Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

Descriptive Summary

Board Policy and Administrative Regulations 1001 and 2006 respectively outline participation in governance at the College. The Board is the ultimate decision-maker in those areas assigned to it by law and other regulations. Policy 2006 details governance participation in the decision-reaching processes of the District to include the following constituencies:

Academic Senate – the official body that represents the faculty in all areas relating to academic and professional matters

Classified Union - the official body of the classified staff exclusive of collective bargaining.

Associated Student Body Cabinet – Official body representing students in governance relating to students.

Administrators, Managers and Confidentials – Represented by individuals appointed by the Executive Committee

AR 2006 details the administration of these regulations under the President and details essential activities of the college decision-making process as

“policy and regulation development, and college planning, implementation and review. College planning is used to determine the college direction and the annual budget. The results of the college planning decision-making processes are regularly reviewed and changes are made in the implementation going forward.”

The regulation also spells out accountability for communication, sincere commitment of all participants, the District structure for participation in governance, the planning process and committee structure and College self-evaluation process.

AR Section 2006.8 – 2006.10 outlines the Academic Senate’s role in governance regarding academic and professional matters in relationship to the Board of Trustees and in regard to “primarily rely on” matters and “Mutually agreed upon” matters. Classified staff relationships to governance and appointments are designated in AR 2006.14 – 2006.19.
**Self-Evaluation**

The Superintendent-President realized that to fully integrate all constituencies into a collaborative college-wide process dependent on trust and open communication, it was necessary to also include collective bargaining unit leadership in the process. Thus, the President reconstituted the President’s Advisory Committee into the President’s Leadership Council (PLC), in 2007. Included were the Presidents of Classified Staff/AFT, full time Faculty/CCA, and part time Faculty/CHI. This has allowed for a more inclusive and collaborative process in college governance. All policies and administrative regulations go through the PLC after review from the various constituent groups on the PLC.

The college planning committees are the primary governance bodies for facilitating decisions about student learning programs and services. The LBCC college wide employee survey done in November of 2013 had a section on governance. Of 361 people who responded to the question regarding their participation on governance committees, 81 people responded “yes” with 280 responding “no.” Of 489 people responding to the question, “I understand the governance process at LBCC,” the majority agreed or were neutral to the statement.

At the end of the last academic year, the CPC realized that the planning structure had become burdensome with meetings and committees needed increased participation. In response, Academic Council established a task force group to assess the structure and process and make recommendations for possible changes back to Academic Council. The task force group met in November of 2013 and is scheduled to present its recommendations in spring of 2014. *(Did this happen and if so what were the results? Should we indicate fall 2014?)*

Student learning outcomes have been a priority since an accreditation visit in 2002. Since then, the Board of Trustees and the current Superintendent-President have lead the institutional push to advance the effort. Board goals and the President’s 12 Month Agenda set the direction for planning and the various College planning committees set and monitor targets through committee and task force group work. TracDat has been used for the collection of data and all new curriculum going to the curriculum committee must have SLO’s attached. The evaluation of current courses and programs is ongoing.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

None

**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**
An institutional code of ethics for all employees was developed through the President’s Leadership Council, which has representatives from all constituency groups, and was approved by the Board of Trustees in July of 2009. It defines ethical behavior, the importance of ethics, compliance with laws and details 11 ethical standards of practice for all staff. The employee code of ethics is accessible through the college website. (4.A.1)

The Academic Senate, Classified Union, Faculty Union, Part-time Faculty Union, Management Team and Associated Student Body all have selection procedures in place to ensure for participation on committees and shared governance bodies. It is the responsibility of representatives to communicate back to their colleagues on critical issues and decisions made by governing bodies particularly as they affect mission, goals and institutional values.

The College’s Educational Master Plan 2011-2016 (4.A.2) is the road map that drives institutional planning and it contains a statement of values that includes: Student Focus, Excellence, Equity and Diversity, Integrity and Responsibility. These values and the accompanying goals defined in the EMP surfaced from an extensive collegial process that included development of criteria for the plan, development of a mission statement, internal and external scans, a SWOT analysis, the setting of goals and measurable objectives and the setting of targets. Measurable objectives were developed for student preparedness, student goal attainment and equitable student success. Updates on the progress towards these goals are reported yearly at the spring College Planning Committee (CPC) meetings and to the Board of Trustees. This Plan includes the yearly Board of Trustee Goals, the President’s 12 Month Agenda, the work of the Planning Committees, and other strategic College initiatives such as Promise Pathways and Student Equity.

Institutional planning starts at the department and program level. Institutional and Board goals are used in the development of department planning. Every strategy proposed by the departments requires a connection to one or more of the goals. Yearly plans begin in the spring and are reviewed by representatives from the Department Planning and Program Review Committee. Each department or program develops strategies for improvement and enhancement of student learning. Suggestions for improvement are sent to the departments/programs, and the final plans are submitted in the fall. These plans are then forwarded to the dean of each of the schools and representatives from all departments and programs meet with their deans and use these plans to develop school plans. School plans are then forwarded to the Vice Presidents, where the VP level plans are established in consultation with faculty representatives. Vice President level plans are then brought to the CPC where they are reviewed by all participants who finalize the plans to be considered in the establishment of yearly planning priorities (4.A.3).

The college wide goals are used in department planning and shared with the Budget Advisory Committee who makes final recommendations back to the CPC. Institutional priorities for 2013-2014 continued a focus on student success and included maintaining the College’s fiscal stability, acquisition of funds to support success initiatives and support of professional development to align with institutional priorities. The CPC tasked a work group to come back with recommendations for 2014-2015 that also includes support for comprehensive programs at the Pacific Coast Campus.
The mission statement is easily accessible online and was projected on the large screen at each Board meeting in 2012-2013.

Self-Evaluation

Even though the College has a clear governance system in place for planning and resource allocation, many individual faculty – especially those not participating on planning committees – and some departments, have expressed concerns about why and how certain decisions are made regarding resource requests. At its May 2013 meeting, CPC discussed how to better integrate planning and resource allocation. They decided to have the Budget Advisory Committee forward budget assumptions to CPC as an action item prior to submitting them to the Superintendent-President. This gives CPC an opportunity to review, approve or recommend changes to the assumptions. They also decided to create a task force to study and recommend strategies to better align planning and resource allocation. The task force was formed in the fall of 2013 and the outcome was to revise the CPC Charge to include an annual presentation to BAC of institutional priorities along with a ranked list of augmentation requests developed through prioritization of Vice President-area goals and resource requests.” Each division is working to develop strategies for communicating back to units and levels regarding status of requests and how priorities were decided. Much more dialogue has taken place regarding this issue and the intent is for deans to work with department heads to better inform the department planning and program review process how planning is linked to resource allocations.

Findings from the College Governance Focus Groups revealed that those who are involved in department planning and those who attend board meetings are able to identify the college goals. This included administrators, managers, classified, but only some faculty and few adjuncts or students. The focus groups further indicated that that the College seemed to be better at innovation but that current processes do not provide clear places for bringing new ideas forward. There is a sense by both classified staff and faculty that they either do not have a way to bring forward innovation or that their ideas are not heard. The College Planning Committee is talking about strategies designed to bring innovative ideas forward to CPC from the department planning process. The College overall also realizes that there have been fewer funds for innovation and has had conversations in CPC about the need for innovation funding. One means of support has recently come from the Irvine Foundation Leadership Award designed to advance innovation practices within the College. The Superintendent-President has set aside a significant portion of the award money to fund faculty innovation in the next academic year.

Upper level administration is sensitive to the fact that there isn’t enough communication but is frustrated by the fact that all groups want to be consulted “in a timely manner.” Academic administrators distinguished between the general nature of the college goals and values and the day-to-day goals that are more measurable. They are concerned that some of the goals, especially student success, tend to overshadow all others and that goals such as creativity and innovation, for instance, have been shaved off in order to save money.
The classified staff in the focus groups felt that they were particularly close to the values—“we live and breathe them here……if we don’t follow this we won’t be employed.” Some faculty, on the other hand, had reservations about the competing demands of integrity and student success. Faculty expressed concern that in discussing student success we do not acknowledge the reality of student preparation: “not only are their academic skills not ready, but their soft skills—being on time, doing homework—arent’t ready, we have lost focus as a college on that.”

While the Institutional Survey results show that 67% of all employee groups are confident they understand their role in achieving college wide goals but 31% are not familiar with the college mission statement. The same survey suggested that 43% of the full time faculty and 24% of the classified staff feel that they have an opportunity to effectively participate in the planning and goal setting at LBCC.

The College continues to have considerable dialogue about what student success and related issues means to all. The Educational Master Plan, Student Success website page and Student Success Committee speak to the goal, definitions and committee charge respectively of student success. Further, the Student Success Committee is addressing the issues related to defining student success. There is a still a need, however, for expanded discussion, as well as a need to share the critical issues with all College groups to better understand what success means, why we are doing what we are doing, and what we need to do as an institution to ensure that our students truly succeed in their goals.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

College Planning Committee to complete the review of the current process used to tie planning to budget allocation and implement any recommendations for improvement.

Include the mission statement and goals as part of all new employee groups’ orientations.

Collegially continue to define student success that can inform and support all college initiatives and goals.

**List of Evidence**

4.A.2  [Educational Master Plan 2011-2016](#)
4.A.3  [College Planning Committee Meeting Agendas](#)
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

When the most recent Educational Master Plan for 2011-2016 was developed, the College established several values including: “Excellence” and “Integrity”. The “Excellence” value states: *We value innovation and creativity as part of our commitment to the continuous improvement of our educational environment.*” and the “Integrity” value states: *We encourage a civil and ethical campus environment and value the perspectives of all individuals.*” (4.A.1.1)

Through the various college-wide committees, faculty, staff, the management team, and students have the opportunity to discuss issues, bring forth ideas for change, and make recommendations. The membership of each committee is defined within the committee charge. The representatives to each committee are appointed by the respective entity (i.e. Academic Senate, CCA, CHI, AFT, ASB, etc.). Participation and input from all committee members is strongly encouraged at each meeting and the participants have the responsibility of taking back the discussion and decisions made to each of their respective constituent groups. Furthermore, Board Policy 2006 defines our Policy on Participation in Governance and acknowledges the Academic Senate, the Classified Union, and Associated Student Body as the official bodies representing their constituent groups. (4.A.1.2) As defined within Administrative Regulation 2006, the President’s Leadership Council (PLC) is the primary advisory body to the Superintendent-President for the purpose of reviewing proposed new or changes to existing policies/regulations. (4.A.1.3). Any person or group can propose changes to a Board Policy and/or Administrative Regulation which would then be sent to the PLC for review and approval before submitting it to the Board of Trustees.

The College planning process is designed to generate program plans and resource requests beginning at the program level in a roll up process to the vice president level. Each vice president's area has a faculty co-chair that reacts to and discusses the area's key objectives and needs. This in turn goes to the CPC for additional discussion and review. All planning committees have constituent group representation to ensure for input and feedback to objectives and goals.

Self-Evaluation

Throughout the college several innovative ideas have stemmed from employees and/or students including: designated smoking areas, Promise Pathways, PENGL classes, Math Boot Camp, alternative placement models, server virtualization, Coffee Mondays, iPad purchase for Cashier line, CUPCCAA, and Success Centers.
In Fall 2010, the Associated Student Body (ASB) passed a resolution asking for designated smoking areas on campus. As a result, we revised our Board Policy 7002 – Smoking in District Facilities and Vehicles in January 2011 and established designated smoking areas on each campus. (4.A.1.4) The smoking areas are now shown on our campus maps. (4.A.1.5)

The Promise Pathways initiative was launched in Fall 2012 as an extension of the Long Beach College Promise. Several committees exist in support of Promise Pathways each focused on a different initiative. As a result of this work we have: piloted a Math Boot Camp in Winter 2013 with a continuation of it in Winter 2014; created an English course entitled PENGL whereby students are placed in a combined course that are one-level below transfer or at transfer level with the goal assessing the students within the first few weeks of the course and determining whether they should remain in the course one-level below transfer or if they can be moved up to the transfer level course; implemented alternative placement models for both math and English.

At the 2012 Chief Information Systems Officer Association (CISOA), two of our employees (Mark Guidas and Arne Nystrom) were given an award for their innovation in virtualizing our servers and converting to a Voice-over IP system. (4.A.1.6)

One of the recommendations that came from the Collegiality and Morale Committee was to institute a time at which employees could gather together and mingle. In response, beginning on Monday, February 24, 2014, we implemented "Coffee Mondays" whereby all staff are invited to come to the LAC Faculty/Staff Lounge and the PCC Associate Vice President’s Conference Room between the hours 9:00 am - 10:00 am and 6:00 pm - 7:00 pm for a free cup of coffee. Various initiatives will continue to be tried to encourage staff to get to know each other and spend some time together in an informal setting.

Although we can cite several examples where our employees have taken initiative to make improvements, this feeling of empowerment doesn’t always flow through to the entire organization. When asked in the LBCC Employee Survey whether LBCC leaders encourage administrators, faculty, staff, and students (no matter what their official title) to take initiative in improving practices, programs and services, 40% of the total respondents either agreed or strongly agreed while 21.8% either disagreed or strongly disagreed. (4.A.1.7) When asked whether input regarding improving practices, programs, and services is encouraged, 50.6% of the total respondents either agreed or strongly agreed while 20.4% either disagreed or strongly disagreed. (4.A.1.8) At the same time when asked whether employees have the opportunity to be involved in making decisions about how work is done 61.9% of the total respondents either agreed or strongly agreed while only 11.9% either disagreed or strongly disagreed.

In the Fall 2013 Governance Focus Groups on Innovation and Decision-Making, some faculty, classified staff and academic administrators expressed considerable frustration about not feeling empowered enough to support student success and have the resources to support it. Some faculty stated that feedback is requested but when it is given “no one uses it.” There was an expressed need for more face to face contact with leaders and more leadership.
training for all groups and more level to level orientation. Those who seemed empowered talked about feeling very clear about their role and what was expected of them and how their work was interdependent with that of employees in other departments. (4.A.1.10)

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

None

**List of Evidence:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.A.1.1</th>
<th>Educational Master Plan 2011-2016 – Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.A.1.2</td>
<td>Board Policy 2006 – Participation in Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.A.1.3</td>
<td>Administrative Regulation – Participation in Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.A.1.4</td>
<td>Board Policy 7002 – Smoking in District Facilities and Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.A.1.5</td>
<td>Campus Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.A.1.6</td>
<td>CISOA Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.A.1.7</td>
<td>LBCC Employee Survey Results by Employee Group (page 74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.A.1.8</td>
<td>LBCC Employee Survey Results by Employee Group (page 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.A.1.9</td>
<td>LBCC Employee Survey Results by Employee Group (page 77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.A.1.10</td>
<td>LBCC Governance Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

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.

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**

LBCC’s institutional policies and procedures clearly describe the roles and involvement of each constituent group within the participatory governance structure. These written policies afford each constituent group information and opportunity for participation. Board Policy 1001: Policy on Policies and Administrative Regulations directs the Superintendent-President to recommend institutional policy “in consultation with the appropriate areas of the college”
Administrative Regulation 1001 outlines how each constituent group participates in the initiation, development, information dissemination, and recommendation of proposed policy before it is presented to the Board of Trustees (4.A.12). Board Policy 2006 further details the role of administration, faculty, staff, and students in college governance. This policy recognizes the Academic Senate as the official body representing faculty relating to academic and professional matters, the Classified Union (AFT), as the official body representing the majority of classified staff, and the Associated Student Body as the official body representing students related to student matters (4.A.13). The Academic Senate President is seated at the Board of Trustees’ table during the board meetings; a Student Trustee, elected by the student body, also sits at the Board Table and holds an advisory vote.

Administrative Regulation 2006: Administrative Regulations on Participation in Governance establishes the roles of all constituent groups (faculty, staff, administrators and students) in the decision-making process as it relates to policy and regulation development (4.A.14). The President’s Leadership Council is the primary advisory body to the Superintendent-President for the purpose of reviewing proposed new or changes to existing policies and regulations and is composed of representatives from the Academic Senate, full-time and part-time faculty unions, classified union, administrators and confidential employees, and the Associated Student Body. The college’s planning structure is coordinated through the College Planning Committee (CPC) with representation from faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators. Sub-committees and taskforces are appointed by CPC as needed and include broad representation.

AR 2006 also outlines additional areas where faculty and classified staff have specific responsibility in the decision-making process; for faculty, this includes academic and professional matters on which the Board of Trustees will rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate or will reach mutual agreement with the Academic Senate.

In accordance with its bylaws, full-time faculty are appointed by the Academic Senate as Academic Senators to represent their peers in discussions on academic and professional matters; Academic Senators have input on Academic Senate meeting agendas and are encouraged to voice suggestions and concerns expressed by other faculty (4.A.15). Academic Senate meetings are open meetings and representatives from part-time faculty, the Associated Student Body, and administration regularly attend.

The Curriculum Committee is the primary recommending body on curriculum and instruction and oversees five subcommittees: Academic Policy and Standards, Assessment Student Learning Outcomes, Associate Degree/General Education, Course Evaluation, and Program Planning and Review (4.A.16). The Academic Policy and Standards Committee, reviews, updates and adds to the present 4000-band policies and standards throughout the school year. These changes are then brought forward to the curriculum committee which has representatives from each department for either approval or denial before being forwarded for review by the President’s Leadership Council and the Board of Trustees.

Self-Evaluation
The findings from the recent LBCC employee survey indicate that the majority of the administrators, managers, and full time faculty understand the governance process while only 26% of the classified and 32% of the part time faculty indicated that they understood the process. Similarly, while 22% of all constituent groups have participated on a shared governance committee and nearly 50% viewed participation as part of their responsibility there was significant variance in participation by employee group. Administrators (56%) and full-time faculty (44%) were most likely to have participated on a shared governance committee, while classified staff (13%) and part-time faculty (8%) were least likely to have been on such a committee (4.A.17).

Results from LBCC Governance Focus Groups also stated the governance structure is based upon a constituent-representation model in which each group appoints representatives to committees and these individuals are charged with reporting back to constituents about the actions of the governing committee. While faculty and staff committee representatives are in general very diligent in their assignments, most employee groups were still frustrated by limitations in this structure.

- Most faculty and staff representatives found it challenging to report back to their groups.
- Some students considered the Associated Student Body to be “clique-y” and isolated, leading to issues in communicating to the larger student body.
- Faculty felt that all the communication from shared governance committees goes to the Academic Senate and rarely gets disseminated any farther than that body.

Focus group respondents—including full-time and part-time faculty and classified staff—felt they did not have consistent access to information about committees, processes, outcomes of committee work, and decisions. Respondents also stated that clarification on what “collegial consultation” means would be valuable in expanding involvement in shared governance structures. For example, respondents cited the need for greater clarity concerning expectations from committees/ and task forces to the college, from leaders to members, from leaders and members to represented groups, and from represented groups to committees and task forces. Comments also suggested the importance of identifying ways to help new committee members feel included, have a sense of belonging, and feel safe and welcomed in their role (4.A.18).

In an effort to ensure greater participation in the shared governance structure, the entire committee structure was revamped five years ago. The process included reducing the number of subcommittees and streamlining communication and decision-making lines as well as limiting the terms that committee chairs could serve. These changes have made committee participation more meaningful for committee members and has allowed more individuals the opportunity to serve on a committee, two key objectives of the reorganization. However, a lack of written information on past practices and committee chair training has left many of these chairpersons without guidance and directions. The college faces an even greater challenge right now in the area of encouraging participation in governance committees as the number of retirees increases dramatically each year and the number of new full-time faculty being hired increases as well. To address this issue, in spring 2014
Academic Council recommended a shared governance handbook be developed to assist in training new committee members and that new member training sessions be offered through staff and faculty professional development (4.A.19).

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

Under the direction of Academic Council, a shared governance handbook will be developed to assist in training new committee members on shared governance committees. In addition, training for new committee members will be included in the college’s professional development plan.

**List of Evidence:**

- 4.A.12 Administrative Regulation 1001: Administrative Regulations on Development of Policy and Administrative Regulations
- 4.A.14 Administrative Regulation 2006: Administrative Regulation on Participation in Governance
- 4.A.15 The Bylaws of the Academic Senate of Long Beach City College
- 4.A.16 Curriculum Committee web page
- 4.A.17 LBCC Employee Survey Results by Employee Group (pages 62-63)
- 4.A.18 LBCC Governance Focus Group Results (page ?)
- 4.A.19 Academic Council Summary Notes, March 6, 2014

**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 has clear policies and administrative regulations in place that establish governance structures and roles for all constituent groups. (Administrative Regulation 2006 - Participation in Governance). The policy also documents the acknowledged role of all constituent groups at the College as required by Education Code and as integrated into locally established College policies and Regulations as follows:

**Board of Trustees**

- The Board is the ultimate decision-maker in those areas assigned to it by state and federal laws and regulations
- The Board is committed to its obligation to ensure that appropriate members of the District participate in developing recommended polices for Board actions.
Academic Senate

- Official body which represents the faculty in shared governance relating to academic and professional matters
- Policies and procedures on academic and professional matters shall not be adopted until consultation has occurred

Classified Union

- Official body which represents classified staff in collegial shared governance, exclusive of collective bargaining issues.
- Recommendations and opinions of the Classified Union shall be given every reasonable consideration

Associated Student Body Cabinet

- Official body representing students in shared governance relating to student matters.
- Students shall have the opportunity to participate effectively in the formulation and development of policies and procedures that could have a significant effect on students

Administrators, Managers, and Confidential

- Represented by individuals appointed from the Executive Committee

The President’s Leadership Council is the primary advisory body to the Superintendent-President for the purposes of reviewing new or changing policies and regulations. It also serves as a consultative body to the President on issues of college leadership and matters of college wide importance other than those not subject to consultation as defined in Board Policy 2006. The College planning process and structure is laid out in 2006.b (Planning process and committee structure) which also outlines purpose and review of committee charges.

Administrative Regulation 2006.8 establishes a list of academic and professional matters for which the Board of Trustees rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate. Policies on academic and professional matters in which the Board of Trustees will reach mutual agreement with the Academic Senate are documented in AR 2006.9 and 2006.10. (4.A.20) The Academic Senate has the right to communicate in writing and/or appear before the Board of Trustees. Faculty, staff and student appointments on committees are documented in AR 2006. 12, 13 and 17-19. Through the respective constituent groups, faculty, staff and students are invited to participate in matters of governance. Appointments to shared governance committees and councils are at the discretion of each group. The planning committee structure also provides each committee with the opportunity to convene task forces and working groups as needed when issues arise that require additional review and assessment. These groups are generally for a fixed period of time. Each committee,
council, or task force is organized around a charge that provides for a specific purpose or goal to be accomplished by the respective group.

Self-Evaluation

A college wide survey completed in November of 2013 demonstrated that almost 90% of those surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that they understood their role in helping LBCC achieve its goals. A majority of employees feel proud to work at the College, feel loyalty to the College and are willing to work harder in order to help the College succeed. A majority of managers, confidential employees, and part-time faculty stated in the survey that we all work together collaboratively; however, less than 50% of the administrators, faculty and classified agreed with this statement. In addition, a majority of employees disagreed or strongly disagreed that there was a climate of mutual respect and trust amongst all groups (4.A.21). This may be due, in part, from the significant budget reductions the College has experienced over the past four years. Prior to 2013, reductions were made to the extent possible in discretionary areas only. Recognizing that an operating deficit was not sustainable, the College Planning Committee, at the direction of Academic Council, set criteria for program discontinuance. After 18 months of work that included data gathering, presentations to the Academic Council and public presentations to the Board of Trustees, the Board voted in January of 2014 to discontinue 11 programs. These actions, along with administrative reorganizations, lead to a reduction in force for faculty, administrators and classified staff (4.A.22).

The survey also asked employees to indicate what their top three areas of improvement would be at the College and “morale” surfaced as the number one area that needed to be improved. With this in mind, the Superintendent-President established a “Collegiality and Morale Advisory Group,” consisting of 25 members form all employee groups, that has met three times thus far this academic year and continues to review issues and make recommendations for improvements.

AR 2006 stipulates that each college group involved in the participatory governance process is responsible for communication. Most of these groups have their agendas and minutes posted on the college web site. However the findings from both the Focus Groups and the Survey indicate that communication continues to be an on-going college issue. The majority of constituents who completed the survey indicated that there are many forms of communication available at LBCC and that it is clear and easy to understand, but there was a concern in some groups about how difficult it is to find out information about governance at the college. Several groups felt that they are not informed about the actions of governance committees and indicated it was difficult to find minutes. There were also some issues with committee information either not always being kept up to date or nonexistent in some cases. Students were most satisfied with the communities they found in smaller programs at the college but felt that they were unable to find much of a community within the college overall. Even though they try to become involved, some adjuncts do not feel that their departments include them yet others think their departments are extremely supportive and inclusive (4.A.21).
The findings also point to a need for communication to be easier and more comfortable among different groups: “I feel we are so low on the totem pole they won’t listen to us,” classified staff say about faculty; “You only speak to those at your same level,” classified staff say; students say they “want to be heard” and want to “interact directly with administrators.”

The Department Planning and Program Review Committee is discussing the communication and work flow between various groups and committees, in an effort to determine where to place the great ideas/projects/strategies from Department Plans that didn’t move forward into the School Plans. They want to ensure ideas do not “sit idle” for a year, or get lost in the process.

While the Academic Senate has made an attempt to provide links to all of the college wide committees, tests of the links on the committee link site indicates that very few of these groups have had the time to update their web page to include even their charge, let alone their agenda and minutes 4.A.23).

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

College leadership should develop communication strategies that allow for better inter and intra level information sharing and input from all constituencies.

**List of Evidence**

4.A.20 Administrative Regulation 2006: Administrative Regulations on Participating in Governance
4.A.21 LBCC Employee Survey Results by Employee Group (p.   )
4.A.22 LBCC Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes, January 22-23, 2013
4.A.23 Committees List

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

**Descriptive Summary**

Long Beach City College places a high value on its relationship with all external agencies. LBCC understands that as an effective institution of higher learning, it must seek out, develop, and nurture partnerships and collaborative relationships with outside agencies and organizations. Whether corporate commercial governmental, institutional, public, non-profit, volunteer, local, national or international, engagement with all external agencies is governed by institutional values that are centered on honesty, integrity, and respect.
Long Beach City College is committed to the mandate for public disclosure in all areas of its operation. Documents and data that define or inform institutional operations and activities are accessible online through the college web site. Additional information is also available through print media, the Long Beach City College cable network, College Advancement and Economic Development (4.A.24), or by specific request from an individual or group. This includes but is not limited to the following:

- Board Agendas, meeting schedules, actions and announcements, and cablecasts of all Board of Trustee meetings
- Student information, class schedules, catalog information, registration, etc.
- Administrative information and access to employment opportunities, salary information, budget information institutional planning, employee organization, etc.
- Bond Construction information, including construction updates, cautionary notices, budget reporting, scheduling, etc.
- The Loop (the college’s online information newsletter), the Viking, (the college’s student newspaper), departmental and organizational web pages, etc.
- Response to emergency situations that may impact college operations (Emergency Preparedness Committee) AR 6005 establishes this…but do we still have one?
- Accreditation Reports, self-study and other institutional reports, midterm reports and institutional responses, Commission recommendations, etc.

The college’s Mission Statement calls for an “ongoing commitment to excellence in student learning.” In support of that mission, Long Beach City College has made it a high priority commitment to respond proactively to all recommendations made by the Accreditation Commission.

Self-Evaluation

Actionable Improvement Plans

List of Evidence:

4.A.24 College Advancement & Economic Development Home Page

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

Descriptive Summary

The College Planning Committee (CPC) plays an important role at the college serving as the coordinating body for the college’s planning efforts in support of institutional priorities. It is through the structure of the CPC that planning issues are discussed and recommendations are
made for decision-making purposes. The District’s Administrative Regulation 2006.2 requires that “the results of the college decision-making processes are regularly reviewed.” Administrative Regulation 2006.6 (B.2) also requires that CPC’s planning process be reviewed annually and information about the structure, process, and content of planning be published for ready access by the campus community (4.A.25).

At the same time, processes and decision-making are also governed by the institution’s collective bargaining agreements. Bargaining agreements are typically negotiated on an annual basis with the full agreement open for negotiation every three years. The negotiation process allows the parties to address issues of concern and propose and agree to changes in Agreements that supports institutional effectiveness.

In the spring of 2013 the Academic Senate’s Consultation on Governance Committee completed an anecdotal survey that focused on shared governance and leadership issues from a faculty perspective. Results from the survey brought about in Senate Resolution 48.4 resulted in a task force charged with tracking the faculty concerns regarding collegial consultation and decision making as it relates to a variety of issues (4.A.26, 4.A.27). Exhibit:

In the spring of 2013, the Accreditation Steering Committee co-chairs conducted employee focus groups on leadership and governance at LBCC. Then in October 2013, they conducted an online employee survey, which provided for a comprehensive evaluation of leadership, governance and institutional effectiveness (4.A.28).

Self-Evaluation

The college provides multiple avenues for evaluating the leadership and institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes as a means to assure their integrity and effectiveness. Such matters are routinely discussed at CPC and the discussions and decisions are memorialized in the CPC minutes published on the District’s website for campus-wide review. For example, at the May 21, 2013 CPC meeting a recommendation was made on the integration of planning and resource allocation. The recommendation provided for the creation of a task force to study and recommend strategies to better align the decision making process between planning and resource allocation. Exhibit: May 21, 2013 CPC minutes:

Further, in fall 2012 a recommendation was made at CPC to disband and reassign the tasks of the Enrollment Management Committee. However, some members expressed concern that some of the department heads might feel that they would not be involved in enrollment management decisions. Consequently, the recommendation was further reviewed by Academic Senate and the Academic Council. Thus this issue was fully vetted by the principal parties involved and ultimately led to the Enrollment Management Oversight Committee’s continuance.
At the same CPC meeting a recommendation was also made to disband and reassign the tasks of the Pacific Coast Campus (PCC) Task Force. Since the PCC Educational Plan had been developed and implemented, a consensus was reached that the PCC Task Force would be disbanded and an advisory group created. It was determined that the advisory group would include community members, students, faculty, staff and administrators. It was decided that the group would not report to the CPC, but directly to the AVP of PCC. Exhibit: November 8, 2012 CPC Minutes: http://agendas.lbcc.edu/Agenda_Minutesdocs/department_9/minutes/2012_2013/CPC_Summary_Notes_110812.pdf

Yearly negotiation sessions have led to multiple process improvements including a revised full-time and part-time faculty evaluation process which supports the effectiveness and integrity of the evaluation process; a new part-time faculty hiring process, which supports the integrity of the hiring process in alignment with equal employment opportunity guidelines; and a newly initiated department head evaluation procedure which includes performance factors, a rating system, an improvement plan (where appropriate) and a Department Head Academy in support of the effectiveness of our faculty leadership. These proposed process changes were vetted through the faculty constituencies prior to ratification of the Agreement. The Academic Senate’s Resolution 48.4 adopted on May 21, 2013 identified a number of decision-making, collegial consultation, and communication issues. These issues were discussed at the October 4, 2013 Academic Council retreat. Since that time the various work groups: 1) Communication, 2) Trust and Respect, and 3) Planning have continued to address the respective issues at each Academic Council meeting. At the March 6, 2014 Academic Council meeting it was acknowledged that many of the issues that had surfaced previously had been or were being addressed. However, there are still some issues that need to be addressed. See Academic Council minutes of November 14, 2013 and March 6, 2014.

The employee online survey conducted by the Accreditation Steering Committee co-chairs resulted in a forty-four percent (44%) response rate, which included responses from all employee groups. On November 14, 2013 the results of the survey were discussed at Academic Council. These results have also been shared with the accreditation standard teams. These responses will prove to be the basis for continued improvement plans.

### Actionable Improvement Plans

Working with the co-chairs of the accreditation team, re-evaluate the usefulness of each question from the online survey. Use the most valuable questions to set up short yearly employee surveys. Rotate the questions so that the survey is new each year, but all questions will have been covered once or twice by the next accreditation visit.

### List of Evidence

- 4.A.26 Academic Senate Action Minutes May 24, 2013
- 4.A.28 College Planning Committee minutes of October 17, 2013
Evidence List for IV.A

IV. A Descriptive Summary
Code of ethics
The 2011 – 2016 Educational Master Plan

Link to College Planning Committee Agenda and Minutes
Minutes from May 2013 the CPC
Charge of CPC

IV. A Self Evaluation
LBCC Governance Focus Groups
Institutional Survey
CPC Minutes

IV.A.1 Descriptive Summary
Department Plans

IV. A.1 Self Evaluation
LBCC Governance Focus Groups
Institutional Survey

IV.A.2 Descriptive Summary
Administrative Regulations 1001 on Development of Policy and Administrative Regulations
Administrative Regulations 2006
Board Policy 2006
Department Planning and Program Review web site.
Academic Senate Motion 39:5
Administrative Regulations 2006

IV. A.2 Self Evaluation
LBCC Governance Focus Groups

IV.A.3 Descriptive Summary
Administrative Regulations 2006
Administrative Regulations 2006.8
AR 2006.9 and 2006.10
AR 2006.11
AR 2006.12
AR 2006.13
AR 2006.14 – 2006.19
College Planning Committee charge

IV. A.3 Self Evaluation
Institutional Survey
The Department Planning and Program Review Committee minutes from December 7, 2012
Committee link site

IV.A.4 Descriptive Summary
College Advancement and Economic Development

IV. A.4 Self Evaluation

IV.A.5 Descriptive Summary
Senate Resolution 48.4
Consultation on Governance sub-committee task force

IV. A.5 Self Evaluation
Academic Senate Minutes from 11/22/1013 and 12/6/2013
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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.

Descriptive Summary

The Board makes clear its governance role through the establishment of written policies that outline governance roles and responsibilities, legal requirements and direction and oversight of the Superintendent-President (Policies 1000-1004 and 2000-2032).

Board duties and responsibilities, outlined in Policy 2016, focus on setting ethical standards, hiring and evaluation of the Superintendent-President, delegation of authority to the Superintendent-President, assuring fiscal health and stability, monitoring and tracking institutional performance and educational quality, and advocating and protecting the District.

Board Policy 1004 directs the Superintendent-President to ensure for a comprehensive, integrated and systematic participatory governance planning process that involves all College constituencies and is supported by data from institutional research. The current five year College Educational Master Plan (Inst. Effectiveness website, 2011-2016 Plan) was approved by the College Planning Committee and the Board of Trustees in December, 2011. For the first time in its history, the College has identified targeted, measurable outcomes and a tracking system to monitor student success and equity. The Master Plan is now able to inform the Board Goals and the President’s 12 Month Agenda and ensures for better alignment between both.

The current planning structure, developed by Academic Council, designates key committees with written charges for each. The committees inform and react to the EMP, Board and President’s goals and all planning issues related to effective student learning programs. They also react to issues involving budget recommendations and priorities and as they relate to fiscal stability.

In addition, the College participated in the California Leadership Alliance for Student Success (CLASS) Initiative for trustees, CEOs and faculty which focused on key strategies and policies to increase successful outcomes for Community College students. The Governance Institute for Student Success (GISS) in April and October, 2013 hosted by the
LBCC Board of Trustees and President Oakley in conjunction with the American Association of Community Colleges, was another outgrowth of student success efforts. It brought together other trustees and CEOs to engage in policies and measures to increase student success.

The selection of the Superintendent-President (Board Policy 2020) requires the Board to establish a search process to fill the vacancy and that the process is fair, open and complies with relevant regulations. The current Superintendent-President, Eloy Oakley, was selected in 2006 and hired officially as of January 2007. A search and selection process presentation was presented to the full Board and public in May, 2006 and detailed the critical selection elements including expectations, goals and the process.

Board Policy 2021 on Evaluation of the Superintendent-President requires the Board to complete an annual evaluation. The process is developed and jointly agreed to by both the Superintendent-President and the Board. Criteria used for evaluation is based on board policies, the Superintendent-President’s job description and performance goals and objectives developed jointly by the Superintendent-President and the Board. A new Management and Professional Development/Evaluation Personnel Plan, initiated by the Superintendent-President, was approved by the Board in August 2012 and provides for a comprehensive 360 evaluation of all Management Team employees including the Superintendent-President. In fact, the Superintendent-President was the first President and member of the Management Team to participate in the new evaluation process which included input from a broader reach of constituents that included faculty, administrators, staff, professional colleagues and community members. (See Management Professional Development/ Evaluation Personnel Plan) The plan has been extended to all members of the Management Team starting January, 2014.

Self-Evaluation

Faculty had expressed concerns in the past that they did not have the opportunity to participate in the Superintendent-President’s evaluation, but the new 360 process now has allowed for critical input from faculty as well as administrators, classified staff and students. For the first time ever, this goes beyond Board input only in evaluating the Superintendent-President. The Superintendent-President’s current contract was changed by the Board in July, 2013 to state that rather than an automatic 4% step increase, any increase up to 4% would be dependent upon achieving goals and objectives as reviewed and agreed upon in the President’s annual evaluation. There is no longer an automatic 4% step increase on a yearly basis as set forth in the previous contract.

The Board has asked for and has received regular status reports to check progress in meeting accreditation requirements and has pushed the College to complete the process (Cite list of accreditation reports to Board).

Actionable Improvement Plans

None
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**

LBCC is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees elected by District defined areas and one student trustee who is elected by the students. Policies 2000 and 2016 states that the Board of Trustees of the Long Beach Community College District is the governing body of the District and that the Board governs on behalf of the citizens of the District in accordance with the authority granted and duties defined in Education Code Section 70902.

As reflected in the Board’s Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice policy and regulations, the Board must be “independent, impartial and responsible for governance in the District and conduct themselves in an ethical manner that does not present the appearance of a conflict of interest.” This commitment is detailed further in Administrative Regulations 2014 that outline commitment, primary tasks, intra-Board relationships, relationship with the Superintendent-President, and delegation of authority, Board evaluation and unethical behaviors. None of the Members has any ownership in the institution. http://www.lbcc.edu/Policies/documents/2014reg.pdf

Policy 2016 states that the Board must represent the public interest and advocate and protect the District.

Public Participation at Board Meetings is detailed in Policy 2031 and describes how the public directly brings business related to the District to the attention of the Board. All Board meetings are public and governed by the Brown Act. The Board ensures that the public is heard through two public comments sections on the Board Agenda: one for items on the agenda and one for items not appearing on the agenda. The Board acts by majority vote, exclusive of the Student Trustee’s advisory vote. Commencing in January 2014, with the current Board President, each Trustee now publicly casts a verbal vote either way on action items. http://www.lbcc.edu/Policies/documents/2031pol.pdf

The Board participates in an annual retreat and self-evaluation process to help them measure their governance and policy role; community relations and Advocating for the College; Board and CEO relations; and Board leadership and organization.

**Self-Evaluation**

In order to assure that the community is fairly represented, and to compensate for the increase in population as indicated by the 2010 Census, it was necessary to adjust the legal boundaries of trustee areas within the Long Beach Community College District. The new boundaries became effective in the April 2012 Board of Trustees election. A map with additional College links is on the website for the public to visit when they may not know who their Trustee is for their area (http://www.lbcc.edu/geninfo_board.cfm)
The Board of Trustees has worked in the past few years to clarify and improve its self-evaluation process. In a summary review of the past four years done at the July 23, 2012 retreat, the Board scored themselves the highest in the area of Board/CEO relations. Community Relation/Advocating was ranked second with Policy and Board leadership ranked either third or fourth. The Board believes that there is an increased focus on policy v. administrative matters but also indicates that there has been a decline in sufficient time for providing a vision for the College. Overall, the Board believes that once a decision is made, members uphold the decision. Results have consistently shown the Board perceives itself as acting as a unified whole. Board Self-Evaluation for 2012-2013 with Rating by Assessment Year from 2010 through 2013. Board Policy 2016.

Actionable Improvement Plans

None

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 mission statement for Long Beach City College is as follows:

Long Beach City College is a comprehensive community college that provides open and affordable access to quality associate degree and certificate programs, workforce preparation, and opportunities for personal development and enrichment. The college develops students’ college-level skills and expands their general knowledge, enables their transfer to four-year institutions, prepares them for successful careers or to advance in their current careers, and fosters their personal commitment to lifelong learning. Based upon a commitment to excellence, college programs foster and support the intellectual, cultural, economic and civic development of our diverse community.


To ensure that the College supports student learning and student success, the Trustees develop Board Goals on a yearly basis in alignment with the Superintendent-President’s 12 Month Agenda. The College planning process, in turn, aligns with these goals to inform and guide the program planning and review process.

The College Educational Master Plan’s Mission, Values and Goals statements focus directly on equitable student learning and achievement as well as academic excellence and workforce development (Educational Master Plan 2011-2016). The four primary goals include Student Success, Equity, Community and Resources and each goal has stated strategies for achieving established quantitative measurable objectives. The Master Plan now actually informs the Board Goals and the President’s 12 Month Agenda.

College policies and Administrative Regulations 4000, 4001, 4002, 4005, 4012, 4019, and 4024 ensure that programs, degrees and certificates are of high quality and in alignment with the College mission and educational master plan.

The College Planning Committee receives budget recommendations from the Budget Advisory Committee which are also developed in consideration of the Board of Trustees' Goals and the President’s Twelve Month Agenda. Institutional resource requests must be integrated into department and unit program planning and review for consideration and they must demonstrate how requests are linked to planning and achieve major college goals. http://www.lbcc.edu/AdminServices/budget-advisory-comm.cfm)

Self-Evaluation

College wide planning has undergone a continuous process of alignment and improvement the past few years. Beginning with the Trustees and the Superintendent-President, the College planning and review process -- through its various committees and planning at the individual instructional and support area levels -- has aligned planning and resource allocation with institutional goals and objectives as developed and refined each year.

From 2007 on, the primary goals at the College have been to support and measure the impacts of Student Success, CTE and Workforce/Economic Development, fiscal stability and the allocation of resources in a manner that prioritizes these goals (List of Trustee goals 2007-09, 2009-11, and 2013-14).

The College continues to improve the linkage of program planning and review and resource allocation to achieve critical College goals and objectives. There is a “roll up” process for budget requests that are derived from program planning, department planning, and school planning followed by rollup to vice president level planning, which is then reviewed by the College Planning Committee (CPC).

In spite of continuing and improving alignment, some faculty and departments have expressed frustration that their resource requests are not acknowledged and that once requests enter their plans and move up the chain, they get “lost.” Many faculty have wondered what the reasons are for not getting funded for certain requests. To address this issue, the planning process now includes language in program plan guidelines that requires input at each level for any resource requests not accommodated: department heads to faculty, deans to department heads and vice presidents to deans. In addition, the CPC tasked a work group to review the charge of the Budget Advisory Committee. The CPC accepted the work group’s
recommendations to include language that requires the BAC and CPC to have a joint yearly meeting to review together institutional priorities and guidelines.

There is also a level of frustration by some faculty and administrators that the planning process has gotten cumbersome with an overly burdened committee structure comprised of many of the same repeat participants. In response to this, the CPC at the end of 2012-13 put forth a recommendation to the Academic Council to review and assess the current planning structure. The Academic Council in November of 2013 (Minutes from AC meeting here) designated a task force to review issues and recommend an improved process and possible structure to address the concerns. The current task force group met in November, 2013, identified key issues and will take back to Academic Council in spring of 2014 recommendations that include improving communication and recommendations for process gaps. The goal is to complete the review process by the end of spring semester and implement any changes beginning fall, 2014.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

Complete the planning structure review and bring forth recommendations to Academic Council. Implement any recommendations in fall, 2014.

Monitor efforts to improve communication regarding resource decisions.

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

**Descriptive Summary**

Policy 1001 (Policies and Administrative Regulations) requires the LBCCD Board of Trustees to be an independent body whose actions are final and are not subject to any other entity. It also defines responsibilities of the Board and Superintendent-President. The Board approves all new courses, programs, certificates and degrees (Policy and Administrative Regulation 4005).

Policy 1002 (District Mission, http://www.lbcc.edu/Policies/documents/1002pol.pdf;) and Policy 2009 (Educational Equity) introduce the focus on quality, effectiveness, opportunity, success and excellence in the District mission. Yearly Board Goals and the President's yearly College Agenda focus on student success and fiscal stability in support of academic excellence and a proactive pursuit of equality in educational goal attainment for students. (Board Goals and President’s 12 Month Agenda)

The Educational Master Plan 2011-2016 – (http://www.lbcc.edu/Planning/EMP11-16final.cfm) provides a mission statement and a set of written values and goals with measurable objectives and a process for determining and tracking objectives. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) provides leadership and coordination of efforts involving Accreditation, institutional planning, program planning and review, and institutional
research. The Board has asked for and receives regular updates on both accreditation and progress of SLO implementation at the College. (47 IE presentations from 2008-09 on—see list)

Policy 1001 (Policies and Administrative Regulations) requires policies to be consistent with provisions of law and that all District employees are expected to know and observe all provisions of law pertinent to their job responsibilities. Policy 2016 (Board Duties and Responsibilities) defines institutional mission and sets prudent, ethical and legal standards for College operations.

Policy 6008 (Delegation of Authority for General Business) stipulates that the Board delegates certain authority to the Superintendent-President including the “Budget, audit and accounting of funds” and requires the President to “make periodic reports to the Board…. and keep the Board fully advised regarding the financial status of the District.”

Administrative Regulations 6010 delineates the budget development process, guidelines and timeline. In 2005, the Board of Trustees adopted Board Policy and Administrative Regulation 2013 which requires an annual, independent audit report. Both were updated again in 2009 with another revision to the AR occurring in 2013. Within the AR, the Board has established an Audit Committee comprising of the Board President and one additional Board member that is appointed annually. As required by Title 5 regulations, the audit reports are submitted to the Chancellor’s Office by December 31st of each year after they have been presented to the Board of Trustees for adoption. (See item 12.9 of Board agenda on Dec. 10, 2013 as an example:
http://agendas.lbcc.edu/Agenda_Minutesdocs/department_10/agendas/2013_2014/12-10-13%20Agenda2.pdf )
http://www.lbcc.edu/Policies/documents/6008pol.pdf

Furthermore, Proposition 39 which passed in 2000, requires any district that has a Bond Fund, approved by voters under Proposition 39 guidelines, conduct both an annual financial and performance audit of the Bond Funds. Both the Bond Financial and Performance Audits are presented to both the Board of Trustees and the Citizens’ Oversight Committee (COC) on an annual basis. (See item 12.9 and 12.10 of Board agenda on Dec. 10, 2013 as an example:
http://agendas.lbcc.edu/Agenda_Minutesdocs/department_10/agendas/2013_2014/12-10-13%20Agenda2.pdf and the COC agenda from Jan. 27, 2014:
http://www.lbcc.edu/BondProgram/documents/COC/COCAgenda1_27_14.pdf of the Bond Audits being presented to the Board and COC.)

Self-Evaluation

In response to state budget reductions and to maintain structural and operational fiscal stability, budget cuts have taken place the past four years which included reduction in force for administrators, classified staff and faculty. The need for reductions lead to a thorough review and assessment of 19 instructional programs considered for program discontinuance.
The College Planning Committee developed and agreed on criteria for budget reductions and the Academic Council heard presentations from 19 programs. The Board of Trustees allowed testimony from all considered programs and 11 gave presentations. In addition, the Board heard public testimony from hundreds of people at Board meetings from August 2013 through January, 2014. The entire process began in March, 2011 and was completed in January, 2013, at which time the Board approved 11 programs for discontinuance.

The Board changed the required reserve from 5.5% to 5% in the 2012-13 fiscal year in response to continuing budget reductions imposed by the State.

Each of the last six years, the district has undergone independent external audits for both the District funds and the Bond Funds (under Proposition 39 guidelines). The external auditors met with the Board Audit Committee related to the District Audits each year on the following date April 17, 2013 (Janet and Bob, please fill-in dates for Audit Committee meetings with Board). Furthermore, as evidenced by the COC meeting agendas, the audit reports were presented to the COC each year as well.


Actionable Improvement Plans

None

**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 2000 series of Policies and Regulations on Board governance describes the Board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure and operating procedures as well as election procedures, terms of office and process for elections or provisional appointments, timelines and public notifications.

The Board publishes its policies and procedures on the College website as follows:

- **Board’s Size** - Policy 2023
  

- **Duties & Responsibilities** - Policy 2016
  

- **Structure** – Policy/Regulations 2015
  
Self-Evaluation

Board minutes are on file and posted on the college website for public access but to accommodate increased access and transparency, all Board meetings are videotaped and shown via the College website on YouTube and on local cable stations.

Actionable Improvement Plans

None

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

A primary duty of the Board is to establish policies consistent with the California Community College Board of Governors and applicable laws of the State of California for College governance. Policy 1001, updated in February, 2009, describes the process of recommending policies and for developing all Administrative Regulations.

The Superintendent-President is responsible for recommending policies and developing administrative regulations in consultation with the appropriate areas of the College. The College is nearing the end of a comprehensive review of all policies and regulations in response to the Superintendent-President’s directive.

A Board Policy Matrix was developed to assist in tracking which policies are determined by law, or deemed necessary to the operations of the District.

IV.B.1.e. Matrix - Board Policy Project (PDF)

Agenda samples containing policy actions and regulations information:
Self-Evaluation

In the last accreditation cycle, the College recognized that many policies needed to be updated and that when a policy change was approved, there was no procedure to ensure that the new policy was documented and placed in the manual. Since the last report, the Superintendent-President has directed all vice presidents to initiate a review of policies and procedures related to their areas. The District has created or revised 67 of the 141 (47%) Board Policies and 59 of the 125 (47%) Administrative Regulations since our last accreditation visit.

Per a planning agenda item from the last accreditation cycle, Policy 1001 was updated but further work needs to be done on a regulation to ensure that there is a written policy for documenting and placing new policies in the Policy and Administrative regulations Manual.

Actionable Improvement Plans

None

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

The Board recently revised the policy on Board Development and Orientation (Policy 2017 on Board Education) to include additional detail regarding trustee orientation, orientation to the mission and Educational Master Plan of the College and professional development opportunities to increase knowledge of governance, finance, accreditation and student success. Three of the five trustees are currently enrolled in the Effective Trustee Program offered through the California Community College League (CCLC) and, in fact, the current president of the Board, Jeff Kellogg, is the first trustee graduate. The program is designed to facilitate the ongoing education of all trustees in California community colleges by providing a solid foundation for effective board governance. The CCLC also provides all new trustees a Trustees’ Handbook which includes a progress tracking system. "Administration Policies/Regulations 2017 – Board Education"

Terms of Office
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Policy 2023 on Board of Trustees Election, revised and adopted October 25, 2011 details the election process for the Board including areas, terms and staggered terms. Policy and Regulation 2024 speak to resignations and vacancies on the Board as well as elections and provisional appointments to fill vacancies as subject to conditions outlined in Education Code 5091. Regulation 2024 outlines procedures for appointments, elections and special elections.

Policy and regulation 2024 – Vacancies on the Governing Board

Self-Evaluation

The Board has recognized that new member orientations are critical to establishing a coherent and informed governance body and governance process for the College. Their efforts to define and clarify policies better are intended to meet this need. Due to two Board resignations and other city wide elections, at least two and perhaps more Board seats will be up for consideration. It is anticipated that the new Board orientation process will be implemented beginning in July, 2014.

Actionable Improvement Plans

None

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

Administrative Policy 2018 provides for completion of an annual evaluation by Board members each year. At a full day retreat and study session, the Board discusses the results of their yearly self-assessment survey. The evaluation process includes quantitative measurements in the areas of: Governance and Policy Role; Community Relations and Advocating for the College; Board and CEO Relations; and Board Leadership and Organization. Also at this retreat, the Board identifies accomplishments and sets goals for the next year.

Adoption of new Board Self-Assessment Form 08_26_08 Action (pdf)
Board Self Evaluation for 2007-2008 (pdf)
Board Self Evaluation_final_2007-08 PowerPoint (pdf)
Board Self Evaluation_final_2012-13 Board Retreat 07_23_13 (pdf)
Board Self Evaluation_final_2012-13 Board Retreat 07_23_13 (pdf)
Board Self Evaluation for 2011-2012 Board Mtg October 23 2012 (pdf)

Self-Evaluation

A new Board Self-Assessment Form was adopted by the Board in August of 2008 with the intent of aligning more closely and clearly Board and College established goals. Modification of Parts II and III has allowed for better alignment and opportunities to consider new issues facing the College. The process is public and results are available to the public also in written form. It should be noted that the form used by the Board since 2008 now allows for a scoring process with quantitative measures tracked over time and showing areas that need improvement. This enables the Board to focus discussions and actions to be taken on areas of concern.

Link new Board form here

Actionable Improvement Plans

None

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

In 2008, Board Policy and Administrative Regulation 2014 - Board of Trustees’ Code of Ethics/Standards of Practice was adopted to list ethics and standards of practice which included regulations for monitoring commitment, primary tasks, intra-Board relationships, Superintendent-President/Board relationship, delegation of authority, evaluation of the Board and unethical behavior. The policy states that the Trustees “shall be independent, impartial and responsible in their governance of the District and shall conduct themselves in an ethical manner that does not present a conflict of interest.” (IV.B.1.h.1 and IV.B.1.h.2).

Board Self Evaluation_final_2012-13 Board Retreat 07_23_13 (pdf)

Self-Evaluation

The Board of Trustees has developed a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code. Fortunately, they have never been put into the position of having to deal with any issues in violation of the code of ethics.

Actionable Improvement Plans
None

List of Evidence:

IV.B.1.h.1  Board Policy 2014
IV.B.1.h.2  Administrative Regulation 2014

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

Descriptive Summary

The Superintendent-President ensures that the District complies with the accreditation process and standards of the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges and of other District programs that seek special accreditation. The President keeps the Board informed of approved accrediting organizations and the status of accreditations and makes sure that the Board is involved in any accreditation process in which Board participation is required.

Accreditation Update-SLOs Implementation 10-23-12 (pdf)
Accred Update__BoT 07_23_2013 (pdf) Policy 1003

On July 24, 2012 during the reorganizational meeting, Board Member Otto was appointed as the Board’s liaison to serve as a resource to Standard IV: Governance and Leadership. The appointment ended in July 2013, but Member Otto, with the Board’s consent, has continued working with the team for Standard IV: Appointment of Board Liaison (Accreditation) (pdf).

Self-Evaluation

In the Board Goals 2009-2011, updated and adopted in August, 2010, report dates were assigned to respond to the goals that would provide Trustees the ability to measure the progress of the below adopted Board Goal:

1. MEASURE AND IMPROVE STUDENT SUCCESS

D. By September 2010, review progress in implementing the 2009 ACCJC Accreditation Recommendations and the 2008 Institutional Self-Study Planning Agendas. Thereafter, receive Periodic Reports on the status of meeting the criteria of the ACCJC for reaching proficiency for institutional effectiveness, as defined by the ACCJC Rubric.

The District’s Accreditation Liaison Officer regularly presents information to the Board on the accreditation process. In addition, Member Otto has been participating in committee work and provides both input to the committee and information to the Board on the progress of Standard IV committee work. The Superintendent-President also provides the Board with a summary of any accreditation commission reports, recommendations and any actions taken or to be taken in response to recommendations by the Commission.

List of Board Presentations by Institutional Effectiveness)
Final_Accred Update__BoT 10_22_2013 (pdf)
Accreditation Update-SLOs Implementation 10-23-12 (pdf)
Accred Update__BoT 07_23_2013
Final_Accred Update__BoT 10_22_2013 (pdf)

Actionable Improvement Plans
None

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

The Board hired a new Superintendent-President, in 2006 through a broad-based screening and selection committee with representation from all constituent groups including external community members. Open forums were held for all candidates. Board Policy 2020 requires establishment of a search process that is fair, open and complies with regulations. Board Policy 2020 [http://www.lbcc.edu/Policies/documents/2020pol.pdf]

Board Policy 2021 requires an annual evaluation of the Superintendent-President that complies with the contract of employment. (Evaluation of Superintendent-President- [http://www.lbcc.edu/Policies/documents/2021pol.pdf]) The job description, performance goals and objectives are developed jointly each year by the Board.

Board Policy 2019 delegates authority from the Board to the Superintendent-President. The Board provides oversight to the District for governance and authorizes the Superintendent-President to administer and execute policies and decisions of the Board and responsibility for District operations. The Superintendent-President recommends policies to the Board and develops recommended Administrative Regulations for each policy. The
Superintendent-President fulfills the duties of the job description as determined in his contract, Board of Trustee goal setting and annual evaluation process. 
http://www.lbcc.edu/Policies/documents/2019pol.pdf (delegation of authority to Superintendent-President)

The Board President communicates with the Superintendent-President and requests that the Board receives bi-annually, annual or quarterly updates on these performances. Policy 2019 states that the Superintendent-President shall make available any information or give any report requested by the Board as a whole.

Self-Evaluation

In 2009, the Board developed Board Policy 2020 on the selection of the Superintendent-President that requires the Board to establish a search process that is fair, open and complies with relevant regulations.

The Board pushed for a more comprehensive evaluation plan for the Superintendent-President. In 2012, the Superintendent-President established a new performance-based Management Professional Development/Evaluation Plan for the entire Management Team. It provided for broader input of college constituencies via a 360 evaluation. This included input from faculty who had expressed concerns in the past that they had not been able to evaluate the Superintendent-President.

The Superintendent-President was the first administrator to complete the new evaluation plan and it has been extended to all Management Team members as of January of 2014.

Actionable Improvement Plans

None

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

Descriptive Summary

As the Chief Executive Officer of the District, President Oakley is ultimately responsible for the quality of instructional programs and services provided to students and the community. Board Policy 1004 on Institutional Planning directs the Superintendent-President to ensure that the District has and implements a broad-based comprehensive, systematic and integrated system of planning that involves appropriate segments of the college community and is supported by institutional effectiveness. In collaboration with constituent leadership, the
Superintendent-President is responsible for establishing a viable, supportive, transparent college planning process that ensures for constituent input into college decision-making with a focus on student success and completion. The Superintendent-President is also responsible for ensuring a financially viable college and encouraging appropriate staff development in support of student learning. The Superintendent-President makes sure that institutional decisions are supported by robust institutional effectiveness efforts that provide timely and relevant data for institutional decision-making.

Self-Evaluation

The College planning structure is the process by which recommendations are made and decisions are acted upon regarding planning for academic and professional matters as well as budgetary matters. Under the leadership of the Superintendent-President and faculty leadership, the College underwent a reorganization of its planning process in 2007 which ensured for more constituent participation with a modified committee structure. One problem was that the number of official planning committees had increased to a point that was deemed unmanageable. It was recommended by the College Planning Committee and supported by the Academic Council last academic year that, once again, there were too many committees while some of the key committees needed a thorough review of charges (minutes of CPC and Academic Council here). The CPC this year intends to assess the current committee structure and charges and make recommendations to the Academic Council by Spring, 2014 for a possible reorganization of the College planning structure.

The Superintendent-President is responsible for bringing to the Board a tentative and final budget each year. The budget process is tied directly to planning through the College planning and review process. The Budget Advisory Committee provides recommended budget assumptions to the CPC which makes recommendations to the Superintendent-President who then makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

The College has college wide professional development programs that focus on legal compliance and various staff development trainings. In addition, each staff division at the College provides professional development opportunities to its staff. Faculty oversee professional development for full and part time faculty. Budget reductions the last four years have reduced funding for professional development in general and the College is looking at ways to increase funding and opportunities for faculty and other staff. Through the leadership of the Superintendent-President and the Board, the College continues to have a very focused agenda on student success and completion and the College planning groups have had discussion regarding the need to look at institutional wide professional development as a way to foster greater support for student success.

With increasing needs for data driven decision -making, the Superintendent-President has pushed for and the College has increased staff and expertise in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

Actionable Improvement Plans
None

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

In 2007, the Superintendent-President published an “18-Month Agenda for the Advancement of Student Success and Community Development” which identified academic excellence and student success (learning and equity), institutional advancement (teamwork and organization), and community and economic development (infrastructure and learning) as key areas of focus in achieving the mission of the college (4.B.2.1). These areas were further advanced in the president’s 12-month agenda presented in July 2008 and 24-month agendas presented in 2009 and 2012 (4.B.2.2, 4.B.2.3, 4.B.2.4).

In support of these agendas, the Superintendent-President has implemented an administrative structure that encouraged progress towards student success and community development outcomes. In 2008, an academic administrative reorganization was implemented that created an instructional School of Student Success and a new dean position with oversight of newly created student success centers at both campuses. In this reorganization, the District also promoted the integration of student success across college divisions by housing distance learning under Administrative Services; in 2011, this integration was further extended by moving the Kinesiology Department under Student Support Services. The 2008 reorganization also included the creation of the Dean of Academic Services position, whose major duties include curriculum and scheduling and the Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, whose duties and responsibilities include research and planning. To support the growth in economic development efforts, multiple new administrative positions were created, including the Executive Director of Economic Development and the Director of College Advancement, Public Affairs and Governmental Relations. These changes aligned the college’s administrative structure with the college’s objectives that would ultimately be captured in the 2011-2016 Educational Master Plan (4.B.2.5).

Evaluation procedures for managers are outlined in Board Policy and Administrative Regulation 3007 (4.B.2.6, 4.B.2.7). A process for evaluating academic reorganizations was also developed through Academic Council to review all academic reorganizations since 2008 (4.B.2.8).

Self-Evaluation

In 2007, the Superintendent-President hired the existing Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs in order to bring continuity and continuation of initiatives to the college. This position was flown unsuccessfully and the interim was retained through 2012 until a successful hiring process for a permanent vice president could be completed. In 2012, a
permanent Vice President of Academic Affairs was hired but then resigned after a year, leaving the position vacant once again. The Superintendent-President filled the interim position for 2013-14 with a seasoned administrator who had previously served as Vice President of Academic Affairs for the college from [insert dates here]. A new hiring committee has been convened with the intent to fill the permanent Vice President of Academic Affairs position for the 2014-15 academic year.

Meanwhile, the Superintendent-President has brought long-term stability in the other vice president positions, including the Vice President of Administrative Services, Vice President of Student Support Services, and Vice President of Human Resources. In 2012, the full executive team structure was reinstated with the appointment of the Vice President of College Advancement and Economic Development to the position of Executive Vice President.

In response to multiple years of budget reductions, the District reorganized its academic administrative structure by eliminating two academic dean positions and combining a dean and an associate vice president position. In this reorganization, oversight of the Pacific Coast Campus was combined with oversight of Academic Services and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness was aligned with the academic School of Student Success. Both of these reorganizations are being closely monitored to ensure the new structures are able to produce the student success outcomes outlined in the Educational Master Plan and a review will occur in spring 2014.

In fall 2013, the article related to faculty department head assignments in the faculty contract was revised to clarify the responsibilities of department heads, modify the formula for assigning reassigned time and stipends, and increase department head visibility through designated on-campus hours. The changes also included an assessment process for department heads to be performed by the area dean and two faculty members with the opportunity for performance improvement and/or removal from the position where appropriate. In addition, the article includes a new section on department head departmental recall procedures, again to ensure accountability for these quasi-administrative positions [http://www.lbcc.edu/HumanResources/documents/080113ArticleXIII-DeptHeadAssignments.pdf].

In 2012-13, the Superintendent-President introduced to the Board of Trustees a performance-based incentive plan for the management team, which as piloted in 2012-13 and fully implemented in 2013-2014. The plan replaces guaranteed annual step increases with salary increases contingent upon a management team member achieving “exceeds expectations” in the overall performance evaluation. The performance evaluation was also modified to include a weighted formula factoring in a management team member’s performance of duties listed in the job description, the completion and level of difficulty of management objectives, performance of other assignments, completion of professional development activities, and the results of a behavioral rating survey completed by a group of 15 employees composed of supervisor, subordinates, faculty leaders, and other peers at the college.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**
None

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

- Establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;

**Descriptive Summary**

The Superintendent-President oversaw the development of the 2011-2016 Educational Master Plan, which entailed a two-year process involving participation from all college constituent groups and input from the community and from local industry. In 2010-11, an environmental scan was administered and collected input from 2,184 respondents, including community members, current and past students, and LBCC faculty and staff. Further community input was received during four community forums held at both campuses. In addition, an internal scan was conducted based upon plans that were created through the college’s planning and review process which was launched in fall 2009. Through this process, plans developed at the department level informed school level plans which ultimately fed into the Vice President-level plans for Academic Affairs, Student Support Services, Community Advancement and Economic Development, Human Resources, and Administrative Services. The resulting Vice President-level plans and the environmental scan were used to inform an in-depth analysis of the college’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. This analysis was a key component used to develop the strategic goals of the Educational Master Plan and was carried out by over 60 faculty and staff of the Vice President planning groups.

The 2011-2016 Educational Master Plan includes measurable objective and performance targets that guide the annual planning process at the department-, inter- and Vice President-levels of planning and program review processes. Each year, the three levels of planning are overseen by the College Planning Committee; annual status updates on the college’s performance toward reaching the established goals are based on objective outcome measures and documented implementation of activities. The majority of these outcome measures directly related to student success and learning.

**Self-Evaluation**

In 2012-13, the Academic Council, co-chaired by the Superintendent-President and the Academic Senate President, oversaw the development of a standardized evaluation process for reviewing academic reorganizations to allow for broader input from faculty and staff. The process outlines the composition of an evaluation workgroup (including faculty, staff, and administrators), the administration of an internal/external survey, and key data components to be reviewed. Once the review is completed, recommendations are made to Academic Council regarding any potential changes. In spring 2013 this process was used to evaluate the 2008 reorganization of distance learning into Administrative Services. A workgroup used the
process to review the 2011 reorganization of Student Affairs, Kinesiology, and Athletics in spring 2014.

After a few years of compounded budget reductions from the State, the college prepared itself for the possibility of the discontinuance of some academic programs. In spring 2012, the Superintendent-President requested that the President’s Leadership Council—composed of the leaders of each constituent group and bargaining unit—review the existing Board Policy and Administrative Regulation 4024 on program establishment, modification, and discontinuance to address any concerns that might exist; no changes were made to the existing policy or administrative regulation. The superintendent-president then charged the College Planning Committee with establishing, in collaboration with the Budget Advisory Committee, criteria for determining budget reductions across the college. When programs were recommended for discontinuance in 2013-14, the administrative regulation was strictly followed and the budget reduction criteria informed the decisions made.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

At the conclusion of the program discontinuance process in 2013-14, the Academic Council requested that Administrative Regulation 4024 be reviewed and modified based upon the experience of the recent reductions. This administrative regulation has been reviewed by an Academic Senate sub-committee and will be fully discussed in Academic Council. Once final changes are recommended, the administrative regulation will be sent to the President’s Leadership Council for final review.

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

- ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;

**Descriptive Summary**

The research and data analysis capacity of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has been dramatically increased over the last six years. This precedent was firmly established in 2008 with the development of a comprehensive evaluation plan for the strategies and outcomes of the LBCC Student Success Plan. In creating the evaluation plan, a research consultant was hired to support development of and early implementation, and measurable objectives were tracked for program goal. Starting in 2011, a highly professional research team was hired into the Office of Institutional Effectiveness under the Associate Dean, including a Director of Institutional Research and three Research Analysts, to further support research and data analysis. This research support enabled the college to develop strong data-sharing agreements with CSU Long Beach and Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) through the Long Beach College Promise. For example, a dataset representing over 6,000 LBUSD students who matriculated to LBCC over five years was used to establish high school performance indicators linked to student performance in college-level coursework through the alternative assessment model piloted in the Promise Pathways program. This same dataset was also used...
to identify key “leakage points,” or points of attrition, of Latino students moving through the educational pipeline in Long Beach as part of a community-based Latino student success grant.

In the development of the 2011-16 Educational Master Plan, both internal and external conditions were analyzed in establishing goals through the use of surveys, local industry data and workforce trends, community town halls, and student performance metrics. The data metrics linked to the Educational Master Plan goals are also disaggregated annually and are provided to instructional and support departments to use in conducting program review activities and in establishing new goals.

Self-Evaluation

In 2012, LBCC’s research team was awarded the California Research and Planning (RP) Group’s [award] for its work on linking high school performance indicators to performance in college-level coursework. Based upon this work, the Chancellor’s Office conducted an expanded study of LBCC’s model at 6 different institutions across the state with positive results and a statewide database is being developed to enable all California community colleges to implement an alternative assessment model founded upon LBCC’s research. This work was further recognized in 2014 when LBCC was awarded the Mertes Research Award by the Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA).

The Superintendent-President was also recognized by the James Irvine Foundation in 2014 for his leadership in closing equity gaps in student performance based upon the data-driven evaluation systems developed in Promise Pathways. Through this award, funding will be made available in 2014-15 for instructional departments to pilot new student success strategies using predictive analytic models conducted through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

Actionable Improvement Plans

None

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

- ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes;

Descriptive Summary

As early as 2007, the Superintendent-President established a strong commitment to integrating resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes in his 18-Month Agenda for the Advancement of Student Success & Community Development. This commitment was continued in the 2008 and 2009 12-month President’s Agendas and in the
2012 24-month President’s Agenda. A faculty SLO Coordinator position with reassigned time was created in 2005 and then institutionalized; this position was further supported by a team of faculty “SLO Officers” receiving stipends to coordinate SLO implementation in each instructional school. In addition, in fall 2013 a full-time Educational Assessment Research Analyst was hired to support the ASLO subcommittee and faculty with SLO assessment.

The Superintendent-President’s 24-Month Agenda 2012-2014 was developed to “better align [the college’s] planning process and resources with the Trustee goals and Educational Master Plan” (p. 1). Key components of the 24-month agenda include continuing to support the development and implementation of outcomes assessment, focusing on the use of data to improve student learning and achievement; prioritizing the implementation of the Educational Master Plan goals and measure and report on their implementation and impact; strengthen the integration between college planning, review, and decision-reaching processes and evaluate how resource allocations lead to improved institutional effectiveness; and review the college’s career technical education (CTE) programs and support the efforts to align those programs with the workforce needs and ensure that program certificates and degrees lead to meaningful employment and future funding opportunities.

Self-Evaluation

As SLO assessment results are more widely communicated at the program and institutional levels, the more resource allocations can be directed toward closing gaps observed between actual student performance and the standards for SLOs that have been established by faculty. The effectiveness of programs and the institution in utilizing resources that support SLO assessment and improvement plans will also be evaluated as part of the cyclical process of planning, resource allocation and review. The first complete set of general education outcomes, as assessed through custom items of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement, will be available fall 2014.

Actionable Improvement Plans

None

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

- Establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.

Descriptive Summary

In 2007, the Superintendent-President led the revision of the former planning process through the Academic Council, addressing “disconnects” that existed in the planning process within the previous shared governance structure. This task has been reflected in each of the President’s Agendas between 2008 and 2012 and continues to be discussed in Academic Council and the College Planning Committee.
Self-Evaluation

The Planning process has been evaluated over the last six years beginning after the first year of implementation in 2009 through the use of a survey that targeted individuals who had served on a standing committee or taskforce; refinements were implemented based upon survey input. Another survey was administered in 2012 that sought college-wide feedback. In addition, the Program Planning and Program Review subcommittee (now called the Department Planning and Program Review subcommittee) evaluated the processes as well, focusing specifically on the format of the data provided to faculty to be used for planning and review and on the prompts built into TracDat, the database the college uses to collect and report planning, Student Learning Outcomes, and Service Unit Outcomes assessment information. In spring 2013, focus groups with all constituent groups were run as part of the college’s evaluation of governance, which included participants’ experience with planning. Also in fall 2013, employees were surveyed regarding the use of the planning process to inform decision-making about resource allocations, and this information was reviewed by the Academic Council. All of the evaluation activities were carried out by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, which reports directly to the Office of the Superintendent-President.

Actionable Improvement Plans

None

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

In his 2007 18-Month Agenda, the Superintendent-President stated that “through this agenda, the leadership of the college will focus its resources on achieving the objectives of the Educational Master Plan.” This focus was continued in the 2008 and 2009 12-Month Agendas as well as the 2012-2014 24-Month Agenda. The most recent President’s Agenda identifies five priorities consistent with the Educational Master Plan and the Trustees’ Goals: student success, planning and governance, fiscal stability, building program, and economic and workforce development.

Self-Evaluation

The Superintendent-President ensures that all pertinent statutes, regulations and Board policies are easily accessed from the LBCC website at http://www.lbcc.edu/policies/. This site is accessible directly from the Superintendent-President’s page as well as from the Faculty and Staff resources tab at http://www.lbcc.edu/facultystaff.cfm. Through the President’s Leadership Council, all board policies and administrative regulations are reviewed on a regular basis and then agendized on the Board of Trustees’ meeting agenda.
In 2012-13, the Superintendent-President, working closely with the Executive Committee and the Board, ensured that program discontinuance followed administrative regulation 4024 on Program Establishment, Modification, and Discontinuance.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

None

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

**Descriptive Summary**

In each of the last three President’s Agendas, the Superintendent-President has put forward goals involving fiscal stability. The goals established included reducing in deficit spending, maintaining an adequate reserve, and adjusting to the ever-changing State budget impacting LBCC. These goals are used to inform both the Board of Trustees goals and by the individual departments when they are preparing their departmental plans. In order to accomplish the President’s goals, the Superintendent-President works closely with the Vice President of Administrative Services on all budgeting and financial information. The Superintendent-President effectively led LBCC through the recent State financial crisis by establishing the Fixed Cost Reduction Taskforce which ultimately advised on ways to reduce fixed costs; overseeing the program discontinuance process; establishing targets for reductions commiserate with revenue levels received from the State, and aggressively going after additional resources. Furthermore, in January 2010, the Superintendent-President recommended and the Board of Trustees adopted BP 6010-Policy on Budget Preparation which established a minimum of 5.5% unrestricted general fund reserve. Each year, the Budget Advisory Committee incorporated the changes resulting from the major initiatives undertaken within the Adopted Budget and presented these recommendations to the Superintendent-President for approval. The results of all of these efforts are evident by the amount of reserves in each of the six years seen in the following chart:
Self-Evaluation

The Superintendent-President practices effective oversight of budgeting and expenditures. At least quarterly, the Vice President of Administrative Services reviews and discusses the financial statements and current projections with the Superintendent-President during their meetings. The Superintendent-President stays abreast of the budget proposed at the State level and requests details on how those proposals will affect LBCC. The Superintendent-President confirms that the Board of Trustees stays abreast of the current and projected financial statements by requiring the Vice President of Administrative Services to present Quarterly Financial Statements at the end of each quarter. Furthermore, at the Board Retreat on July 23, 2013, an in-depth look at the past four years of Apportionment Cuts and Expenditures was presented and discussed as shown below:
### Apportionment Cuts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ongoing Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>One-Time Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>Total Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>% Increase/ (Decrease) From 2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10 Recalc</td>
<td>($3,428,505)</td>
<td>($336,836)</td>
<td>($3,765,341)</td>
<td>(3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11 Recalc</td>
<td>2,382,049</td>
<td>(307,263)</td>
<td>2,074,786</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 Recalc</td>
<td>(7,277,394)</td>
<td>(1,832,720)</td>
<td>(9,110,114)</td>
<td>(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13 Year-End</td>
<td>1,046,456</td>
<td>(4,566,076)</td>
<td>(3,519,620)</td>
<td>(5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4-Year Total</strong></td>
<td>($7,277,394)</td>
<td>($7,042,895)</td>
<td>($14,320,289)</td>
<td>(16.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount of Cuts</th>
<th>Total Increase/(Decrease) From 2008-09</th>
<th>Percentage Increase/(Decrease) From 2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>($5,200,000)</td>
<td>($3,742,069)</td>
<td>(3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>($5,500,000)</td>
<td>(4,471,849)</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>($5,800,000)</td>
<td>363,219</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13 Tentative Estimate</td>
<td>($5,100,000)</td>
<td>(5,094,343)</td>
<td>(4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4-Year Total</strong></td>
<td>($21,600,000)</td>
<td>($12,945,042)</td>
<td>(11.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These graphs indicate that without the Superintendent-President’s direction of reducing the college’s deficit spending and matching expenditures commiserate with revenues provided, the District would not be in the financial share that it is in today. As is demonstrated, LBCC was cut over $14 million in revenues and was effectively able to reduce overall expenditures by almost $13 million after undergoing over $21 million in budget reductions.

### Actionable Improvement Plans

None.

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

#### Descriptive Summary

Over the last six years, the Superintendent-President has worked diligently to communicate effectively with the communities served by LBCC through a wide variety of efforts. Beginning in 2008, the Superintendent-President holds an Annual State of the College Luncheon, a free event that allows over 400 community members, student leaders and employees from all groups to hear a report on the accomplishments of the past year and the agenda for the coming year. In support of the Long Beach College Promise, annual events
and reports keep communities informed of the partnership and its key initiatives. The Superintendent-President is also engaged in the press and public relations efforts of the college and regularly appears in printed, online and broadcast outlets to provide timely information about programs and developments at LBCC. In addition, a Community President’s Newsletter is published several times a year to brief the community and other key stakeholders on policy issues and developments at the college.

Extensively involved in leadership at the national, state, and local levels, the Superintendent-President serves on the SB 1440 Implementation Team, AACC Board of Directors, CA Forward Board, Campaign for College Opportunity Board, Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Long Beach Rotary Club, and the St. Mary’s Medical Center Board. The Superintendent-President has also engaged in advocacy efforts which include the passage of legislation to support LBCC’s programs and goals—SB 650 the Long Beach College Promise Partnership Act and AB 955 the CA Community College Intersession Extension Act.

To promote internal communication, the Superintendent-President publishes college-wide memos at the start and close of each semester to share important information about changes in state policy and important campus updates; the Superintendent-President has also used video messages posted on YouTube to reach more students. Several times each year, the Superintendent-President hosts constituent forums (college-wide, classified staff, students, ASB) to receive feedback and address constituent concerns. Specific topics of forums held in the last six years include state budget updates, staffing program changes at LBCC, program discontinuance, Promise Pathways, and AB 955.

Self-Evaluation

The 2013 employee survey results showed that the majority of employees neither agreed nor disagreed that the Superintendent-President communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution (3.18 mean). Administrators (3.79), managers (3.86), and part-time faculty (3.51) were more likely to agree with the statement, while full-time faculty (2.54) were less likely to agree.

Communication efforts made by the Superintendent-President have been monitored to determine effectiveness. External communication efforts led to the passage of Measure E Bond with 73% support from voters in 2008 and to board awareness of the Long Beach College Promise, which has been cited as a model at the State and national level by the Little Hoover Commission (Fall 2013) and the White House Initiative on Excellence in Education for Hispanics (Winter 2011). The college has also seen regular coverage of its initiatives in local and regional press.

Successful advocacy led to the passage and implementation of two pieces of legislation specific to LBCC – SB 650 and AB 955 – but also increased broader awareness of LBCC as an innovative college and leader in key reform efforts, especially through the Promise Partnership, which resulted in 30 members of the California Senate conducting a two-day education summit at LBUSD and LBCC. The close working relationships of the Promise
Partnership have also led to successful implementation of Promise Pathways, the AB 86 planning grant application, Career Pathways Trust grants, and 100K in 10 teacher STEM training grants to name only a few.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

While the communication efforts over the last six years have been strong, efforts to improve communication with the community and college constituencies will continue. For example, budget reductions and the increasing use of online registration ended the longstanding practice of mailing class schedules to every household in the district. To improve communication efforts on campus and between colleagues, the Superintendent-President will implement the recommendations from the Morale and Collegiality Committee which has been meeting this academic year.