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.

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.

4A.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.

Summary

Mission College is committed to sustaining an environment that empowers all faculty, staff, administrators and students to work together to improve teaching and learning for the success of students. To that end, the college has developed a participatory decision-making structure that encourages creativity, collegiality and collaboration and ensures all stakeholders have a voice in planning, implementing and evaluating programs and services. The highest level participatory governance body in the college is the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), which is advisory to the college President and which is responsible for strategic planning and processes. GAP is chaired by the President and includes representatives from the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the ASB, the DCC, the SSC, the CBAC and administration (t1). (Notation of themes appears throughout the standard as follows: t1, t2, t3, t4, t5, t6). (A list of acronyms and definitions is available on page 388).
The Division Chair Council (DCC), composed of the ten chairs of the academic divisions of the college, is advisory to the Vice President of Instruction and also works with the Academic Senate to recommend academic policy and procedures. The college’s student service areas participate in the Student Services Council (SSC), which advises the Vice President of Student Services. The College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC), which includes representatives of the DCC as well as the Academic and Classified Senates and other groups, reports to GAP. In addition to these groups, there are other college committees with specific charges such as the Facilities and Safety Committee, the Auxiliary Services Committee, the Commencement Committee, the Global Education Committee, and the Technology Committee, which draw members from a variety of constituent groups and make recommendations with college-wide implications (EIV.A1.1).

Decision-making processes with college-wide implications are carried out in a participatory manner. For example, the college’s budget allocation model is designed to allow requests for new funding from any faculty or staff member, but requests are systematically reviewed and prioritized at various levels and by appropriate bodies before allocations are recommended (EIV.A1.2). When the college needed to make a recommendation to the Board regarding whether to reconstruct or replace the Main Building, the President designed a series of campus and community forums over a period of several weeks to gather input and bring options to GAP for its recommendation. This process provided an opportunity for broad-based participation of all stakeholders and a recommendation was made to the Board within the established time frame (EIV.A1.3) (t5).

Program review and the draft of the new educational master plan are further examples of the participatory decision-making process used at Mission College. In Spring 2007, under the leadership of the Academic Senate, the college held a series of campus-wide forums to complete the processes begun in 2005 and to draft an update of the college’s educational plan. College-wide forums were held over a period of several weeks to ensure maximum participation and culminated in 10 recommendations for future directions of instructional programs and services (t2).

The college and District seek to empower their faculty, staff, administrators and students to assume leadership roles and develop leadership skills. The District’s staff development office began a Leadership Development Academy in December 2006 with participation from all managers and supervisors District-wide, and from classified staff in Admissions and Records at both colleges (EIV.A1.4). Participation will eventually be extended to faculty and staff throughout the District.
Evaluation

As noted above, the college has in place a participatory governance structure that is designed to ensure that all stakeholders have a voice and work within an environment that promotes creativity, collegiality and collaboration to improve student learning. Since the college’s last accreditation, the college’s ability to sustain such an environment has been strained at times. During the 2002-2003 State budget crisis, the issuance of March 15 layoff notices to large numbers of faculty caused major problems with faculty and staff morale, although they were rescinded and no layoffs of faculty or staff actually occurred. Problems with morale and campus climate over the following three years adversely affected relationships between faculty, staff, administration, and students (t6).

The District Academic Senate implemented a resolution on March 15, 2006 that halted faculty participation on all committees until issues in four areas were resolved – respect, morale, participatory governance, and campus climate – and used the progress of contract negotiations as one key indicator of District attitudes in these areas (EIV.A1.5). The Classified Senates also supported the resolution and suspended committee work effective March 15, 2006. Without full faculty and staff participation, many activities and initiatives came to a halt. Contract negotiations on salary and benefits reached a successful conclusion in November 2006 and faculty participation in committees resumed at that point. The Classified Senate lifted its resolution in February 2007.

Even before the work-to-contract situation was resolved, the District began to take positive steps to address the issues and there has been progress in the past year. For example, in May 2006, at the request of the District Academic Senate, the Board of Trustees held a Strategic Conversation on “Working Environment: Respect, Morale, and Campus Climate” (EIV.A1.6). The District requested a Technical Assistance Visit by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) and the Community College League of California (CCLC). The visit was made in August 2006, and addressed concerns relating to participatory governance, campus climate, and respect (EIV.A1.7). Further, in July 2006, the District invited the Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) to do a fiscal health assessment of the District as well. Each of these visits involved conversations and input from classified staff, faculty, administrators, and others throughout the college and District (EIV.A1.8-9). The Leadership Development Academy, begun in December 2006, is seen as a possible way of empowering faculty, staff and administration to promote creation of innovation and institutional excellence (t7).
At Mission College, the current college President has made strong efforts to ensure that collaborative and consultative processes are used in all major decision-making situations, including facilities decisions, development of the Educational Master Plan, and other issues. The college continues to move forward with these and other major initiatives that demonstrate the college’s ability to plan and to plan creatively. For example, faculty members have developed numerous innovative proposals. A Title V Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) grant was awarded to the college in 2004 to fund programs assisting underserved student populations, with a particular focus on Hispanic students (EIV.A1.10). A proposed program is under development to bridge students from the existing Licensed Vocational Nursing degree to a new Registered Nurse curriculum (EIV.A1.11). Many faculty have been involved since 2003 in developing learning communities courses and projects (described in more detail in Standard 2A.1.b), such as “Fulfilling Your American Dreams,” “Survival on Success Island,” and “Working for Change.” All of these initiatives have been developed by faculty or staff and brought forward through a collaborative process for college-wide support. These initiatives all demonstrate the college’s ability to ensure that new ideas are promoted through participatory processes that ensure effective planning and implementation.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

- EIV.A1.1 Mission College Committee List 11-06,
- EIV.A1.2 Mission College Budget Allocation Models, 05-05 & 05-07
- EIV.A1.4 WVMCCD Leadership Institute Funding Proposal, 05-23-05
- EIV.A1.5 Important Message from the District Academic Senate Regarding the resolution as of 02-07-06 that was implemented 03-14-06, http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/documents/DAS_resolution_020706.pdf
- EIV.A1.6 WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda, 05-18-06, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php
- EIV.A1.7 WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda, 08-24-06. Item 2.1 showing presentation by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and the Community College League of California,
- EIV.A1.10 Paris > Office of Instruction > Title V Grant http://0-paris.wvmccd.cc.ca.us.library.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/
- EIV.A1.11 Mission College Academic Senate Meeting minutes, 09-27-06 (showing presentation of LVN-to-RN program.), http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/agendas_minutes.html
4A.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.

Summary

Mission College strongly advocates a participatory governance model that complies with AB 1725 and the California Administrative Code Title 5, Sections 51023 and 53200. The District policy is a process of collegial participation between administration, faculty, students, and classified staff with regard to decision-making and policy recommendations. District Policy 2.17.3j was adopted by the Board of Trustees on July 15, 2004. Each administrator/manager is required “to promote participatory governance and administrative effort within the college and District communities by working in a cooperative manner with faculty, staff, students, and other administrators” (EIV.A2.1).

The participatory governance plan is outlined in the Mission College Faculty Handbook (EIV.A2.2). The Board of Trustees has agreed to rely primarily on the Academic Senate in all of the academic and professional matters outlined in Title 5 (EIV.A2.3). The highest level participatory governance body in the college is the Governance and Planning Council (GAP). The College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) operates under GAP. The academic divisions are represented through the Division Chair Council. The Student Services Council appoints representatives as well. Administrators are represented in each of these groups. New faculty Orientation conducted by the Office of Instruction provides information on participatory governance for faculty and the District addresses participatory governance principles in its annual Orientation for all new employees, both faculty and staff (EIV.A2.4). The charges of the college’s participatory governance groups and standing committees are included in the annual update of the committees’ memberships, provided by the Academic Senate (EIV.A2.5).

At the District level, similar participatory governance structures are in place, with both the District Council and the District Budget Advisory Council having clear charges and operating procedures as well as broad-based representation from all constituencies throughout the District (EIV.A2.6).

All constituencies are likewise represented at meetings of the governing board, including students, who are represented both by student Trustees and by student body leaders in attendance at meetings (EIV.A2.7). Board meetings are also attended by the Academic and Classified Senate presidents, who are given regular items on the agenda during which they may address the Board.
Evaluation

The college has demonstrated a high degree of participatory governance in both its operations and in major initiatives, such as the decision regarding the Main Building and the development of its educational plan. However, the college has not effectively documented its governance processes. For example, the college has written descriptions of its participatory governance structure, but the comprehensive governance plan that the college began to develop in 1998 was never finalized. The college’s participatory governance organizational structure has not been systematically reviewed since the late 1990’s. During the intervening time, there has been substantial turn-over among administrators as well as the hiring of significant numbers of new faculty and staff who lack historical knowledge of the college’s organizational development.

In particular, the role of the college’s Governance and Planning Council (GAP) is not clearly defined or well understood by the college at large, and the role of GAP has varied over the last seven years with changes in the college administration. In Fall 2007, GAP began a discussion of its role in the participatory governance and decision-making process. A task force has been appointed to assess the role and responsibilities of GAP, and a forum is being scheduled to begin a review of the college’s overall participatory governance and decision-making process, with participants from all the different committees and councils throughout the institution (EIV.A2.8, EIV.A2.9). As noted in the response to Standard 1.B.4, the college’s participatory governance and standing committees are also being asked to review their charges and membership, set goals, and conduct evaluations, following the model of the District Council. This should help to improve awareness of the college’s participatory governance policies by all participants (t2).

Planning Agenda

- PA 4.1 Through the college’s participatory governance process, the college will update its participatory governance model, procedures, and policies. The college will implement training and strategies for faculty, administrators, staff and students to improve participation in college governance and ensure that all participants be knowledgeable about decision-making processes.

Evidence

| EIV.A2.2 | Mission College Faculty Handbook 2005-2006, section 1, page 7 |
| EIV.A2.3 | District Policy Manual, 3.3.4.b, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/policies/index.php |
| EIV.A2.4 | Agenda for New Employee Orientation, 08-22-07 |
| EIV.A2.5 | Mission College Committee List 11-06, |
| EIV.A2.6 | WVMCCD Council Operating Procedures, Approved, 05-10-06 |
| EIV.A2.7 | WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda, 06-21-07, showing oath of office administered to Student Trustee Thomas LoCurto, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php |
| EIV.A2.8 | Mission College Shared Governance and Decision Making Plan, 05-98 |
| EIV.A2.9 | Governance and Planning Council Summary, 09-05-07 |
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.

Summary

Participatory committees are the primary vehicles for institutional governance at Mission College. The college has a number of standing committees and governing bodies, including the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Governance and Planning Council (GAP), Division Chair Council (DCC), College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC), Performance Goals Committee (PGC), Technology Committee, Global Education Committee, and the Facilities and Safety Committee.

Administrators serve on many participatory governance committees. The management team (administrators and managers) are both members and resources for the faculty, professional support staff, and students on committees (EIV.A2a.1).

The Academic Senate serves as the primary body addressing faculty participation in governance and evaluation of instruction. The Senate meets once a week with additional meetings as necessary. The Academic Senate president represents the faculty at Board meetings, at the District Council sessions, and on most participatory governance committees. The Academic Senate president is elected by the full-time faculty at large. Senators representing each division are elected by the full-time faculty in the division. Senators representing associate faculty are elected by the associate faculty at large. The Academic Senate is responsible for appointing faculty representatives to all college and District participatory governance committees (EIV.A2a.2).

For Academic Senate subcommittees, administrators may be invited to participate and/or attend when appropriate, although faculty have the lead role. *Ad hoc* college committees and task forces are created as needed to study and recommend actions on pressing college issues. Appointments to *ad hoc* committees are made through established management, professional support staff, faculty, and student governance committees. A list of Academic Senate committees, by-laws, meeting times, agendas, and minutes is available on the Academic Senate website (EIV.A2a.3). Academic Senate subcommittees include:

- Distance Education
- Technology
- Curriculum Review
- Student Learning Outcomes
The Curriculum Review Committee is composed of representatives from each division, and is responsible for approving all curricula and academic programs. Approved curricular changes are then sent to the Academic Senate and college administration for approval and then to the Board of Trustees with a recommendation that they be adopted (EIV.A2a.4).

The Classified Senate at Mission College represents basic unit, confidential, and supervisory classified staff. The Classified Senate provides a formal structure to ensure the role and participation of the classified staff in the college’s formation of campus goals, objectives, policies, procedures, and regulations. The Classified Senate president represents the classified staff at Board meetings, in District Council, and on many participatory governance committees. The Classified Senate President is also responsible for appointing classified representatives to ad hoc committees and task forces.

Two seats on the Academic Senate are allocated to student representatives, who are appointed by the Associate Student Body (ASB). In addition, a student Trustee is elected each year by the ASB for a one-year term on the District Board of Trustees. The college seeks active participation from student leaders (e.g., ASB officers) in the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), the college’s highest participatory governance body (EIV.A2a.5). In 2003, the Associated Student Body established a new Associated Student Body (ASB) position called Director of Recruitment and Public Relations. This position serves to broaden the pool of students to participate directly in student governance and to promote overall student participation in college-wide activities, including ASB activities. Each year, student leaders are selected by the ASB committee to participate in several State and national leadership conferences, with an emphasis on community college student governance. For example, the college sponsors several students to attend the American Student Association of Community College’s National Conference for Student Advocacy held in Washington D.C. during the spring. Additionally, this year, the college sponsored students to attend the “Leaders of the World” Conference that was held in San Diego, California (EIV.A2a.5) (t5).

**Evaluation**

The college strives to provide an environment that encourages and supports participation of all constituents. Classified staff participation in participatory governance is problematic. Although most participatory governance committees are supposed to have classified staff members, many times allotted spaces are not filled or classified representatives are not present. Classified staff usually do not receive release time to attend committee meetings, and in some cases managers have raised objections to their absence from their regular assigned duties to participate in governance bodies such as the Classified Senate. This issue was raised in the Participatory Governance Report issued following the Technical Assistance Visit by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) and the Community College League of California (CCLC) in August, 2006 (EIV.A2a.6). The new President has been working actively with the Classified Senate President to explore ways in which classified participation can be better supported (t4).
Although student participation is sought for GAP, CBAC, and the Academic Senate, the actual participation is low and it is frequently difficult to find students willing to commit the time necessary. However, when students participate in committees, their opinions and comments are given weight by those in attendance.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

EIV.A2a.1  Mission College Committee List 11-06,  
http://paris/mc/inside/mc_committee_list.pdf

EIV.A2a.2  Mission College Academic Senate Constitution & Bylaws, Revised & adopted 05-24-07,  

EIV.A2a.3  Mission College Academic Senate website,  
http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/

EIV.A2a.4  Mission College Curriculum Committee Homepage,  
http://salsa.missioncollege.org/curriculum

EIV.A2a.5  Mission College ASB Student Senate Minutes,  

EIV.A2a.6  WVMCCD Technical Assistance Visit, 09-09-06,  

4A2.b.  The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

**Summary**

Mission College relies primarily on the faculty and the Academic Senate for academic and professional matters, in accordance with District policy. Faculty provide leadership for changes that may be needed to ensure that curriculum and programs meet the needs of students. Faculty members develop curriculum, programs, and establish student learning outcomes for all educational programs offered at the college (t3). The documents that identify the importance of faculty in development of educational offerings of the college are available online as part of the District Policy Manual. The published documents establish the foundation for faculty participation in every major discussion and decision related to the student learning programs and services offered by the college (EIV.A2b.1).
The Academic Senate has played a leading role in program review, educational and facilities master planning. For example, the Academic Senate facilitated college-wide discussions in 2006 and 2007 which resulted in the completion of program review for all programs and services as part of the Educational and Facilities Master Planning (EFMP) process, development of a draft of the new college Education Plan, and laid the foundation for the development of the college’s facilities master plan, now underway (EIV.A2b.2, EIV.A2b.3) (t2).

The Curriculum Review Committee, a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, is composed of representatives from each division, and is responsible for approving all curricula and academic programs. Approved curricular changes are then sent to college administration and the Academic Senate for approval before being sent to the Board of Trustees with a recommendation that they be adopted (EIV.A2a.4, EIV.A2a.5).

Student Learning Outcomes are being developed for all college programs and courses, with leadership by faculty through the Student Learning Outcomes subcommittee of the Academic Senate. The new Basic Skills Initiative has lead to the formation of a Basic Skills Committee (a subcommittee of the Academic Senate) with representation from faculty, academic administrators, and classified staff. The initial charge of this committee is to develop a plan for implementing the Basic Skills Initiative at Mission College, and it is anticipated that this will have a significant effect on student learning programs and services college wide (EIV.A2b.6) (t3).

Per the Administrative Handbook (June 2007), administrators are responsible for “the efficient and effective administration of the programs of the District...for providing educational leadership and support services.” Administrative job descriptions describe the responsibilities and duties for each position. Administrators participate at all levels of participatory governance and are represented on all major committees (t4).

**Evaluation**

The official responsibilities of the Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee and of academic administrators in the development and approval of curriculum and other educational matters are well established in the policies, procedures, and other authoritative documents that establish standard operating procedures at the college. At Mission College, classified staff, faculty and administrators generally have a positive, collaborative working relationship as evidenced by the college’s ability to recover relatively quickly from the work-to-contract situation in 2006, and by the college’s ability to complete major planning activities and initiatives in 2006-2007.

**Planning Agenda**

None.
Evidence

EIV.A2b.2 Email, “Time to Discuss,” 02-05-07 and email announcing first EFMP forum, 02-27-07
EIV.A2b.3 Mission College Education Master Plan, 06-18-07

4A.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.

Summary

Mission College’s participatory governance model and participatory governance policy are stated in Section 1 of the Faculty Handbook (EIV.A3.1). Various District policies also explicitly state the intent of the District that the Board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together in a consultative and collaborative manner (EIV.A3.2).

Participation in college governance from all segments of the college community is both allowed and actively encouraged at all levels. The student government at each college elects a student trustee to sit on the governing board each year. By May of each year, the Board formally confirms the voting and other privileges of student trustees [Section 1.6.4 of Board policy], who have advisory voting privileges and who contribute to the discussion of topics affecting the entire District (EIV.A3.3).

Representatives of the classified and academic senates are in attendance at all board meetings. Major college governance bodies, including the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), the College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC), and others are composed of representatives from all segments of the college community (students, faculty, staff, and administration). Other governance bodies include the Division Chair Council and the Student Services Council. All of these bodies have representatives on GAP and provide input from and communication with their individual constituencies (EIV.A3.4) (t5).
At the District level, Mission College participates in similar bodies. The District Council advises the Chancellor, and is the highest participatory governance body in the District. It includes representatives from all constituencies throughout the District. District Council provides a venue for faculty and staff throughout the District to communicate information, raise issues, and consider solutions which cross constituencies or affect both colleges (EIV.A3.5).

The District Budget Advisory Committee (DBAC) is advisory to the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, and considers budget and fiscal issues which affect the District as a whole. Membership on DBAC includes key District administrative staff as well as the Vice Presidents of Administrative Services from both colleges, both Academic Senate presidents, and faculty and classified representatives. The Budget Allocation Model Subcommittee (BAMS) is a subcommittee of DBAC charged with developing a new model for the allocation of District resources, and has participation from the Director of Business Services, the District’s budget manager, faculty representatives from both colleges, and others.

Most major decisions facing Mission College are decided in an inclusive, collaborative manner. Recent examples of this have included the development of the college’s Education Plan and completion of the Educational and Facilities Master Planning process in Spring 2007, both of which were developed with input from faculty, staff, and administrators gathered through a series of college-wide forums under the auspices of the Academic Senate. The discussions and communication at these forums contributed strongly to the development of consensus on the directions the college will move over the next five to ten years (EIV.A3.6) (t5).

Evaluation

Historically, the college has sought representatives to sit on various committees and governance bodies from all constituent groups, but participation has not been as extensive as the college would like. Beginning in 2006, the Chancellor has held regular roundtable discussions with the presidents of the Classified Senates and Academic Senates from both colleges to enhance communication. The Academic Senate President would like to increase the level of participation among all faculty. However, the major concern is classified staff. The 2006 visit by a Technical Assistance Team from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and the Community College League of California noted that the District needs to work harder to improve participation in governance structures by classified staff (EIV.A3.7). These recommendations, along with recommendations from the 2006 Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) report, are being discussed by the Academic Senate and by college and District administration to develop ways to improve participation by classified staff in participatory governance (t4).
Student participation in governance is particularly low, and student seats on bodies such as the Academic Senate, GAP, and CBAC frequently are vacant although student government is encouraged to send representatives to all three bodies. As noted in the Planning Agenda item for section 4A.2, new mechanisms to improve participation of both students and classified staff in participatory governance structures need to be explored. However, student input is regularly sought on key issues through presentations to student government at their scheduled meetings (EIV.A3.8).

While involvement and communication are high, some college constituents remain uncertain of the specific structures. Half (50%) of all staff, faculty, and administrators who responded to a Spring 2007 survey indicated disagreement with the statement, “There are clear divisions of authority and responsibility between and among the governing board, district office, and the colleges,” with just one-quarter (25%) indicating agreement (EIV.A3.9) (t4).

The college’s participatory governance plan has not been updated in a number of years, and is currently under review by the Governance and Planning Council (GAP) as part of a review of GAP’s role and responsibilities as noted in the Planning Agenda for standard 4A.2 (EIV.A3.10).

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

- EIV.A3.1 Section 1, Faculty Handbook 2005-2006
- EIV.A3.5 District Council Meeting Agendas and Minutes, 10-29-03, 03-07-07
- EIV.A3.6 Mission College Education Master Plan, 06-18-07
- EIV.A3.8 District Policy Manual, 2.4.2 and 2.4.5, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/policies/index.php
- EIV.A3.9 WVMCCD Spring 2007 Accreditation Survey Summary Results
- EIV.A3.10 Governance and Planning Council Summary, 08-29-07, 09-05-07
4A.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.

Summary

The District Policy Manual states, “We believe the District must operate with integrity. Ethical behavior is the over-riding responsibility of every member of the District community” (EIV.A4.1). Mission College strives to carry out that philosophy in every area of operation by advocating and demonstrating honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. The 2001 accreditation process included a certification of the institution’s continued compliance with eligibility requirements. Midterm progress reports have been submitted as required and all have been accepted by the Commission. In 2007, the Commission accepted the college’s 2006 Focused Midterm Report but requested further documentation of progress. That information was submitted as required in April 2007 and accepted by the Commission in June 2007 (EIV.A4.2-3) (t6).

A number of accreditation reports, including the 2001 Application for Reaffirmation of Accreditation and the 2004 Focused Mid-Term Report, along with supporting documentation and the responses of the Commission, are available to faculty and staff on the college’s intranet, “Inside Mission.” In addition, accreditation documents have been distributed to all full-time employees via campus email, and copies are available to the public on request. Other requirements of the Commission, such as reporting of college efforts to implement student learning outcomes, have been met (EIV.A4.4) (i3).

In dealing with other external agencies, the college makes every effort to demonstrate honesty and integrity. In Fall 2006, an anonymous complaint was received by the State Department of Finance concerning “hours by arrangement” (HBA) attached to courses. This initiated an investigation by the State Chancellor’s Office into the reporting of FTES generated for HBA at Mission College, during which the college has given its full and complete cooperation to further the investigation (EIV.A4.5) (t6).
**Evaluation**

During the past two years (2005-2006 and 2006-2007), the college and the District have been involved in a number of reviews of procedures and practices by various external and internal bodies. The District requested and received a Technical Assistance Visit from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and the Community College League of California. The District invited a visit from the Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT). In addition, the District has been undergoing an audit to certify the FTES claimed from the state for Hours by Arrangement. In all of these instances, the college has made every effort to demonstrate honesty and integrity in its dealings with external agencies. Emails from the college President and the Office of Instruction have given clear direction to faculty and staff in this regard (EIV.A4.5-6) (t6).

The college has also worked to ensure effective and expeditious responses to Commission requests and recommendations. This has not always been as easy as it could be, due in some cases to difficulty locating appropriate information or data. However, the college and the District have begun implementing changes which will make this task easier in the future. Minutes of important participatory governance bodies and planning committees are being gathered into a searchable data archive, which will enhance the ability of the college to produce the evidence-based reports required by the Commission. The District is also working to establish a data warehouse that will support college research as well as the new District research and planning function recently proposed by the Chancellor (EIV.A4.7). These efforts should improve the college and District’s ability to respond efficiently and effectively to both internal and external requests for information (t2).

The accreditation process has been carried out in an open, fully accessible manner, with active participation from all segments of the college community. Accreditation documents have been available via the college intranet to all faculty and staff. However, neither the accreditation report nor the mid-term progress reports are currently available to the public via the internet, and the college may consider ways of making these documents more easily accessible on the college and District websites (t6).

**Planning Agenda**

None.
Evidence

EIV.A4.2 Mission College 2001 Application for Reaffirmation of Accreditation, “Certification of Continued Compliance with Eligibility Requirements”
EIV.A4.4 SLO Progress Report, 04-16-07
EIV.A4.5 Emails from President Harriett Robles, 02-12-07, 02-23-07, 05-09-07, 05-16-07, on Hours by Arrangement
EIV.A4.7 WVMCCD Council Minutes, 09-26-07

4A.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.

Summary

As previously noted, Mission College has a strong tradition of participatory governance and has in place governance structures that have generally been effective. Some governance and decision-making structures and processes have been evaluated in a comprehensive or regular way during the past ten years. For example, programs and services, including administrative services, were assessed through the Educational and Facilities Master Planning process which began in Fall 2005 and concluded in Spring 2007, and that evaluation will continue with the review and updating of the program review process in Fall 2007 (EIV.A5.1) (t2).

In addition, the College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) reviews the college’s budget allocation model every two years, with the most recent review and update being approved by both the Academic Senate and the Governance and Planning Council (GAP) in May 2007 (EIV.A5.2). With the hiring of a permanent college President, the Governance and Planning Council (GAP) began discussions of its role and operating procedures in August 2007. As part of these discussions, a review and update of the college’s participatory governance and decision-making plan is also being undertaken (EIV.A5.3).
**Evaluation**

Although some governance structures have been routinely evaluated, the college as a whole has not done a good job of regularly evaluating its governance and decision-making structures and processes. There is no current, comprehensive document which adequately describes the current relationship of the various participatory governance and decision-making bodies of the college to one another. In addition, the role of several major bodies in the college governance and decision-making process is poorly understood by many members of the college community, who are relatively new hires. While GAP plans to discuss its role and operating procedures in Fall 2007, a comprehensive review of the college participatory governance plan would help clarify the relationship of various groups involved in decision making and assist in evaluation of their effectiveness. The college addresses this need in Planning Agenda item 4.1.

Unlike many other areas, the college’s budget planning process has been reviewed every two years. The most recent revision of the College Budget Allocation Model incorporated relatively minor changes to the budget request process that will affect the timing of budget requests over the coming two years. However, as the Academic Senate reviews the program master planning process in the 2007-2008 academic year, the processes used by the college for developing budget requests and allocating funds will need significant revision to link program evaluation and planning with resource allocation. The college President has conveyed this objective to the Academic Senate President and the Vice President of Administrative Services, who chairs the College Budget Advisory Committee, and this is addressed in the Planning Agenda for Standard 1A.1 (EIV.A5.4) (t2).

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIV.A5.1</td>
<td>Mission College Education Master Plan, 06-18-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIV.A5.2</td>
<td>CBAC Budget Allocation Model, 05-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIV.A5.3</td>
<td>Governance and Planning Council Summary, 08-20-03, 03-24-04, 10-19-05, 09-20-06, 03-14-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIV.A5.4</td>
<td>E-mail from President Harriett Robles, 09-07-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

4B.1. The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution. The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.

Summary

The District is governed by an independent, seven-member Board of Trustees that sets policy for the District: “The duties of the Board are to determine the general policies which will govern the operation of the District and review them periodically” (1.6.5.a). Board roles for policy formulation and monitoring are found in Chapter 2 of the District Policy Manual. The Board has as one of its major responsibilities the selection and appointment of the District Chancellor, as well as confirmation of other executive administrators. The District Policy Manual (1.6.5.a.1) provides that the governing board appoint and evaluate the performance of the Chancellor. A formal procedure was established (with the assistance of an outside consultant) for the performance evaluation of the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor, the two college Presidents, and the Board itself, all of whom undergo annual evaluations. As stated in the District Policy Manual, the Board is clearly committed to academic program excellence and effectiveness (EIV.B1.1) (t1).

The Board of Trustees uses several sources of information to monitor the quality of the District’s educational programs. All college curricular and program additions, deletions, and revisions are sent to the Board through the Academic Senate for review and approval. Each college provides regular reports to the Board on current activities and programs. The Board also receives input regarding the quality of education directly at Board meetings (EIV.B1.2, EIV.B1.3).

The Board may schedule a “strategic conversation” in place of a regular business meeting. Strategic conversations allow the Board to engage in discussions in the spirit of participatory governance without micro-management. At these strategic conversations, Board members hear directly from students and other interested parties (EIV.B1.4). During years when departments undergo program review, the Board is given copies of their reports, most recently in June 2007. Additionally, during regular business meetings, more detailed discussion regarding specific academic programs is provided either upon request or when the college believes that supplying such information would be helpful to the Trustees (EIV.B1.5) (t5).
Board members regularly receive minutes of the Academic Senate meetings at both colleges. At each Board meeting, there is an item on the agenda for reports from the Academic and Classified Senates as well as from the Associated Students, and comments are welcomed from the presidents of all the senates on topics under discussion (EIV.B1.5-6). Finally, the District is fortunate to have active and informed student Trustees who provide a vital link between student organizations and the Board.

Less formal methods by which the board monitors educational programs include (but are not limited to) the following: individual conversations with students, administrators, faculty, and staff, and attendance at open houses, classes, and various presentations regarding academic programs.

The Board of Trustees ensures the financial stability of the institution by setting the strategic budget priorities and reviewing the initial and final budgets against these priorities. Each year, the Board adopts a final budget by mandated deadline and receives regular reports to enable Trustees to effectively monitor expenditures. The Board annually reviews an independent audit of the District’s financial statements and internal controls. The Board maintains a prudent financial reserve as well as a contingency fund to ensure the fiscal health of the District.

The Board of Trustees has established the Land Corporation, a 501 (c) (3) corporation under the IRS tax code, to administer leases and revenues from District-owned land adjacent to Mission College. The District Board of Trustees serves as the Land Corporation Board of Directors, whose decision-making meetings are held monthly prior to Board of Trustees meeting (EIV.B1.7).

**Evaluation**

The intent of the Board is to show commitment to academic program excellence with policies that assure integrity and effectiveness, and the current Board appears to confirm that commitment (t1).

In regard to ensuring the financial stability of the institution, the Board has expressed a great deal of concern over the District’s liability in regard to unfunded medical benefits for retirees. Recurring misprojections of ending balances makes it difficult for the college to plan and budget for instructional programs and services. The financial needs of the college’s educational programs regularly exceed available funding, and the District could improve its projections of ending balances [as discussed on page 54 of the report of the Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT)] (EIV.B1.8).

**Planning Agenda**

None.
**Evidence**

EIV.B1.1  District Policy Manual, 1.6.5.a and Chapter 2, 
http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/policies/index.php

EIV.B1.2  Samples of Curriculum Committee Agendas and Minutes,  
http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/archives/archives_old/default2.html


EIV.B1.4  WVMCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda, 05-18-06,  
http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php

EIV.B1.5  WVMCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda, 07-20-06, 09-07-06, 05-03-07, 06-21-07, 08-16-07,  
http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php

EIV.B1.6  Samples of Mission College Academic Senate Agendas and Minutes  
http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/agendas_minutes.html


**4B1.a.**  The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

**Summary**

The District is governed by an independent seven-member elected Board of Trustees that reflects public interest in board activities and decisions. The electorate of the community college district elects each member of the Board of Trustees at-large. There are two Student Trustees, one elected by the students at each college. Board seats are sub-districted geographically. Two of the seven Board of Trustees seats are from the Los Gatos/Saratoga High School District, three seats from the Santa Clara Unified School District, and the remaining two seats from the Campbell Union High School District. All seven members of the Board serve staggered terms of four years, with three or four Trustees (depending on the election year) running for election at any regularly scheduled election.

The Board of Trustees meets twice each month and alternates venues between West Valley and Mission Colleges. At each meeting there are regular items on the agenda and both oral and written communication from the public can be considered. Trustee phone and fax numbers and e-mail addresses are available to the public through the Chancellor’s Office to facilitate direct contact by the public with members of the Board. In District policies it is clearly stated that the Trustees “encourage and support participation, discussion and productive debate at Board meetings from all elements of the District community as well as from residents of the communities served” (EIV.B1a.1) (16).
All Trustees regularly acknowledge the Board’s central role in policy-making and input is sought from the colleges and community when developing policies.

The Board advocates for the institution in the larger community. A Board Legislative Subcommittee is responsible for researching and recommending positions on legislation affecting students and the District. Individual Trustees also communicate with legislators and representatives of outside organizations to advocate positions they believe will be in the best long-term interests of the District (EIV.B1a.2) (16).

**Evaluation**

While individual Board members may occasionally take an enhanced interest in particular activities or issues at one of the colleges, the Board as a whole advocates for what it sees as best for each college. The Board’s commitment is outlined in District Policy 1.4.8 (EIV.B1a.1).

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

EIV.B1a.2 WVMCCD Board of Trustees Legislative Committee Meeting, 10-04-07, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php

4B1.b. The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

**Summary**

As stated in the District Policy Manual, the Board has established clear policies in line with the District Mission Statement, the college mission statements, the District Values and Vision Statements, and the District Goals and Objectives (EIV.B1b.1) (11).

The Board has included in the District Policy Manual policies on Standards for the Teaching/Learning Process, the Study of Controversial Issues, the use of Off-Campus Facilities and the inclusion of Guest Artists, Lecturers, and Speakers. Other policies regulate Educational Planning, Programs and Courses, including Curriculum Development and Library Services (4.3). There are statements of policy on graduation and degree requirements (4.4) and on academic freedom (4.8) (EIV.B1b.2).
The Board approves programs and curriculum based on recommendations of the academic senates and the administration in line with the District’s stated goals and priorities. Further, there are specific regulations guiding Student Support Services, including policies on Student Equity, Matriculation, Counseling and Advising, Disabled Student Programs and Services, Childcare, Financial Aid, Athletics, Student Organizations, Student Speech, and a Grievance Policy (EIV.B1b.3).

The Board reviews each of the six chapters of the District Policy Manual once each year with an eye to improving service to the community in general and to the students in particular. The District subscribes to the Community College League of California (CCLC) Policy and Procedure Service. Since joining the service, staff members have utilized the model policies and procedures and their semi-annual updates to revise existing policies and procedures. The District Council reviews all proposed changes and additions to policy and provides advice to the Chancellor. Since the last accreditation reaffirmation, many new policies have been added, including detailed policies on fiscal standards for the development and administration of the District’s budget. The District Policy Manual also includes the mission statements of each college and that of the District, which were recently revised and approved by the Board. These mission statements provide the basis for all other policies adopted by the Board (EIV.B1b.4, EIV.B1b.5) (i2).

**Evaluation**

District procedures provide guidance for and ensure implementation of board-approved policies. All procedures were reviewed and revised in 2007 (EIV.B1b.6).

When the college community was asked in Spring 2007 whether “The governing board provides the support necessary to effectively manage the district,” nearly two-thirds (64%) of respondents disagreed that this occurs. Policies related to supporting student learning programs and services are not perceived as sufficient by many within the college community. Of the staff, faculty, and administrators who participated in the survey, response was nearly evenly split between agreement (32%), disagreement (31%) and neutral/don’t know (36%) when prompted with, “Governing board policies support the quality, integrity and effectiveness of student program learning and services” (EIV.B1b.7).

**Planning Agenda**

None.
4.B1.c. The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

Summary

The Board of Trustees derives its authority and duties from Education Code 70902 and sets it forth in District Policy 1.5. Chapter 1 of the District Policy Manual also addresses the roles and responsibilities of Board members (including educational, legal and financial matters) and its code of ethics and standards of practice. The Board does delegate authority for day-to-day operations to the Chancellor and senior executives as indicated in policy, and the Board has agreed to rely primarily on the Academic Senate in all academic and professional matters as defined by Title 5. As stated in the District Policy Manual, the Board is committed to academic program excellence and effectiveness (EIV.B1c.1) (tt).

All college curricular and program additions, deletions, and revisions are sent to the Board through the Academic Senate and college administration for review and approval. The college provides regular reports to the Board on current activities and programs (EIV.B1c.2 - EIV.B1c.3). Board members display a keen interest in the educational programs, and frequently comment on matters brought before them relating to the quality of these programs. It is extremely rare for the Board to act contrary to the advice of the Academic Senate in matters concerning the educational programs of the college.
The Board of Trustees takes ultimate responsibility for the financial integrity of the District in a variety of ways. In 2004, the Board held a strategic conversation to discuss a “10-year Financial Analysis of the District” (EIV.B1c.4). The Board also participates early in the annual budget process by setting the strategic budget priorities and reviewing the initial and final budgets against these priorities. Among the priorities listed for 2007-2008 was the implementation of a new District budget allocation model which would eliminate large rollover fund balances (EIV.B1c.5). In addition, the Board reviews quarterly financial statements, all construction change orders, new positions, hiring, and all contracts over $69,000.00 (an indexed figure which is adjusted annually). It also ratifies warrants. In addition, the Board reviews all grant applications and research contracts and monitors compliance with regulations. The Board annually reviews an independent audit of the District’s financial statements and internal controls (EIV.B1c.6). The means by which the Board effectively controls expenditures is described in additional detail in Section 4B.3.d.

Evaluation

District Policy clearly states the ultimate responsibility of the Board in the areas outlined in this standard.

Planning Agenda

None.

Evidence

| EIV.B1c.1 | District Policy Manual, 1, 2.1, 2.3, 3.3.4.b, and 6.2, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/policies/index.php |
| EIV.B1c.2 | Samples of Curriculum Committee Agendas and Minutes, http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/archives/archives_old/default2.html |
| EIV.B1c.3 | Samples of Mission College Academic Senate Agendas and Minutes, http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/agendas_minutes.html |
| EIV.B1c.4 | WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda, 02-19-04, Strategic Conversation “West Valley-Mission Community College District Financial Condition,” http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php |
| EIV.B1c.5 | WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda, 04-19-07, showing approval of the Board Budget Priorities for 2007-2008, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php |
| EIV.B1c.6 | WVMCCD Final Budget, 2006-2007 |
4B1.d. The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board’s size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

**Summary**

The District Policy Manual is published on the District website. The District Policy Manual includes descriptions of the Board’s roles and responsibilities (1.6.5, 1.7), the Board’s structure (1.7), and the Board’s operating procedures (1.8) (EIV.B1d.1). Many administrators have hard copies of the District Policy Manual in their offices and all District policies are available electronically at http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/policies/index.html (t6).

**Evaluation**

This standard has been met.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

EIV.B1d.1 District Policy Manual, 1.6.5, 1.7, 1.8, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/policies/index.php

4B1.e. The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

**Summary**

The Board uses its District Policy Manual to guide its functioning and inform its practice as a board. Following a complete overhaul of the District Policy Manual from 1999-2001, the Board has regularly reviewed and revised its policies. Despite a one-year hiatus in 2006, the Board has committed to and completed a review of each of the six chapters of the District Policy Manual once each year. Individual chapters of the manual were revised in 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2006. Using the Community College League of California (CCLC) Policy and Procedure Service as a beginning point, the Special Assistant to the Chancellor has primary responsibility for working directly and consistently with the Chancellor and the Board to regularly review and revise policies as necessary (EIV.B1e.1) (t2).

Following a request from the Board, District and college procedures for implementation of all District Policies were completed in Summer 2007.
The Board’s role in policy formulation is also evident in the development of the District budget. Initiated nine years ago, the Board’s budget planning workshop is open to the public and is attended by Academic and Classified Senate representatives as well as several administrators from the District and the college. During the workshop, budget priorities are established by the Board to provide guidance to the District in developing the budget (EIV.B1e.2).

**Evaluation**

District policies covering administration, general services, educational services, student services, and business services are sufficiently clear to provide guidance to the Board, the college, and the District in decision-making.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**


EIV.B1e.2 WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda, 04-19-07, showing approval of the Board Budget Priorities for 2007-2008, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php

4B1.f. The governing board has a program for board development and new member Orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

**Summary**

The Board offers Orientation and development activities to all board members. The Chancellor meets with all candidates for board membership prior to elections to familiarize them with the District and its operations. Formal Orientations for newly-elected members include meeting with senior administrators, Human Resources staff, and representatives of the District’s participatory governance committees.

New Board members are actively encouraged by the Chancellor and fellow Board members to attend new board member workshops sponsored by the Community College League of California. Additionally, all Board members are encouraged and provided support to attend local, regional, State, and national programs, meetings, conferences, and workshops that relate to community colleges and service as elected officials. Additionally, presentations have been made at various Board meetings to review the Board’s legal responsibilities under the Brown Act, the principles of participatory governance, and other relevant topics (EIV.B1f.1-2).
The seven members of the Board serve staggered terms of four years, with three or four Trustees (depending on the election year) running for election at any regularly scheduled election. District policy (1.6.2.a) requires staggered terms of office for Trustees (1.6.8), and Board policy governs Board development and new member Orientation (EIV.B1f.3). There are provisions for filling an unscheduled vacancy or resignation.

**Evaluation**

The Board of Trustees enjoys relative stability in tenure of office with one incumbent Trustee having served five terms and another incumbent serving his third term. Two other Trustees have been re-elected to their second terms and one Trustee is in his first term. This relatively low turnover and long length of service has resulted in continuity and stability on the Board. The Board has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.

The visit of the technical assistance team from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and the Community College League of California, in August 2006, provided an excellent training opportunity for most of the current Board, and a repeat visit and presentation might prove beneficial whenever a majority of Board members have been replaced with newer Trustees who have not attended such a presentation. The District should continue to encourage Trustees to take full advantage of all resources available for training and development.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

- **EIV.B1f.1** WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda, 03-18-04, showing Brown Act presentation, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php
- **EIV.B1f.2** WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda, 08-24-06, showing Technical Assistance Visit presentation on Participatory Governance, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php
- **EIV.B1f.3** District Policy Manual, 1.6, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/policies/index.php
4B1.g. The governing board’s self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

**Summary**

Chapter One of the District Policy Manual was most recently reviewed and revised in January 2007. The policies in this chapter include clarification of duties, responsibilities, ethical conduct requirements, structure, and operating procedures as well as processes for assessing the performance of the Board. District policy 1.6.8.c sets forth the purpose of self-evaluation, mandates that an instrument be used, and allows for the use of a facilitator for the evaluation process (EIV.B1g.1).

Beginning in 2003, the Board used standardized questionnaires (true/false and rating sheets) in the process of completing its annual self evaluation (EIV.B1g.2). In 2005-2006, the Board eliminated the true/false questionnaire and revised the rating questionnaire substantially. The same questionnaire was distributed to administrators and constituent group representatives in addition to the Trustees themselves. This represented the first time in recent memory that the Board solicited input and feedback from staff in the evaluation process. All feedback was reviewed and discussed by the Trustees in a meeting devoted to completing the evaluation (EIV.B1g.3) (t2).

On October 4, 2007, the Board held a special meeting to discuss its evaluation process. An external consultant was hired to provide guidance in this process. Trustees are establishing measurable criteria for evaluation, defining the values and priorities upon which they are to be evaluated using the CCLC Trustee handbook, WASC accreditation handbook, and other appropriate resources (EIV.B1g.4).

**Evaluation**

The Board of Trustees has regularly reviewed itself in public meetings and has used an instrument and/or consultant to assist in the process of evaluation. The Board of Trustees seems to be substantially in compliance with published policies and with the language of this standard.

The District policies on Board self-evaluation are published and clearly stated. Policies are broad and are intended to be a guide with respect to roles and responsibilities of the Board, the administration, general services, educational services, student services, and business services. Standards for ethical conduct and structural and operating considerations are clear.
However, the process used for the self-evaluation could be more clearly defined. The specific procedures for the Board’s self-evaluation have not been published. The overall process appears to be improving recently with the hiring of a consultant to begin the development of a more rigorous and effective self-evaluation process. One Trustee noted that this was the first time such a process had been used in her twenty years on the Board (EIV.B1g.5).

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

EIV.B1g.1 District Policy Manual, 1.6.8.c,  
http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/policies/index.php  
EIV.B1g.2 Mission College Midterm Report, October 2004  
EIV.B1g.3 WVMCCD Board of Trustees Special Meeting Agenda, 10-16-06,  
http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php  
EIV.B1g.4 WVMCCD Board of Trustees Special meeting Agenda, 10-04-07,  
http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php  
EIV.B1g.5 Mission College Academic Senate President’s Report, 09-27-07

4B1.h. The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

**Summary**

In the District Policy Manual, expected roles, responsibilities and conduct of Board members are clearly delineated (Sections 1.6.5, 1.6.6). The Board’s adopted Code of Ethics can be found in Policy 1.6.6 and violations of the Code are addressed in 1.6.6.n (EIV.B1h.1). The Board’s Code of Ethics was expanded and language related to handling violations of the Code was added in the most recent revision of Chapter 1 in 2007.

**Evaluation**

This standard has been met.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

EIV.B1h.1 District Policy Manual, 1.6,  
http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/policies/index.php
4B1.i. The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

Summary

The Board of Trustees is generally well-informed about the accreditation process. Several Trustees have served multiple terms of office extending over prior accreditation cycles. Two Board members have participated directly in the accreditation of other community colleges as members of visiting teams.

During the current accreditation cycle for Mission College, the Board appointed a Trustee to represent them in the development of this Self Study. This Trustee took an active role in the discussions and planning meetings for Standard IV, and provided insight and current information on Board activities and operational procedures. The entire Board of Trustees will review the Accreditation Self Study before it is submitted to the Commission. The Board receives regular updates on the accreditation process and reviews and approves (as necessary) the Self Study, Midterm Report, and Progress Reports (EIV.B1i.1).

Evaluation

This standard has been met.

Planning Agenda

None.

Evidence

EIV.B1i.1 Standard IV committee membership list, Buck Polk (Trustee)
The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.

In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

Summary

The Board has established District policy language addressing the District’s administrative organization, the Chancellor, and senior executive management evaluation. These policies include selection of the Chancellor, delegation of responsibilities, and annual evaluation requirements (EIV.B1j.1).

The Board sees as one of its major responsibilities the selection and appointment of the District Chancellor, as well as confirmation of other executive administrators. The District Policy Manual (1.6.5.a.4) provides that the governing board appoint and evaluate the performance of the Chancellor. A formal procedure was recently established (with the assistance of an outside consultant) for the performance evaluation of the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor, the two college Presidents, and the Board members themselves (EIV.B1j.2).

The Chancellor submits annual District objectives to the Board for review against the Board’s overall strategic priorities for the year prior to approval. Routine duties are listed in the Chancellor’s position description. The District Policy Manual delegates to the Chancellor full responsibility and authority for administering and executing “all decisions of the Board requiring executive action.” The Chancellor submits periodic oral and written reports to the board and is formally evaluated by the Board annually (EIV.B1j.1, EIV.B1j.3).

The Chancellor uses the Administrative Performance Appraisal Plan to evaluate the Vice Chancellor and the two college Presidents with input from faculty, staff, students, and community members. The Chancellor, through broadly delegated authority, approves all personnel appointments and makes recommendations to the Board for confirmation. To date, all personnel appointments recommended by the Chancellor have been confirmed by the Board (EIV.B1j.4).
A process exists for the selection of the President (EIV.B1j.5). The current President was selected through a process that involved wide participation from all segments of the campus community, including open forums and meetings with major campus participatory governance bodies. A similar process was used in selecting previous permanent Presidents. The college President is given full responsibility for implementing District policies at the college level, in accordance with District Policy Manual (2.1.3) (EIV.B1j.1).

The current Chancellor has announced his retirement effective June 2008. The District has initiated a search process for a new Chancellor, following the process outlined in the administrative hiring procedures approved in April 2006 (EIV.B1j.5). Regular reports on the progress of this hiring process are being given to the Board of Trustees.

**Evaluation**

The processes used to select and evaluate the Chancellor and the college Presidents are well understood and followed.

A frequent complaint of faculty and staff, noted in the report of the Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT), concerns perceptions of “micromanagement” of District operations by the Board in matters which more appropriately should have been directed to staff through the Chancellor (EIV.B1j.6). The District Academic Senate resolution (adopted 02-07-06 and implemented on 03-14-06) stemmed in large part from a perceived lack of communication and adherence to participatory governance on the part of both the Chancellor and the Board. The concerns of faculty were laid out even more explicitly, along with desired “behavioral objectives,” in a document presented to the Board by the District Academic Senate in April 2006 (EIV.B1j.7, EIV.B1j.8) (r6).

Since Summer 2006, there has been a gradual but steady improvement in the current Board’s apparent understanding of its role relative to that of the Chancellor.

**Planning Agenda**

None.
4B.2. The president has primary responsibility for the quality of the institution he/she leads. He/she provides effective leadership in planning, organizing, budgeting, selecting and developing personnel, and assessing institutional effectiveness.

4B.2.a. The president plans, oversees, and evaluates an administrative structure organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity. He/she delegates authority to administrators and others consistent with their responsibilities, as appropriate.

Summary

The college administrative structure underwent a major change in 2005 to realign and balance the responsibilities and reporting structure of the Student Services and Instructional areas, as well as reduce the number of direct reports to the President. This reorganization was approved through the participatory governance process with participation from the Governance and Planning Council and was approved by the Board of Trustees. Additional changes to the administrative structure have resulted in the present configuration (t4).
The following positions report directly to the college President:

- Vice President of Instruction
- Vice President of Student Services
- Vice President of Administrative Services
- Director of Marketing, Public Relations and Graphic Design Services
- Staff Development Coordinator

Additional positions support most of these areas, including the Dean of Instruction, Dean of Student Support Services, Dean of Workforce Development and Continuing Education, and Dean of Technology and Distance Learning. A Director of Evening/Weekend and Emergency Services was hired in Spring 2007, reporting to the Vice President of Administrative Services (EIV.B2a.1).

The President also holds a weekly staff meeting with the President’s Council. This council consists of the following positions:

- Vice President of Instruction
- Dean of Instruction
- Vice President of Student Services
- Dean of Student Support Services
- Vice President of Administrative Services
- Dean of Workforce and Continuing Education
- Dean of Information Technology and Services
- Director of Marketing, Public Relations and Graphic Design
- Library Director
- Director of Evening/Weekend and Emergency Services
- Institutional Research Analyst

The President’s staff has the authority to make decisions and supervise employees and their assignments as necessary and consistent with their responsibilities. Each Vice President has direct authority over their support staff and determines how to achieve goals and complete activities determined by the college. Deans also supervise their staff according to their various departments’ composition. They carry out department evaluations and set department goals.

The current President completed evaluations of her direct-report staff in late Spring 2007. Per the Manager Association Handbook, part of the evaluation process includes setting of goals for the coming year. These goals are presented to the President for approval and during individual meetings with the staff member during the year, these goals are reviewed. These evaluations include peer surveys to identify how their staff and colleagues perceive their performance (EIV.B2a.2) (12).
Evaluation

When asked to provide their perceptions of the administrative structure, response to a Spring 2007 survey was mixed. Although 63% of participants agreed that, “The college president provides effective leadership for the college,” only 29% indicated agreement with, “The college administration is structured and staffed to provide effective management.” 13% disagreed with the first statement and 57% disagreed with the latter statement, respectively (EIV.B2a.3).

In addition to the high turnover in the President’s office, which has been addressed separately, there has been a similar rate of turnover among the college’s administrative staff. As of Fall 2007, the Vice President of Instruction is an interim appointee, and the college has sought internal applicants to fill the Dean of Workforce and Community Education position on an interim basis because of two previous failed searches. The Dean of Instruction and the Dean of Student Support Services positions were filled in 2006, and the Director of Evening/Weekend and Emergency Services was hired in May 2007. A permanent Vice President of Student Services was hired in June 2007 (t4).

The high administrative turnover at the college has resulted in a lack of consistency in processes and procedures. The current President must shoulder many responsibilities normally handled by the Vice President of Instruction due to legal restrictions imposed on interim employees. At the same time, however, the hiring of highly qualified interim appointees has allowed the college to benefit from their expertise in analyzing college processes and suggesting improvements in key areas such as enrollment management, recruitment, and compliance with Title 5 regulations.

Planning Agenda

• PA4.2 The college will assess the reasons for frequent administrative turnover and develop and implement solutions to improve retention.

Evidence

EIV.B2a.1 WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda showing approval of administrative reorganization (2005), http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php
EIV.B2a.3 WVMCCD Spring 2007 Accreditation Survey Summary Results
4B.2.b. The president guides institutional improvement of the teaching and learning environment by the following:

• establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;
• ensuring that evaluation and planning rely on high quality research and analysis on external and internal conditions;
• ensuring that educational planning is integrated with resource planning and distribution to achieve student learning outcomes; and
• establishing procedures to evaluate overall institutional planning and implementation efforts.

Summary

Mission College’s President is committed to promoting an environment that ensures institutional effectiveness through collegial, participatory, and systematic planning, implementation and assessment. Large-scale decisions affecting the college as a whole are frequently made through discussions with the constituencies of each of the participatory governance groups, and all members of the college community are invited to share their thoughts, ideas and concerns (t2).

Strategic planning and policy decisions at Mission College are developed through a participatory governance process. The highest level participatory governance body is the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), which meets weekly and which has representation from all major constituencies. The Governance and Planning Council serves as the top-level advisory body to the President in matters concerning college goals and priorities (EIV.B2b.1).

Regular all-college forums provide an opportunity for administrators to present plans and ideas to the college community as a whole. During these forums, ideas are exchanged, information is gathered and many decisions are made collaboratively.

The college’s most recent Educational and Facilities Master Planning (EFMP) process may serve as an example of such a collaborative process. Led by the Academic Senate in conjunction with the Office of Instruction, the process was launched in August 2005 at the Professional Development Day. Goals and priorities were further discussed and refined following input from faculty and staff at an all-college forum in October of 2005. All departments and programs in the college were required to complete three assignments during Fall 2005: reviewing the past several years, projecting future needs and trends, and developing Student Learning Outcomes for their areas. All completed assignments were evaluated by a core group of faculty, staff, and administrators. The core group determined that certain programs needed to be discussed by a wider group due to the effect of their projections on other areas of the college, because of outside factors, or for other reasons (t3).
Due to contract and negotiation issues, which led to a “work-to-contract” action, the process was interrupted for nearly nine months in 2006. However, when the process resumed in January 2007, a series of college-wide forums was held under the auspices of the Academic Senate to discuss academic, vocational, and service programs and future trends. The results of these forums and the assignments that preceded them were used to draft a new Education Plan for the college, which will be going to the various participatory governance bodies of the college for final approval in Fall 2007 (EIV.B2b.2) (t5).

The new President has a strong planning background and ensures that evaluation and planning are based on research and analysis. The Office of Institutional Research was instrumental in supporting the research needed to complete the EFMP process and research is a visible component across campus planning initiatives. The college’s Research Analyst reports directly to the Vice President of Instruction, and works with the Vice President of Student Services to support Matriculation activities. The President includes the Research Analyst in the President’s Council, and this position holds ex-officio status as part of the Governance and Planning Council (GAP), as well as membership in other college and District committees (EIV.B2b.3) (t4).

The Research Analyst supports many assessment and planning activities. For example, he analyzed the success of the college’s first Winter session to corroborate the need for this added session with student needs. The Research Analyst also provides data and analysis for program review, staff and student equity, assessment validation, matriculation evaluations, Accountability Reporting for the California Community Colleges (ARCC), ongoing and short-term grants, and many other functions. The Research Analyst also acts as a consultant to guide research and evaluation-related activities within programs and areas such as marketing. At the direction of the President, the Research Analyst is reviewing models for a “scorecard” approach which will be shared with GAP and college constituents to provide ongoing information useful for evaluation and planning (t2).

The college’s budget allocation model and processes have for many years relied on data from institutional research to justify budget and staffing requests. The new college President has set as a goal for 2007-2008 the integration of educational and strategic planning (the 2007 EFMP and the college’s program review process) with resource allocation and has asked the Academic Senate to take this into account in setting priorities for the current year. The Academic Senate has appointed a task force to work on this issue (EIV.B2b.4-5).

In respect to evaluation of overall institutional effectiveness, the President has charged the Research Analyst to develop a research agenda and to provide the college with models for measuring effectiveness, for example an institutional “scorecard.” The Analyst presented some models for consideration to GAP in September 2007 (EIV.B2b.6) (t2).
**Evaluation**

The new college President has done a good job of establishing collegial processes to set values, goals, and priorities under very trying circumstances. During the “work to contract” action which impaired participation in District and college committees from March to November, 2006, an urgent and major issue arose concerning the reconstruction of the Main Building. Decisions were needed within a very short time frame, in order to avoid the loss of State funds for construction. By holding a series of open forums, maintaining frequent email communication with the faculty and staff, and soliciting creative ideas and input from the college at large and the community, a consensus was established within the needed time frame (EIV.B2b.7).

Historically at Mission College, and throughout the District, resource allocation has not been well integrated with educational planning. The 2001 Program Master Planning (PMP) model was never fully utilized as a strategic planning tool college wide. The current efforts of the President to integrate the results of program review into the resource allocation process will greatly improve the college’s ability to plan strategically and achieve student learning outcomes (t3).

Research is a key factor in strategic planning, and the college’s ability to engage in constructive data-based planning is hampered by the current lack of support for institutional research at the District level. As previously indicated, the Chancellor has proposed a District research and planning function. Within the current scope of responsibilities, however, the Office of Institutional Research consistently provides a high level of data and research, which is well-utilized by the President to support planning and evaluation.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

- EIV.B2b.1 Governance and Planning Council Summary, 09-07-07, showing membership/discussion of GAP’s role
- EIV.B2b.2 Mission College Education Master Plan, 06-18-07
- EIV.B2b.5 Email from President Harriett Robles, 09-07-07
- EIV.B2b.6 Governance and Planning Council Summary Notes, 09-19-07
- EIV.B2b.7 Mission College emails describing the Main Building Forums and Discussion, http://paris/mc/presidents_office/index.html; Paris → Main Building Discussion Documents → Emails or Discussion (Q & A)
4B.2.c. The president assures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and governing board policies and assures that institutional practices are consistent with institutional mission and policies.

Summary

The President is a member of the District Executive Management Team (EMT) and meets weekly with the Chancellor, the President of West Valley College, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services. The President also is part of the District Council and participates in the District Budget Advisory Committee (DBAC). These committees adhere to the directives of the Board of Trustees and Board Policies, the administrative handbook, and the Faculty Handbook (EIV.B2c.1). The President holds weekly meetings with her staff, both individually and as a group (t5).

The Vice President of Instruction also attends Academic Senate meetings, and the President attends as necessary, to maintain communication with faculty on academic policies and practices (EIV.B2c.2).

Through these bodies, the President and administrators establish processes that are in alignment with the education code. The District performs yearly audits and an auditor position is being developed at the District level. All college committees are directed to consider the college’s mission, core values and goals, including the CBAC college budget request process. The CBAC budget request form asks requestors to relate their funding requests to specific core values (EIV.B2c.3-4) (t2).

It is ultimately the responsibility of the President to ensure that the college adheres to all statutes and regulations. To accomplish this, she may delegate certain tasks to appropriate administrators or other staff. For example, the Vice President of Instruction is responsible for ensuring the compliance of the academic affairs of the college with Title 5 regulations; the Vice President of Administrative Services is responsible for development of the college budget (t6).

Evaluation

During the 7 years of this accreditation cycle, Mission College has had 5 presidents, 5 Vice Presidents of Instruction, and 4 Vice Presidents of Student Services. Other high-level administrative positions have had similar rates of change. As a result, the monitoring of compliance with regulations has suffered. One illustration of this is the situation faced by the college with regard to implementation of “Hours by Arrangement,” supplementary instructional hours attached to courses. It is anticipated that the recent hiring of a new college President who has a long history of service in this District will greatly improve consistent implementation of statutes, regulations, and policies. The current college President, in her former position of Vice President of Instruction, had already begun efforts to bring the college into compliance with Title 5, and has continued and amplified those efforts (EIV.B2c.5).
Planning Agenda

None.

Evidence

EIV.B2c.1  WVMCCD District Council Operating Procedures, Approved 05-10-06
EIV.B2c.2  Mission College Academic Senate minutes, 09-06-07 showing attendance of the Vice President of Instruction, http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/agendas_minutes.html
EIV.B2c.4  CBAC approved Budget Request Form, 2007-2008
EIV.B2c.5  Emails from President Harriett Robles, 02-12-07, 02-23-07, 05-09-07, 05-16-07, on Hours by Arrangement

4B.2.d.  The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.

Summary

The President is involved in the budget process both directly, as a member of GAP, and indirectly, via administrative staff who report directly to her and who chair several committees with responsibility for portions of the budget prioritization process. Direct supervision of the college budget and expenditures are delegated to the Vice President of Administrative Services, who reports directly to the President. This position was reclassified from a dean to an executive level position in Summer 2007 to provide a higher level of support for the college’s fiscal, facilities, and emergency services, as well as to ensure closer coordination with District administrative services, particularly the Finance Office (t4).

The Vice President of Administrative Services chairs the College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC), which is a subcommittee of the Governance and Planning Council (GAP). GAP is advisory to and chaired by the President, and has ultimate responsibility for advising the President on budget decisions for the college. The Grants Advisory Committee is a subcommittee of GAP, although its recommendations are sent directly to the President.

CBAC considers budget requests according to a budget allocation model approved through participatory governance. Requests for expenditures are divided into categories and are prioritized by the appropriate committees – the instructional materials and staffing by the Division Chair Council, technology requests by the Technology Committee, etc. – before returning to CBAC, which then makes recommendations to the President through GAP (EIV.B2d.1, EIV.B2d.2).
Final authority for approving budget recommendations rests with the President, and she takes actions as necessary to control the budget and expenditures of the college.

**Evaluation**

The College Budget Allocation Model was revised in Spring 2007 with the approval of the Academic Senate to ensure better planning and to reduce the amount of carryover from one budget cycle to the next. The Administrative Services area adjusted the timelines for budget requests in Fall 2007. This adjustment will lead to budget planning for the Fall/Spring academic year taking place well in advance, during the previous Spring semester. The most recent revision of the College Budget Allocation Model was approved by the Academic Senate and GAP, and has been accepted by the President (EIV.B2d.3, EIV.B2d.4) (t2).

The college President has made planning a major goal for 2007-2008 and specifically includes strengthening the college’s fiscal processes (EIV.B2d.5). In particular, the President has indicated a need to move away from rollover budgets, to reduce carry-over, to identify fixed costs, to implement more regular budget monitoring processes of all college accounts, and to link budgeting to planning.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

- EIV.B2d.1 CBAC Budget Allocation Model, 05-07, Budget Request Processes 05-05
- EIV.B2d.3 Governance and Planning Council Summary, 05-09-07
- EIV.B2d.4 Mission College Academic Senate minutes, 05-03-07, http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/agendas_minutes.html
- EIV.B2d.5 Mission College Educational Master Plan, 06-18-07, Mission College President’s Goals, 2007-2008

4B.2.e. The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.

**Summary**

The current President is a member of the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Chamber of Commerce, where she works with the members of the local business and entrepreneurs of the community. The President attends monthly board meetings and yearly chamber events and participates in their membership campaigns and fundraisers (t6).
During the academic year the President coordinates the Mission College – City of Santa Clara Liaison Meeting where the City of Santa Clara’s Mayor and City Council and Mission College and District leaders discuss Mission College’s plans for the future and update the city on current projects underway (EIV.B2e.1). The college also asks for their feedback on Mission College’s effectiveness in the community and the City Manager shares information about City of Santa Clara planning and its impact on Mission College’s interests. At the invitation of Mission College’s President, the Mayor of Santa Clara is a regular speaker at Mission College’s commencement ceremonies and welcomes the new graduates into the greater community (EIV.B2e.2) (t6).

News articles are regularly prepared for the local newspaper under the direction of the President from the college Public Relations Office in which the college highlights special events on campus, recognizes outstanding achievements and informs the public of schedule and class information (t6).

The President has previously arranged for focus groups composed of business and industry leaders to meet to discuss upcoming technological advances and other business needs of the community and to help determine how Mission College can develop the curriculum needed to train and prepare a skilled workforce and transfer student population (EIV.B2e.3). In 2006, she sent personal invitations to community leaders to participate in discussions regarding the Main Building, and in 2007, she also invited community members to participate in the master planning forums (t5).

The President convenes regular meetings with the Santa Clara Unified School District, Mission College’s main feeder high school district, to discuss concurrent enrollment, Middle College and outreach opportunities that benefit Mission College students and the SCUSD students (EIV.B2e.4).

The President’s office welcomes community involvement and seeks opportunities to develop relationships with local businesses and consortia. Mission College’s President is a member of the Silicon Valley Higher Education Roundtable which is comprised of executives of the Bay Area’s universities, state colleges and community colleges. Their purpose is to explore ways in which to develop cohesive educational opportunities tailored to the surrounding economic climate (t6).

Mission College’s President has also participated in the Silicon Valley Leadership Group that meets regularly to discuss legislation, emerging technologies and other issues involved in promoting a healthy, growing regional economy.

**Evaluation**

Mission College’s President is fully involved in the surrounding communities and is committed to bringing attention to the needs of Mission College students and to developing plans to meet our goal of preparing the college’s students to take their place in the surrounding community as participating citizens. She is actively seeking to expand partnerships and ways to leverage resources to benefit the college. One example is exploring private funding to improve athletic facilities and to support new programs, such as the proposed LVN to RN program.
Planning Agenda

None.

Evidence

EIV.B2e.1 Santa Clara Chamber of Commerce & Convention- Visitors Bureau Board of Officers & Directors 2007/2008, City of Santa Clara Council Committee/Agency Memberships, 12-11-07
EIV.B2e.2 Commencement program, 05-25-07
EIV.B2e.3 Mission College Main Building Forums and Discussions on Paris Intranet, http://paris/mc/predidents_office/index.html; Paris→ Main Building Discussion Documents→ Emails or Discussion (Q & A)
EIV.B2e.4 Santa Clara Unified School District Regular Meeting of the Board of Education Agenda, 12-13-07, Santa Clara Unified School District Course Catalog 2007-2008

4B.3. In multi-college districts or systems, the district/system provides primary leadership in setting and communicating expectations of educational excellence and integrity throughout the district/system and assures support for the effective operation of the colleges. It establishes clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system and acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board.

4B.3.a The district/system clearly delineates and communicates the operational responsibilities and functions of the district/system from those of the colleges and consistently adheres to this delineation in practice.

Summary

District Policy 1.4.10, District Function and Services, describes those areas for which the District has responsibility as distinct from those of the colleges. The District has responsibility for, but is not limited to:

- Support for Board activities, including meetings, Strategic Conversations, Trustee Orientation, and on-going Board development;
- Support for college instructional and student development activities, including research, strategic planning, professional development, budgeting, and evaluation in cooperation with the college Presidents;
- Financial planning and accounting;
- Human Resources and coordination of affirmative action/non-discrimination employment activities;
- Facility planning, development, modification, and maintenance;
- Government/Legislative relationships;
• Information Services;
• Purchasing and material management;
• Maintenance of physical assets;
• Public information; and
• Foundation/grants activities

The District organizational chart outlines the reporting responsibilities of the various District officers and administrators. All of the areas listed above report either directly to the Chancellor or to the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services or to the Associate Vice Chancellor of Human Resources. The Chancellor delegates all responsibilities for college-level activities to the college Presidents (EIV.B3a.1, EIV.B3a.3).

District Policy 2.4.4 defines the administrative responsibility to review and develop recommendations for policy and procedure revision; the areas of responsibility defined within this policy statement are as follows:

• Basic District Foundations - Board of Trustees, Chancellor
• District Governance and Administration - Chancellor
• Human Resources - Vice Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor
• Educational Programs/Instructional Affairs - college Presidents
• Student Services - college Presidents
• Business Operations/Administrative Services - Vice Chancellor (EIV.B3a.2)

Included in the appendices to this Self Study is a functional map showing delineation of responsibilities between the District and the colleges.

**Evaluation**

District policy clearly delineates the services, organizational responsibilities, and functions assigned to the District as well as to the college officers. These policies set clear-cut boundaries between service areas which are the operational responsibility of the District and those which are the responsibility of the college. In most areas, these boundaries are adhered to.

It is essential to recognize that although the District officers have responsibilities for their specific areas of control, the physical distance between Mission College and the District offices (approximately ten miles) places the college employees at a disadvantage whenever proximity to District services is essential. This is especially true with Information Systems, receiving/warehouse services, and purchasing. It should also be noted that the District has not had a research and planning function for many years and has relied on the the colleges’ Research Analysts for assistance. In Fall 2007, the Chancellor proposed the establishment of a District Office of Research, Planning and Advancement, which should make it possible in the future for the District to fulfill its responsibility to support the colleges in research and strategic planning (EIV.B3a.4).
Planning Agenda

None.

Evidence

EIV.B3a.2 District Policy Manual, 2.4.4, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/policies/index.php
EIV.B3a.3 WVMCCD Organizational Chart, 03-23-07
EIV.B3a.4 WVMCCD Council Minutes, 09-26-07

4B.3.b The district/system provides effective services that support the colleges in their missions and functions.

Summary

As indicated in the response to Standard 4B.1, the District (EIV.B3b.1, EIV.B3b.2) is responsible for 11 primary activities that impact the colleges and provides an array of services to support the colleges. These services include Information Systems, Fiscal Services, Human Resources, District Staff Development, Police, Advancement, Sponsored Research and Grants, Facilities (maintenance and construction), and Public Information. Institutional research is not directly supported by the District, although data-gathering is facilitated by District-wide use of Datatel. These services are, for the most part, physically located on the West Valley campus. As outlined in the mapping document included in this Self Study, some services are the sole responsibility of the District, but other functions involve the collaborative efforts of both District and college staff. For example, the technological infrastructure of the District is maintained by District Information Systems Department (IS), which is administered from the West Valley campus but maintains a staff presence at Mission College (EIV.B3b.3-4) (t4).

Evaluation

The District provides centralized services to ensure efficiency and uniformity as necessary. In some cases, District staff are assigned to the colleges, and college and District staff work collaboratively. Some services could use more support. For example, District IS faces numerous challenges in terms of funding and staffing, and regularly has to seek additional funding from the District’s Land Corporation for improvements. While Datatel has provided greatly improved functionality in some areas, IS has had insufficient resources to fully exploit the capabilities of the system (EIV.B3b.3-4).
The District has made improvements in other services, however. The District has not had a central research and planning function for a number of years. In Fall 2007 the Chancellor proposed the establishment of a District Office of Research, Planning and Advancement (EIV.B3b.5). In the past, the District has lacked a professional development plan which would clearly convey expectations and procedures to staff, a fact which was noted by the Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) in their report on the District in Fall 2006. Progress has been made, and a three-year Staff Development Plan has been developed collaboratively between college and District Staff Development personnel, and was approved by the Mission College Academic Senate in May 2007. This plan will address many of these needs, including training in Datatel and other systems, institutionalizing Department and Division Chair training, and improving participation by classified staff in the planning of District and college staff development activities (EIV.B3b.6-16) \(t_2\).

Views at the college level suggest that the current structure may not fully meet support needs. Faculty, staff, and administrators who participated in the Spring 2007 accreditation survey disagreed more often than agreed with the statement, “The district office is structured and staffed to provide effective management” (64% disagreed while 13% agreed). This perception may also reflect a lack of clarity in roles and responsibilities. When presented with the statement, “There are clear divisions of authority and responsibility between and among the governing board, district office, and the colleges,” only 25% agreed this represents the District, while a full 50% of respondents were in disagreement (EIV.B3b.17). As one of his goals for 2007-2008, the Chancellor has indicated that he plans to conduct a review of the organizational structure District wide (EIV.B3b.18).

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

| EIV.B3b.2 | WVMCCD: District Strategic Plan, 11-01-01 |
| EIV.B3b.3 | Mission College Organization Chart, 2006 |
| EIV.B3b.4 | WVMCCD Organization Chart, 03-23-07 |
| EIV.B3b.5 | WVMCCD Council minutes, 09-26-07 |
| EIV.B3b.6 | Emails from 10-21-05, 3-6-06, 11-14-06, and 02-05-07 showing EFMP progress |
| EIV.B3b.8 | WVMCCD Final Budgets, 2005-2008 |
| EIV.B3b.9 | Division Chair Council Minutes 11-20-06 |
| EIV.B3b.10 | WVMCCD Leadership Institute Funding Proposal, 05-23-05 & Leadership Institute Presentation District Council Meeting 08-09-06 |
| EIV.B3b.11 | WVMCCD Information Services Employee Handbook, 08-20-07 |
4B.3.c The district/system provides fair distribution of resources that are adequate to support the effective operations of the colleges.

Summary

Financial resources of the District – the base apportionment revenue - are distributed according to a budget allocation model developed through a participatory governance process. The allocation model allocates funds for salaries and benefits and all fixed costs and other commitments of the colleges and the District Office. Any funds remaining after deducting those costs are allocated to the colleges using FTES as the allocation factor. The District Budget Advisory Council (DBAC) is advisory to the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services and reviews both the Final Budget and any changes or modifications to the tentative budget. Once the District’s fixed costs are deducted from the total available monies, the remainder is divided between the colleges and Central Services. In 2003, DBAC established a Budget Allocation Model Subcommittee (BAMS) charged with developing a new budget allocation model for the District (EIV.B3c.1-2). (t4).

In 2006, the District was evaluated by the Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT). While the District’s overall level of financial risk was assessed as “low,” the team made a number of recommendations regarding budget practices in the District. These recommendations are being assigned to various key stakeholders throughout the District by DBAC (EIV.B3c.3, EIV.B3c.5).
**Evaluation**

Over time, the fact that District expenses are taken “off the top” before allocating money to the two colleges has become a contentious issue (EIV.B3c.4, EIV.B3c.6). The total percentage of District funds allocated to Central Services has increased relative to the percentage available to the colleges and as the percentage of FTES held by each college shifts. There is wide agreement with the Board of Trustees’ goal of developing a new budget allocation model for the District, as long as it is developed through a collaborative process and assures transparency of financial processes. However, work on the development of a new budget model has been very slow. Under the new Interim Vice Chancellor, the committee has been working steadily and it is hoped that the committee will be able to present a model prior to the 2008-2009 budget cycle (EIV.B3c.2, EIV.B3c.4, EIV.B3c.5).

**Planning Agenda**

- **PA4.3** The District should adopt a new budget allocation model that ensures an equitable distribution of resources to the colleges.

**Evidence**

- **EIV.B3c.1** WVMCCD Final Budgets, 2005-2008
- **EIV.B3c.2** WVMCCD Budget Allocation Model Subcommittee Minutes, 03-14-07
- **EIV.B3c.3** District Budget Advisory Committee Minutes (showing FCMAT rec. matrix), 02-28-07
- **EIV.B3c.4** Mission College Academic Senate minutes, 04-26-07, http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/agendas_minutes.html
- **EIV.B3c.5** Mission College Academic Senate minutes, 04-12-07
- **EIV.B3c.6** Mission College Academic Senate minutes, 03-01-07

4B.3.d The district/system effectively controls its expenditures.

**Summary**

The District Finance Office, under the direction of the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services, is responsible for preparation of the District budget each year. The Board of Trustees must adopt the Final Budget by September 15th. The Board establishes the allocation amounts for expenditures based on projected revenues. Funds are allocated in a manner that is consistent with the annual budget priorities. The adoption of the final budget by the Board results in spending authorization as identified in the supporting detail documents of the final budget. The budget is used to control or limit the expenditure of funds by major expenditure codes defined by the Budget and Accounting Manual. Once a budget is adopted, the total designated for each major expenditure classification is the maximum expenditure allowed. Pursuant to Title 5, Section 58307, any budget transfers between major classifications, or from reserves, must be authorized by the Board (EIV.B3d.1) ($4)
The District maintains a reserve of 5% in the unrestricted general fund. The Board has also established a 3% contingency reserve. Per the Board’s budget priorities for 2007-2008, a transfer of $1.5 million was made as part of the FY 06/07 year-end close toward building that reserve (EIV.B3d.1).

Expenditures at the college level are monitored by Administrative Services, and budget administrators are required to follow District and college procedures for purchasing and financial operations (EIV.B3d.2). The college’s Vice Presidents of Administrative Services report to their respective Presidents but have a “dotted-line” relationship to the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services and meet regularly to ensure that policies and procedures are adhered to.

Evaluation

The District effectively controls its expenditures and attempts to anticipate and plan for future challenges, for example funding retiree health liabilities and meeting GASB 43 and 45 reporting requirements. In this case, the Board is proactively reviewing a number of possible methods for managing this expense over the long term, including the issuance of “Other Post-Employment Benefit” (OPEB) bonds and the District has committed to having a plan in place by July 1, 2008 (EIV.B3d.3-6).

Planning Agenda

None.

Evidence

| EIV.B3d.1 | WVMCCD Final Budget, 2005-2008 |
| EIV.B3d.2 | CBAC minutes at http://paris/mc/cbac/index.html, Paris→Inside Mission →College Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) Minutes |
| EIV.B3d.3 | WVMCCD Board of Trustees Agenda, 01-18-07, showing discussion of OPEB bonds; http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php |
| EIV.B3d.4 | WVMCCD DBAC minutes, 01-15-03 |
| EIV.B3d.5 | WVMCCD DBAC minutes, 12-01-02 |
| EIV.B3d.6 | Email from Joe Samuels, Mission College Interim President, 03-28-03 |
4B.3.e The chancellor gives full responsibility and authority to the presidents of the colleges to implement and administer delegated district/system policies without his/her interference and holds them accountable for the operation of the colleges.

**Summary**

Board Policy 2.1.3 outlines the authority and responsibility of the college Presidents to implement and administer those District policies that are delegated to them. Board Policy 2.3.9 clearly defines the responsibility of the college Presidents for the administration and operation of their colleges, and for the educational and student services programs of their colleges. Board Policy 2.2.1 requires annual evaluations of the college Presidents. These evaluations are conducted by the Chancellor. The Presidents of both colleges in the District meet weekly with the Chancellor as part of the Executive Management Team (EMT), and are fully responsible for implementing and administering delegated policies on their campuses (EIV.B3e.1, EIV.B3e.2, EIV.B3e.3).

**Evaluation**

The roles of the Chancellor and the Presidents are clearly defined per District policy. Communication between the Chancellor and the President is frequent and timely. The Chancellor ensures that the Presidents have full responsibility and authority to administer their respective colleges.

**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

- EIV.B3e.1 Administrative Handbook, 12-97
- EIV.B3e.2 WVMCCD Administrative Handbook Section 2 on Evaluations, 06-07
4B.3.f The district/system acts as the liaison between the colleges and the governing board. The district/system and the colleges use effective methods of communication, and they exchange information in a timely manner.

Summary

The District Council is the highest level participatory governance body in the District, composed of members from all major constituencies: administrators from both colleges and Central Services, representatives of the two major bargaining units, the Academic Senates of both colleges, faculty and classified staff representatives. District Council serves as an advisory body to the Chancellor, through which the colleges and the various constituencies represented can raise issues and develop policies for consideration by the Board. DBAC serves a similar role and advises the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services (EIV.B3f.1-3) (t4).

A number of different means of communication are used within the District, all of which are primarily administered through the Information Systems department. These methods include phone and email systems, as well as the Colleague executive reporting system (commonly referred to by the name of one of its modules, Datatel). Delivery of physical mail is also handled by the District (EIV.B3f.7).

Evaluation

The major District-level participatory governance entities, District Council and the DBAC, both have clearly defined operating procedures which are regularly reviewed. Communication of college and District concerns to the Board follows established procedures through these committees. Communication of Board concerns and discussions to the college community is not as clear-cut, due in large part to the fact that only summary minutes of Board actions are reported out following meetings. In Fall 2006, the Board took action to allow Board meetings to be broadcast via streaming video. This project has not taken effect, but may make Board deliberations more accessible to faculty and staff (EIV.B3f.1-4) (t6).

The various systems used by the District for communication – both telephone and email – are generally reliable and effective, with infrequent interruptions of service. Internet services, including web access to the executive reporting system, have a high degree of reliability. The physical distance between the two colleges in the District (approximately 10 miles) is responsible for some minor problems in communication. Delays of one to two days may be imposed by the need to route mail from the District mailroom to Mission College. Other communication problems arise from established procedures and processes. Minutes of many committees have not been widely distributed in the past, although that is improving, and a searchable District data archive has been established to which minutes and other documents can be posted from both colleges as well as from District committees.
**Planning Agenda**

None.

**Evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIV.B3f.2</td>
<td>WVMCCD DBAC Roles, Responsibilities and Operating Procedures, 12-07-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIV.B3f.3</td>
<td>WVMCC District Council Operating Procedures, Approved 05-10-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIV.B3f.4</td>
<td>WVMCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Agenda, 08-03-06, showing streaming video proposal. Online at <a href="http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/agendas/2006/20060803_bot_agenda.pdf">http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/agendas/2006/20060803_bot_agenda.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4B.3.g  The district/system regularly evaluates district/system role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals. The district/system widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

**Summary**

The District has a number of established committees which participate in the evaluation of governance and decision-making structures and processes. These committees include District Council, which advises the Chancellor; the District Budget Advisory Committee (DBAC), which advises the Vice Chancellor; the Administrative Services Council (ASC); and the District Information Systems Policy Advisory Council (DISPAC). The District Policy Manual, which delineates the governance and decision-making policies of the District, is reviewed on a regular basis by District Council and revised by the Board as needed (EIV.B3g.1) (t2).

**Evaluation**

Some groups, such as District Council and the District Budget Advisory Committee, regularly review their operating principles and procedures. Generally, however, the District needs to do a better job of evaluating governance, decision-making structures, and processes to ensure effectiveness. The District Strategic Plan has not had a comprehensive revision since 2001. The fact that both colleges will have updated their strategic plans by 2008 and the proposal to establish a District planning position should provide the foundation for the District to proceed with an update of the District plan (t2).
In August and September 2006, the District was visited by the State’s Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) and also had a technical assistance visit from a team from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) and the Community College League of California (CCLC). The reports generated by these visits provided valuable input to the District in evaluating role delineation, governance structures, and decision-making processes, and were communicated widely across the District via email and in meetings. The recommendations from these reports are being used as the basis for improvement by participatory governance bodies throughout the District and college (EIV.B3g.2, EIV.B3g.3, EIV.B3g.4) (t6).

Planning Agenda

None.

Evidence

EIV.B3g.1 WVMCCD Board of Trustees Meeting Agendas showing District Policy Manual revisions, 04-15-04, 08-05-04, 01-18-07, 12-07-06, 08-16-07, http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/board/calendar.php
EIV.B3g.3 WVMCCD Technical Assistance Visit, 09-09-06, http://www.missioncollege.org/senate/documents/Part_Gov_Rept.pdf
EIV.B3g.4 FCMAT Recommendation Matrix, 03-09-07