

Standard IV:
leadership & governance



meet **elac** people

Rose Lee-Chun Huang
Architecture

“I have a bachelor’s degree in tourism from Taiwan, but I always wanted to design buildings. I majored in architecture at ELAC, which prepared me to transfer to the master’s degree program at Cal Poly Pomona.”

Start at ELAC...
Go Anywhere!

STANDARD IV: LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

Committee		
Co-chairs	Evelyn Escatiola Professional Development Coord. escatie@elac.edu 265-8757	Reneé Martinez Vice President, Workforce Ed & Economic Development martinrd@elac.edu 265-8973
Members	Julie Benavides Professor, CF&E and Offsite Coordinator benavij@elac.edu 265-8870	Armida Ornelas Associate Professor, Political Science AFT Chapter Chair ornelaao@elac.edu 415-5387
	Danelle Fallert Associate Dean, EOPS FallerdJ@elac.edu 265-8797	Al Rios Dean, South Gate Educational Center riosa@elac.edu 357-6200
	Margaret Galvan Professor, Women’s Physical Education galvanm@elac.edu 265-8917	Angelica Toledo Associate Dean, CalWorks toledoa@elac.edu 267-3746
	Alex Immerblum Professor, English and Academic Senate President Immerbaw@elac.edu 265-8557	Vanessa Valverde Professor, Chemistry valverdev@elac.edu 415-4186
	Sonia Lopez Associate Dean, Student Activities lopezms@elac.edu 267-3794	

IV.A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

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

Descriptive Summary

East Los Angeles College has an established shared governance process that includes participation by representatives of all campus constituencies. The intent of this process is to provide a means for campus constituents to make their concerns known and participate in decision-making. The shared governance structure depends on committees representing the different campus constituencies. These committees forward recommendations to the East Los Angeles College Shared Governance Council (ESGC), which makes final recommendations to the president of the college. The college is developing a shared governance handbook that will clearly delineate the process.

The working relationship among college constituencies—faculty, staff, administrators, and students—is designed to be collegial and cooperative. Representatives of the faculty union and the Academic Senate work collaboratively. Efforts are made to encourage all

constituencies to participate in the decision-making process at the committee level. Additionally, the college leadership works collaboratively with the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) personnel and the governing board of trustees.

IV.A.1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning and implementation.

Descriptive Summary

College leaders on campus are the college president, administrators, department chairs, and the college's Shared Governance Council (ESGC). The ESGC is comprised of representatives from the administration, the Academic Senate, the AFT Faculty Guild, the AFT Staff Guild, SEIU Local 99, Buildings & Trade Union, the Supervisory Employees Union, Local 347, and the Associated Student Union. **(4.1)**

The college maintains an inclusive participatory governance process that promotes our mission and vision for the college. All constituent groups are brought together to participate in planning, decision-making, and conflict resolution. The college follows the mandates for shared governance found in AB1725, the Education Code, Title 5 regulations, collective bargaining agreements, LACCD policies, and the college's own shared governance agreement that has been in force since 1993. **(4.2)**

The college's primary shared governance body, ESGC, serves as a clearinghouse for recommendations presented by our standing committees, as well as a forum for the college president, Academic Senate, and the leadership of the Associated Student Union to report on campus issues. **(4.3)** The following committees report regularly to ESGC:

- Budget Committee monitors the college budget to ensure that it supports the college mission;
- Work Environment Committee deals with issues involving campus space utilization, the work environment, and the Facilities Master Plan;
- Facilities Planning Subcommittee addresses issues regarding the college's facilities planning;
- Strategic Planning issues are reported by the Dean of Research and Planning. For example, recommendations and commendations prepared by the Program Review Validation Committees for each unit's program review are presented for final consideration by ESGC. College-wide planning structures and processes such as those in program review, strategic planning, and program viability are submitted to ESGC for approval. Research and Planning is responsible for monitoring and reporting of District planning initiatives and requirements such as the District Strategic Plan and connecting the district-wide future bond initiative to educational planning; **(4.4)**

- Educational Planning Subcommittee reports on all matters that pertain to the Educational Plan, including review and approval of the completed educational plan, vision and mission before it is forwarded to the Board for approval;
- Technology Planning Subcommittee provides updates on technology issues;
- The Accreditation Liaison Officer and the Self Study co-chairs report on accreditation activities, including review and approval of the college's self study for renewal of accreditation.

These committees, which include representatives from all campus constituencies, meet on a regular basis to consider issues affecting the campus and forward recommendations to the ESGC. When the Council approves a recommendation, it is forwarded to the college president.

Furthermore, the college goals are formulated through planning processes that solicit and obtain participation from all college constituencies. The following institutional guiding documents and institutional plans were developed in this fashion:

- College Mission Statement and Vision;
- College Core Competencies;
- SLO Mission Statement and Philosophy Statement;
- Educational Master Plan;
- Basic Skills Initiative;
- Technology Plan;
- Facilities Plan; and
- The Strategic Plan (a compilation of the Education Plan, Technology Plan, and Facilities Plan).

The college has numerous committees and subcommittees through which members of the campus community can provide input and make suggestions to improve the college. **(4.5)** Additional opportunities exist for input to the operation of the college:

- Ideas, suggestions, and concerns are discussed at academic department meetings. Department chairs then share these ideas at the college's Chairs Council meeting. The Chairs Council reports its concerns to administration at monthly Department Chairs meetings, and also may make recommendations directly to the Academic Senate.
- The president of the college meets regularly with his cabinet, comprised of senior administrators, who advise him on issues of campus governance.
- Research and Planning Office reports data on institutional performance, such as ARCCs, periodically at campus meetings and particularly in Educational Planning Subcommittee meetings.
- Individuals can bring forward ideas for institutional improvement in their own units and through the shared governance structure of the validation committees during program review. Public notice is given to provide individuals, units, and organizations the opportunity to submit commendations and recommendations for validation committees to consider when specific units are under review.

- Through the Student Learning Outcomes Committee, constituencies, both instructional and non-instructional, participate in setting policy and providing guidance in the SLO process.
- The Student Success Committee is actively engaged in formulating goals and timelines to improve campus-wide student learning and success. A large number of campus constituencies (more than 40) are participating in this effort.
- Members of the college community participate in district-wide shared governance committees, including: the District Budget Committee; the Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee; Advisory Council on Student Learning Outcomes; the Equal Employment Opportunity Advisory Committee; Student Success Initiative Steering Committee; District Research Committee; District Planning Committee; and District-wide Professional Development Committee.

Self Evaluation

The college's institutional leaders foster a collegial environment in which viewpoints are expressed and in which all constituencies are openly invited to contribute their opinions and suggestions. The college's administrators work respectfully with all segments of the campus community. Those who participate in institutional governance have forged an effective working relationship with their colleagues. The AFT Faculty Guild and Academic Senate leadership cooperate well during the consultation process. The president regularly receives recommendations from his cabinet made up of his vice presidents. However, what is discussed at cabinet is not explicitly reported to shared governance committees. No minutes are kept, so it is not known what role cabinet decisions play in policy making.

It was noted in the last self study that the college could improve its budget planning process. A team of basic skills consultants found that the perception exists among some faculty that the college gives too much priority to ensuring a large fund balance to help build up the District's reserves. The concern is that budget planning reflects greater priority on boosting enrollment, which does further student access, to the exclusion of retention and other indicators of student success. **(4.7)**

While a budget planning process exists, this process has not always been clearly linked to effective and long-term institutional planning. Budget planning decisions are principally the result of budget requests submitted by department chairs/unit managers and the processing of those requests by administration based on available financial resources and the needs of the department/unit. Recently, the college has directed department chairs to provide, in advance of the budget development, annual updates of the department's progress towards program review goals. By adding this requirement, the administration can ensure that department members are regularly providing input on program review progress and that progress is linked to the budget development process. **(4.8, 4.9)**

It should be noted that neither the ELAC Budget Committee nor the ESGC participates in budget development, a process which limits shared governance oversight of budget planning. However, the adopted budget and actual expenditures are reviewed by the ELAC Budget Committee, which may make recommendations to the ESGC. **(4.10)**

At the college level, recommendations for allocation of discretionary funds, when one-time funding is provided by the State, are determined by the ELAC Budget Committee and recommended to the ESGC. The Budget Committee uses proposals by units, departments, or divisions as endorsed by college planning committees and department chairs that are supplemented with program review results to determine the allocation of funds. **(4.11)** However, there remain instances when the administration has made decisions to allocate discretionary funds without following this process. **(4.10)**

Recently, the ESGC has requested from the Educational Plan Subcommittee a list of prioritized Educational Plan action items that specifies which items are unfunded and under-funded, if any. Any unfunded and under-funded action items may be referred to the Budget Committee for review. **(4.3)** This report will enable the Budget Committee to oversee and make recommendations concerning the allocation of financial resources to achieve strategic goals.

The Program Review and Viability Committee, in collaboration with the vice presidents of all divisions, will oversee the development, structure, and process that will formalize the use of departmental planning processes and measures of effectiveness through Program Review for use in budget allocation. Upon full assessment and confirmation of these processes, they will be forwarded to the ESGC for approval. With the new program review annual update process, the process of budget allocation is now clear in facilities, technology, and operations, as well as for individual units. **(4.12)** Perhaps what is unclear at this time in the college's development is how it will structure the resource allocation process for the long-term goals and objectives that will be published soon in the college's latest revision of its Strategic Plan, especially in the Educational Master Plan, in which goals and objectives are often tied to innovation and institutional change.

Furthermore, resource allocation decisions operate under a narrow window of time that negates or severely limits sustained collegial dialog. The resource allocation process on this campus is fragmented in that each campus unit submits a budget request that is reviewed by its vice president, sent to the President for approval, and then forwarded to the District. Due to constraints imposed by the District, the allotted time is primarily during winter intersession (January) when most faculty members are not available.

Prior to spring 2008 when the college hired an Associate Dean of Research, it had not had one for the previous two years. Three individual search processes were held over a year and a half to locate the current Associate Dean of Research. **(4.13)** During this time, a research analyst filled requests for institutional data and on student outcomes by the President's Office and administration as well as faculty, programs and services as requested. **(4.14)** However, data that would provide substantial information about the effectiveness of programs, services, or for strategic planning were limited, and available mainly as provided to the college by the District Research Office. **(4.15)** Therefore, although some data have been available, not all decisions have been data-driven.

Using data in the decision-making process is an area which must continue to be improved. The Research and Planning Office has just completed the design for and has posted a website providing all consumers, both internal and external, with information on the college and its students. The website contains all college profiles for the past seven years, in addition to other information, and will also provide forms and information on how to submit data requests to the Research and Planning Office.
(<http://www.elac.edu/collegeservices/researchplanning/index.htm>).

Additionally, the college is forming the Research Prioritization Committee that will assist the college in establishing a college-wide research agenda for broader use in effective decision making. This committee will also provide the college at-large with guidelines on how data should be used in decision making because the production of data does not guarantee that the college-at-large will use these data to guide in decision making. Institutional data, while reported in some committees, are not widely circulated to faculty, students and staff, nor are they explicitly the basis for decision making.

Planning Agenda

The Budget Committee will develop a narrative of the process and structure of the budget allocation process at all levels and will provide a graphic that assists the college at-large in understanding this process. It will be incorporated in the college's decision-making handbook when it is completed.

The Research and Prioritization Committee will establish a college-wide research agenda and post this agenda on the college's Research and Planning website. Additionally, through consultation with the Research and Planning Office, the Research Prioritization Committee will develop a structure and process for the dissemination and use of data and research findings by faculty, staff, committees, the President and his Cabinet for use in decision making.

The Budget Committee will report to ESGC recommendations on spending any discretionary monies derived from the college's yearly fund balance.

IV.A.2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

Descriptive Summary

The college follows the mandates for shared governance of AB1725, the Education Code, Title 5 regulations, collective bargaining agreements, LACCD policies, and its own shared governance agreement. The college is structured into three major areas: Administrative Services, Student Services, and Academic Affairs. Each area is responsible for creating its own goals in alignment with the college goals. All of the different goals feed into the

college's Strategic Plan. Additionally, key college committees have bylaws that delineate their purpose and functions. A decision-making handbook is in draft format . **(4.16)**

IV.A.2.a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

Descriptive Summary

As previously stated, ELAC was among the first of the district colleges to adopt a shared governance agreement with the college president in 1993. Faculty members have many opportunities to participate in shared governance and to serve on committees for which they volunteer or in some cases are appointed to by the Academic Senate president, by a vote of the senators, or by the Faculty Guild chapter president. At the annual Fall Opening Day event, which all probationary and tenured faculty are required to attend, faculty are informed about college governance and given a list of all the campus committees along with their meeting days and times. **(4.5)**

Emphasizing the importance of faculty participation, the LACCD/Los Angeles College Faculty Guild agreement spells out faculty representation from the union and Senate on certain shared governance committees. Committee work is considered part of a contract faculty member's responsibilities, and faculty evaluations consider performance of responsibilities, which includes committee participation. **(4.17)** For key shared governance leadership positions, for example, the Academic Senate, Curriculum, and Student Success, and Student Learning Outcomes, that require intensive use of time, the college provides reassigned or released time.

Adjunct faculty members are welcome to participate on committees. A provision in the faculty collective bargaining agreement allows for adjuncts to be compensated for duties and tasks beyond the scope of their primary adjunct assignment, and the college has developed guidelines to facilitate payment. **(4.18)** In spring 2007, an adjunct faculty voting representative was approved to serve on the Academic Senate. **(4.19)**

In addition to the committee process, ideas, suggestions, and concerns are also discussed at academic department meetings. Department chairs have two avenues for offering recommendations to the college leaders: Chairs Committee and Chairs Council. The Chairs Committee is an administrative body overseen by the instructional vice presidents to inform the chairs of issues and policies. The Chairs Council is a Senate-sponsored committee that enables chairs to share and forward departmental concerns to the Chairs Committee and the Academic Senate.

Department chairs are responsible, in consultation with department members, for submitting annual budget requests based on departmental needs and goals. In the past, department chairs have been directed to prepare departmental needs and goals based on their Program Review.

(4.21) To improve the linking of budget requests to program review goals, in advance of the budget requests, department chairs are to submit annual updates on their progress toward Program Review goals. (4.22)

Staff members are encouraged to participate in their unit's Program Review and to serve on program review validation committees. They also provide input to shared governance committees, for example, ESGC, through their representatives from their bargaining units.

Administrators are appointed by the college president to shared governance committees based on their areas of expertise. Students are represented by the ASU, whose president is a voting member of the ESGC.

Self Evaluation

While the shared governance model attempts to be all inclusive, there are areas which can be strengthened. For instance, while the shared governance process involves different constituencies, the individuals representing the different constituencies must be more proactive in reporting back to their respective constituencies and sharing information.

Also there exists a core group of faculty who are active on more than one shared governance committee. This places a disproportionate burden on some active faculty. A challenge to increasing faculty participation at the institutional level is the ever increasing need for participation on department-level committees, such as SLOs, program review, advisory, discipline, course outline revisions, and syllabus review.

Full-time faculty member are obliged by their bargaining agreement to fulfill their professional duties by serving on at least one department, college, or district-wide committee. This is to be enforced by performance evaluations. Although the information is available through the published committee list on paper and on the Academic Senate website, there are some who do not understand how to initiate change or bring suggestions to the proper committee for implementation. Successful encouragement of faculty participation is not consistent throughout the academic year. Beyond communicating with constituent leaders, the college has not developed specific strategies for broadening participation on shared governance committees.

Student participation in shared governance could also be improved. Given the "commuter campus" nature of the college, it is often difficult to ensure the participation of our students.

Planning Agenda

In light of the recent increase in the hiring of new faculty, great opportunity exists for recruiting new committee participants. The importance of participation on committees should be stressed during new faculty orientation, at department meetings, and during opening day activities. The college, led by the faculty leadership, classified leadership, and administrators, will collaborate via a workshop or retreat to determine methods of promoting of the involvement of all constituents in the governing process.

The Academic Senate will reexamine professional development guidelines to develop a specific policy that supports faculty participation on committees.

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

Descriptive Summary

The college's Academic Senate, comprised of faculty members elected by their peers from each department to represent them in all academic and professional matters, plays a leadership role in recommending instructional policy and changes in instructional programs and student services. It meets at least two times a month, as does its executive committee. Through consultation, as needed, the Senate forwards policy recommendations to the college president and/or shared governance committees.

The Chair of the Curriculum Committee attends all Senate meetings and brings forward all of that committee's actions for final approval by the Senate. The responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee include reviewing all new curricula prior to approval by the Board of Trustees. The Committee also oversees revision of existing courses and programs. The Curriculum Committee includes representation from faculty throughout disciplines on campus. The committee meets at least 3 times per month. The faculty chair of the Curriculum Committee is given .6 reassigned time. **(4.23)**

Faculty play a substantial role on faculty hiring committees, in faculty evaluations, and in departmental program reviews, which directly impact student learning programs and services. In fact, when departments submit their budget requests, such requests must be linked to the department's Program Review goals. **(4.24)**

Academic administrators serve on all shared governance bodies as active participants or as information resources.

The Student Learning Outcomes Committee, chaired by the student learning outcomes coordinator, meets bimonthly to develop and review policy for the student learning outcomes cycle. Every college unit is encouraged to send one representative to the meetings. The vice presidents for academic affairs and for workforce education, as well as some deans, regularly attend the meeting. **(4.25)** The SLO Handbook provides guidelines for the SLO process. **(4.26)** A recent action by the Student Learning Outcomes Committee is the consideration for the need to develop a second committee to concentrate on the issues related to the assessment of SLOs.

A positive example of a program that provided support for academic programs is the "One Time Funding" program, available during the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 academic years. This program was a result of discussions in the Budget Committee, wherein the determination was made to allocate a designated amount of funding for faculty-proposed

projects specifically related to academic programs with an emphasis on student success. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were allocated to departments that submitted proposals.

The College also relies on other governing structures including Title 5 regulations, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Board of Governors, California Education Code, LACCD human resources guides and hiring policies, and LACCD Regulations and Board rules for guidance in arriving at recommendations about student learning programs and services.

Self Evaluation

Faculty and administrators play a central role in decision-making regarding student learning programs and services. Their principal involvement in program review, SLOs, sound curriculum development, and the one-time funding awards are examples of this process. Administration and faculty actively participate in the development and oversight of student support and academic services. Math and English faculty sit on the Matriculation Committee, Transfer Committee, and Scholarship Committees.

The faculty has taken a proactive role in developing outreach strategies with the Financial Aid Office so that a greater number of students receive federal and state financial assistance. Other committees on which faculty and administrators play a key role are Distributive Learning/Distance Education Committee, Off-Site Committee, and the Student Success Committee.

Planning Agenda

The college meets this standard.

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

Descriptive Summary

The college maintains an environment of inclusive participatory governance to promote our mission and vision for the college. Our structures bring all of our constituent groups together to participate in planning, decision making, and conflict resolution. In addition to regularly scheduled committee meetings, other effective methods of communication include the college website, posted minutes, e-mails, consultations between the president and other campus leadership, and campus weekly bulletins. When these processes are utilized, discussion among the institution's constituencies occurs in the spirit of shared governance.

Self Evaluation

Shared governance brings everyone to the table. Participants feel that they have a voice in decision-making process. Usually communication between the administration and the faculty is positive. Two notable exceptions are presented here:

The Senate expressed concerns over the deviation from the practice of shared governance over faculty hiring decisions as required by the district policy, the AFT/LACCD Faculty Agreement, (4.17) and the college's unofficial faculty hiring policy under the interim president from July 2006 to 2008. The Senate objected to the lack of explanation for the reasons the interim president gave for his hiring decisions. Moreover, during 2007-2008 period, instead of adhering to the clear and critical timelines delineated in the hiring policy, (4.29) the president took more than 60 days to forward any changes to the Senate-approved hiring priority list, and to compound the error, he initially sent his changes to the Joint Hires Committee co-chairs, not the Senate president. This was the second year in a row that the interim college president had violated the faculty hiring process and approved shared governance practices. With the return of the president, the Academic Senate feels more hopeful that the hiring policy will be honored.

The administration does not always consult the faculty when making decisions regarding administrative hires. For example, during fall 2008, an administrative hire was initiated without consulting the faculty. During a meeting with the Senate Executive Committee, the college president agreed to work with the Chancellor to arrange for a transfer of the new hire and promised to apprise the Senate president of plans for future administrative hires.

To our credit, the college benefits from having strong and independent constituent groups which can and have challenged perceived violations of the shared governance process. Two notable examples have occurred in the area of resource allocation. The Academic Senate has raised objections over the implementation of the Faculty Hiring Policy and the practice of hiring administrators without consultation. (4.19)

During the time of the construction occurring under Bond A and AA measures, the Facilities Committee time and again challenged the lack of communication and follow through between the constantly changing membership on the construction management team and the administrative leadership, seriously questioning the escalating costs, limited reporting, and missed timelines. (4.30)

While the shared governance process can be tenuous, it is productive for advancing the greater interests of the college. The senate president and college president had several focused meetings regarding the Student Success Committee's recommendations to improve student success. Consequently, the President approved the hiring of an Associate Dean for Student Success and supports the college's year-long orientation for new faculty.

Using several modes of communication, including e-mail, Internet, and committee meetings, communication can be maximized so that particular campus constituencies do not feel left out of the decision-making process.

Planning Agenda

The Academic Senate and college president will work to iron out areas of disagreement in the faculty hiring policy, with the goal of formalizing an official policy.

The Academic Senate and college president will work toward improving transparency and timeliness of communication between the President and Joint Hires Committee regarding final hiring decisions and explanation of any deviations from Joint Hires recommendations.

IV.A.4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationship with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission Standards, policies, and guidelines and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self-study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

Descriptive Summary

The college has relationships with many outside agencies – businesses, other colleges and college districts, the media, the State Chancellor’s Office, neighborhood associations, Chambers of Commerce, and federal, state, county, and city governmental bodies and legislators. Some of our programs are audited by outside agencies, such as the National League of Nursing Accreditation Committee. We have relationships with the U. S. Department of Education, and CalWORKs/TANF, as well as with Los Angeles area law enforcement and fire agencies.

Vocational Advisory Boards made up of local business leaders and workers are regularly convened to advise our deans and instructors regarding our vocational programs. The construction and renovation made possible by Prop A/AA bonds have required the college to meet with community representatives (Citizen’s Oversight Committee for the Bond) and neighborhood associations and coordinate with governmental agencies. The president of the college also has a community-based advisory council (President’s Advisory Council), comprised of different community members.

Whenever the college has been involved in accreditation-related processes, it has prepared appropriate interim reports, midterm reports, and self studies. In all cases, the college has fully complied with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, including requirements for public disclosure, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes.

Self Evaluation

The college has been in compliance with past Accrediting Commission requirements. Substantive change reports are in progress for the operation of its South Gate Educational Center and its distance education program. However, they have not been completed in a timely fashion.

Planning Agenda

The college will be more responsive to the preparation of substantive change reports as required by guidelines and policies of the Accrediting Commission.

IV.A.5. The role of leadership and the institution's governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis of improvement.

Descriptive Summary

The institution's decision making is guided by the Board of Trustees, the college's strategic plan, and shared governance. The Board of Trustees establishes policies that must be implemented by the district's chancellor and college president, who is evaluated on his success in implementing these policies. In addition, the Board of Trustees adopts the strategic plan for each of its nine colleges.

In June 2007, the interim president held a Strategic Planning Retreat in which members of the different campus constituencies had a chance to engage in dialogue regarding future facilities concerns. **(4.33)**

In fall 2006, the function and membership on the shared governance committee, at that time named the East Los Angeles College Budget and Planning Advisory Committee (EBPAC), were evaluated. The membership was restructured and the committee renamed to East Los Angeles Shared Governance Council. **(4.3, 8/28/06 and 9/11/06)**

The Academic Senate evaluated its processes when it updated its constitution in spring 2006 **(4.19, 5/23/06)** and developed bylaws in spring 2007. **(4.34)** The Senate further committed itself to reviewing its bylaws every three years, thus assuring regular evaluation of its governance processes.

Two additional key campus committees, the Student Success Committee and the Budget Committee **(4.34)** have developed bylaws to identify their purpose and participation of key constituents. The Technology Planning Subcommittee will develop bylaws during fall 2008. The Educational Planning Subcommittee and the SLO Committee will also develop bylaws by spring 2009.

Self Evaluation

Although the college has made great progress in developing inclusive shared-governance planning structures and process where college-wide input is obtained for decisions on college priorities, goals, and objectives since its last accreditation review, it has not been effective in formally measuring the success of the intended plans. Informal review of the status of prior plans was required to develop the current Education Plan and the Technology Plan and is being used for the revision of the Facility Plan that is in progress.

What is new to this process and completes the evaluation cycle for strategic planning in this evaluation cycle is the determination of measurable objectives that will be monitored. The status of these measures of success in implementing plans will be reported to the college at large on an ongoing basis. Additionally, since the last accreditation, the Research and Planning staff has been augmented to include staff whose responsibility it will be to monitor the progress of measurable goals and objectives. (4.37) The creation of the District Planning Committee has also supported the college in more recently completing the college's evaluation cycle by establishing Core Indicators of success that the district will monitor for all colleges. (4.38)

The district also recently required that each college report to the board on its progress in meeting the District's Strategic Plan. (4.4) The college would benefit from feedback about the results of the achievement of District and College plans, goals, and objectives for ELAC that were established through a inclusive decision-making process.

Planning Agenda

The Research and Planning Office will present the District Core Indicator measures and the measures for monitoring the strategic, educational, facility, and technology plans to the ESGC. Additionally, it will determine the exact timeline it will use to report the progress on these measures to the college-at large over and above posting results on the Research and Planning website.

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.

East Los Angeles College is one of nine colleges in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD). The district exists in accordance with Education Code 70902 and 72000, and as articulated in chapter one of the Board Rules. Currently East Los Angeles College is participating with Los Angeles Trade Technical College and Los Angeles City College in a joint multi-college accreditation review.

Section IV.B.1 was authored by representatives from the district office. The college reviewed the section for accuracy.

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 the Education Code. **(4.40)** LACCD board members are elected for four-year terms district-wide by voters in the city of Los Angeles and several neighboring communities. 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 non-voting student member for a one-year term.

Board meetings are held both at the district's central office and at each of the nine college campuses during the academic year. They are publicized and open to the public. The trustees meet approximately twice a month to consider and vote on policy, financial and personnel matters. All nine college presidents, district office senior staff, representatives of employee unions, and students sit at the resource table and may participate freely in the discussion of issues.

All rules and regulations of the LACCD must be approved by these elected representatives of the community. On all matters deemed to be academic and professional, the board has agreed either to rely primarily on the advice of, or to reach mutual agreement with, the District Academic Senate (DAS). For the creation of collective bargaining agreements, the trustees delegate authority to the chancellor and his human resources team to bargain in good faith with agents of the six unions representing employees in the district though they do vote on the adoption of all collective bargaining agreements.

Self Evaluation

As officials elected at large, 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. Its odd-year election schedule gives board races greater visibility on the ballot but also results in lower voter turnout and on occasion a high cost for conducting an election.

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

Planning Agenda

The board meets this standard.

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 LACCD Board of Trustees exercises oversight of the college's educational programs by means of board rules and administrative regulations that establish standards for graduation, set policies for curriculum development, and detail the faculty's role in educational matters in accordance with the district's stated mission. **(4.41)** The board has set policies in relation to the curriculum approval process and its role in ensuring the quality of the college's academic offerings as well as the central role played by the district and college academic senates in relation to academic and professional matters. **(4.42)** The board also must approve or disapprove all changes to the curriculum that are brought before it from the district's Office of Instructional and Student Support Services or the DAS.

The board is directly responsible for guaranteeing the colleges' integrity and financial health by periodically reviewing and approving the colleges' mission and vision statements and by requiring regular reports from the college presidents on the colleges' budgets. Through district administrative offices, the board is also responsible for overseeing compliance with all federal, state, and local policies in relation to student financial aid and other fiscal programs.

Self Evaluation

Over the past 10 years, district administrators, the Council of Academic Affairs (the assembled Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs), 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. A policy on emergency equivalencies has also been adopted to facilitate the hiring of adjunct faculty. In addition, the district 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. These and other aspects of decentralization allow local college academic programs to be more responsive to local stakeholders. **(4.43)**

Board members regularly meet with state lawmakers and educational leaders to promote legislation and other initiatives aimed at improving college access for students and securing funding for special projects. The board played a central role in promoting the Prop A and AA bond initiatives passed in 2001 and 2003 that have provided more than \$2 billion in badly needed capital construction funds for projects on all LACCD campuses that will directly benefit instructional programs.

Planning Agenda

The board should consider appointing a district representative(s) to oversee the construction progress within the district.

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 all LACCD programs through its Committee on Planning and Student Success, which addresses issues related to educational effectiveness, student achievement, and educational program support. In addition, it oversees the accreditation process and reviews and comments on college accreditation reports. In conjunction with the chancellor's office and district general counsel, the board is apprised of and assumes responsibility for all legal matters associated with the operation of all nine campuses. The District Budget Committee (DBC) 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 auditor. (4.44)

Self Evaluation

The ultimate responsibility for policies and decisions impacting all nine colleges lies with the board. The board and district administration, working cooperatively with the academic senate, and employee unions, have addressed past accreditation concerns related to college funding in order to secure the financial future of the nine LACCD colleges. The District Budget Committee (DBC) was reconstituted in 2003 to assure broader faculty and staff participation. Under its guidance, allocation procedures and policies were revised to more accurately reflect the needs of each college's educational programs. Cooperation among the board, district, and unions has also resulted in positive ending balances and a healthy district-wide contingency fund, another result of board and district involvement in overseeing the fiscal health of the colleges. The maintenance of this significant contingency fund has allowed the district to minimize the impact of state budget cuts on local college programs and has also made it possible for smaller LACCD colleges to seek additional funding, when needed, to support educational offerings.

Planning Agenda

The board should develop a planning policy to allow a college the use of contingency funds during a budget crisis if the college can demonstrate a significant growth in technical or academic programs.

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 the State Education Code, Section 70902, and internally by board rules. (4.45) The chancellor and general counsel also play an important role in monitoring board responsibilities. The bylaws and policies are published on the district's website.

Self Evaluation

According to the district's self study, (4.46) the LACCD's own internal checks and balances have generally been effective in ensuring compliance with the board's externally and internally defined duties and responsibilities.

Planning Agenda

The board meets this standard.

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 and the administrative regulations that support them are outlined in Chancellor's Directive Number 70, District-wide Internal Management Consultation Process. (4.47) These rules and regulations established through the consultation process are subject to regular review and revision by district administrative staff to ensure that they remain appropriate and effective. Revisions are reviewed and considered for adoption at the board's regular semi-monthly meetings.

The board relies on the chancellor and the college presidents to ensure that all rules and regulations are implemented uniformly and effectively across the district. The district's legal counsel conducts regular reviews of all board rules and policies to ensure that they are relevant and up-to-date. When board rules or policies are considered to be in need of revision, they are directed to the appropriate constituencies for review. In February 2007, the board adopted Administrative Regulation C-12, which stipulates the process for the cyclical, automatic review of all policies and regulations. (4.48)

Self Evaluation

The trustees consistently act in accordance with established board policies. When constituents bring issues to the board's attention, policies are revised as needed. For instance, when it was brought to its attention that board rules precluded adjunct faculty from serving on presidential selection committees, the board changed the rule to allow participation.

Working in collaboration with the DAS, the board revised district hiring procedures by adopting the state minimum qualifications for all faculty positions. The board also revised district-wide faculty hiring policies to streamline procedures and give campuses direct control over their own hiring processes.

Planning Agenda

The board meets this standard.

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 February 2007, the board adopted Board Rule 2105, a formal policy for the orientation of new board members. (4.49) The board has also developed procedures for the orientation of student trustees. (4.50)

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.

Planning Agenda

The board meets this standard.

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. For the following decade, the board used a self-evaluation checklist to evaluate its overall effectiveness. In June 2005, the board reviewed and amended its self-evaluation process, this time expanding it to include additional feedback on its performance 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, scoring its performance in 20 general areas and reporting on its self-assessment and the summarized evaluations of constituency representatives. The board's most recent self-evaluation (4.51) was reviewed and discussed at a committee of the whole meeting on December 19, 2007.

In response to an ACCJC recommendation that the board memorialize the setting of board goals as part of its annual self-evaluation, the Board of Trustees adopted Board Rule 2301.10 in October 2007. **(4.52)** At its January 30, 2008 meeting, the board established a new set of annual board goals. **(4.53)** In the Fall of 2008, the board will again assess its progress in accomplishing its goals as part of its self-evaluation process and will set new goals for the following year.

Self Evaluation

The board meets this standard.

Planning Agenda

Feedback on the board's performance should also include input from the Student Affairs Committee.

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, Board Rule 2300.10, in October 2005, which requires each member to adhere to values of honesty, integrity, reliability, and loyalty. With input from district legal counsel, in February 2007 it established procedures for sanctioning board members in case of ethics violations, Board Rule 2300.11. **(4.45)**

Self Evaluation

The board has a clear code of ethics.

Planning Agenda

The board meets this standard.

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

Descriptive Summary

The governing board's Committee on Planning and Student Success monitors the accreditation self-study processes of the nine colleges by receiving regular reports on their progress and reviewing their midterm and final accreditation self-study reports. **(4.54)** The board works with this committee to ensure that past recommendations are effectively and appropriately addressed. During site visits, board members meet with visiting teams, respond to questions and concerns, and may participate in other forums, meetings, and receptions.

In fall 2007, the Chancellor created the position of District Liaison for Accreditation, reporting directly to the Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness. The Liaison coordinates board activities in relation to accreditation and works closely with the Board's Committee on Planning and Student Success. The Liaison meets regularly with faculty accreditation chairs and ALOs to provide assistance, coordinate efforts, share best practices, and provide information necessary to respond to ACCJC recommendations regarding the district.

Self Evaluation

Through the active oversight provided by the board's Committee on Planning and Student Success, the colleges have engaged in more positive and productive accreditation processes since 2000. Over the past eight years, all district colleges have participated in new rounds of accreditation and have all had their accredited statuses reaffirmed by the ACCJC. More importantly, the accreditation self study process at all district colleges has become much more pro-active, collaborative, and collegial than in past years. District colleges are now approaching accreditation self studies as essential elements in strategic planning and institutional goal setting, and are using accreditation to address college issues.

Planning Agenda

The board meets this standard.

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

In accordance with board rules, the governing board bears primary responsibility for selecting the district chancellor and evaluating his/her performance annually. Using the General Counsel as staff, the board conducts the evaluation of the chancellor, whose contract includes a provision for an annual evaluation. Each year, the board reviews its previous evaluation and directs the General Counsel regarding the process for the current year. To address an ACCJC recommendation in 2007, the Chancellor's Office wrote a directive that spells out the evaluation procedure. (4.55) The board solicits input from various constituencies and collects the data to evaluate the chancellor's performance on a number of criteria. (4.56) The chancellor typically prepares a written self-evaluation based upon his stated goals, and the trustees submit their own appraisals. The trustees then discuss the evaluation in closed session, and a designated trustee prepares a final draft of the evaluation

for the full board's review. The trustees meet with the chancellor and provide the final written document.

The chancellor and senior staff oversee the administrative tasks of the district. The chancellor also oversees the district foundation to obtain additional resources. He meets regularly with the cabinet, comprised of senior staff and the college presidents, and has regular consultations with leadership of the unions and 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 the provisions of the Education Code, the board delegates its authority to the chancellor, gives him the autonomy to make decisions without interference, and holds him accountable for those decisions.

The board shares responsibility with the chancellor for hiring and evaluating the performance of district vice chancellors, college presidents, and the General Counsel. Board rules specify selection procedures. (4.57) The selection process for the chancellor and other key administrative positions typically involves national searches. 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.

The chancellor conducts regular evaluations of the college presidents in accordance with board rules and makes recommendations to the board on the renewal of their contracts. The process for the evaluation of college presidents, which has been in place since 2002, is facilitated by the Chancellor's Office. The procedure is followed each spring with about three presidents undergoing the comprehensive process each year. To address an ACCJC recommendation in 2007, the district created a formal written policy, Performance Evaluation Process for College Presidents, to spell out the evaluation process for college presidents. (4.58) The description is included in the packet with the evaluation forms that are used to collect information. (4.59)

Self Evaluation

The broadening of hiring procedures in 2000 to include all stakeholder groups has increased community and faculty involvement in the selection of the chancellor and the college presidents. Revised evaluation procedures mandate the hiring of an outside consultant to facilitate the evaluation of key administrative personnel through interviews with relevant college constituency groups. This process appears to have worked well in past years and will continue to be used in future evaluations. The board has also adopted a similar consultant-led process for the periodic evaluation of the chancellor.

Planning Agenda

The board should reconsider whether a consultant-led process is in fact the best way to evaluate key administrative personnel and the chancellor. In an effort to promote transparency from the district, the board should clarify the components/rating system to

include the relevance of a consultant led process in the overall evaluation of key administrative personnel and the chancellor.

IV.B.2. Administrative Leadership

IV.B.2. The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting, and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

IV.B.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

President Ernest H. Moreno has been serving as the permanent president of the college since 1995 and is the longest serving president in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD). During the period of 2006 through 2008, the college was under the direction of Interim President Robert Isomoto while President Moreno was away serving as the Interim President at Los Angeles Mission College. President Moreno was selected by former Chancellor Rocky Young due to his expertise in college management and leadership.

As President, Mr. Moreno attends biweekly meetings of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) to represent the interests of the college and to serve as a resource to the Board. The Chancellor's Cabinet meets the first Friday prior to Board meetings. The Cabinet includes the presidents of the nine District colleges and selected District officers.

The President meets once a month with the Academic Senate President/Executive board to consult on "academic and professional matters" per *Shared Governance Agreement (4.2)* signed on August 23, 1993 by former President Omero Suarez. This agreement has been in effect for over 15 years and continues to support the principle of shared governance on campus.

The East Los Angeles Shared Governance Council (ESGC), formerly known as East Budget President's Advisory Council (EBPAC), is an established shared governance process that includes systemic participation by representatives of all campus constituencies. **(4.60)** The shared governance structure is comprised of several committees **(4.61)** where different constituencies are represented. The committee meets biweekly on Monday afternoons. The ESGC is a recommending committee to the President of the college.

The President meets on a weekly basis with his Cabinet consisting of the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Vice President of Workforce Education and Economic Development, Vice President of Administrative Services, and Vice President of Student Services. The Vice Presidents annually provide the President with their yearly goals based on ELAC Strategic

plan and the district strategic plan. **(4.4)** District administration sets enrollment goals for each of the nine colleges that the Vice President's are expected to attain as part of their stated annual goals as reported to the President.

The President has a monthly meeting with his Administrative Council. **(4.62)** The Council is comprised of all administrators both certificated and classified. The council provides updates on their respective areas and advises the president on issues affecting the college.

Additionally, the President meets with other campus constituencies on a regular or in some cases, an as needed basis or an invited basis. These groups include the American Federation of Teachers (AFT1521), Classified Union (AFT1521A) and representatives from other classified staff unions, the Associated Student Union (ASU), and department chairs. Periodically he holds all-campus as well as town hall meetings. He encourages instructors to invite him to their classes.

Two key community constituent groups that the President communicates regularly with are the Community Advisory Oversight Committee and the ELAC Foundation Board.

The passage of two Bonds for college construction requires that the President presides regularly with the Community Advisory Oversight Committee who provides the check and balance of building construction taking place on campus over the next 5 years.

To oversee implementation of the Facilities Master Plan, faculty and staff members join administrators in a monthly facilities planning committee meeting, held on the first Thursday of each month on campus. The IT Department has also included on each faculty/staff computer an information webpage that includes alerts concerning ongoing college construction projects.

The President meets monthly with the ELAC Foundation. This committee is comprised of members who represent community businesses and organizations who work on fund raising events to support the college's mission for student access and success. The Dean of Resource Development and Community Relations assists the President with this committee.

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

The President provides his goals in writing to his Cabinet and the Chancellor annually. These goals are used as a framework for the Vice Presidents to plan their annual goals. Goals are based on measurable data from the district as well as the college's office of Research and Planning which reports directly to the president. Data include faculty and student surveys, **(4.63, 4.64)** IPEDS, performance indicators (degrees, transfer, persistence, completions, basic skills, ESL; Accounting Report for Community Colleges (ARCC) data **(4.65)** and Internal Scan. **(4.66)** External Scan data are also used. The system office Management of Information System (MIS) data and the Labor Market Inventory (LMI) provide annual data for program planning and improvement.

The cabinet consists of the four vice presidents, who provide the president with their Cluster Program Reviews reflecting the strategic plan of the college and the district. Each department/program under the four vice presidents is required to produce a Program Review every three years. The Program Review document is evaluated by a shared governance committee and then reported with recommendations and commendations to the ELAC Shared Governance council. These program reviews are updated annually to ensure that program goals are being met and/or improvement continues. **(4.8)** Student Learning Outcomes are included in every program review. The SLO committee has created the mission and vision for the college's student learning outcomes. The President has supported reassigned time for 1 SLO coordinator and 3 facilitators to assist the departments with completion of student learning outcomes in all disciplines. The committee, made up of department representative and administrators, meets every second Wednesday of each month. **(4.68)**

The program review process is linked to program viability.

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 is under the directive of the LACCD Board of Trustees, which provides him with the statutes, regulations and board policies that govern the institution. The president must provide regular reports to the board. The president meets regularly with his cabinet to discuss and review institutional practices relative to statutes, regulations and policies. He also meets with the chancellor individually and is part of the chancellor's cabinet which is composed of all of the 9 college presidents and administrative staff.

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

Descriptive Summary

The LACCD Board of Trustees is directly responsible for guaranteeing the college's integrity and financial health by periodically reviewing and approving the college's mission and vision statements and by requiring regular reports from the college president. The president receives the budget reports on all major budget categories and funds from the vice president of administrative services. Budget control, utilization, and strategy are regularly addressed in cabinet and budget committees. Corrective action and adjustments are made on an ongoing basis. The college has integrated into the budget development process, the annual program review, which includes program cost analysis to assist in having a more effective budget and expenditure system.

The college provides a quarterly financial status report on enrollment projections and budget to the district office.

The president serves as the chair of the ELAC Foundation Board of Directors. The foundation provides a newsletter that is distributed local businesses and industries. The foundation hosts an annual scholarship dinner which includes the new \$1million dollar scholarship for high school students.

To supplement the regular budget an Associate Dean of Resource Development was hired in December 2005 to write and monitor grant funding. Since that date the college has been successful in obtaining five federal grants and three local grants to support academic programs.

Under the Workforce Education and Economic Development division, more than 23 grants have awarded to the college. **(4.69)**

The college has established guidelines and training for purchasing and processing of expenditures as they relate to district policies.

Self Evaluation

In light of budget challenges the college has effectively maintained a respectable budget balance, hired new faculty (which include both replacement and growth positions), hired classified staff and updated campus technology.

Planning Agenda

The college meets this standard.

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

The president is a board member of Monterey Park Hospital and USC Medical Center and the East Los Angeles Pan American Bank. He is an active member of the East Los Angeles Rotary Club. He attends regular meetings that are held with Monterey Park City officials and staff and has established effective lines of communication with community leaders.

The college hosts a number of community events such as dance recitals, musical performances, theater productions, health fairs, sporting events and art exhibits.

The publication of the *President's Corner* is a quarterly publication that is available both in hard copy and online and has had a positive impact on campus communication. **(4.70)** The college has developed an information campaign in the East Los Angeles service that provides monthly college updates on events and recognitions (awards, grants, recognized faculty & staff). Advertisement has been purchased to provide enrollment information as well. The *Monterey Park Cascades*, *Alhambra News*, *La Opinion*, *San Gabriel Tribune*, *Hoy!*, and *University Times* are a few of the publications used. Moreover, the college mails a mini-schedule booklet that features stories and information on the colleges and course offerings to approximately 300,000 community households. **(4.71)** Each semester, banners are

strategically placed on Atlantic Boulevard, a major thoroughfare in Monterey Park. Cable television interviews have been conducted periodically with administrative staff and faculty reflecting the multilingual audience/communities served.

A high school principal's breakfast is held annually with the top feeder high schools in the service area, and Field trips to the college are encouraged by the College President to learn about college programs.

A partnership with the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) (4.72) includes concurrent enrollment in high schools focusing on A through G requirements, and middle schools focusing on math and science programs such as Escalante and the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE).

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 office and its nine colleges are governed through legislation, the Education Code, board rules, administrative regulations, and current and past practices. In the past few years, the Board of Trustees has pursued a policy of partial administrative decentralization, which has shifted additional responsibility and accountability for planning and decision making to the local college level. Since the board formally adopted the principle of decentralization in 1999, the district and the colleges have been working to clarify and delineate operational responsibilities.

Shortly after adopting this principle of decentralization, the district participated in the Multi-College Pilot Program (MCP) organized by the ACCJC, aimed at clarifying lines of accountability in multi-college districts. What came out of the program was the creation of a 45-page functional map, which was revised several times over the years. (4.73) To respond to ACCJC concerns that the map primarily related to accreditation standards and did not provide a clear delineation of operational responsibilities and functions, the district initiated a review of all district office functions in 2005.

Over a two-year period, every district office charted the functions it provides to the colleges and produced District Office Service Outcomes, specifying user constituencies at the college level, areas of responsibility, and expected outcomes for all services. (4.74) These service outcomes were shared with the Chancellor's Cabinet and the three vice presidents' councils

to elicit feedback. Further dialogue took place at the annual District Academic Senate Summit in September 2006, a day-long event attended by 125 faculty leaders and senior staff from all nine colleges. A panel comprised of the chancellor, a member of the Board of Trustees, the president of the DAS, a faculty union representative, and a college president explored the current state of decentralization and district/college relations with attendees. Breakouts afforded participants a chance to go more in depth to discuss specific areas, such as payroll, HR, and marketing. **(4.75)**

In a continuing effort to clarify district/college responsibilities, the district, in conjunction with the AFT College Faculty Guild, began holding annual Department Chair Workshops. **(4.76)** The first such workshop was held in October 2006; the second in November 2007. About 100 department chairs and vice presidents of Academic Affairs attended each of these sessions to learn the ins and outs of district and campus roles related to the vital function of running the colleges' academic departments.

To further clarify functions, District Office departments have begun a pilot project to create flow charts of districtwide functions, both on the district and college levels. The goal is to create simple, intuitive visual process maps of critical functions, such as faculty and staff hiring, curriculum approval, procurement, specially funded programs, faculty and staff evaluations, etc. These functional flow charts will delineate responsibilities between the colleges and the District Office for each step of the process being described. The eventual goal is to post these online with links to forms and contact information. The Faculty Hiring Flow Chart is a sample of the charts that are being developed. **(4.77)**

In addition, Chancellor Mark Drummond has made a commitment to redefining decentralization as it impacts the district's efficiency and effectiveness. One of the board's goals for 2008 is to further clarify the division of roles and responsibilities between the colleges and the district office. In response to this Board priority, the chancellor has directed district senior staff to engage the colleges in an ongoing dialogue to further clarify district/college relationships. The initial result of this effort is the *LACCD District/College Functional Map*, which offers a concise description of the history and current state of district/college relations and a detailed accounting of how district committees and offices interface with their college constituencies. The Functional Map also includes an extensive set of "functional flow charts" which present visual maps of the district and college roles in 30 critical administrative processes, ranging from curriculum approval to the establishment of specially funded programs. **(4.73)**

The Functional Map is being discussed by college Academic Senates and shared governance councils across the district. In Winter/Spring 2009, it will be evaluated and further refined by the District Academic Senate and be a focus of the Board of Trustees' annual retreat. By spring, sections of the Functional Map--including the listing of all district-wide councils and committees and the functional flow charts-- will be added as links on the District website for the use of faculty and staff.

Finally, the District will further clarify the functional relationships and decision-making pathways between the district office and the colleges by documenting all district-wide

committees and by posting complete committee descriptions, charges, and meeting times on its website. This project expects to be completed by the end of Fall Term 2008 and will be shared with the college's administration, Academic Senate, and shared governance committee.

Self Evaluation

Operating within the framework of a large multi-college district, it is an ongoing challenge to delineate our roles. Decentralization is a work in progress that requires periodic review and alterations. Our district has become partially decentralized, with some decisions made locally and others made by the district. In curriculum, some characteristics of a course are determined by the college and some by the district. Some aspects, such as hiring decisions, are totally decentralized.

Although the original functional map was developed and modified with considerable input from the college community, it was not widely disseminated or clearly understood by all constituents. However, the district's efforts in the last several years, including the Chancellor's dialogue on decentralization, the creation of functional process maps for critical administrative functions, and the formal delineation of district-wide committees, have greatly improved understanding of roles and responsibilities across the district for all campus constituencies.

At East Los Angeles College the administration has developed a campus-wide organizational chart delineating administrative and supervision oversight as well as for each campus division and department. **(4.78)** In addition, each Department Chair was provided an orientation and a Department Chair's Handbook for reference to clarify each department's operational responsibilities and considerations.

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. In this effort, the district office offers an array of support services to the colleges. The main services involve instructional and student services support, institutional research, human resources, business services (including contracts and risk management), financial services (budget and accounting), legal services, public relations and marketing, facilities planning (including oversight of the \$2 billion-plus construction program by the executive director of facilities planning), development in conjunction with project managers, and information technology. Collaborative procedures between the district and the colleges include the budget allocation model, codes for student conduct, and implementation of board rules. Each college, through its funding allocations, determines specific operational and educational priorities, which may vary from college to college.

Self Evaluation

The district's recent two-year process of self-analysis resulted in recommendations for the re-organization of administrative unit structures and the refinement of their functions. Involving input from all nine colleges, this re-organization has resulted in the establishment of clear outcomes for all district administrative offices, which will then be used to measure the effectiveness of support services.

Although many administrative functions have been decentralized to the nine colleges, most of the functions the district performs are, for technical or financial reasons, best carried out centrally. Although the previous DEC system was antiquated, the new HR system, SAP, has created many challenges for the colleges. The various IT systems were not communicating to manage human resources. Personnel placed on each campus (Single Point of Contact Staff, or "SPOCs") have been dealing with problems as they arise. The district created an HR Help Desk to assist employees with HR issues that are not solvable at the campus level and is in the process of creating an Employee Service Center to assist the district's employees with payroll, benefits, retirement, and other personnel matters.

Another example of the district's role in supporting the colleges is offered by the project undertaken in 2006-7 to upgrade college websites. Working collaboratively, college public information officers met over a year period with district staff and outside consultants to design "templates" for the design and content of college web pages. These templates combined positive web design features with marketing best practices aimed at improving communication and creating a positive image of the colleges. At the same time, the templates allowed each college to fashion a unique identity for their sites—one that stressed the individual character of their campuses and honored the local communities they serve. This project, now fully implemented, greatly enhanced district-wide communications and provided valuable support to college Public Information Office staff.

At East Los Angeles College, the college website has undergone a remarkable transformation in both design and functionality. Each of the college's divisions and respective departmental/program units are now involved in the design of their web pages to ensure meeting the mission of the college and their units.

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 in response to a district-wide budget crisis in order to include additional faculty representation and expand union and academic senate participation. It is now comprised of the nine college presidents and representatives from the administrative units, the DAS, and the collective bargaining units.

Responding to ACCJC recommendations, the DBC adopted a revenue-based model that mirrored allocation formulas in place at the state level, a model consistent with board policy, which stipulates that college funding be allocated in the same manner that revenues are received by the district.

Periodically, the DBC reviews the allocation model and recommends changes when deemed necessary. Among these have been changes to the way colleges receive growth funds and basic skills money, a “window shade” approach to the allocation of growth dollars, and the creation of growth targets/ceilings, designed to maximize FTES growth and basic skills revenue. An FTES Allocation Taskforce, convened in 2005, concluded that the FTES allocation formula adequately provided resources necessary for colleges to serve their communities and should be continued.

In 2001, the DBC instituted allocation grant procedures to assist smaller colleges that had trouble balancing their budgets. A college ending the year in deficit can request the intervention of the DBC Allocation Grant Task Force, comprised of administrators, faculty, and staff from other colleges in the district. To apply for debt relief, the college submits a fiscal self-study to assess the causes of its deficit. Members of the task force review the data, visit the college, meet with college constituents, and issue recommendations to help the college reach financial independence. If the college follows these recommendations, a portion of the deficit is offset with funds from the district’s contingency reserve. Southwest College underwent the process in 2001-02, Harbor College in 2003-04, and Mission College in 2007. In Spring 2007, the DBC decided that a college that ends the year in deficit for more than \$500,000 or 1% of its budget (whichever is greater) is required to submit a financial plan and participate in a quarterly review.

In response to ACCJC concerns, in the spring of 2006, the district engaged a third-party consultant to review the district’s budget allocation and funding mechanisms. Studies were conducted to find out whether the model contained inherent disadvantages for the smaller colleges in the district. Among the findings were that the district should move quickly to bring its internal budget allocation formula into alignment with the provisions of SB 361, adjust the allocation model to make assessments on a cost per FTES basis, and to consider a different way of conducting assessments. In October 2006, then-chancellor Rocky Young established a DBC budget allocation task force, comprised of stakeholder groups, including representatives of both small and large colleges, to review the district’s allocation model.

The Budget Allocation Task Force thoroughly discussed the findings contained in the independent studies, and in January 2007, issued its recommendations for a new budget allocation model, **(4.80)** which was adopted by the DBC on January 17, 2007. The new LACCD allocation model parallels the state budget formula, distributing funds to the colleges on a credit FTES basis with a two-tiered basis for noncredit. However, it does differ from the state formula in one critical respect: it increases the foundation grant for the district’s four smaller colleges (Harbor, Mission, Southwest, and West) by \$500,000. This augmentation of the basic \$3,000,000 foundation grant was made in acknowledgement of the additional administrative expenses incurred by the smaller colleges.

The task force also recommended that district-wide assessments be changed from a percentage of college revenue over total district revenue to a cost per FTES basis, in order to make the system more equitable. The task force further suggested that the district office budget allocation not be set at a fixed percentage and that its budget be periodically reviewed.

Self Evaluation

The allocation of resources is one of the district's most challenging tasks. However, revisions made by the DBC to the allocation process in the past few years have created a more equitable and efficient system. As a result of district intervention, one of our colleges in need, Harbor College, saw its deficit reduced from \$3 million to \$1 million between 2005 and 2008. The recent revision allows for flexibility and encourages colleges to live within their means. It also rewards colleges that practice sound enrollment management strategies and that shepherd resources wisely.

The new model adopted by the DBC addresses the concerns regarding disparity in the treatment of the smaller colleges, noted by the ACCJC. Despite these efforts however, as of fall 2008, several district colleges continue to project potential budget shortfalls. These shortfalls are expected to be mitigated by future growth funds as they become available. In addition, the district is working with the colleges on enrollment management strategies for 2008-09 to bring their budgets under control.

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

Descriptive Summary

Meeting on a monthly basis, the DBC, with administrative, faculty, and staff representation from all nine LACCD colleges, monitors all college budgets and expenditures. College budget projections, including reserve funds, are tracked from quarter to quarter, and district staff members meet with college administrators as needed to address budget problems before they arise.

As a result of these procedures, the district has maintained at least a 3% contingency reserve fund every year since the reform of the DBC and allocation formula in 2000. **(4.80)** The district's outside audit assesses the effectiveness of its financial management. **(4.81)** The Board of Trustees, college presidents, and the public are provided periodic updates and presentations regarding the district's financial condition.

In order to maintain some level of control over health benefit costs for employees, the district and employee unions formed the Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC), which decides collaboratively on medical insurance carriers and plans.

Self Evaluation

The district effectively controls its expenditures. The maintenance of a significant contingency fund has allowed the district to minimize the impact of state budget cuts on local college programs and has made it possible for our smaller colleges to seek additional funding to support their offerings. The JLMBC has been a successful model for savings in an environment of spiraling health care costs. It won the 2004 AFT Saturn/UAW Partnership Award as an exemplary model of labor-management collaboration that has resulted in delivering cost effective, efficient, high quality services. (4.82)

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

College presidents undergo annual review conducted by the chancellor and a consultant-administered evaluation every third year. Evaluations contain clear grades for effectiveness in key areas, so that they are held accountable for the effective functioning of their colleges. These evaluations are reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees.

Self Evaluation

Since the adoption of administrative decentralization as the current approach to district/college relations, presidents have enjoyed additional freedom to make key decisions and have also been held more directly accountable for their actions than they were in the past.

At East Los Angeles College, the college president works with his administrative cabinet in consultation with the East Shared Governance Council (ESGC) which is comprised of representatives from each of the administrative divisions: Administrative Services, Academic Affairs, Workforce Education and Economic Development, and Students Services, as well as members from Academic Senate and AFT.

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 office has several vehicles for communicating with the colleges. The district provides reports pertaining to such areas as finance, personnel, and demographics. District-wide committees, such as the Presidents' Cabinet, the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs Council, the Vice Presidents of Administrative Services Council, and the Chief Student Services Officer Council, facilitate the sharing of information, which attendees bring back to their campuses. The chancellor visits the colleges and conducts cabinet meetings and other sessions with the college presidents and staff. The district's mainframe computer database, DEC, allows personnel to access student information and information related to college

operations and enrollment management. Information is exchanged through courier and e-mail.

Representatives from constituency groups (all collective bargaining units, including faculty, staff, and administration, the academic senate, and students) have seats at the resource table at every board meeting, and comments from the resource table are a standing item on each agenda. Representatives also have the opportunity to take part in the discussion of any item that comes before the board for a vote.

Changes in board rules and resolutions passed are communicated to the college presidents via e-mail and forwarded to all users on campus. Before board meetings, agendas are posted at the district office and on line, and the college's president, vice presidents, academic senate president, and AFT faculty and staff guild chapter presidents receive copies. Minutes of Board meetings are posted on the district website.

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 delineation of district/college roles and functions is reviewed and revised regularly. The delineation of district roles has been revised through the creation of process maps to replace the previously-used functional map. The chancellor initiated a project to revisit the meaning of decentralization. Customer service satisfaction surveys of district offices are the most recent effort to evaluate district processes. At every stage, these changes are discussed by constituents and evaluated. As an example, the results of the study of district office service outcomes were presented to the vice presidents' councils and the DAS in Fall 2006 for discussion and feedback.

Another opportunity to engage in dialogue related to district/college relationships and functions was launched in the Spring of 2006, when the district initiated the District Strategic Planning Initiative. This comprehensive district-wide strategic planning process gave the colleges a chance to assess progress made toward achieving past goals and establish new objectives. Informal SWOT analysis focus groups were held at each college that semester. Participants identified district-wide strengths and weaknesses and suggested future priorities. **(4.85)** A draft of the District Strategic Plan 2006-2011 **(4.86)** was circulated in Fall 2006, discussed in open forums held on the campuses and at the annual DAS summit, and received final approval by the Board of Trustees in January 2007.

Among the goals approved is Strategic Plan Goal #4, which deals with 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 short-term and long-term outcome measures of effectiveness for the plan's goals and objectives are outlined in the implementation matrix. **(4.87)**

In terms of decision-making structures and processes, the LACCD has a policy in place to identify, consider, and act upon operation and policy matters and specify the form of board rules and administrative regulations issued through the chancellor's office. The policy engages the three councils of vice presidents and the Chancellor's Cabinet (the chancellor and college presidents) in the policy development and review process. When appropriate, other district-wide committees and constituency groups (academic senate, bargaining units, Student Affairs Committee) are consulted as well.

Self Evaluation

The recent effort by the district office to clarify and analyze its functions is a positive step toward improving its processes. The strategic planning initiative has involved all the colleges in dialogue on ways to work together to achieve mutual goals.

The district's governance and decision-making structures are collegial and inclusive; with constituents working together to help the colleges reach their educational 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. The current student trustee, Rose Bustos, is from East Los Angeles College, a participant in the shared governance process as the former Associated Student Union president.

