4A. 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.

4A1. 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 of significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

Description:

One of the four institutional goals set forth in the Educational Master Plan (EMP), 2005-2010 calls for effective teamwork and organizational development. The rationale behind this goal states, “Trust is an inherent component within the organization that must be addressed mutually in order to successfully achieve the goal of teamwork/organization development and implement its strategies for serving students of the 21st century.” Among the strategies identified to achieve this goal, the EMP calls for the creation and facilitation of opportunities “for informal interactions across organizational boundaries” and for the implementation of “formal processes to improve communication and coordination across organizational lines.” This high-level document communicates the college’s commitment to creating and supporting an environment in which all college employees are encouraged to collaborate in realizing a common vision and achieving shared goals.

Board Policies 2006, 2009, and 2010, and 2012, all of which were written prior to 2002, call for an environment of participatory governance that, in addition to the Board of Trustees and administration, includes faculty (through the Academic Senate), classified and support staff, and students. While these documents were last revised in 2002, a group under the direction of the Curriculum Chair is currently working to update Board Policy 4005, which provides an outline of the duties of the Curriculum Committee and its subcommittees. Furthermore, Superintendent-President Oakley’s 18-Month Agenda, reassigned spring semester 2007, calls for the establishment of a Superintendent-President’s Leadership Council, which brings together the appointed leaders of the college, including faculty, staff, and administration, to promote effective leadership and communication throughout the college.

Long Beach City College’s opportunities for empowerment attempt to extend to all who are on its campus. The college and faculty have made student learning outcomes a priority since the last self study. In 2002, the accreditation visiting team recommended moving quickly to advance the effort by resolving issues related to the student learning outcomes coordinator position and the necessary reassigned time. The college applied for a Title 5 Cooperative grant in 2003-04, and funding for coordinator reassigned time and faculty stipend funding became available. Since then, much progress has been made to infuse learning outcomes
into faculty development and departmental planning. For example, an address by former Superintendent-President Kehoe at a 2005 Flex Day called for a commitment to Student Learning Outcomes. Following her address, all 2005-2007 professional development calendars included Student Learning Outcomes training. With a coordinator in place, the ASLO committee and the coordinator began activities and a process by which instructional student learning outcomes are developed and assessed. The college is currently in the fourth year of a five-year Title 5 cooperative grant in collaboration with California State University Long Beach (CSULB). The grant provides for 40% funding for the Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator while the College provides 20% of the funding. The momentum of a college-wide student learning outcomes effort is well underway. This collaboration between the faculty and college leaders has been recognized as a priority, and the appropriate funding will be available to continue this effort when grant funding subsides (History of Student Learning Outcomes at LBCC).

More recently, on August 21, 2007, a new planning structure was approved by the Academic Council, a council which is represented by the Superintendent-President, the Vice Presidents, and faculty who serve on the Academic Senate Executive Committee. The new planning structure was developed with the intent of providing broad-based participation and expedient processes for decision-making through the work of task forces. At the same time, a task force co-chaired by the Vice President of Academic Affairs and a faculty member was created to restructure department planning and program review processes so that the processes coordinate with institutional planning and budget development.

The campus further strives to encourage empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence throughout the campus community in the following areas:

**Professional Development**

The Superintendent-President set in his 18-month Agenda the goal of developing a comprehensive professional development plan. The plan is to establish organizational learning priorities and to leverage existing and future resources to accomplish broad, college-wide learning objectives. Thus, through the Faculty Professional Development Program, funding has been available for individuals for discipline-related professional development. District-wide grant funding and reassigned time for faculty in support of activities promoting institutional excellence have also been provided. As an example, during fall 2007, the District supported reassigned time for 24 full-time faculty equivalents. Such activities include chairing of key committees such as Curriculum and Faculty Professional Development. Furthermore, sabbaticals have been routinely approved for faculty.

Although the faculty maintained a Faculty Professional Development Program, limited opportunities for professional development existed for management and the classified staff. This led the Staff Planning Committee to recommend a Professional Development Program which would also include management and classified staff. Consequently, in 2007, with the support of the Superintendent-President and under the leadership of Human Resources, a Professional Development Program was developed, and a new Staff Development Coordinator was hired. The Professional Development Program will serve as the umbrella organizational unit for all professional development activities which include management, classified staff, and faculty.

Administrators, managers, and classified staff attend a variety of conferences such as the Community College Leadership Development Initiatives program. And administrators and managers have regularly attended Admin 101, a professional development program focused on community college administration. Both faculty and administrators have regularly attended the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development. Furthermore, opportunities to attend conferences are extended to classified staff who are eligible for benefits such as tuition reimbursement and conference funding. Student Services has also held annual Staff Development Days for student services classified staff to address their professional development needs.
Committee Work
Campus planning committees and task forces include administration, faculty, classified staff, and students. New faculty orientation also encourages participation in participatory governance as an option for fulfilling the College Service requirement, and incoming instructors learn of such committees through the Academic Senate’s Professional Development Committee activities such as panel discussions. A faculty member and an administrator are designated as co-chairs on the College Planning Committee and on the Hiring Priorities Committee. Classified employees also serve on administrative and classified hiring committees.

Students are invited to participate on planning committees. Former planning committees that have had student representation included the Educational Master Planning Committee, Budget Advisory Committee, Student Development Planning Committee, AQSESS (with representatives from both the Liberal Arts and Pacific Coast campuses), and the Facilities Planning Committee.

Hiring
Hiring is one area in which LBCC’s leadership and governance extend to all on its campus. Job announcements include language that shows a commitment to participatory governance as part of the requirements for many positions. During the last three attempts to hire a Vice President of Academic Affairs, faculty, administrators, and classified staff attended discussion forums with each finalist. This new discussion format first took place in spring 2005. Furthermore, within administrative hiring committees, administrators, faculty, classified staff, and students serve as voting members. To ensure effective and appropriate decision-making processes, equal employment opportunity training is conducted for every employee engaged in hiring committees.

Evaluation:

Careful examination of the college’s shared governance structure shows that while structures are in place to allow all constituents of the campus to participate in leadership, there are certain areas for improvement.

The establishment of the Professional Development Program in 2007 reflects a commitment by the college to create a “learning organization” for its staff. However, while the college has embarked upon a Professional Development initiative, the lack of adequate funding will continue to impede the progress necessary in this learning effort. As part of the college’s goal under Teamwork/Organizational Development, the institution supports an environment that provides for organizational development while at the same time creating a learning organization. As such, a comprehensive professional development program will demand more financial and human resources than have been allocated to date.

Within hiring committees, the training format not only indicates a respect for hiring regulations, but it also shows that all members of a hiring committee have received an amount of training that allows them to be full participants of committees. However, the Equal Employment Officer does not have the right to vote on hiring committees, which has the effect of marginalizing the Equal Employment Officer’s input. This issue runs counter to the institutional value of inclusiveness and shared governance. This issue is being studied in the Staff Diversity Task Force.

Planning Agenda:

Ensure that the newly created Professional Development Program includes an adequate allocation of budget to meet the increased and varied needs of all constituent groups.

Review the voting rights of members serving on hiring committees based on the institutional values of inclusion and shared governance.
4A2. 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 relates 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.

Description:

The College’s institutional policies and procedures clearly and definitively describe the roles and involvement of each constituent group involved in the participatory governance structure. These written policies afford each constituent group information and opportunity for participation "that allows for systematic participative processes … that are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation." Administrative Regulations 1001 on Development of Policy and Administrative Regulations provides detail on initiation of proposed policy by all constituent groups as well as development, information dissemination, and recommendation of policy to the Board of Trustees. Administrative Regulations 2012 details the role of the Classified Senate in participatory governance and the opportunity to communicate with the Board of Trustees through the Superintendent-President. In 2003, the Classified Senate ceased to exist, and the AFT Classified Union took on that participatory governance role. In this way, the Classified Union represents the majority of classified staff in providing recommendations and opinions to the Board in a collegial participatory governance structure as outlined in Administrative Regulations 2006. The faculty are represented and given a voice through their Academic Senate President, who sits at the Board of Trustees' table during Board meetings. Students are given a voice by submitting recommendations and/or concerns to their elected Student Trustee, who has an advisory vote on the Board of Trustees and who also sits at the Board Table.

Board Policy 2006 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 and college planning, implementation, and review. The planning process and planning committee structures are outlined in Administrative Regulation 2006.6. The regulation further stipulates the purpose of the group as a whole. The newly restructured College Planning Committee structure was approved by the Academic Council in August 2007 (Planning Structure Revision). The membership is an inclusive list of college-wide constituents comprised of the following:

1. All members of the Superintendent-President’s Executive Committee, excluding the Superintendent-President
2. The Academic Senate Executive Committee
3. A representative from the department heads, elected by the department heads.
4. A representative from the instructional deans
5. A representative from the student services deans
6. A representative appointed by ASB
7. A representative appointed by CCA
8. A representative appointed by CHI
9. A representative appointed by AFT
Administrative Regulation 4005.4 states that curriculum development is primarily the responsibility of the faculty, but students, administrative and community involvement also have a role in the decision-making process. Administrative Regulations 2009 identifies the role of the Academic Senate in participatory governance, and the Board of Trustees acknowledges that its members rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate on academic and professional matters. This policy further elaborates the responsibility of both the Board of Trustees and the faculty to reach mutual agreement on the aforementioned matters. Board liaisons are also appointed by the Board of Trustees at the annual May reorganization meeting to Human Resources, Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, and a liaison to the Budget Advisory Committee, Pacific Coast Campus, Student Services, Governmental Relations and to the Legislative Advocacy Committee. These Board liaisons are responsible for maintaining contact with management staff for input and serving as a resource to the Board of Trustees in their respective areas of expertise.

The composition of the Hiring Priorities Committee includes the executive committee of the Academic Senate as well as the Vice Presidents and the Deans. Through this representation, faculty provide input into the institutional decision-making process as it relates to hiring full-time faculty. Board Policy 301 and Administrative Regulations 301 state that the selection of faculty shall be determined through consultation among the various segments of the college: faculty, administrators, students, and others when appropriate. This is accomplished by providing representation from all constituencies to participate actively in the recruitment and selection process.

Evaluation:

This standard addresses the themes of institutional commitment and evaluation, planning, and improvement. A structure for participatory governance at Long Beach City College is in place. In the formation of any committee that has to do with curriculum or instruction, a faculty co-chair is designated that reports to the Academic Senate, and the college continues to work actively to include collegial consultation language into administrative job descriptions. Dialogue by the Academic Council in August 2007 resulted in the newly restructured College Planning Committee, with an inclusive list of college-wide constituents.

As specified in the Board Policies and Administrative Regulations, mechanisms and protocols have been established to provide constituents with an opportunity for input into the institutional decision-making process. Progress has been made toward the goal of participatory governance, and efforts have been made to renew a climate of respect and professional courtesy across the campus, although in areas of academic and professional matters, some disagreements and communication lapses continue to occur.

Administrative Regulations 2012 identifies the Classified Senate as the body that represents classified staff in collegial governance, while the Classified Senate was dissolved in 2003 and the AFT Classified Union assumed this role.

Planning Agenda:

Update the Administrative Regulations 2012 to reflect the re-instatement of the AFT Classified Union to serve the role in participatory governance that the Classified Senate had previously filled.

The College will evaluate the effectiveness of the new College Planning Committee structure, as revised by the Academic Council.
4A. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the
governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together
for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of
ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

Description:

Administrative Regulations 2006 on Participative Governance recognizes the governance
roles of the Academic Senate as it relates to academic and professional matters; the
Classified Senate (now the classified union) relative to classified matters exclusive of
collective bargaining issues; the Associated Student Body as it relates to student matters;
and administrators and managers. The regulation also establishes the activities of the
college decision-making process that include policy and regulation development and college
planning, implementation, and review.

Administrative Regulations 2009 establishes a list of the academic and professional
matters for which the Board of Trustees will rely primarily upon the advice and judgment
of the Academic Senate. Administrative Regulations 2010 establishes the areas in
which the Board of Trustees will provide the opportunity for students to be involved. And
Administrative Regulations 2012 articulates the classified and professional matters in which
the Board of Trustees and the Superintendent-President shall provide participation to the
Classified Senate (now the classified union) on participatory governance matters. These
various regulations also establish the various manners and processes for appointments to
committees, councils, or task forces by their constituent bodies.

It is through the respective constituent groups that staff and students are invited to participate
in matters of governance. Appointments to committees, councils, and task forces are thus
at the discretion of each group. 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
body. Administrative Regulation 2006 establishes that participation in governance is a
collaborative, college-wide process dependent on trust and open communication.

The college has a multitude of committees, councils, and task forces which result in broad-
based collaboration and institutional improvement for the College. For example, the newly
formed Professional Development Committee, comprised of administrators, faculty, and
classified staff, is implementing the Professional Development Program; the Equity for All task
force completed their study focused on factors affecting disadvantaged student performance;
and the Academic Council has developed a new planning process.

Administrative Regulation 2006 stipulates that each college group involved in the participatory
governance process is responsible for communication. Communication entails providing
rationales for proposals made and reporting to constituents. These college groups are
accountable for communicating their proposals for input prior to finalization.

Evaluation:

The general consensus is that policies 2006 (general) and 2010 (students) are clear and
accurately reflect the activities of the participatory governance process. Many of the faculty
roles are also outlined in the Administrative Regulations 4005.

It is early in the process to evaluate the new planning structure, but the college community
recognizes these changes as significant and necessary to improve district-wide
communication and efficiency. The President’s Leadership Council and the College Planning
Committee are intended to help expand communication. Previous to these changes, the
classified and faculty unions felt disenfranchised from the planning process due to a lack
of representation on key planning committees, such as the Educational Master Planning
Committee. However, the district’s new interpretation of their role in the participatory governance process is a positive step toward better communication and a resolution of several long-standing grievances (Response to Recommendation, #5).

Generally, faculty and staff participate in participatory governance consistently and are better informed than students about their role. Even though students are invited to participate in the participatory governance process, their participation varies from semester to semester based on availability, class load, personal obligations, and commitment. In the 2002 Self Study, a student survey was conducted to assess barriers to participation; it appears no progress has been made in improving student participation.

However, the ability to acquire representation from classified staff is not always achieved due to a combination of factors. Thus, appropriate representation from classified staff on a variety of committees and task forces is an area that should be strengthened.

The general view on collaboration is that those who are involved do work together and achieve some positive outcomes (i.e., educational master plan, enrollment management plan, task force on Flex Day planning, and the study of the 16-week academic calendar). Because an environment of congeniality is promoted during committee discussions, collaboration has been more cooperative and constructive (Response to Recommendation, #5).

Communication as a whole at the college still needs improvement, though certain aspects of it have been centralized (i.e., online newsletter In the Loop and district-wide email distributions) to help inform employees about general college activities. Although Board Policy 2006 stipulates the use of a decentralized communication model to keep college constituencies informed about participatory governance activities, this may not be the most effective model. Each group is responsible for informing its own membership and delivering feedback to committee discussions. The decentralized model has proven to be only partially effective since each group delivers to its members varying levels of information about ongoing participatory governance discussions, and opportunities for feedback into the process are just as uneven.

Faculty have been offered extensive opportunities in the last year to learn more about institutional goals and plans, such as with Flex Day workshops on enrollment management and leadership and multiple colloquia on the educational master plan. Communication with classified staff about institutional efforts has been more limited. This can create unevenness in general knowledge of college functions by employees. Employees are experts in their specific areas, but they may not have exposure beyond their departments, which can negatively impact services to students.

**Planning Agenda:**

Board Policy 2006 on Participation in Governance and Board Policy 2012 - Role of the Classified Senate in Shared Governance need revising to reflect the changes to the governance structure. Policy 2006 should reference faculty and classified union representation in order to align with the new planning process. Updating these policies will help clarify the new paradigm that expands representation in the planning process to include all college constituencies.

Communication with students needs to improve, and they should be encouraged in order to participate more consistently in the participatory governance process. Classified representation should be encouraged to increase input in the participatory governance process. A universal method for communicating about participatory governance issues should be developed to improve uniform distribution of information and retrieval of feedback. Classified personnel should receive orientation on college-wide initiatives and services available to students.
4A4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

*Description:*

Long Beach City College places a high value on its relationships with all external agencies. At its foundation, LBCC understands that in order to continue to exist 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 or international, engagement with all external agencies are governed by institutional values that is 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 website. Additional information is also available through print media, the Long Beach City College cable network, the Community Relations and Marketing office, or by specific request from any individual or agency. This includes but is not limited to the following:

- Board Agendas, meeting schedules, actions and announcements, and cablecast 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 organizations, 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)
- Accreditation Reports, self-study and other institutional reports, midterm reports and institutional responses, Commission recommendations, etc.

The college’s Mission Statement embraces 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. This is perhaps best evidenced by the progress that has been made in response to the Commission Recommendations made in the 2004 midterm visit. In addition, the Superintendent-President and the Board of Trustees have made accreditation a number one institutional priority (18-Month Agenda for the Advancement of Student Success & Community Development, Board of Trustees’ Goals for 2007-2009). The accreditation process continues to involve active participation by members that represent every aspect of the college.

*Evaluation:*

Long Beach City College’s institutional commitment to support effectiveness, honesty, and integrity in its relationships with all external agencies is perhaps best demonstrated by the recent addition of two full-time positions: Director of Media and Public Relations and Director of Community and Governmental Relations. The addition of these two positions in the
Office of Public Affairs and Marketing has significantly strengthened the college’s ability to communicate and interface effectively with all external constituencies with which the college operates. This has also had the positive benefit of significantly increasing the college’s presence and positive image in local print and broadcast media. This is evidenced in part by the frequent radio spots on area commercial radio stations that highlight the college, an increase in programming of institutionally produced media content on the college cable network, and a general increased exposure of the LBCC “brand” to the local community. All of these efforts are driven by an institutional pledge to openness and honesty and a demonstrated commitment by the Board of Trustees, the Superintendent-President, and the Office of Community Relations and Marketing to represent Long Beach City College in a positive way to both the local and global community. In pursuit of that goal, Long Beach City College is dedicated to earning and maintaining the respect of others by modeling and nurturing professionalism, honesty, and integrity on every level of communication and interaction with all external agencies.

The institution continues its commitment to excellence by striving to follow and implement accreditation standards, policies, and guidelines in its daily operations. This is perhaps best evidenced by the commitment of the college to proactively respond to recommendations made in the midterm report, team visits, and other institutional recommendations brought forward by the accreditation process. The college leadership continues to make accreditation a primary focus for the institution as a whole. This is evidenced by the high priority placed on the accreditation process by the Board of Trustees, Superintendent-President, the Executive Team, and the Academic Senate of the College. However, while the accreditation process at Long Beach City College attempted to involve broad and comprehensive participation by all levels of staff from across the college, participation became limited from a number of individuals. Several spoke of the workload as the cause for their limited involvement. Regardless, those who remained involved worked diligently to bring this process to fruition. This ongoing institutional commitment demonstrates that the college is committed to responding expeditiously and effectively to recommendations from the Commission.

**Planning Agenda:**

None.

**4A5.** The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

**Description:**

The College’s participatory governance structure is outlined in Administrative Regulations 2006. In addition there are a host of committees and task forces that provide opportunity for broad-based constituent input for collegial decision-making.

Since the last accreditation, efforts have been undertaken and remain ongoing to evaluate the College’s governance structure and decision-making processes. From the fundamental issue of consensus building in planning committees to streamlining the planning structure, the Academic Council has played a central role in evaluating the effectiveness of the decision-making process and structure (Academic Council Meeting Notes, November 25, 2003).

In 2003, the Academic Council created Subgroup B to formulate guidelines on when to vote or consensus build in committees (Academic Council Meeting Notes, December 16, 2003). Beginning in January 2004, the Educational Master Planning Committee agreed to design and distribute a college-wide survey that evaluated the planning process for needed improvement (January 22, 2004, Academic Council Meeting Notes). The outcomes
of that survey were established in a document titled *Planning Survey 2004: Findings and Possible Implications* and further discussed at an EMPC Retreat in August 2004. In July 2005, the Academic Council continued the dialogue of communication between the planning committees, discussing the effectiveness of planning structures and planning processes, including the role of school plans and the integration of department plans (*Academic Council Meeting Notes, July 5, 2005*). The evaluative dialogue remains ongoing. In March of 2007 as a result of an Academic Council retreat focused on the planning process, a planning restructure task force was created to address the issue of a planning process that was perceived to be cumbersome and lacked understandability and accountability (*Academic Council Meeting Notes, March 2, 2007*). At the same meeting, a second task force was created to identify the disconnects in the planning process (Report of the "Disconnects" Team). During spring 2007 and over the course of several meetings, the task force discussed a variety of structures for a new planning process. Ultimately, the Superintendent-President, in conjunction with the past and current Academic Senate Presidents, formulated and agreed upon a draft proposal for a revised planning structure that was approved at the August 21, 2007, Academic Council meeting. The revised planning structure provides for greater inclusion at the highest level. The former EMPC planning structure included administration, senate appointees, and one student. The new College Planning Committee also includes classified and faculty union representatives, both full-time and part-time (*Academic Council Minutes, August 21, 2007*).

Recognizing that department plans and program planning are areas that require a better defined process, it was also agreed at the August 21st Academic Council meeting to create a task force to revise the current department plans and program planning processes for better integration with the Educational Master Planning Goals and budget. This initiative is currently underway through the direction of the College Planning Committee.

**Evaluation:**

Since 2003, the Academic Council has perennially evaluated the planning process, touching on various issues throughout the years. In 2007, the evaluative discussions resulted in an assessment that there were problems with the planning structure and that “disconnects” existed. The “disconnects” included the issue that in general, the campus community was uninformed about decisions, planning processes, and outcomes. It was recognized that there was thus a lack of communication from the leadership to its constituents and among constituent groups. It was not until 2007 that the evaluative discussions led to change with the implementation of a new planning process.

**Planning Agenda:**

Provide leadership training for all college constituents, especially on the newly established planning structure and process, to the college community.

Provide communication to the college community on the results of the evaluations that are used as the basis for improvement. Act upon identified weaknesses in a timely manner.
STANDARD 4A - DECISION-MAKING ROLES AND PROCESSES
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Faculty Orientation Schedule
Flex Day Workshop Schedule, Spring 2007
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In the Loop, website: [http://communityrelations.lbcc.edu/Loop/loop_index.htm]
IN4ME, Your Planning Newsletter, October 2005, website: [http://ie.lbcc.edu/planning_newsletter/IN4ME_Oct05.pdf]
Long Beach City College Employment Opportunities, website: [http://hr.lbcc.edu/jobs.cfm]
Long Beach City College Mission Statement, website: [http://www.lbcc.edu/cat/missionstatement.html]
Manager Performance Evaluation Forms, website: [http://hr.lbcc.edu/forms_evaluation.cfm]
Management Team Procedure Manual
Office of Economic and Resource Development, website: [http://econdev.lbcc.edu/]
Planning Survey “Findings and Possible Implications” (2004 Survey)
Professional Development Program, website: [http://pdp.lbcc.edu/index.cfm]
Report of the “Disconnects” Team
Revised Planning Structure, website [http://ie.lbcc.edu/New_Planning_Structure.cfm]
Staff Development Plan
Superintendent-President Memo on New Planning Process - Sept 2007, website: [http://ie.lbcc.edu/CPC_email.cfm]
4B. 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.

4B1. 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.

**Description:**

*Board Policy on Policies 1001* outlines the Board’s responsibility to govern the District through the establishment of written policies. The board adopts those policies as are necessary for interpreting, supplementing, and implementing the legal requirements of the District as well as providing direction for the Superintendent-President and the management staff in the administration and operation of the District. The Superintendent-President is responsible for recommending those policies and the Board has, as its major responsibility, the establishment and final interpretation of all policy.

The administration and support staff, assigned by the Superintendent-President, address educational programs and services to ensure their compliance with state requirements and alignment with the needs of students.

This enforcement depends on a variety of inputs, such as the committee on curriculum and instruction, the academic senate, institutional effectiveness studies, program reviews, and student learning outcomes assessment results. Revised or new policies are reviewed by constituent groups as part of the planning process and structure and as outlined in *Administrative Regulation 2006.6.*

*Board Policy 2000,* implemented through *Administrative Regulation 2000.4 D,* states that the Superintendent-President will send to each Board Member a Board of Trustees’ Self-Evaluation form to be used for self-evaluation of the current fiscal year. The evaluation responses are to be discussed at a Board meeting in July each year. At this same meeting, the Board goals should be reviewed and revised for the coming fiscal year.

The Board goals are designed to measure and monitor the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The Board has requested an annual report on Institutional Effectiveness, presented by the dean of research/academic services. This report details how the institution is progressing in various areas of student success, including transfer rates and retention.

Annually, the Board self-evaluates the work they have done on current year goals and uses this evaluation to develop the following year’s goals.

The Board’s adopted goals for 2006-2007 state the Board’s commitment to monitor and assess student learning outcomes, student access, transfer-readiness, basic skills improvement, and retention of students. Two of the Board’s three adopted goals for 2007-2009 are especially relevant to this standard and are described below.

The first goal is to measure and improve student success. This goal has been calendared for reporting back to the Board to ensure that progress is monitored and that steady improvement occurs in areas of student success. The Board will request follow-up of more information necessary to accurately measure the success of these goals, if necessary.
The first goal reads as follows:

**GOAL #1. MEASURE AND IMPROVE STUDENT SUCCESS**

A. Ensure that a college readiness (basic skills) program with timelines and performance measures is presented by Fall 2007 and monitor the program bi-annually (reports to Board on 10/23/07)

B. Monitor implementation strategies and their results to improve LBCCD’s standing on the ARCC student success measurements, including results by ethnicity bi-annually (reports to Board on 7/10/07)

C. Review a report with an action plan that assesses the effectiveness of student support services and its relationship to the LBCCD mission by Spring 2008 (reports to Board in March 2008)

D. Review progress on the LBCCD’s Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan, including timelines and measurement criteria annually, concurrent with the Annual Accreditation Report in the spring semester (reports to Board in March 2008)

E. Review a report on LBCCD’s transfer success programs such as the Honors Program to ensure that the needs of transfer-oriented students are being met by Spring 2008 (reports to Board in March 2008)

F. Review a report by fall 2007 on the effectiveness of LBCCD Career Technical Education programs with an action plan and timeline to increase their effectiveness and alignment with the workforce needs of the region (reported to Board in November 2007).

The annual approved Board goals establish a plan for monitoring the fiscal activities of the college by requiring regular financial budget updates, comparisons of current and prior year budgets, monitoring expenditures of public bond moneys, and adopting a balanced budget that meets the Board’s fiduciary responsibilities specified in these goals and annual audits.

**GOAL #2. MEASURE AND IMPROVE FISCAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE STABILITY**

1. Adopt Board budget guidelines that include the following:
   - a balanced General Fund budget
   - a 5.0% General Fund reserve
   - a sound reserve for retiree benefits
   - a sound reserve for increased facilities maintenance
   - a sound reserve for technology replacement and support (reports to Board 9/25/07)

2. Review technology plans with timelines and budgets for
   - administrative support
   - instructional and student support services (reports to Board in April 2008)

3. Adopt a revised Facilities Master Plan and assess the need for, and if necessary, adopt, a General Obligation Bond Extension Plan (reports to Board 7/10/07)

4. Continue to monitor progress toward goals of the Enrollment Management Program, including the following:
   - enrollment goals
   - recruitment and retention
   - marketing and branding
   - scheduling and curriculum alignment
   - a review of the matriculation process and identification of institutional barriers to matriculation (reports to Board 8/28/07)
On April 22, 2003, the Board of Trustees adopted a Code of Ethics and Conduct that states that the Board will appoint the best qualified professional leader available when a Superintendent-President is to be appointed and will support the appointment.

In fall 2006, the Board selected and hired a new Superintendent-President through a broad-based screening and selection committee with representation from all constituent groups, as well as from community members.

The Board’s self-evaluation for each fiscal year since 2003 contains a section that addresses Board/Superintendent-President Relations. The Board establishes clear expectations, collaborates on a set of unified goals, and evaluates the Superintendent-President. As per the employment contract between the Superintendent-President and the Board of Trustees, annual performance evaluations of the Superintendent-President are conducted every June in closed session of a Board meeting. The evaluation is consistent with the terms of the Superintendent-President’s contract along with his or her own self-evaluation of his/her own goals and/or accomplishments for the previous year, along with the new goals for the coming year. After the review of these documents, the Board of Trustees then votes on the continuance of the Superintendent-President’s contract.

**Evaluation:**

The Board sets policy and delegates authority to the Superintendent-President to implement the policies through administrative regulations.

The Board, through its own approved Board goals, establishes a plan for reviewing and monitoring the fiscal activities and the quality and educational programs as set forth in policies, the mission statement, the educational master plan, and other planning documents.

The Board assures that Board policy is followed by annually evaluating the Superintendent-President, reviewing how policies have been adhered to, and receives reports on institutional effectiveness and financial budget performance reports.

The evaluation of the Superintendent-President is set forth in his/her employment contract, and the Board does adhere to this process. The Superintendent-President is required to provide a list of annual priorities, goals, and objectives.

The evaluation is one way in which the Board can assess how well the institution is fulfilling its mission as it pertains to educational and fiscal goals, and because these goals contain timelines, the Board is provided a means to measure progress over time.

**Planning Agenda:**

None.

**4B1a.** The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

**Description:**

The Long Beach Community College District is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees representing five trustee areas. There is also a Student Trustee. The Board of Trustees is an independent policy-making board with members elected by their constituencies in an open election as defined in [Administrative Regulations 2000](#).
All Board meetings are open to the public per the Brown Act, and the public has the opportunity to address the Board in open session at all meetings. Agendas are posted and widely distributed to internal constituents as well as to the local community. All meetings are videotaped and broadcast on the Long Beach City College cable television station for public viewing. A record of all transactions of the Board of Trustees is set forth in the minutes of the Board. The minutes are kept on file as a permanent, official record of the District, and shall be open to inspection by the public.

The Board ensures that the public is heard through two Public Comments sections in the Board agenda: one for items appearing on the agenda, and another for items not appearing on the agenda.

The Board acts by majority vote of all of the membership constituting the governing board, except where another provision of law requires a two-thirds or unanimous vote of the membership.

Another function of the Board is to advocate for and defend the institution on local, state, and national levels.

**Evaluation:**

The Board of Trustees’ Code of Ethics and Conduct includes a statement on conflict of interest that ensures that the Board is an independent body that protects the district from undue influence or pressure. The Board ensures that the public is heard through two Public Comments sections on the Board agenda: one for items appearing on the agenda, and another for items not appearing on the agenda.

**Planning Agenda:**

None.

4B1b. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

**Description:**

The Board of Trustees has broad oversight and policy-making responsibility. Foremost, the Board sets educational policy. The Board reviews and approves educational courses, program requirements for the associate degree, certificates, and general education. It ensures that programs, degrees and certificates are of high quality and consistent with the college’s educational mission (Administrative Regulations 4001, 4002, 4005, 4012, 4019, 4024).

The Board also reviews and approves the annual District budget. The tentative budget is approved before June 30, and a budget workshop is held prior to the final adoption of the budget. The Board has final responsibility for approving all disbursements, appropriation transfers, contracts, fund investments, and capital outlay projects (Administrative Regulations 5013, 5014, 6005, 8000, 8003).
**Evaluation:**

It is evident that The Board of Trustees establishes policies that are consistent with the mission of the institution.

**Planning Agenda:**

None.

**4B1c.** The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

**Description:**

The LBCCD Board of Trustees is an independent body whose actions are final and not subject to the actions of any other entity. The "Policy on Policies and Administrative Regulations" (1001) defines the Board of Trustees' and the Superintendent-President’s responsibilities with respect to adoption of policy. Administrative Regulations 1001 outlines the process for the initiation, development, information dissemination, and recommendation of policies to the Board of Trustees for approval. The Policy on Board of Trustees (2000) and its Administrative Regulations (2000) sets forth organization, powers, duties, and other matters pertaining to the responsibilities and activities of the Board of Trustees in governing the college. The Policy on Participation in Governance (2006) provides a broad definition of participation in governance, and its Administrative Regulations 2006 outlines the processes by which the District strives to achieve participation in governance, the various groups involved in that process, and their respective responsibilities in policy and regulations in planning, budgeting and review, and in accreditation. The Academic Senate is recognized by the Board of Trustees as the body that represents the faculty in collegial governance relating to academic and professional matters as defined in Title 5 of the State Code of Regulations. The Board also approves and adopts the institution’s annual budget.

**Evaluation:**

The Policy on Board of Trustees (2000) and its Administrative Regulations (2000) sets forth organization, powers, duties, and other matters pertaining to the responsibilities and activities of the Board of Trustees in governing the college.

**Planning Agenda:**

None

**4B1d.** The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

**Description:**

Regulation 2000 posted on the intranet outlines the Board of Trustees-size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures. Regulation 2000.4 describes the organization, transaction of business and powers and duties of the Board.

**Evaluation:**

The college website publishes the policies specifying the Board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure and operating procedures.
Planning Agenda:

None.

4B1e. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

Description:

The primary duty of the Board of Trustees is to establish policies and administrative regulations consistent with the regulations of the California Community College Board of Governors and the laws of the state of California for the governance and operation of the college. Through the Superintendent-President, the Board delegates appropriate authority to officers and employees of the College to carry out the policies.

During the "Annual Board Self Evaluation," the Board has an opportunity to evaluate its policies and practices and revise them as necessary.

Evaluation:

In reviewing the LBCC policy and administrative regulations manual, it has become clear that many of the policies need to be updated. When there is a policy change that is approved by the Board, there is presently no written procedure to ensure that the new policy is documented and placed in the manual.

Planning Agenda:

The institution shall develop a process for regularly reviewing and updating college policies.

4B1f. The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

Description:

Board Policy 2001 states that within established budget limitations, the Board of Trustees will encourage attendance of its members at conferences, conventions, and committee meetings, which, in the Board’s judgment, are in the best interest of the Long Beach Community College District. The details on attendance and reporting on conference attendance are spelled out in this regulation.

While there is no official policy on new member orientation procedures, orientation takes place both formally and informally over time. Superintendent-President Kehoe began the Vice Superintendent-President Liaison program by which select district Vice Superintendent- Presidents are paired with new Board of Trustee members to serve as a conduit of information and as a means of orienting the new Board members to the college. New Board members also attend the Community College League of California conference, which is designed for training and development of Board of Trustees members. New and continuing Board members also attend the annual California Community College Trustee Association conferences. Informal orientation takes place continuously through conversations with the Superintendent-President as well as through Board retreats, meetings, workshops, and study sessions.
The continuity of Board membership is provided for by elections in April of even-numbered years. The four-year terms are staggered to ensure this continuity. The Student Trustee is elected by students at the college and serves a one-year term from June 1 through May 30.

**Evaluation:**

There is no official policy that describes the new member orientation procedures; the process is one of historical practice rather than documented policy.

**Planning Agenda:**

None.

4B1g. The governing board’s self evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

**Description:**

Administrative Regulations 2000 provides for completion of an annual self-evaluation by Board members. The three-part evaluation includes self evaluation, progress toward goals, and setting new goals. In January of each year, Board members receive and complete the evaluation. The results are compiled and discussed at a Board study session in February. Additionally, each year the Board of Trustees publishes annual goals, which can be utilized as an evaluative tool.

**Evaluation:**

The process regarding the assessment of board performance and evaluation has been defined, implemented and published.

**Planning Agenda:**

None.

4B1h. The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

**Description:**

The LBCC District Board of Trustees approved a revised code of Ethics and Conduct on April 22, 2003. The policy contains expectations in the areas of Commitment, Primary Tasks, Intra-Board relationships, and Delegation of Authority and Evaluation.

**Evaluation:**

While the LBCC District Board of Trustees has a code of ethics, there is currently no clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code. Included in the policy should be language that describes the actions to be taken if the code of ethics is violated.
Planning Agenda:

The board will develop and adopt a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code of ethics.

4B1i. The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

Description:

On March 13, 2007, at a regularly scheduled Board meeting, the Accreditation Liaison Officer informed the Board of the accreditation process. The Board is directly involved in accreditation through their appointed liaison, Board President Douglas Otto. The Board member serves on the Accreditation Steering Committee and serves as a resource to Standard 4: Governance and Leadership. The Board Liaison is responsible for providing regular updates to the entire Board about the accreditation process and its status.

In fall 2007, the Board President and Superintendent-President Oakley were interviewed by committee members of standard 4 and by the accreditation co-chairs.

The Superintendent-President regularly keeps the Board abreast of the progress and process of accreditation through verbal and written correspondence and reports at the Board of Trustees’ meeting.

Evaluation:

The college’s progress with the accreditation process is well reported to the Board.

Planning Agenda:

None.

4B1j. 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 Superintendent-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 Superintendent-Presidents of the colleges.

Description:

In fall 2006, the Board selected and hired a new Superintendent-President through a broad-based screening and selection committee with representation from all constituent groups, as well as from community members. The Board conducts an annual evaluation of the Superintendent-President consistent with the terms of his/her contract.

The Board delegates full responsibility to the Superintendent-President by providing oversight to the district without micromanaging its day-to-day operations. Board Policy 1001 details the role of the Board of the Trustees and the delegation of responsibility to the Superintendent-
President to implement and administer board policies. The Superintendent-President’s employment contract also spells out the authority and responsibilities of the Superintendent-President in carrying out Board policy.

**Evaluation:**

Although the Board adopted a format for the composition of a search committee for the most recent selection of the Superintendent-President, there is no adopted formal policy outlining the recruitment or selection of a Superintendent-President.

An evaluation of the Superintendent-President is conducted annually by the Board of Trustees. The annual evaluation allows the Board to hold the Superintendent-President accountable for the operation of the college. The Board has delegated full responsibility and authority to the President to implement and administer board policies without board interference.

**Planning Agenda:**

The Board shall establish a formal written process by which the search and selection process of a Superintendent-President is initiated and will decide by what performance measures the Superintendent-President will be evaluated.

4B2. The Superintendent-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.

4B2a. The Superintendent-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.

**Description:**

In her goals for 2002-2003, Superintendent-President Kehoe listed as one of her primary goals “guiding the evolution of the college’s evaluation system and staffing adjustments to support changing curricula, services, technology and facilities.” In 2006, Dr. Kehoe redesigned and implemented a new evaluation instrument for administrators that includes the evaluation of administrators’ participation in the analysis and assessment of student learning outcomes. In addition, through the collective bargaining process Superintendent-President Kehoe supported the deans’ input into the evaluation of tenured faculty. Consequently, the July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2009 faculty union contract allows for an “administrative review process” of tenured faculty members. An administrative review may be initiated and conducted by the appropriate dean when concerns arise over a tenured faculty member’s performance with respect to the professional standards established in the faculty collective bargaining contract.

Under the leadership of Dr. Kehoe, the college engaged in an assessment of the feasibility of converting LBCC to a two-college district. The two-college structure assessment began as a 2001 Board of Trustees’ goal driven by issues of resources, equity, diversity, and facilities. Superintendent-President Kehoe worked with administration and the Academic Senate to establish a committee to conduct the initial study of the issue. Following the initial study, a consultant was hired to engage in a comprehensive evaluation of a two-college structure. Recommendations from that study were incorporated into the facilities master plan. In fall 2006, the Pacific Coast Campus was approved as a “Center” under the new state funding

In the Superintendent-President's Goals for 2004-2005, Superintendent-President Kehoe stated that it was her goal to reorganize the college staff to manage effectively despite a limited budget. Dr. Kehoe reported that she had successfully reorganized the executive management team. As part of this administrative re-organization, the position of Executive Dean of PCC was re-titled Provost, PCC; the position of Dean of Planning was re-titled Administrative Dean of Planning; and the Dean of Institutional Research and Academic Services became an Administrative Dean position. A new position of Executive Director of Community Relations and Marketing was also created. With expected retirements under the leadership of Superintendent-President Kehoe, in fall 2006 an administrative reorganization plan was drafted that included placing a greater focus on the enrollment management needs of the Pacific Coast Campus. At the same time, the creation of a new position titled Associate Vice President, Economic and Resources Development, was under discussion. Following Dr. Kehoe’s retirement in December 2006, in spring 2007, the newly appointed Superintendent-President Oakley proposed an administrative reorganization. With the expected retirements of the current Administrative Dean of Institutional Research and Academic Services and the Administrative Dean of Planning, the reorganization resulted in the creation of the Dean of Academic Services, whose major duties include curriculum and scheduling; the Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, whose duties and responsibilities include research and planning. The position of Provost of PCC was changed to Associate Vice President of PCC; the Associate Vice President, Economic and Resources Development, was supported as a newly created position (Proposed Reorganization Chart, Memo from Superintendent-President Oakley, June 28, 2007). This proposed reorganization was reviewed and assessed by the Board at the Board of Trustees’ Meeting Minutes, July 10, 2007.

The Vice President of Academic Affairs retired summer 2004. Dr. Kehoe hired an interim Vice President of Academic Affairs for fall 2004. Attempts to hire a permanent Vice President of Academic Affairs during spring 2005 and 2006 did not produce an acceptable candidate for this position. In spring 2007, Superintendent-President Oakley hired the existing Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs as Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs in order to bring continuity and continuation of initiatives to the college.

Throughout this evaluation period the Superintendent-President has involved the Budget Advisory Committee in formulating budget assumptions and funding priorities based on the planning process. For example, in spring 2007, Superintendent-President Oakley informed the Budget Advisory Committee of the need for funding for the technology plan formulated by the Academic Council and the EMPC.

**Evaluation:**

Dr. Kehoe was responsible for planning, overseeing, and evaluating a new administrative structure that included a reorganization of the executive management team and student services. However, the positions of Vice President of Academic Affairs, Vice President of Student Services, and Vice President of Human Resources remained vacant for some time.

**Planning Agenda:**

None.

**4B2b.** The Superintendent-President guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:

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

Soon after taking office, Superintendent-President Kehoe created the Academic Council (Academic Council Minutes, February 2, 2007). The purpose of the Academic Council was to discuss academic and professional matters, which included issues of teaching and learning. Dr. Kehoe continued to review regulations through the President's Advisory Council; however, the President's Advisory Council functioned through electronic communication.

Dr. Kehoe, in consultation with the Academic Senate, initiated the college’s involvement in the student-centered “Equity for All” project (Equity for All Letter of Interest). Dr. Kehoe also encouraged members of the college community to serve on evidence teams that identified students based on self-identified race and ethnicity and conducted research into causes of these students’ success or failure. This project was begun in 2006 and while the study itself has concluded, other studies, such as the Missing 87 project and the Basic Skills Math project, started as a result of the data gathered from the Equity for All project.

Dr. Kehoe assumed leadership positions with many organizations, locally, statewide, and nationally. She served as Chair-Elect for Catholic Healthcare West St. Mary Medical Center Community Board; Chairman of the National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ) in the Southern California region; Co-Vice Chairman of the Aquarium of the Pacific; and served as a member of the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce. In addition, Dr. Kehoe served as a Board of Director for the Accreditation Commission, a Board member of the California Commission on Athletics, a member of the Chief Executive Officers of the California Community College System, and a member of the Educational Testing Service National Advisory Community College Council. Dr. Kehoe’s local community as well as statewide and national involvement helped advance the mission and importance of the college. Dr. Kehoe was quoted as stating “that I have always believed that my community involvement only enhances educational access and opportunities for our students.”

In spring 2007, Superintendent-President Oakley revised the role and composition of the President’s Leadership Council, which was formerly the President’s Advisory Council. The President’s Leadership Council has representatives from all constituent groups at the college, including the three unions. The stated goal of this council is to reach mutual agreement as designated as such by Administrative Regulation 2006 on Participation in Governance. Superintendent-President Oakley considers this council to be a forum for the Superintendent-President to inform and receive input from leaders of the various college constituencies (President’s Leadership Council Minutes, March 30, 2007). Superintendent-President Oakley instituted phase one of an organizational restructure in order to utilize human resources most effectively in concert with the mission of the college (Academic Council Minutes, March 2, 2007).

Shortly after he took office in January 2007, Superintendent-President Oakley revisited the planning process. At an Academic Council retreat in March 2007, Superintendent-President Oakley asked the Academic Council to review the college planning process and its effectiveness (Academic Council Minutes, March 2, 2007). Under Mr. Oakley’s leadership, at their meeting on August 21, 2007, the Academic Council approved a new planning structure. This new planning structure includes a College Planning Committee (CPC) that is made up of representatives of diverse college groups, including the Superintendent-President’s Executive Committee, the Academic Senate Executive Committee, a representative from the department heads, two deans, and representatives appointed by ASB, CCA, CHI, and AFT. The new planning structure also includes a Planning Steering Committee made up of the CPC co-chairs and the Chief Planning Administrator (Planning Structure Revision).

During her tenure, Dr. Kehoe’s annual goals for the institution were available college-wide. In the Superintendent-President Goals for 2004-2005, Dr. Kehoe included the development of the next phase of the Educational Master Plan based on the evaluation of the previous plan and further needs. During that year and again in 2005-2006, in light of a need to reduce
the budget, Dr. Kehoe set parameters that supported maintaining instruction at the previous year's level while cutting other support areas.

Soon after he took office in January 2007, Superintendent-President Oakley presented the goals of the Board of Trustees and his own 18-month Agenda to the college community. Both the Board goals and the Superintendent-President’s 18-month Agenda were reviewed by the Academic Council. Superintendent-President Oakley has proposed the “re-imagining” of the college’s planning process with the goal of “more results-oriented engagement and measurable objectives.” Included in his plan are references to increasing student retention, addressing current technology replacement and maintenance needs, and a plan to identify the college’s facility needs through 2020 with a plan for funding.

**Evaluation:**

Recommendation five in the 2002 accreditation report states that the leaders of all employee constituencies groups at the college need to work together to re-establish a spirit of collaboration and congeniality in order to improve an institutional climate permeated by suspicion and distrust. Progress toward establishing this spirit of collaboration began under Dr. Kehoe in 2003 when she contracted the National Conference for Community and Justice NCCJ to work with the Academic Council, a body that comprises the District Executive Committee and the Academic Senate Executive Committee. The Academic Council discusses academic and professional matters; however, the employee unions felt left out of this process because they had no representatives on the Council. Confidence and trust were enhanced when Superintendent-President Oakley revised the composition of the President’s Leadership Council spring 2007. This group is advising the Superintendent-President and has representatives from all constituent groups at the college, including the three employee unions. Presently, there is no agreed upon charge and composition of the President’s Leadership Council.

In the spring of 2007, Superintendent-President Oakley published his 18-month Agenda, which emphasized the importance of planning in the future of the college. Superintendent-President Oakley is taking a directive and hands-on approach to guiding the college; however, some improvement is still needed in communication and shared governance with middle management and department heads. Superintendent-President Oakley has supported further modifications in the planning structure, which were approved by the Academic Council August 2007. The revised planning structure includes a new committee to take charge of planning, the College Planning Committee; this committee has representatives from all college constituencies, including the three employee unions.

**Planning Agenda:**

More fully involve all college constituencies, including the Academic Senate, classified staff, the three employee unions, and all administrators and managers in setting values, goals, and priorities for the college. Continue to share the Superintendent-President’s goals with all college constituencies yearly.

The charge and composition of the new President’s Leadership Council should be agreed upon and placed in the district’s policies and regulations.

- **(4B2b) Ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;**

**Description:**

Dr. Kehoe was very familiar with the work being done in research and planning. After the Vice President of Student Services retired in 2006, Research and Planning reported directly to Dr.
Kehoe. She routinely received reports on enrollment and the status of the college’s generation of FTE’s. She also encouraged the incorporation of research in measuring student learning outcomes and in program review. While there is still work to be done to link planning to budget and resource allocation, Dr. Kehoe attempted to guide some of that work in relation to the new state initiative on basic skills and in light of the college’s Equity for All Project.

Superintendent-President Oakley has expressed a commitment to facilitate an analysis of students’ ability to persist and wishes to develop a plan to promote academic excellence and student success based on information from the research office (18-Month Agenda for the Advancement of Student Success & Community Development). The Administrative Dean of Institutional Research and Academic Services as well as the Administrative Dean of Planning reported directly to Superintendent-President Oakley. A reorganization in fall 2007 created a new Office of Institutional Effectiveness (which includes Planning and Research), and this office continues to report directly to the Superintendent-President. This reporting structure supports close communication between research and the Superintendent-President. The Superintendent-President receives and is briefed regularly on numerous reports, including those on enrollment and enrollment trends, ARCC accountability data, transfer trends, and equity data. In conjunction with Human Resources, Superintendent-President Oakley also receives an annual report on staff diversity. Dr. Kehoe instituted an annual Institutional Effectiveness Report, initially based on the Partnership for Excellence measures and suggestions from the American Association of Community Colleges, to encourage inquiry into problem areas. This report is presented annually to the Board of Trustees. Data contained in the Institutional Effectiveness report is used by many areas of the college, including grants development, economic development, and departments conducting program review.

**Evaluation:**

Dr. Kehoe verbally supported research and analysis, and beginning in 2006, the Administrative Dean of Research and Academic Services and the Administrative Dean of Planning reported directly to her. With Superintendent-President Oakley’s administrative reorganization in 2007, the research and planning functions of the college are both overseen by the Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, who reports directly to the Superintendent-President.

**Planning Agenda:**

None.

- **(4B2b) Ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes;**

**Description:**

Dr. Kehoe stated at an EMPC meeting in 2002 that student learning outcomes should be much higher on their list of priority projects (EMPC Minutes, April 11, 2002). The creation of the college’s first Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes Committee came out of the shared governance planning process during Dr. Kehoe’s tenure (Academic Council Minutes, December 7, 2004). In her goals for 2005-2006, Dr. Kehoe set a goal to “establish student learning outcomes as an institutional focus with a systematic plan for implementation.” In 2003 (position filled in spring 2005), Dr. Kehoe created a faculty coordinator position with reassigned time in support of advancing student learning outcomes (Academic Senate Minutes, January 27, 2006).

The Chancellor’s office encouraged community colleges across the state to develop a college readiness plan to address the needs of underprepared students. Community colleges were encouraged to use an External Review Team to help the colleges identify their strengths and
weaknesses in this area and recommend improvements. Dr. Kehoe and the Vice President of Academic Affairs agreed to ask Merle Deming of the Deming Group to head the external team. The team visit and activity were funded through a Title 5 grant and completed in January of 2007.

Dr. Kehoe communicated a focus on student learning in her work with other college administrators (CSULB administration) on Seamless Education by sending LBCC teams to the Community College Leadership Development Institute (CCLDI), and by her support of nominees for the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development award, a recognition that emphasizes the importance of teaching and leadership excellence.

Dr. Kehoe’s commitment to student learning outcomes is reflected in the fact that the revised Management Evaluation instrument incorporates and evaluates participation by managers in the analysis and assessment of student learning outcomes (Human Resources Evaluation Forms and Documents).

Superintendent-President Oakley took this commitment one step further when he highlighted his support for the development of learning outcomes and the assessment of student progress toward those learning outcomes across the college (18-Month Agenda for the Advancement of Student Success & Community Development). He stated that the college needs to look at its curriculum, student support services, and administration in relation to measurable learning outcomes, and that it is important “to provide the college with an improved means of assessing the students’ attainment and use of knowledge.”

Evaluation:

In response to Recommendation 2 in the 2002 accreditation report, which stated that the college needed to move forward in assessing student learning outcomes and resolve the issues regarding the Coordinator of Student Learning Outcomes, Dr. Kehoe approved the granting of reassigned time in 2003 for a faculty member to serve as Coordinator of Student Learning Outcomes, although the assignment was not made until spring 2005. In her 2005-2006 goals, Dr. Kehoe set a goal of establishing student learning outcomes as an institutional focus with a plan for implementation. Dr. Kehoe initiated and participated in the college’s involvement in the student-centered Equity for All project... In his 18-month Agenda, Superintendent-President Oakley emphasized his support for a continuing focus at the college on the development and assessment of student learning outcomes.

Based on feedback from Department Chairs and some faculty, it appears that the linkage between department planning and resource allocation is not totally clear. Some elements of the planning process need further development, particularly in the areas of linking resource allocation to institutional priorities and improving channels of communication through which feedback is provided to constituents.

Planning Agenda:

The College Planning Committee, based on recommendations from the Program Plan/ Program Review Task Force, should determine a way to more effectively directly link the allocation of resources to the planning process. Also, the college must ensure that the planning process integrates SLOs as part of the department and program plan in both Instruction and Student Services. Furthermore, it is crucial that the college communicate college-wide goals with respect to student learning outcomes to all college constituencies.
• **(4B2b)** Establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.

**Description:**

Dr. Kehoe supported and was involved in development of the college’s former planning structure. The former planning process has been under review by Superintendent-President Oakley and two college-wide groups in order to increase its efficiency and expediency of decision making. Superintendent-President Oakley halted “business as usual” in the college planning process until a new planning process could be agreed upon. A new planning structure was approved on August 21, 2007, by the Academic Council. Superintendent-President Oakley distributed a list of “disconnects” in the planning process and sought alternatives, through the shared governance process, to the current structure (Report of the Disconnects Team). Superintendent-President Oakley has emphasized his efforts in this regard in his speeches to the college and the community.

**Evaluation:**

The institutional planning process supported by Dr. Kehoe in 2002 was evaluated using a college-wide survey in 2004. The findings suggested a perceived disconnect between college planning and school-area/department planning. The new planning structure, supported by Superintendent-President Oakley and approved August 2007, does not include a method by which the planning process itself will be evaluated.

**Planning Agenda:**

Establish a formal means by which the new planning structure is evaluated yearly. Particular emphasis should be given to evaluating whether the planning process is directly linked to resource allocation and whether institutional planning is focused on the development and assessment of student learning outcomes. The results of these yearly evaluations should be shared with all college constituencies and feedback elicited.

**4B2c.** The Superintendent-President assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

**Description:**

In 2003-2004, Superintendent-President Kehoe set a goal to “re-examine our mission and refine our process for fulfilling it.” She said that work on the Educational Master Plan would assist with the evaluation of the college mission. She also stated that program reviews, departmental planning, and staff evaluation all helped the college fulfill its mission. In her 2005-2006 goals, Superintendent-President Kehoe stated that the college mission would be furthered by the continuation of construction of state and locally funded bond projects, the continued integration of PeopleSoft, and improvements in the registration process.

In his **18-month Agenda**, Superintendent-President Oakley stated on its cover page that “through this agenda, the leadership of the college will focus its resources on achieving the objectives of the Educational Master Plan.” Superintendent-President Oakley organized his goals in terms of the college mission statement in relation to teamwork and organization, shared governance, the enrollment management plan, professional development, and technology replacement and maintenance.
Evaluation:

Dr. Kehoe included as one of her 2002-2003 goals to re-examine the mission and refine the process for fulfilling it. She stated that work on the Educational Master Plan would assist with this evaluation of the college mission, as well as program review, departmental planning, and evaluation.

In his 18-month Agenda, Superintendent-President Oakley stated that under his leadership, the college will focus its resources on achieving the objectives of the Educational Master Plan. Superintendent-President Oakley organized his goals in terms of the college mission statement in relation to teamwork and organization, shared governance, professional development, technology replacement, and the enrollment management plan.

Planning Agenda:

The yearly evaluation of the planning process should include evaluation of how well the college is meeting the objectives of the new Educational Master Plan. The results of these yearly evaluations should be shared with all college constituencies and feedback elicited.

4B2d. The Superintendent-President effectively controls budget and expenditures.

Description:

In her goals for 2002-2003, Dr. Kehoe committed to personally “guide the evolution” of the college budgeting system. During that same year she stated, “When resources are insufficient to support improvement in all goals, the college needs to adjust its resource decisions to reflect priorities or seek other means of supplying resources” (EMPC Minutes, April 11, 2002). In 2002, Dr. Kehoe suspended a $100,000 allocation for priority projects that had been approved by the Academic Council and endorsed by the EMPC in response to midyear cuts in state revenue.

Dr. Kehoe was an active participant in the coalition of underfunded districts that led the support of the governor’s plan to equalize community college funding in the state (Budget Advisory Committee Minutes, May 13, 2004). Kehoe also spearheaded a $176 million local bond issue to finance facilities improvements that passed, following through on her promise to “obtain resources by other means” (Superintendent-President’s Goals 2002-2003).

As a result of stabilization, Dr. Kehoe supported the establishment of a $3 million reserve in the 2006/2007 budget until the college learned whether it would achieve its base enrollment. Superintendent-President Oakley took several other measures in response to the college’s uncertain funding picture, including being discriminate in filling classified vacancies, extending the search process to delay hiring of some management positions, and reorganizing the Executive Committee to allow for a more effective and less costly structure.

In 2002 and 2003, the academic school budgets were reduced across the board by ten percent. When Dr. Kehoe hired an Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs in 2005, he increased the input received from the schools, set expenditure targets, and introduced an enrollment management plan.

When Superintendent-President Oakley hired the existing Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs as the Executive Vice President in spring 2007, he set new guidelines for expenditures, introduced base budgets for schools, and created a budget for technology replacement.

Throughout this evaluation period, the Superintendent-President has involved the Budget Advisory Committee in formulating budget assumptions and funding priorities based on the planning process. In the Superintendent-President’s message contained in the LBCC
Adopted Budget, the Superintendent-President sets parameters and direction for the budget process.

**Evaluation:**

During this evaluation period, both Superintendent-Presidents have effectively controlled budget and expenditures in response to both internal and external factors.

**Planning Agenda:**

None.

4B2e. The Superintendent-President works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

**Description:**

In her goals for 2002-2003, Superintendent-President Kehoe supported the implementation of a comprehensive, college-wide program for outreach and marketing in the community. For 2003-2004, Dr. Kehoe listed as one of her goals the strengthening of links between the community and the college’s academic and vocational programs, as well as enhancing the image of the college in the community. In her 2004-2005 goals, Dr. Kehoe defined the college community in the state, and during that year she continued to play a leadership role in organizing underfunded community colleges in the state to work toward equalization. Dr. Kehoe worked and communicated with the college community through her associations with many community organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club, Leadership Long Beach, the Long Beach Aquarium, St. Mary’s Medical Center, and the Youth and Gang Violence Prevention Task Force.

In his 18-month Agenda, Superintendent-President Oakley established the goal of engaging the community in discussion and debate to foster community awareness of the college’s mission and activities. In this regard, Superintendent-President Oakley has spoken and represented the college at numerous community events such as his speech at the Museum of Latin American Art in March of 2007, the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce Annual Conference in August of 2007, and the 2nd Annual Port Technologies conference on July 31, 2007. In addition, in June of 2007, a Director of Community and Governmental Relations was hired to direct the District’s relationships with members of Congress, members of the California legislature, and federal, state, city, and county administrative agencies by fostering relationships and creating opportunities to advance the college. Also in June 2007, a Director of Public and Media Relations was hired to develop the District’s strategic internal and external communication programs in order to advance the institution. In his 18-month Agenda, Superintendent-President Oakley stated that he wants to improve the relationship between the community and the College’s Economic and Workforce Development programs in order to strengthen the local economy.

In January 2008, he presented the first *State of the College Address* to members of the college community and to members of the college staff. The college intends that this event will occur in the future on an annual basis.

**Evaluation:**

Dr. Kehoe was involved extensively in the college’s local and statewide community. She belonged to many local and statewide organizations and chaired a number of them. During Dr. Kehoe’s tenure, due to financial constraints, the practice of mailing the schedule of classes to all homes in the community was ended, although that practice was reinstated in 2006.
Superintendent-President Oakley has taken Dr. Kehoe's place on some of the community boards on which she served. Since he became Superintendent-President, Mr. Oakley has spoken at numerous community venues.

*Planning Agenda:*

None.
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