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Standard IV: Leadership and Governance

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

Descriptive Summary

Board Policy and Administrative Regulations 1001 (4.A.1, 4.A.2) and Board Policy and Administrative Regulation 2006 (4.A.3, 4.A.4) respectively outline participation in governance at the college. The Board is the ultimate decision-maker in those areas assigned to it by law and other regulations. Policy 2006 details governance participation in the decision-reaching processes of the district to include the following constituencies:

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

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

- **Associated Student Body Cabinet** – the official body representing students in governance relating to students.

- **Administrators, Managers and Confidentials** – represented by individuals appointed by the Executive Committee.

AR 2006 (4.A.4) details the administration of these regulations under the Superintendent-President and details essential activities of the college decision-making process as

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

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

AR Section 2006.8 – 2006.10 (4.A.4) outlines the Academic Senate’s role in governance regarding academic and professional matters in relationship to the Board of Trustees and in regard to “primarily rely on” matters and “mutually agreed upon” matters. Classified staff relationships to governance and appointments are designated in AR 2006.14 – 2006.19 (4.A.4).
Self Evaluation

The Superintendent-President realized that to fully integrate all constituencies into a collaborative college-wide process dependent on trust and open communication, it was necessary to also include collective bargaining unit leadership in the process. Thus, the President reconstituted the President’s Advisory Committee into the President’s Leadership Council (PLC) in 2007 (4.A.5). Included in the PLC were the presidents of Classified Staff/AFT, full-time Faculty/CCA, and part-time Faculty/CHI. This new structure has allowed for a more inclusive and collaborative process in college governance. All policies and administrative regulations go through the PLC after review from the various constituent groups on the PLC.

The college planning committees are the primary governance bodies for facilitating decisions about student learning programs and services. The LBCC college-wide employee survey done in November of 2013 had a section on governance (4.A.6). Of 361 people who responded to the question regarding their participation on governance committees, 81 people responded “yes” and with 280 responded “no.” Of 489 people responding to the question, “I understand the governance process at LBCC,” the majority agreed or were neutral to the statement.

At the end of the last academic year, the CPC realized that the planning structure had become burdensome with meetings, and committees needed increased participation. In response, the Academic Council established a task force group to assess the structure and process and make recommendations for possible changes back to Academic Council. The task force group met in November of 2013 and is scheduled to present its recommendations in spring of 2014.

Student learning outcomes have been a priority since an accreditation visit in 2002. Since then, the Board of Trustees and the current Superintendent-President have lead the institutional push to advance the effort. 2013-14 Board goals (4.A.7) and the President’s 2012-14 Agenda (4.A.8) set the direction for planning and the various college planning committees set and monitor targets through committee and task force group work. TracDat has been used for the collection of data, and all new curriculum going to the curriculum committee must have SLOs attached. The evaluation of current courses and programs is ongoing.

Actionable Improvement Plans

None
Standard IV.A - Decision-Making Roles and Processes

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

Descriptive Summary

An institutional code of ethics (Board Policy 3008) for all employees was developed through the President’s Leadership Council (4.A.9), which has representatives from all constituency groups, and was approved by the Board of Trustees in July 2009. It defines ethical behavior, the importance of ethics, compliance with laws and details 11 ethical standards of practice for all staff. The employee code of ethics is accessible through the college website (4.A.9).

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

The college’s Educational Master Plan 2011-2016 (4.A.10) is the road map that drives institutional planning, and it contains a statement of values that includes student focus, excellence, equity and diversity, integrity and responsibility. These values and the accompanying goals defined in the EMP surfaced from an extensive collegial process that included development of criteria for the plan, development of a mission statement, internal and external scans, a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis, the setting of goals and measurable objectives and the setting of targets. Measurable objectives were developed for student preparedness, student goal attainment and equitable student success. Updates on the progress towards these goals are reported yearly at the spring College Planning Committee (CPC) meetings (4.A.11) and to the Board of Trustees. This plan includes the yearly Board of Trustee Goals, the President’s 12-Month Agenda, the work of the planning committees, and other strategic college initiatives such as Promise Pathways and Student Equity.

Institutional planning starts at the department and program level. Institutional and Board goals are used in the development of department planning. Every strategy proposed by the departments requires a connection to one or more of the goals. Yearly plans begin in the spring and are reviewed by representatives from the Department Planning and Program Review Committee (4.A.12). Each department or program develops strategies for improvement and enhancement of student learning. Suggestions for improvement are sent to the departments and programs, and the final plans are submitted in the fall. These plans are then forwarded to the dean in each of the schools and representatives from all departments and programs meet with their deans and use these plans to develop school plans. School plans are then forwarded to the vice presidents, where the vice president-level plans are established in consultation with faculty representatives (4.A.13). Vice president-level plans
are then brought to the CPC where they are reviewed by all participants, who finalize the plans to be considered in the establishment of institutional priorities.

The institutional priorities are used by the Budget Advisory Committee in developing Budget Assumptions, and they are also shared with the rest of the college (4.A.14). Institutional priorities for 2013-14 continued a focus on student success and included maintaining the college’s fiscal stability, acquisition of funds to support success initiatives and support of professional development to align with institutional priorities. The CPC tasked a work group to come back with recommendations for 2014-15 that also includes support for comprehensive programs at the Pacific Coast Campus.

The Mission Statement is easily accessible online and was projected on the large screen at each Board meeting in 2012-13 (4.A.15).

Self Evaluation

Even though the college has a clear governance system in place for planning and resource allocation, many individual faculty – especially those not participating on planning committees – and some departments, have expressed concerns about why and how certain decisions are made regarding resource requests. At its May 2013 meeting, CPC discussed how to better integrate planning and resource allocation. They decided to have the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) forward budget assumptions to CPC as an action item prior to submitting them to the Superintendent-President (4.A.14). This gives CPC an opportunity to review, approve or recommend changes to the assumptions. They also decided to create a task force to study and recommend strategies to better align planning and resource allocation. The task force was formed in the fall of 2013 and the outcome was to revise the CPC charge to include an annual presentation to BAC of institutional priorities along with a ranked list of augmentation requests developed through prioritization of vice president-area goals and resource requests. Each division is working to develop strategies for communicating back to units and levels regarding status of requests and how priorities were decided. Much more dialogue has taken place regarding this issue and the intent is for deans to work with department heads to better inform the department planning and program review process of how planning is linked to resource allocations.

Findings from the college Governance Focus Groups revealed that those who are involved in department planning and those who attend board meetings are most likely to be able to identify the college goals (4.A.6). The focus groups further indicated that that the college seemed to be interested in innovation but that current processes do not provide clear places for bringing new ideas forward. There is a sense by both classified staff and faculty that they either do not have a way to bring forward innovation or that their ideas are not heard. The College Planning Committee is talking about strategies designed to bring innovative ideas forward to CPC from the department planning process. The college also realizes that there have been fewer funds for innovation, and the need for innovation funding has been discussed at CPC. One means of support has recently come from the Irvine Foundation Leadership Award (4.A.16) designed to advance innovation practices within the college. The Superintendent-President has set aside a significant portion of the award money to fund faculty innovation in the next academic year.
Upper level administration is sensitive to the fact that there is not enough communication but is frustrated by the fact that all groups want to be consulted “in a timely manner”. Academic administrators have distinguished between the general nature of the college goals and values and the day-to-day goals that are more measurable. They are concerned that some of the goals, especially student success, tend to overshadow all others and that goals such as creativity and innovation, for instance, have been shaved off in order to save money.

The classified staff in the focus groups felt that they were particularly close to the values—“we live and breathe them here…if we don’t follow this we won’t be employed”. Some faculty, on the other hand, had reservations about the competing demands of integrity and student success. Faculty expressed concern that in discussing student success, the college does not acknowledge the reality of student preparation: “not only are their academic skills not ready, but their soft skills—being on time, doing homework—aren’t ready, we have lost focus as a college on that”.

While the Employee Survey results show that 67 percent of all employee groups are confident they understand their role in achieving college-wide goals, 31 percent are not familiar with the college mission statement. The same survey suggested that 43 percent of the full-time faculty and 24 percent of the classified staff feel that they have an opportunity to effectively participate in the planning and goal setting at LBCC (4.A.6).

Different groups at the college have considerable differences in their understanding of what constitutes student success and how it can be measured. The Educational Master Plan (4.A.10), Student Success webpage (4.A.17) and Student Success Committee (4.A.18) speak to the goal, definitions and committee charge respectively of student success. Further, the Student Success Committee is addressing the issues related to defining student success. There is a still a need, however, for expanded discussion and a recognition that this should be an ongoing negotiation, not a discussion that should end, as well as a need to share the critical issues with all college groups to reach some consensus on what success means, why the college is doing what it is doing, and what LBCC needs to do as an institution to ensure that its students truly succeed in their goals.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

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

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

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

Descriptive Summary

When the most recent Educational Master Plan for 2011-2016 was developed, the college established several values including “excellence” and “integrity.” The “excellence” value states, “We value innovation and creativity as part of our commitment to the continuous improvement of our educational environment.” The “integrity” value states, “We encourage a civil and ethical campus environment and value the perspectives of all individuals” (4.A.10).

Through the various college-wide committees, faculty, staff, the management team, and students have the opportunity to discuss issues, bring forth ideas for change, and make recommendations. The membership of each committee is defined within the committee charge. The representatives to each committee are appointed by the respective entity (i.e., Academic Senate, Community College Association (CCA), Certified Hourly Instructors (CHI), American Federation of Teachers (AFT, representing classified employees), Associated Student Body (ASB), etc. Participation and input from all committee members is strongly encouraged at each meeting and the participants have the responsibility of taking back the discussion and decisions made to each of their respective constituent groups. Furthermore, Board Policy 2006 defines the Policy on Participation in Governance and acknowledges the Academic Senate, the Classified Union, and Associated Student Body as the official bodies representing their constituent groups (4.A.3). As defined in Administrative Regulation 2006 (4.A.4), the President’s Leadership Council (PLC) is the primary advisory body to the Superintendent-President for the purpose of reviewing proposed new policies/regulations or changes to existing ones. Any person or group can propose changes to a board policy and/or administrative regulation, and such proposals are sent to the PLC for review and approval before being submitted to the Board of Trustees.

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

Self Evaluation

Throughout the college several innovative ideas have been developed with input from employees and students including: designated smoking areas, Promise Pathways, P-ENGL classes, Math Boot Camp, alternative placement models, server virtualization, Coffee
Mondays, iPad purchase for cashier line, CUPCCAA (California Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act), and the success centers.

In fall 2010, the Associated Student Body (ASB) passed a resolution asking for designated smoking areas on campus. As a result, the college revised Board Policy 7002 – Smoking in District Facilities and Vehicles in January 2011 and established designated smoking areas on each campus. (4.A.19) The smoking areas are now shown on the campus maps (4.A.20).

The Promise Pathways initiative (4.A.21) was launched in fall 2012 as an extension of the Long Beach College Promise (4.A.22). Several committees exist in support of Promise Pathways each focused on a different initiative. As a result of their work, the college has supported the two programs to address the needs of students who were not adequately prepared for the math and English courses into which they were placed by the alternative assessment pilot: a Math Boot Camp in winter 2013 with a continuation of it in winter 2014 and an English course entitled P-ENGL whereby students are placed in a combined course that is one-level below transfer or at transfer level with the goal of assessing the students within the first few weeks of the course and determining whether they should remain in the course one-level below transfer or if they can be moved up to the transfer level course.

At the 2012 Chief Information Systems Officer Association (CISOA), two LBCC employees (Mark Guidas and Arne Nystrom) were given an award for their innovation in virtualizing the servers and converting to a voice-over IP system (4.A.23).

One of the recommendations that came from the Collegiality and Morale Committee (4.A.24) was to institute a time at which employees could gather together and mingle. In response, beginning on Monday, February 24, 2014, LBCC implemented "Coffee Mondays" (4.A.25) whereby all staff are invited to come to the LAC faculty and staff lounge and the PCC associate vice president's conference room between the hours 9:00 am - 10:00 am and 6:00 pm - 7:00 pm for a free cup of coffee. Various initiatives will continue to be tried to encourage staff to get to know each other and spend some time together in an informal setting.

Although there are several examples where employees have taken initiative to make improvements, this feeling of empowerment does not always flow through to the entire organization. When asked in the LBCC Employee Survey whether LBCC leaders encourage administrators, faculty, staff, and students (no matter what their official title) to take initiative in improving practices, programs and services, 40 percent of the total respondents either agreed or strongly agreed while 21.8 percent either disagreed or strongly disagreed (4.A.6, p. 74) When asked whether input regarding improving practices, programs, and services is encouraged, 50.6 percent of the total respondents either agreed or strongly agreed while 20.4 percent either disagreed or strongly disagreed (4.A.6, p. 70). At the same time, when asked whether employees have the opportunity to be involved in making decisions about how work is done, 61.9 percent of the total respondents either agreed or strongly agreed while only 11.9 percent either disagreed or strongly disagreed (4.A.6, p.77).

In the fall 2013 Governance Focus Groups on Innovation and Decision-Making (4.A.6), some faculty, classified staff and academic administrators expressed considerable frustration about not feeling empowered enough to support student success and have the resources to support it. Some faculty stated that feedback is requested but when it is given “no one uses it”. There was an expressed need for more face-to-face contact with leaders, more leadership...
training for all groups, and more level-to-level orientation. Those who seemed empowered talked about feeling very clear about their role, what was expected of them, and how their work was interdependent with that of employees in other departments. Trainings on Shared Governance were held during Academic Senate meetings on November 22, 2013 and December 6, 2013 (4.A.41).

Actionable Improvement Plans

None

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

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

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

Descriptive Summary

LBCC’s institutional policies and procedures clearly describe the roles and involvement of each constituent group within the participatory governance structure. These written policies afford each constituent group information and opportunity for participation. Board Policy 1001: Policy on Policies and Administrative Regulations directs the Superintendent-President to recommend institutional policy “in consultation with the appropriate areas of the college” (4.A.1, 4.A.2). Administrative Regulation 1001 outlines how each constituent group participates in the initiation, development, information dissemination, and recommendation of proposed policy before it is presented to the Board of Trustees (4.A.2). Board Policy 2006 further details the role of administration, faculty, staff, and students in college governance. This policy recognizes the Academic Senate as the official body representing faculty relating to academic and professional matters, the Classified Union (AFT), as the official body representing the majority of classified staff, and the Associated Student Body as the official body representing students related to student matters (4.A.3). The Academic Senate president is seated at the Board of Trustees’ table during the board meetings; a student trustee, elected by the student body, also sits at the Board table and holds an advisory vote.

Administrative Regulation 2006: Administrative Regulations on Participation in Governance establishes the roles of all constituent groups (faculty, staff, administrators and students) in the decision-making process as it relates to policy and regulation development (4.A.4). The
President’s Leadership Council is the primary advisory body to the Superintendent-President for the purpose of reviewing proposed new policies and regulations or changes to existing ones and is composed of representatives from the Academic Senate, the full-time and part-time faculty unions, the classified union, administrators and confidential employees, and the Associated Student Body. The college’s planning structure is coordinated through the College Planning Committee (4.A.26) with representation from faculty, classified staff, students, and administrators. Subcommittees and task forces are appointed by CPC as needed and include broad representation.

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

In accordance with its bylaws, full-time faculty are appointed by the Academic Senate as Academic Senators to represent their peers in discussions on academic and professional matters; Academic Senators have input on Academic Senate meeting agendas and are encouraged to voice suggestions and concerns expressed by other faculty (4.A.27). Academic Senate meetings are open meetings and representatives from part-time faculty, the Associated Student Body, and administration regularly attend.

The Curriculum Committee is the primary recommending body on curriculum and instruction and oversees five subcommittees: Academic Policy and Standards, Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes, Associate Degree/General Education, Course Evaluation, and Department Planning and Program Review (4.A.28). The Academic Policy and Standards Subcommittee reviews, updates and adds to the present 4000-band policies and standards throughout the school year. These changes are then brought forward to the curriculum committee, which has representatives from each department for either approval or denial before being forwarded for review by the President’s Leadership Council and the Board of Trustees.

Self Evaluation

The findings from the recent LBCC Employee Survey indicate that the majority of the administrators, managers, and full-time faculty understand the governance process while only 26 percent of the classified and 32 percent of the part-time faculty indicated that they understood the process. Similarly, while 22 percent of all constituent groups have participated on a shared governance committee and nearly 50 percent viewed participation as part of their responsibility there was significant variance in participation by employee group. Administrators (56 percent) and full-time faculty (44 percent) were most likely to have participated on a shared governance committee, while classified staff (13 percent) and part-time faculty (8 percent) were least likely to have been on such a committee (4.A.6, pp. 62-63).

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

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

Focus group respondents—including full-time and part-time faculty and classified staff—felt they did not have consistent access to information about committees, processes, outcomes of committee work, and decisions. Respondents also stated that clarification on what “collegial consultation” means would be valuable in expanding involvement in shared governance structures. For example, respondents cited the need for greater clarity concerning expectations from committees/task forces to the college, from leaders to members, from leaders and members to represented groups, and from represented groups to committees and task forces. Comments also suggested the importance of identifying ways to help new committee members feel included, have a sense of belonging, and feel safe and welcomed in their role (4.A.6).

In an effort to ensure greater participation in the shared governance structure, the entire committee structure was revamped five years ago. The process included reducing the number of subcommittees and streamlining communication and decision-making lines as well as limiting the terms that committee chairs could serve. These changes have made committee participation more meaningful for committee members and have allowed more individuals the opportunity to serve on a committee, two key objectives of the reorganization. However, a lack of written information on past practices and committee chair training has left many of these chairpersons without guidance and directions. The college faces an even greater challenge right now in the area of encouraging participation in governance committees as the number of retirees increases dramatically each year and the number of new full-time faculty being hired increases as well. To address this issue, in spring 2014 Academic Council recommended a shared governance handbook be developed to assist in training new committee members and that new member training sessions be offered through staff and faculty professional development (4.A.29).

### Actionable Improvement Plans

Under the direction of Academic Council, a shared governance handbook will be developed to assist in training new committee members on shared governance committees. In addition, training for new committee members will be included in the college’s professional development plan.
IV.A.3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

Descriptive Summary

The college has clear policies and administrative regulations in place that establish governance structures and roles for all constituent groups. (Administrative Regulation 2006 - Participation in Governance) (4.A.4). The policy also documents the acknowledged role of all constituent groups at the college as required by Education Code and as integrated into locally established college policies and Regulations as follows:

Board of Trustees

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

Academic Senate

- The official body representing the faculty in shared governance relating to academic and professional matters.
- Policies and procedures on academic and professional matters shall not be adopted until consultation has occurred.

Classified Union

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

Associated Student Body Cabinet

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

- Represented by individuals appointed from the Executive Committee

The President’s Leadership Council is the primary advisory body to the Superintendent-President for the purposes of reviewing new or changing policies and regulations. It also serves as a consultative body to the President on issues of college leadership and matters of college-wide importance other than those not subject to consultation as defined in Board Policy 2006 (4.A.3). The college planning process and structure is laid out in 2006.b (Planning process and committee structure) which also outlines purpose and review of committee charges.

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

Self Evaluation

A college-wide survey completed in November of 2013 demonstrated that almost 90 percent of those surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that they understood their role in helping LBCC achieve its goals. A majority of employees feel proud to work at the college, feel loyalty to the college and are willing to work harder in order to help the college succeed. A majority of managers, confidential employees, and part-time faculty stated in the survey that colleagues all work together collaboratively; however, less than 50 percent of the administrators, faculty and classified agreed with this statement. In addition, a majority of employees disagreed or strongly disagreed that there was a climate of mutual respect and trust amongst all groups (4.A.6). This may be due, in part, to the significant budget reductions the college has experienced over the past four years. Prior to 2013, reductions were made to the extent possible in discretionary areas only. Recognizing that an operating deficit was not sustainable, the College Planning Committee, at the direction of Academic Council, set criteria for program discontinuance. After 18 months of work that included data gathering, presentations to the Academic Council and public presentations to the Board of Trustees, the Board voted in January of 2013 to discontinue 11 programs. These actions, along with administrative reorganizations, lead to a reduction in force for faculty, administrators and classified staff (4.A.30). Another factor that inhibits effective communication among groups
has been the physical reorganization of the college: new buildings and parking lots at LAC make it less likely that administrators and faculty, for instance, will encounter each other in informal settings on campus. Administrators in the focus groups complained that they only saw the same few faculty members over and over again, thereby limiting the reach of communication to faculty.

Another concern that emerged in the 2013 focus groups was a tension among different constituent groups about the value of the planning process. On the one hand, administrators express concerns that the planning process is not flexible enough to accommodate innovation or short-term needs. On the other hand, other groups express concerns that adequate consultation is not always allowed and that new initiatives are implemented outside the planning process. A prime illustration of this tension has been the implementation of Promise Pathways, the signature initiative during this evaluation period. In order to support this initiative, the college established new work groups outside of the planning process. Affected groups felt that these alternative structures did not allow adequate consultation with those who were most impacted by the new programs. The Academic Council and College Planning Committee have been addressing this concern throughout the 2013-14 year, and will continue to do so next year as a governance handbook is developed and shared with all groups and refinements to the planning structure are put into place. The Student Success Committee is looking at ways to better integrate the Promise Pathways initiative into the college's overall student success plan, and Academic Council is expected to receive recommendations from them by fall 2014.

Another related shortcoming with the planning process has been lack of consistent communication regarding prioritization decisions. Currently, plans progress from program to school to the college level; at each of the lower levels all planning must be justified by alignment with college goals and planned outcomes, but when final decisions are made, there has been no clear procedure established to make available the rationale for these decisions—groups ask that college leadership provide explanations of which plans have been accepted and which rejected and how evidence supports that decision. The college has been attempting to embrace a culture of evidence, but announcements of planning decisions have not yet reflected that culture.

The planning process might gain credibility and become more dynamic if it were regarded as circular rather than linear; instead of plans emerging from departments and moving to the college leadership, the planning process should start with guidance from college leadership about particular priorities and incentives, move through the appropriate levels (as it does now) and end with a clear statement from the leadership to the college at larger about how decisions to accept or reject planning proposals have been reached and how each decision is based upon data analysis.

The survey also asked employees to indicate what their top three areas of improvement would be at the college and “morale” surfaced as the number one area that needed to be improved. With this in mind, the Superintendent-President established a “Collegiality and Morale Advisory Group,” consisting of 25 members from all employee groups, that has met three times thus far this academic year and continues to review issues and make recommendations for improvements (A.24).
AR 2006 stipulates that each college group involved in the participatory governance process is responsible for communication (4.A.4). Most of these groups have their agendas and minutes posted on the college website. However, the findings from both the focus groups and the survey indicate that posting material may not be enough; communication continues to be an ongoing college issue. The majority of constituents who completed the survey indicated that there are many forms of communication available at LBCC and that it is clear and easy to understand, but there was a concern in some groups about how difficult it is to find out information about governance at the college. Several groups felt that they are not informed about the actions of governance committees and indicated it was difficult to find minutes. There were also some issues with committee information either not always being kept up-to-date or nonexistent in some cases. Students were most satisfied with the communities they found in smaller programs at the college but felt that they were unable to find much of a community within the college overall. Even though they try to become involved, some adjuncts do not feel that their departments include them, while others think their departments are extremely supportive and inclusive (4.A.6).

The findings also point to a need for communication to be easier and more comfortable among different groups: “I feel we are so low on the totem pole they won’t listen to us”, classified staff say about faculty; “You only speak to those at your same level”, classified staff say; students say they “want to be heard” and want to “interact directly with administrators.”

The Department Planning and Program Review Committee is discussing the communication and work flow between various groups and committees, in an effort to determine where to place the great ideas, projects and strategies from department plans that did not move forward into the school plans. They want to ensure ideas do not “sit idle” for a year, or get lost in the process (4.A.12).

While the Academic Senate has made an attempt to provide links to all of the college-wide committees, tests of the links on the committee link site indicate that very few of these groups have had the time to update their webpage to include even their charge, let alone their agenda and minutes (4.A.31).

Actionable Improvement Plans

College leadership should develop communication strategies that allow for better inter and intra level information sharing and input from all constituencies.
IV.A.4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self-study, and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

Descriptive Summary

Long Beach City College places a high value on its relationship with all external agencies. LBCC understands that as an effective institution of higher learning, it must seek out, develop, and nurture partnerships and collaborative relationships with outside agencies and organizations. Whether corporate commercial governmental, institutional, public, non-profit, volunteer, local, national or international, engagement with all external agencies is governed by institutional values that are centered on honesty, integrity, and respect.

Long Beach City College is committed to the mandate for public disclosure in all areas of its operation. Documents and data that define or inform institutional operations and activities are accessible online through the college website. Additional information is also available through print media, the Long Beach City College cable network, College Advancement and Economic Development (4.A.32), or by specific request from an individual or group. This includes but is not limited to the following materials:

- Board Agendas, meeting schedules, actions and announcements, and cablecasts of all Board of Trustee meetings
- Student information, class schedules, catalog information, registration, etc.
- Administrative information and access to employment opportunities, salary information, budget information institutional planning, employee organization, etc.
- Bond Construction information, including construction updates, cautionary notices, budget reporting, scheduling, etc.
- The Loop (the college’s online information newsletter), the Viking, (the college’s student newspaper), departmental and organizational webpages, etc.
- Response to emergency situations that may impact college operations (Emergency Preparedness Committee, AR 6005.8) (4.A.33)

The college takes seriously all requests from the Commission and submits on time all annual college and fiscal reports. In response to Commission requirements, LBCC submitted a Follow-Up report in 2009 and its Midterm Report in 2011. The Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes Implementation was submitted on time in fall 2012. The college was also proactive in contacting ACCJC regarding the anticipation of discontinuing several programs in 2012-13. After review of the materials submitted, ACCJC determined there was no need for a substantive change proposal regarding these discontinued programs and that standard II.A.6.b., requiring the college to make appropriate arrangements for students in these programs to complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption, was being upheld.
Self Evaluation

The college has complied with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure. The college moved expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission and Evaluation Team by submitting all required reports, and it is well prepared for all team visits.

Actionable Improvement Plans

None

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

Descriptive Summary

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

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

In spring 2013, the Academic Senate’s Consultation on Governance Committee completed a survey that focused on shared governance and leadership issues from a faculty perspective. Results from the survey brought about in Senate Resolution 48.4 resulted in a task force charged with tracking the faculty concerns regarding collegial consultation and decision making as it relates to a variety of issues (4.A.34, 4.A.35).

In the spring of 2013, the Accreditation Steering Committee co-chairs conducted employee focus groups on leadership and governance at LBCC. Then in October 2013, they conducted an online employee survey, which provided for a comprehensive evaluation of leadership, governance and institutional effectiveness (4.A.36).
Self Evaluation

The college provides multiple avenues for evaluating the leadership and institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes as a means to assure their integrity and effectiveness. Such matters are routinely discussed at CPC and the discussions and decisions are recorded in the CPC minutes posted on the district’s website for campus wide review. For example, at the May 21, 2013 CPC meeting a recommendation was made on the integration of planning and resource allocation. The recommendation provided for the creation of a task force to study and recommend strategies to better align the decision making process between planning and resource allocation (4.A.37).

Further, in fall 2012 a recommendation was made at CPC to disband and reassign the tasks of the Enrollment Management Committee. However, some members expressed concern that some of the department heads might feel that they would not be involved in enrollment management decisions. Consequently, the recommendation was further reviewed by Academic Senate and the Academic Council. Thus this issue was fully vetted by the principal parties involved and ultimately led to the Enrollment Management Oversight Committee’s (EMOC) continuance. New co-chairs were appointed for 2013-14 but due to continuing problems in recruiting faculty to serve on the EMOC, the committee remains on hiatus.

At the same CPC meeting a recommendation was also made to disband and reassign the tasks of the Pacific Coast Campus (PCC) Task Force. Since the PCC Educational Plan had been developed and implemented, a consensus was reached that the PCC Task Force would be disbanded and an advisory group created. It was determined that the advisory group would include community members, students, faculty, staff and administrators. It was decided that the group would not report to the CPC, but directly to the associate vice president of PCC (4.A.38).

Yearly negotiation sessions have led to multiple process changes including a revised full-time and part-time faculty evaluation process with the goal of improving the effectiveness and integrity of the evaluation process; a new part-time faculty hiring process, which supports the integrity of the hiring process in alignment with equal employment opportunity guidelines; and a newly initiated department head evaluation procedure which includes performance factors, a rating system, an improvement plan (where appropriate) and a Department Head Academy in support of the effectiveness of faculty leadership. These proposed process changes were vetted through the faculty constituencies prior to ratification of the Agreement.

The Academic Senate’s Resolution 48.4 adopted on May 21, 2013 identified a number of decision-making, collegial consultation, and communication issues. These issues were discussed at the October 4, 2013 Academic Council retreat (4.A.39). Since that time the various work groups (communication, trust and respect, and planning) have continued to address their respective issues at each Academic Council meeting. At the March 6, 2014 Academic Council meeting it was acknowledged that many of the issues that had surfaced previously had been or were being addressed. However, there are still some issues that need to be addressed (4.A.29).

The employee online survey conducted by the Accreditation Steering Committee co-chairs resulted in a 44 percent response rate, which included responses from all employee groups. On November 14, 2013 the results of the survey were discussed at Academic Council
Standard IV.A  Decision-Making Roles and Processes

(4.A.40) These results have also been shared with the accreditation standard teams. These responses will prove to be the basis for continued improvement plans.

**Actionable Improvement Plans**

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