the Board, policies are changed, if necessary. For instance, the Board recently approved a board rule requiring course outlines of record for non-Career Technical Education (CTE) courses to be updated every six years; CTE course outlines are updated every two years. The Board also adopted a policy for funding of the District's building program reserve to address the levels of risks and work remaining and a policy to set aside District operating funds to address deferred maintenance and repair of existing facilities.

### **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

**IV.B.1.f. 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.**

### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

In 2007, the Board adopted a formal policy for the orientation of new board members (IV.B-22). It has also developed procedures for the orientation of student trustees (IV.B-23). In July of 2011, when the two newest board members were elected, each participated in a nine hour orientation held on three separate days (IV.B-24). These orientations included information about Accreditation Standards and ACCJC expectations that trustees be involved in all aspects of accreditation.

Trustee elections are held on a staggered basis, with three or four seats being filled every two years. At its annual organizational meeting, the Board elects a president and vice president to serve one-year terms. A district wide student election is held annually to select a student member (who has an advisory vote) for a one-year term.

## **SELF EVALUATION**

While there is no formal guarantee of continuity of leadership, the staggering of board elections does provide some consistency. The fact that incumbents are frequently re-elected to their positions provides a measure of continuity to governance although the student trustee position changes every year.

## **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

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

## **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The Board's formal policy on self-evaluation was adopted in 1995, and for 10 years, the Board used a checklist to evaluate its overall effectiveness. In June 2005, the Board amended its process, expanding it to also include additional feedback from college presidents, District senior staff, and union and academic senate representatives, who regularly sit at the resource table during board meetings. Using this revised process, the Board conducts annual self-evaluations (IV.B-25). The next one will occur in January 2013.

In 2007 the Board adopted a Board Rule to set goals as part of its annual self-evaluation (IV.B-26). To increase follow-through and accountability at the District level, in 2010 the Board adopted a District Effectiveness Review Cycle, which aligns annual Board and CEO goals with DSP goals. The annual cycle includes Board evaluation, Board retreats, college activities in support of goals, institutional effectiveness reports, and District effectiveness reports that align with the DSP. At its retreats, the Board assesses District priorities and discusses processes for addressing them (IV.B-27).

In response to a recommendation received from the Commission in June 2012, professional development training was held at two fall 2012 retreats to help Board members distinguish their responsibilities from those of the Chancellor, understand their roles in setting policy, and develop goals and objectives to address items noted in their evaluation (IVB-28).

## **SELF EVALUATION**

While new Board members participate in an orientation and all receive training on their roles, evaluations have indicated that some trustees may have needed more training on their roles and responsibilities. In order to improve performance, a thorough program of professional development was implemented, with ongoing board development to measure improvement.

As a result of a self-evaluation, the Board streamlined the number of standing committees from seven to four. The adoption of an annual review cycle has increased the Board's ability to monitor progress on strategic goals and Board priorities to guide district-level decision making.



It has allowed the Board to synchronize annual goal setting with the academic calendar and ensure that institutional effectiveness reports align with strategic plan reports, ARCC AB 1417 review, and the self-assessment process.

#### **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

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

##### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The Board adopted a Statement of Ethical Values and Code of Ethical Conduct in 2005 that requires each member to adhere to values of honesty, integrity, reliability, and loyalty. With input from District legal counsel, in 2007 it established procedures for sanctioning board members in case of ethics violations (IV.B-29).

##### **SELF EVALUATION**

The Board has a clear code of ethics and a process in place for sanctioning behavior that violates the code.

#### **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

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

##### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

To ensure that they are knowledgeable about the accreditation process, trustees learn about Accreditation Standards at retreats and meetings. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee (formerly the Committee on Planning and Student Success) monitors the accreditation self-evaluation process by receiving regular reports and reviewing the Colleges' comprehensive self-evaluation, midterm, and follow-up reports. A three-hour meeting to discuss progress on responding to the latest recommendations was held October 1, 2012 (IV.B-30). During site visits, Board members meet with visiting teams, respond to questions, and participate in meetings, forums, and receptions.

In fall 2007 the Chancellor created the position of Accreditation Liaison, who reports directly to the Vice Chancellor of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness, and helps to facilitate the reporting process to the Board.

## SELF EVALUATION

Through active oversight by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Board members have become more engaged in and aware of the accreditation process. The accreditation Self Evaluation process at the Colleges has become much more pro-active, collaborative, and collegial over the years. District colleges are now approaching accreditation as an essential element in strategic planning and institutional processes. In addition, Board members attend workshops at conferences, such as the Community College League, on topics including the accreditation expectations of the ACCJC.

## ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

No recommendations at this time.

**IV.B.1.j. 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.**

## DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

Pursuant to California Ed Code, the Board employs the chancellor and gives him/her full authority and responsibility to oversee the operation of the District. The hiring of a chancellor starts with board action authorizing the HR Division to launch a search. After a chancellor is selected, a policy outlines procedures for his/her annual evaluation (IV.B-31). The Board solicits input from constituencies and collects data to evaluate performance on a number of criteria. The most recent evaluation of the current Chancellor, hired in August 2010, was conducted in October 2012 (IV.B-32).

The Chancellor and ESC senior staff oversee the administrative tasks of the District. The Chancellor also oversees the District Foundation to help obtain additional resources, meets regularly with the Cabinet (senior staff and college presidents), and holds regular consultations with the leadership of the employee unions and the DAS. The Chancellor considers recommendations on financial matters from the District Budget Committee (DBC) and on employee benefits from the Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC). In keeping with Ed Code provisions, the Board delegates its authority to the Chancellor, gives him/her the autonomy to make decisions without interference, and holds him/her accountable for those decisions.

The Board shares responsibility with the Chancellor for hiring and evaluating the performance of vice chancellors, college presidents, and the General Counsel. Board rules specify selection procedures for key administrative positions, which typically involve national searches (IV.B-33).

Hiring committees are comprised of representatives of all stakeholder groups, including faculty, students, staff, and community representatives. In accordance with the Brown Act, the Board approves employment contracts and compensation in open session.

One of the Chancellor's duties is to conduct regular evaluations of the College presidents and make recommendations to the Board on the renewal of their contracts. The process for this comprehensive evaluation, which has been in place since 2002, is facilitated by the Deputy Chancellor's Office (IV.B-34). College presidents undergo evaluations at least every three years (IV.B-35). They are conducted by District HR and include feedback from all segments of the campus community (IV.B-36). In addition, every year the College presidents meet with the Chancellor to update their annual goals.

### **SELF EVALUATION**

The chancellor is responsible for evaluating those who directly report to him/her (college presidents, General Counsel, Deputy Chancellor and vice chancellors) and those regular cycles of evaluation have been followed diligently.

### **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

**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.**

### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College President plans, organizes, leads, and evaluates the administrative structure of the College to achieve the overall vision of the institution. The vision of the College is to provide quality education and training and to achieve student success. The mission is to ensure successful transfer of students to four-year institutions, prepare students for successful careers in the workplace, and improve basic skills.

To achieve the institution's vision and mission, the President engages in planning, organizing, budgeting, developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness by meeting with his cabinet weekly. The President's Cabinet consists of three Vice Presidents, the Manager of Information Systems, Director of Facilities, and Public Information Officer. The cabinet team plays an advisory role to the President and provides overall administrative leadership for the College. In addition, the President meets monthly with the senior management team, the President's Council, comprised of the members of the President's Cabinet, three Deans, one Associate Dean, and General Foreman (IV.B-37). Members of the President's Council discuss matters relating to their respective offices and engage in open communication on issues impacting their units.

Additionally, the President meets with the Professional and Staff Development shared governance committee and recommends appropriate training programs to meet the needs of faculty and staff. For example, a communications workshop was held November 14, 2012 to improve workplace communication and a proposal was submitted to utilize available diversity funds for spring 2013.

The President's leadership on fiscal matters occurs through the President's weekly meetings with the Vice President of Administrative Services. The President also participates in monthly District Budget Committee meetings. These meetings are critical to stay abreast of federal and state laws and the District's administrative regulations. Quarterly budget meetings are held between District and College staff to monitor expenditures and to ensure the College remains financially sound while maintaining its FTES targets for the academic year.

The President participates in selecting and developing personnel by working closely with the Academic Senate and the AFT Faculty and Staff Guilds to adhere to District and College hiring policies and procedures. Appropriate committees are formed to select administrators, faculty, staff and Specially Funded Programs personnel.

The President assesses institutional effectiveness through an Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report which is presented to and reviewed by the Board of Trustees. The President also assesses institutional effectiveness by analyzing the data generated from student success initiatives, Achieving the Dream, and accreditation preparation. In collaboration with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the President guides the research agenda conducted by the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness to assess progress on the College's strategic goals.

## **SELF EVALUATION**

Through the shared governance process, annual College Council Retreat, and ongoing meetings with his respective Vice Presidents and District personnel, the President is able to provide effective leadership in planning, budgeting, organizing, selecting and training personnel. He uses his many years of experience in assessment while at the Educational Testing Service and as a former Director of Institutional Research to help guide and assist the institutional effectiveness agenda and assessment for the College.

## **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

**IV.B.2.a. 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.**

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

Even though over the last six years senior administrators have changed at LAMC, the administrative structure has not changed significantly since the last ACCJC visit in 2007. From 2006 through 2012, the College has had four presidents (Table 5). Mr. Ernest Moreno, the permanent president of East Los Angeles College served as Interim President of LAMC from July 2006 to April 2008. Ms. Judith Valles began her tenure as permanent president in April 2008 and served in that capacity until January 2011. Dr. Kathleen Burke-Kelly, the permanent President of Pierce College, was appointed as Interim President for three months, until the present College President came on board on May 1, 2011.

<b>TABLE 5 LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE PRESIDENTS (2006-2013)</b>	
<b>President</b>	<b>Period of Service</b>
Mr. Ernest Moreno	July 2006 to April 2008
Dr. Judith Valles	April 2008 to January 2011
Dr. Kathleen Burke-Kelly	February 2011 to April 2011
Dr. Monte E. Perez	May 2011 to present

Since 2006 six vice presidents have overseen Instruction, Administrative Services, and Student Services. While there has been a change in the administration, the responsibilities remain the same. Tables 6 and 7 summarize the administrative staffing at Los Angeles Mission College during the period from 2006 through January 2013.

<b>TABLE 6 LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE VICE PRESIDENTS (2006-2013)</b>		
<b>Division</b>	<b>Vice Presidents</b>	<b>Period of Service</b>
Academic Affairs	Dr. Kathleen Burke-Kelley	July 2006 to August 2007
	Ms. Alma Johnson-Hawkins	August 2007 to June 2012
	Mr. Michael Allen	January 2013 to present
Administrative Services	Dr. Karen Hoefel	March 2004 to June 2010
	Mr. Daniel Villanueva	January 2012 to present
Student Services	Mr. Joe Ramirez	July 2005 to present

**TABLE 7**  
**LOS ANGELES MISSION COLLEGE ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS (2006-2013)**

<b>Division/Area</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Period of Service</b>
Academic Affairs	Ms. Alma Johnson-Hawkins, Dean	July 2006 to July 2007
	Ms. Nadia Swerdlow, Dean	December 2008 to January 2013
	Ms. Stephanie Atkinson-Alston, Dean	October 2009 to present
	Ms. Cathy Brinkman, Associate Dean	October 2009 to present
Student Services	Mr. David Green, Assistant Dean	June 2006 to June 2008
	Ms. Ludi Villegas-Vidal, Dean	September 2008-present
Institutional Research and Planning	Mr. Maury Pearl, Dean	November 1999 to November 2010
	Ms. Hanh Tran, Dean	November 2010 to March 2012
Title V	Ms. Belinda Acuna, Assistant Dean	June 2005 to June 2007
	Ms. Susan Rhi-Kleinert, Assistant Dean	November 2007 to September 2012
	Ms. Young-Ji Lee, Interim Assistant Dean	September 2012 to present
Administrative Services	Dr. Rolf Schleicher (CFA)	December 2010 to April 2012
	Mr. Hubert Lee (CFA)	July 2012 to September 2012
	Mr. Jerry Huang (CFA)	October 2012 to present

The President inherited an administrative structure that clearly defines the role of the vice presidents and their respective divisions. The challenge for the President is to ensure that the Instructional, Student Services and Administrative Services divisions are communicating and working in tandem toward the strategic goals of the campus.

The President plans, oversees, and evaluates the administrative structure utilizing several strategies.

1. Through the weekly President's Cabinet meetings with the Vice Presidents, Director of Facilities, Manager of Information Technology, and Public Information Officer, the President ensures common agendas and issues confronting the College are addressed together as a group. The President uses these weekly meetings to plan, oversee, and evaluate progress on operations and specific objectives and activities. These weekly meetings are used to assess progress on strategic goals.
2. The President is able to plan, oversee, evaluate, and delegate authority by chairing the monthly President's Council meeting with the Vice Presidents, Deans, Associate Deans and other college administrators. The President informs the administration of internal and

external issues and progress toward meeting the College strategic goals, district goals, and issues. Members engage in open communication and listen to the concerns of the senior administrative staff, seek solutions to challenges that may arise, and solve problems to address immediate issues facing Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Services units.

3. The President ensures that plans are implemented and he evaluates the effectiveness of the implementation by meeting weekly with the three Vice Presidents to encourage open communication, team work, and problem-solving strategies across their respective divisions. He seeks recommendations to improve efficiency to move the College toward achievement of its strategic goals. He utilizes these meetings to delegate authority so that plans and corresponding goals are implemented effectively.
4. The President evaluates progress by collaborating with the Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Affairs to guide the research agenda for the College with assistance from the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. Student success initiatives including Achieving the Dream interventions are discussed in the College's data and core leadership team meetings. The President participates in the data and core team meetings and listens to the research questions that are prevalent. The President provides the framework and recommends research agendas that address pressing questions confronting Instructional, Student Services, and Administrative Services personnel.

The current organizational structure of Los Angeles Mission College has proven to be effective. Even with the limitations of its resources, the President encourages cross division teams to enhance instruction and student services.

The President's management philosophy encourages the delegation of authority to his respective Vice Presidents, who in turn delegate authority to their administrators, supervisors, and staff. The President encourages the Vice Presidents to take ownership of issues affecting their areas. Faculty and staff are encouraged to solve issues at the management level and seek assistance from the Vice Presidents when needed. Some examples of the President's delegation of authority include:

- Assigning the Vice President of Student Services to coordinate the Achieving the Dream Initiative.
- Assigning the Vice President of Academic Affairs to work with the Strategic Enrollment Management Subcommittee to develop a five-year strategic enrollment plan.
- Ensuring that the bond program has oversight by the Vice President of Administrative Services.
- Assigning the responsibilities of workforce education to the Associate Dean of CTE and ensuring targets are met for the Workforce Education Center.
- Working with deans and department chairs to assess the need for new programs such as allied health, applied technology, and computer science and engineering.

The President reviews enrollment trends of the College monthly and assures that the administrative structure and resource allocation for the College meet its purpose, complexity, and size.

In fall 2012, 10,200 students were enrolled at LAMC. In fall 2011, the headcount was 10,500. Even with 100 fewer sections in fall 2012 compared to fall 2011, the College was able to accommodate a population of 300 fewer students. This data implies that once enrolled, students are not dropping from classes and that classes are filled to maximum capacity. LAMC currently has the highest average class size in the District at 41.

With the enrollment holding steady, the administrative structure meets the purpose and size of the institution. LAMC's strategic goals are the mainstay of the institution: transfer, obtaining degrees and certificates, and obtaining basic skills; thus critical transfer courses in mathematics, English, science, social sciences, and fine arts remain a priority for the College. In addition, Basic Skills is an area of priority, given the high percentage of students that do not meet the minimum requirements to enroll in freshman English and mathematics. The College has a well-organized administrative structure to address the basic skills issue. The Learning Resource Director reports to the Dean of Academic Affairs who is also in charge of the Basic Skills State Initiative funding.

### **SELF EVALUATION**

The President has taken the College organization that has gone through six years of senior management changes and sought ways to improve planning, monitoring, evaluation, and the delegation of authority. Through weekly, monthly, and ongoing meetings with the Vice Presidents, Deans, and district executives, the President participates in planning, evaluation, and overseeing the implementation of objectives and activities to fulfill the strategic goals of the College.

The President delegates authority and has assembled a team that reflects the purpose and size of the institution. His participation in developing the research agenda with the Vice Presidents and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness in collaboration with the shared governance committees provides a framework to evaluate the effectiveness of the administrative structure. The administration's role in the Student Success Initiative, Achieving the Dream, and Basic Skills provide rich data to evaluate the institution's effectiveness toward student completion, retention, persistence, and graduation.

### **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

#### **IV.B.2.b. 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.**

### DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

Upon arrival of the President a year and half ago, an “open door” policy was established within his office. The President makes himself available to listen to concerns affecting faculty, staff, administrators, students, and members of the community. This open door policy has led to initiatives that further support collegiality and identifies values, goals, and priorities.

The President utilizes the shared governance committees to identify issues in budget and planning, facilities, educational planning, student services, professional and staff development, human resources and information technology. The chairs of each committee understand the importance of entertaining issues that need input from faculty and the administration. The President participates in College Council meetings and gives priority to all recommendations made by the Council. Information and data is provided to respective shared governance committees so informed decision can be made.

The President participates in the annual College Council Retreat to discuss the importance of evaluating the Strategic Master Plan, college plans, aligning the plans into an integrated system and conducting an overall evaluation of the College planning processes. This is done by collaborating with the co-chairs of the College, Academic Senate, AFT Faculty and Staff Guilds, and the Associated Students Organization.

In the State of the College Address that the President gives on Flex Day, he reviews the institutions values, goals, and objectives. To improve collegiality, he reemphasized the 2007 collegiality and civility policy approved by the College and pledged to monitor its use in academic year 2012/13.

The President uses the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the Office of Information Technology to provide data to the shared governance committees and the College Council. In addition, he also provides district and statewide data for the respective shared governance committees as they deliberate on budget, strategic enrollment, facilities, technology, and student services issues.

The President utilizes data from the Student Success Initiative, Essential Skills Committee and Achieving the Dream efforts that the College has undertaken over the last year. He engages the shared governance committees with data to help formulate data driven recommendations for College Council.

The President presided over the last College Council Retreat and conducted sessions that involved:

- Assessing the progress of the strategic goals and developing new goals as needed.
- Evaluating the achievement of goals for each shared governance committee master plan (e.g. Educational Master Plan, Facilities Plan, Technology Plan, etc.).
- Further aligning the shared governance committee plans with the Strategic Master Plan.
- Conducting an overall evaluation of the entire planning process to improve planning at Los Angeles Mission College.

The President reviewed the resource allocation processes and ensured the Budget and Planning Committee is fully informed about budget trends impacting the campus. As information was received regarding the state budget and the allocations to the nine colleges and how the Colleges would proceed, the President, through the committee chairs, shared information and encouraged recommendations and suggestions to address budget short falls. With the President's leadership, the Budget and Planning Committee developed a ranking and prioritization criteria and process.

The President conducted a mega evaluation discussion at the last College Council Retreat. He invited participation from the chairs of the College Council and the respective shared governance committees. A discussion was brought forth to the College Council that served as another overall evaluation exercise of the entire college planning processes. This occurred at the November 15, 2012 College Council meeting.

### **SELF EVALUATION**

The President assures quality by his leadership in planning, budgeting, research, and resource allocation. He works with all the shared governance committees and reviews and approves recommendations made by the respective shared governance bodies and the College Council. The President keeps the shared governance committees up to date data on college and district matters. He supports professional and staff development and assesses institutional effectiveness utilizing the College Council Retreat and the evaluations conducted by the College Council, shared governance committees, and college task forces. He also reviews carefully the Annual Institutional Effectiveness Report, ARCC, and the impact and outcomes of the College's Student Success Initiatives and AtD interventions.

### **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

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

### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The President attends the monthly district cabinet meetings, District Budget Committee (DBC) meetings, and President's Council at the District level. In addition to these meetings, he also attends bi-weekly meetings of the Board of Trustees and individual meetings with District

executive staff. The President is aware of the status of implementation of statutes, regulations and governing board policies.

The President brings this information to the campus and immediately notifies the appropriate shared governance committees of changes to policies, or when statutes, regulations, and governing board policies may conflict with college practice. Issues are discussed with members of shared governance and senior management. The President monitors the implementation of changes to ensure the College complies with statutes, regulations, and governing board policies.

### **SELF EVALUATION**

The President has been able to keep the College fully informed about statutes, regulations, and governing board policies that need to be implemented or changed on campus. He does this through his monthly meetings, the President's Corner—Monte's Mission Minutes—and through e-mails to the entire college community. He monitors the actions of the designated committees, management, and staff that are assigned to rectify any issues in statutes, regulations, and governing board policies to ensure the College meets the standards set forth by these policies.

### **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

### **IV.B.2.d. The President effectively controls budget and expenditures.**

#### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College has reduced its total unrestricted budget by \$3 million from last year fiscal year. The College budget for fiscal year (FY) 2012/13 is \$23.5 million compared to \$26 million in FY 2011/12. Approximately 94 percent of the College's budget is fixed costs (e.g. personnel), leaving 6 percent of the budget available for reduction at the discretion of the College.

In Academic Year (AY) 2012/13 the College reduced FTES to 5,700 compared to 7,000 in AY 2011/12. With fewer sections hourly adjunct costs are reduced. This strategy has been the primary means by which the College has been able to reduce its total budget to meet the allocation reductions of the state.

With the extraordinary tight budgets, the Los Angeles Community College District and its nine campuses must adhere to strict budget controls, and expenditures must be closely monitored. During the President's Cabinet meetings, the Vice President of Administrative Services reports on expenditures and their relation to the proposed budget for 2012/13. The President participates in the cyclical budget reviews which occur quarterly with the District Budget Officer and staff, and the College's Vice Presidents. In these cyclical meetings, the spending rates are reviewed and compared to the 2012/13 budget. In addition, the enrollment status of the College is analyzed to ensure that college spending meets the FTE targets set forth by the District and college.

These cyclical meetings are essential to take corrective actions when expenditures exceed the budget and for the purpose of enrollment management planning. The status of the number of sections for fall 2012 in relation to the number of sections needed for spring 2013 is also discussed. Plans to take corrective action for enrollment are made at these meetings and communicated with the shared governance committees and College Council.

The President's weekly monitoring of the College budget and expenditures keeps him informed of the financial direction of the College. The President attends the District Budget Committee (DBC) meetings and acquires information about district spending compared to spending at the other colleges and methods to enhance savings and revenue.

### **SELF EVALUATION**

The President attends the Board of Trustee's Finance and Audit Committee and assesses College performance in accordance with the issues and standards set forth by the Board. For instance, the Finance and Audit Committee requested the identification of more revenue enhancement and cost saving measures for each campus. As a result, Los Angeles Mission College provided a report about its successes with cost savings and revenue enhancement strategies (IV.B-36).

### **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

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

#### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The College President has made significant progress in working and communicating effectively with the communities served by Los Angeles Mission College. The President has reached out to K-12 schools, businesses, non-profit organizations, community organizations, and four-year institutions. He is very active in meeting with leaders from these organizations to build partnerships that support the College mission and strategic goals. Over the past year and half the President has done the following:

- Met with local CEOs of hospitals to help build an allied health program.
- Obtained funding from Youth Policy Institute to provide the use of computers for students and community members in the College Work Source Center.
- Acquired partnerships with Cesar Chavez Learning Academies, a chartered high school under the Los Angeles Unified School District.
- Been appointed to the Los Angeles County Work Force Investment Board to assist Northeast San Fernando in obtaining more federal support for Workforce training.
- Sponsored articulation meetings with California State University, Northridge, and UCLA to implement STEM transfer agreements.

- Hosted meetings with the Latino and African American community organizations to engage their support in referring youth and adults to Los Angeles Mission College.
- Established the President’s Advisory Committee consisting of members from businesses, non-profits, K-12 schools, community organizations, and government sectors to assist in the development and funding of the College.
- Developed a partnership with Velozzi Industries to establish a Light Technology Program at Los Angeles Mission College.
- Been appointed to the National Governing Board of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities and the National Association of Work Force Boards.
- Partnered with Communities and Schools to develop education and training programs for at-risk youth in collaboration with Local 300 Construction Trades Apprenticeship programs.

These activities complement the President’s work with the Citizen’s Bond Oversight Committee and the LAMC Foundation. In particular the President has been supporting the growth of the Foundation and partnered with the foundation to do the following:

- Administer the Sylmar Farmers’ Market at Los Angeles Mission College.
- Host the annual Spring Fest Food & Wine Festival and Sylmar Olive Festival events.
- Support a partnership with Maximus Corporation to offer LAMC students employment, while businesses earn tax credits for each LAMC student hired.
- Establish partnerships with Verizon Corporation to train faculty on the use of NetBooks (Lap Tops) and provide Internet service for low income students.

Finally, the President attends local neighborhood council meetings as well has Chamber of Commerce meetings. The President is a member of the Valley Economic Alliance and is co-sponsoring a Valley Economic Summit in spring 2013 with Los Angeles Valley College, Pierce College, and California State University, Northridge.

### **SELF EVALUATION**

Based on the results of the Fall 2011 Faculty and Staff Survey, a majority of respondents were very or somewhat satisfied with the following statements: “*The College President communicates effectively*” (72%) and “*the College President provides effective leadership*” (60%) (Table 8).

### **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

**TABLE 8**  
**RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ON LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE**  
**FACULTY AND STAFF FALL 2011 SURVEY (N=158)**

Survey Questions	Very or Somewhat Satisfied (%)	Not Satisfied (%)	Not Applicable (%)
14. The College President communicates effectively with the constituencies within the College.	72	11	17
16. The College President provides effective leadership.	60	13	27

The President has made significant progress in solidifying support for the College through his memberships, outreach, and service to community organizations, businesses, and non-profit organizations. In addition, the President has ongoing meetings with local elected officials. The meetings with Los Angeles City Council member Richard Alarcon have resulted in positive traffic mitigation plans for the neighboring community. The meetings with the Los Angeles County Supervisor, Zev Yaroslavky, have generated support for the Work Source Center and the hiring of at-risk youth in the Communities and Schools Program. The President also serves on the San Fernando Oversight Committee that decides on the disposition of redevelopment funds in the San Fernando area. Finally the President is available to local media to highlight LAMC's progress and bring more attention and support for the College.

### **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLANS**

No recommendations at this time.

**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.3.a. 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.**

### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The areas of responsibility of the District and its nine colleges are governed through legislation, the Education Code, board rules, administrative regulations, and current and past practices. In 1999, the Board of Trustees adopted a policy of partial administrative decentralization, which shifted additional responsibility and accountability for planning and decision making to the local

college level. Since the adoption of this principle, the District and the Colleges have worked to clarify and delineate operational responsibilities.

The District has been actively engaged in addressing this Standard since it participated in the ACCJC's first Multi-College Pilot Program in 1999. Several generations of functional maps delineating the mutually-defined operational roles and responsibilities of the District system and the Colleges have been produced. The 130-page 2008 Functional Map contained descriptions of board and committee roles, functions and membership of 56 district-wide governance and administrative committees, a definition of the District/college relationship, a grid of service outcomes detailing the functions of each division and administrative unit and outlining its relationship with its college counterparts, and flow charts showing administrative processes (IV.B-38).

The ACCJC evaluation teams visiting three of our colleges in 2009 agreed that while the *2008 Functional Map* might not have been sufficiently publicized at the campus level, it did successfully delineate the roles and responsibilities of the District and the Colleges (IV.B-39). However, the teams felt that the District needed to take the additional step of evaluating the accuracy of the delineation and use the information to improve effectiveness.

To respond to this recommendation, the District Planning Committee (DPC) created a two-year project that culminated in a full assessment and revision of the functional map and engaged faculty, staff, administrative, and student leaders in a dialogue about the roles and responsibilities of the Colleges and the District. The project consisted of the following:

- Review and Revision of Service Outcomes: In 2009, all ESC administrative units reviewed their sections for accuracy, simplified descriptions of functions, and made sure outcome measures were feasible. The draft was circulated among user groups for suggestions used to produce a final version of the outcomes.
- Update of District-wide Committee Descriptions: All standing district wide committees and councils were asked to revise their descriptions using a new template to provide uniform information (IV.B-40).
- Expansion of the Functional Map: The DPC incorporated additional sections to clarify the principles of governance in a partially decentralized district, including policy, roles of stakeholder groups and committees, and the cyclical evaluation of the new handbook. To assist colleges in documenting their governance and planning processes, the DPC designed a governance handbook in August 2011 (IV.B-41).
- Survey: Results of a survey to assess the accuracy of the definition of the District/college relationship were used to create an assessment report with action items for continuous improvement of District/college role delineation (see IV.B.3.g).

These efforts led to the replacement of the 2008 Functional Map with the LACCD District/College Governance and Functions Handbook in spring 2010 (IV.B-42), which was posted on the District Web site and distributed to the Colleges and constituency groups. Additionally, ESC staff is working with the Colleges to map business processes in anticipation of the roll-out of the new SIS, administrative software that will support academic advising,

admissions, financial aid, student billing, curriculum and scheduling, and student records. The mapping process has resulted in the creation of over 275 process maps that detail functions across the District (IVB-43).

### **SELF EVALUATION**

The District recognizes that it is an ongoing challenge to delineate roles in a large multi-college district and that decentralization is a work in progress that requires periodic review. The LACCD has become partially decentralized, with some functions undertaken locally and others at the ESC. For example, some characteristics of a course are determined by the College and some by the District. Other functions, such as hiring decisions, are handled at the Colleges, but rating-in and verification of MQ's are done at the ESC.

The extensive efforts involved in revising the functional map and the current process mapping project for the new SIS have greatly improved the understanding of roles and responsibilities across the District. Program review for ESC units will be another instrument used to address gaps in service and eliminate redundancies between college and District functions (see IV.B.3b for details).

The District Governance and Functions Handbook serves as a convenient, user-friendly guide to decision-making processes and provides employees with a more accurate and informed understanding of the District's role in relation to the Colleges. The Vice Chancellor of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness keeps the online edition updated. The handbook includes results of District committee self-evaluations. Beginning in spring 2012, the handbook is being re-assessed and revised on a two-year cycle (see IV.B.3.g.).

### **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

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

### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The District's primary purpose is to provide operational and logistical support to the Colleges. To do this, the ESC offers an array of support services, the main ones involving instructional and student services support, institutional research, human resources, business services (including contracts and risk management), financial services (budget and accounting), legal services, public relations and marketing, facilities planning (including oversight of the construction program), and information technology. Collaborative procedures between the District and the Colleges include the budget allocation model, submission of state MIS data, and implementation of board rules. Each college, through its own budget allocation process, determines specific operational and educational priorities.



The DSP identified among its goals the development of a district-wide “culture of service and accountability” to maximize the ability of the Colleges to act efficiently as independent entities while enjoying the benefits of being part of a large, multi-college district. The revised 2012-17 plan has made one of its principles the goal of “organizational effectiveness.”

To assess effectiveness in providing services, Customer Satisfaction Surveys for every major service unit in the ESC were piloted in fall 2008 and continue to be collected (IV.B-44). The results of these surveys are used to improve unit performance and further refine operations. To take the satisfaction surveys one step further, in August 2012 all administrative service units of the ESC were placed on a comprehensive three-year Program Review cycle, with annual plans due every year.

The District’s Research Office serves the Colleges by providing information they can use to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness. The office conducted student surveys in 2000, 2005, 2009, and 2012 (IV.B-45) and distributes and analyzes the results of surveys at the monthly District Research Committee. The District’s Research Office has also taken the lead on MIS awards submissions, Federal Gainful Employment, SB 70, and Achieving the Dream reporting for the nine colleges (IV.B-46).

To assist the Colleges, the District is taking the lead to address the U.S. Department of Education requirement to put state authorizations in place for students taking online classes. The Vice Chancellor of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness wrote to all 50 states to request authorizations for all nine colleges, taking the burden off of the Colleges to comply with this regulation.

The Office of Diversity Programs has taken on duties that were previously performed locally, such as the investigation of complaints.

## **SELF EVALUATION**

The District’s ongoing self-analysis (see IV.B.3.a.) has resulted in recommendations for the refinement of functions. Involving input from all nine colleges, survey results have led to the establishment of clear outcomes for all LACCD administrative offices, which are being used to measure the effectiveness of support services. For example:

- The Environmental Health and Safety Unit was ranked as performing at a level that either "exceeds expectations" or "meets most expectations" 87.5% of the time. All of the qualitative comments were positive.
- A high degree of satisfaction (81.9%) was expressed for the unit handling Workers Compensation claims.
- Business Services at the Colleges and the ESC were on different cycles, but as a result of feedback from the surveys, starting fall 2012 all units are on the same three-year cycle.
- The Office of Diversity Programs concluded that it needed to provide more training to colleges on compliance issues (e.g., sexual harassment and reasonable accommodations), provide guidance on diversity and equal employment, and continue to offer technical

assistance on prohibited discrimination complaints. In the past year, the Office offered trainings on serving as Equal Employment Opportunity Reps on hiring committees, conducting Disciplinary and Harassment Investigations, and reasonable accommodations (IVB-47).

Although many functions have been decentralized, the functions the District performs are beneficial to the Colleges. For example, when the District replaced its outdated paper payroll system with an automated version (SAP), the District designated trained personnel on each campus to deal with payroll issues that arose from the conversion. To assist LACCD employees with questions about their benefits, the District established a call center (IV.B-48). When colleges said they needed to reduce the time it took to establish budgets for new Specially Funded Programs, the Office of Budget and Management Analysis streamlined the process and conducted trainings.

Another example of District support is the upgrading of college Web sites. Working collaboratively, college public information officers met with District staff and outside consultants to design web page templates. This project has enhanced district wide communications and provided valuable support to college staff.

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

**DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The District Budget Committee (DBC) develops and oversees implementation of the District's resource allocation model. In 1999, the DBC was restructured to include additional faculty representation; it is now comprised of the nine college presidents and representatives from the administrative units, the DAS, and the collective bargaining units.

The DBC has periodically reviewed and evaluated the allocation model and recommended changes when necessary. In 2007, as a result of a third-party review instituted to assure that the smaller colleges were not being negatively impacted, the District instituted a budget allocation model that paralleled SB361, the state budget formula. Funds were distributed to the Colleges on a credit FTES basis with a two-tiered basis for noncredit, less assessments to pay for centralized accounts, services provided by the ESC, and set aside funds for the District's contingency reserve. Five of the Colleges received an augmented foundation grant of \$500,000 due to the additional administrative, business, and operational expenses incurred by the four smaller colleges and the high-cost CTE programs at Trade-Tech. To make the system more equitable, District-wide assessments were changed from a percentage of college revenue over total district revenue to a cost per FTES basis (IV.B-49).

In 2008, the DBC formed the Fiscal Policy and Review Committee (FPRC) to address the situation of colleges continuing to experience budget difficulties and to consider new approaches for improving their fiscal stability. To address an action item to review the District budget process-(see IV.B.3.g), the FPRC and the DBC reviewed their roles. In spring 2011, the FPRC

was renamed the Executive Committee of the DBC (ECDBC) and the charges for both committees were revised to ensure that budget planning policies were consistent with the DSP (IV.B-50).

In 2011, the ECDBC began reviewing the District's budget allocation formula, examining base allocations, the use of ending balance policy, assessments for ESC operations, enrollment growth targets, and the College deficit repayment policy, in addition to a thorough review of other multi-college district models. The result was a recommendation to amend the current allocation model to one with minimum base funding. The new model has two phases:

- Phase I increases the Colleges' basic allocation to include minimum administrative staffing and maintenance and operations (M&O) costs.
- Phase II calls for the ECDBC to study the remaining allocation agenda for allocation changes that identify college needs (including M&O), provide funding for colleges to deliver equitable access for students, and ensure that colleges are provided with sufficient funding to maintain quality instruction and student services.

After vetting the proposed changes through the DBC and Chancellor's Cabinet, the DBC approved the recommendations in March 2012, and sent them to the Board's Finance and Audit Committee for review. The Board adopted the new budget allocation model in June 2012 (IVB-51). The ECDBC is continuing to review budget allocation issues as the new model is implemented.

## **SELF EVALUATION**

Since 2006, the District has been constantly reviewing and adjusting its budget allocations to ensure the Colleges can operate and support their programs and services, for example, giving supplemental funding to the four smaller colleges and to Trade-Tech to compensate for high cost vocational programs. As the District faces state funding shortfalls, it will continue to review its resource allocations to the Colleges and its reserve levels. The District is currently conducting its phase II of the budget allocation review to address other funding and expenditure issues.

## **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

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

#### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The District has established mechanisms to control expenditures. Each college president is responsible for the management of his/her college's total budget and must establish a process for budget development; each District vice chancellor is responsible for his/her budget. Each is expected to balance his/her budget and effectively utilize financial resources. Each college is required to prepare a quarterly fiscal report that provides budget-to-actual revenue and expenditure data for all budget line items to determine if there are any expenditure problems.

To ensure sound fiscal management and provide a process to monitor and evaluate their financial health, all nine colleges follow standards of good practice that include the development of an annual financial plan, quarterly status reports, the requirement to set aside a 1% reserve, and the obligation to balance the College's budget (IV.B-52).

The District's monthly budget reports support the fact that the District is making sound financial and expenditure decisions. Extensive Budget and Financial Reports are prepared for each of the meetings by the Chief Fiscal Officer and Budget Director and informed by an independent audit report that is reviewed by the Board's Finance and Audit Committee. All of these reports show that the District consistently ends each fiscal year with a positive balance and meets its financial obligations (IV.B-53).

In fall 2006, the LACCD took significant steps to address the issue of its unfunded liability for retiree health care by negotiating with the employee unions to begin pre-funding its unfunded obligation. The District annually directs 1.92% of the previous fiscal year's full-time employee payroll into an irrevocable trust managed by CalPERS. An amount equivalent to the District's annual Medicare D refund is also diverted from its operating budget into the trust. As of June 2012, the ending balance in the trust was \$39,751,541. The Fair Market Value of the Trust was \$41,694,651 (IV.B-54).

In order to maintain control over health benefit costs for employees, the Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC) which works collaboratively to recommend medical insurance carriers and plans. In 2009, facing a state budget crisis and enormous increases in the cost of health benefits, the JLMBC reduced the cost of health care coverage for active and retired employees by agreeing to move to health care plans administered by CalPERS. Because of the significantly lower retiree benefit costs, the District's GASB obligation was reduced by about \$97 million (IVB-55).

## **SELF EVALUATION**

The District has a long history of financial solvency. Through its effective control of expenditures, since the 1990's the District has consistently ended the fiscal year with a positive balance. Over the last few years it has maintained healthy ending balances (14% in 2009-10, 17% in 2010-11, and 14% in 2011-12) despite drastic cuts in state funding (more than \$100 million or between 15%-20%).

The District's adherence to the State's recommendation to maintain a reserve of at least 5% has proven to be a prudent policy. In June 2012, the Board directed the CFO to set aside a 5% general reserve and an additional 5% contingency reserve, which has allowed the District to minimize the impact of cuts to college operations resulting from the State's financial crisis (IV.B-56).

In 2007, the District's GASB pre-funding plan was cited as a best practice by a State commission (IV.B-57). The District monitors its liability and continues to assess the adequacy of its annual contribution. Even though the District received less funding from the state due to the budget

crisis over the last three years, it has not interrupted its annual contribution. If the pre-funding plan continues, in addition to the annual pay-as-you-go amount, the District will accumulate sufficient funds over the next 15 to 20 years to fully fund the ARC.

The JLMBC has been a successful model for savings in an environment of spiraling health care costs and was honored as an exemplary model of labor-management collaboration that has resulted in delivering cost effective high quality services (IV.B-58). The switch to CalPERS and the self-funding of employee dental and vision coverage saved the District about \$30 million in the two years following the move (IV.B-59).

**IV.B.3.e. 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.**

#### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The Chancellor gives the College presidents the authority to administer their responsibilities at the Colleges without interference. Monthly Cabinet meetings are held to keep the College presidents apprised of District policies. Through a regular evaluation process that includes clear grades for effectiveness in key areas, the Chancellor holds college presidents accountable for the effective functioning of their colleges. These evaluations are reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees (see IV.B.1.j).

#### **SELF EVALUATION**

Seeking a balance between centralized and decentralized control, presidents make key decisions but are also held directly accountable for their actions.

#### **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

**IV.B.3.f. 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.**

#### **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The District has several vehicles for communicating with the Colleges. It provides reports pertaining to such areas as finance, personnel, and demographics. It maintains several databases which allow personnel to access information related to college operations as well as employee and student information.

District-wide councils and committees, such as the Presidents' Cabinet, the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs Council, the Vice Presidents of Administrative Services Council, the Chief Student Services Officer Council, the CTE Deans, the Student Success Initiative Committee

(SSI), and the Technology Policy and Planning Committee (TPPC) facilitate the sharing of information, which attendees bring back to their campuses. A video conferencing system allows representatives from the nine colleges and the District to meet virtually.

Representatives from constituency groups (collective bargaining units—including faculty, staff, and administration—the Academic Senate, and students) have seats at the resource table at Board of Trustees meetings, and comments from the resource table are a standing item on the agenda. Representatives have the opportunity to participate in the discussion of any item that comes before the Board for a vote. Before meetings, agendas are posted at the ESC and on the District Web site and emailed to the College presidents, Vice Presidents, Academic Senate presidents, and bargaining unit representatives. Minutes are posted on the District Web site.

## **SELF EVALUATION**

Recognizing that communication had been an issue, the Chancellor, who took office in 2010, made a commitment to improving the flow of information between the District and the Colleges. The Chancellor's Office issues frequent bulletins to all employees at the Colleges with budget updates and relevant information, including resolutions passed by the Board (IV.B-60).

The new chair of the District Strategic Planning Committee made a similar commitment by creating a communications plan designed to increase employee understanding of how their roles relate to the strategic plan (IV.B-61).

In the past two years, the District's Office of Educational Programs and Institutional Effectiveness has improved communication by taking the following steps:

- Established a new link—District level Governance Committees—on the District home page and posting current agendas and minutes on this LACCD 411 page
- Added a search feature to find information in the minutes (in the first two months, the page had over 600 hits)
- Reminded District-level governance chairs to send agendas to the IE Office at least 72 hours before each meeting as well as approved minutes following the meetings (IV.B-62).

In 2011, District IT began the process of completely revamping the District Web site (IV.B-63). The new Web site, launched in fall 2012, will facilitate the ease by which ESC personnel can manage content and update the Web site. The site has a calendar of events and news updates on the homepage.

## **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.

**IV.B.3.g. 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.**

### DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY

The LACCD has been continuously delineating the roles played by the District and the Colleges (see IV.B-3.a) and has a long history of active participatory governance at the District level; however, the effectiveness of its role delineation and its decision-making processes had not been formally assessed prior to ACCJC site visits in 2009. In response to the teams' recommendations, the DPC took the following steps to implement a new cyclical process for self-evaluation (IV.B-64):

- Conducted a survey to assess district/college role delineation and issued an assessment report, based on the results, with two action plans:
  1. Review the District budget process (see IV.B.3c)
  2. Optimize District/college administrative operations (see IV.B.3b)For an examination of steps taken to clarify district/college role delineation as a result of this evaluative process, (see IV.B.3a).
  
- Conducted a survey to assess district wide participatory governance and issued an assessment report, based on the results, with four action plans:
  1. Implement a district wide communications and transparency initiative (see IV.B.3f)
  2. Review the District budget process (see IV.B.3c)
  3. Streamline district-level governance and planning processes (see committee Self Evaluation template, described below)
  4. Enhance professional development on District governance (IV.B-65). A module is being developed for the District Web site to train constituents on the inter-connection between local shared governance decision-making structures and district governance.
  5. Designed a template for the annual Self Evaluation of district-level governance committees that allows committee members to report the major issues addressed, accomplishments, obstacles to effective functioning, and future goals. Results are posted online and reported to the Board as part of its annual review of District effectiveness (IV.B-66).

To close the loop on its biennial cycle of governance, the DPC revised the survey and disseminated it in 2012. The results will be used to craft new recommendations to improve district-level governance and decision making processes, which will be re-assessed every two years (IV.B-67).

## **SELF EVALUATION**

The comprehensive assessment efforts described above led to the creation of the new LACCD District/College Governance and Functions Handbook, which clearly establishes District roles of authority and responsibility and helps leaders navigate district wide governance and decision making processes more effectively. The District's follow-up regimen is improving district-level governance and decision-making processes by ensuring that ongoing efforts lead to continuous improvement.

The committee self-evaluation process allows those who participate in governance to check that activities align with the committees' charges, reflect on achievements, set new goals, and make recommendations for improvements.

In addition to these Self Evaluation efforts, the Board's District Effectiveness Review Cycle (see IV.B.1g) has improved its ability to monitor district-wide progress on all district-level strategic goals and Board priorities and help guide decision-making.

The District's governance and decision-making structures are collegial and inclusive, with constituents working together to help the Colleges reach their goals. District leadership actively seeks the participation of local college leaders in decisions that affect all of the Colleges. Faculty and staff are well represented on district wide committees. Students have a voice through a student trustee, who sits on the College Planning and Advisory Councils and college president selection committees, and convenes the Student Affairs Committee, which considers policies that impact students.

## **ACTIONABLE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

No recommendations at this time.



**STANDARD IV.A – EVIDENCE**

Evidence documents can be found at: <http://www.lamission.edu/2013accreditation/IVA.aspx>

- IV.A-1 College Council Charter, Los Angeles Mission College (LAMC)
- IV.A-2 LAMC College Council Annual Retreat
- IV.A-3 LAMC Shared Governance Handbook
- IV.A-4 Shared Governance Committee Members
  - Budget & Planning Committee
  - Educational Planning Committee
  - Facilities Planning Committee
  - Professional and Staff Development Committee
  - Student Support Services Committee
  - Technology Committee
- IV.A-5 LAMC Academic Senate Responsibilities
- IV.A-6 American Federation of Teachers, Faculty Guild
- IV.A-7 American Federation of Teachers, College Staff Guild, Local 1521A, CFT/AFT, AFL-CIO
- IV.A-8 LA City & County School Employees' Union, Local 99, AFT-CIO, S.E.I.U.
- IV.A-9 Los Angeles Community College District Administrator' Unit represented by California Teamsters Public, Professional & Medical Employees Union Local 911
- IV.A-10 Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building and Construction Traders Council
- IV.A-11 Supervisory Employees' Union, S.E.I.U. Local 721 (Formerly 347)
- IV.A-12 LAMC Professional and Staff Web Page – Governance Committees section
- IV.A-13 Institutional Effectiveness Web site
- IV.A-14 LAMC Online Program Review System
- IV.A-15 LAMC Online Student Learning Outcome and Assessment System
- IV.A-16 College Spirit Day
- IV.A-17 RoboTecas Computer Club

- IV.A-18 STEM Program
- IV.A-19 Curriculum Committee
- IV.A-20 Communication Facilitation
  - Monte's Minute Videos
  - Weekly Mission
- IV.A-21 Signing of the Pledge Video
- IV.A-22 Communications Workshop Video
- IV.A-23 External Advisory Committee
- IV.A-24 LAMC Code of Conduct
- IV.A-25 LAMC Substantive Change Proposal Approved by the ACCJC in 2012
- IV.A-26 ACCJC Progress Report 2008
- IV.A-27 ACCJC Follow-up Report 2009
- IV.A-28 ACCJC Midterm Report 2010
- IV.A-29 Financial Audit Training Programs Sponsored by the District
- IV.A-30 Self and External Shared Governance Committee Evaluations
- IV.A-31 LA Mision Independent Student Newsletter

**STANDARD IV.B – EVIDENCE**

Evidence documents can be found at <http://www.lamission.edu/2013accreditation/IVB.aspx>

- IV.B-1 Board Rules 1200 and 1800; Administrative Regulation E-64 – Curriculum Development
- IV.B-2 Los Angeles Community College District Strategic Plan 2006-2011
- IV.B-3 District Strategic Plan Scorecard Report and Recommendations
- IV.B-4 District Strategic Planning Committee Meeting Minutes – 5/24/2011
- IV.B-5 LACCD Strategic Planning Focus Groups
  - Focus Group Flyer
  - Focus Group Questions
  - Focus Group Results
- IV.B-6 LACCD Strategic Executive Summary – Vision 2017
- IV.B-7 LACCD Technology Strategic Plan
- IV.B-8 LACCD Technology Implementation Plan
- IV.B-9 Administrative Regulation E-64 - Curriculum Development
- IV.B-10 Research and Planning Excellence Award
- IV.B-11 Standing Committee Meeting Minutes; Board Rule 2605.11
- IV.B-12 Building Program Actions - Board Rules 4006 and 17300
- IV.B-13 Moratorium Project Status
  - Moratorium Project List March 2012
  - Moratorium Project List April 2012
  - Moratorium Project List August 2012
  - Moratorium Project List September 2012
  - Projects Exempted from Final Expanded Moratorium
- IV.B-14 Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meeting Minutes
  - June 2012 Meeting Minutes
  - July 2012 Meeting Minutes
  - August 2012 Meeting Minutes

- IVB-15 Corrective Action Matrix - Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meeting
  - Minutes
  - Corrective Action Matrix July 2012
  - Corrective Action Matrix October 2012
  - Corrective Action Matrix Final 2012
- IVB-16 Accreditation Summit Agenda September 26, 2012
- IV.B-17 Board Rules – Chapter II, Article III – Duties of the Board of Trustees
- IV.B-18 LACCD Board Rules
- IV.B-19 Chancellor’s Directive 70
- IV.B-20 Administrative Regulation C-12
- IV.B-21 Rule Reviews
  - Human Resources Review Reports
  - Diversity Review Reports
  - CTF/Treasure Reports
  - Vice Chancellor Reports
  - Chancellor Reports
- IV.B-22 Board Rule 2105
- IV.B-23 Orientation Procedures for New Student Trustees
- IV.B-24 Orientation Procedures for Board Member Trustees
  - Trustee Orientation Letter
- IVB-25 Board rule 2301.10
- IVB-26 Special Board Meeting February 2012
- IV.B-27 District Effectiveness Review Cycle Flow Chart
  - Board Retreat Meeting Minutes August 2011
- IV.B-28 Corrective Action Matrix – Board of Governance
- IV.B-29 Board Rule 2300.10 and 2300.11
- IV.B-30 Institutional Effectiveness Meeting Minutes October 1, 2012
- IV.B-31 Chancellor’s Directive 122
  - Institutional Effectiveness Meetings July 2011, November and December 2011

- Institutional Effectiveness Meetings January 2012, February 2012, April 2012, July 2012
- IV.B-32 Chancellor Evaluation Data Collection; BOT Agenda October 3, 2012
- IV.B-33 Board Rule 10308 - Selection Procedures for College Presidents
- IV.B-34 Performance Evaluation Process for College Presidents
- IV.B-35 Addendum Agenda Closed Session 2/22/2012 – President’s Evaluation
- IV.B-36 Presidents’ Evaluation Packet
- IV.B-37 Communication Workshop – November 14, 2012
- IV.B-38 LACCD 2008 Functional Map
- IV.B-39 Evaluation Reports East and Trade-Tech Colleges
- IV.B-40 Committee Evaluation Template
- IV.B-41 District Governance Handbook Template
- IV.B-42 LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook
- IV.B-43 Process Mapping  
BOG  
Catalog Creation Process  
Counseling Process  
Districtwide Mapping  
Financial Aid Process  
Human Resources  
Scheduling Process  
SPOC
- IV.B-44 Surveys of ESC Units  
  
2009 Budget Office Services Satisfaction  
Payroll Audit Evaluation Survey - Harbor College  
Payroll Audit Evaluation Survey - Trade College  
Payroll Audit Evaluation Survey - Mission  
Office of Diversity Client Survey Report  
Environmental Health and Safety Customer Satisfaction Survey  
Human Resources Survey Report  
Office of General Counsel Client Feedback Survey

	Property and General Liability Insurance Service Survey
	Information Technology Survey
	CalWORKs Outcomes Survey
	Curriculum Support Outcomes Survey
	Workers Compensation Customer Satisfaction Survey
	Workforce Survey
IV.B-45	Survey Results
IV.B-46	District Research Committee Meeting Minutes
IV.B-47	Unit Improvement Plans
	Budget Management Analysis Office
	Human Resources
	Information Technology
	eBTA
	Economic and Workforce Development
IV.B-48	Health Benefits Call Center
IV.B-49	2010/11 Final Budget Allocation SB361 Allocation Mechanism
IVB-50	District Budget Committee Meeting Minutes - May 18, 2011
IV.B-51	New Budget Allocation Model
IV.B-52	DBC Meeting Minutes on Fiscal Solvency
	Fourth Quarter Report 2011-2012
	First Quarter Report 2012-13
IV.B-53	District Budget Committee Agendas and Meeting Minutes
IV.B-54	Governmental Accounting Standard Board Trust Quarterly Statement, June 2012
IV.B-55	Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee Meeting Minutes - August 2012
IV.B-56	Finance Audit June 13, 2012
IV.B-57	Public Employee Post-Employment Benefits Commission Report
IV.B-58	AFT Saturn/UAW Partnership Award
IV.B-59	JLMBC Report to BOT on July 13, 2011
IV.B-60	Chancellor's Bulletin

- IV.B-61 District Strategic Planning Communications Plan July 2011
- IV.B-62 District Level Governance Committee
- IV.B-63 District Website Redesign Kickoff Meeting
- IV.B-64 Cityside College Follow-Up Report – DPC Meeting Minutes March 2010
- IV.B-65 District wide Governance Survey Assessment Report
- IV.B-66 Completed District wide Governance Committee Self Evaluations
- IV.B-67 2012 District wide Governance Survey Results