
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.

The timing of this institutional self-study, and particularly for the response to this standard, is both difficult and fortuitous for Santa Monica College—difficult because recent events have called into question basic institutional values regarding leadership and governance issues; and fortuitous because this very questioning creates the potential for the institutional improvement that is the intended outcome of the accreditation self-study process.

Over the past six years, the College has experienced both unusual growth and sudden contraction. On the growth side, college enrollment increased by 35% (reported FTES in the 2002-2003 year as compared to that in 1997-1998); the College has hired 92 new full-time faculty members and has significantly increased its classified staff during this same period; and significant capital funding has been acquired from federal, state, and local sources. Contraction began during the 2002-2003 academic year, with a 7.5% reduction in the Spring 2003 course offering (as compared to that of Spring 2002), escalating to a painful 27% reduction in the course offering for Fall 2003 (as compared to that of Fall 2002). To address budget constraints for the 2003-2004 academic year, the College also discontinued several academic programs, offered retirement incentives, terminated the employment of classified staff, and significantly reduced services. This fluctuation has resulted in disagreements—often vehement—over both specific decisions and the general direction of the College.

Board Policy 1600 states that: *The Board of Trustees embraces the concept of participatory governance as policy of the Santa Monica Community College District, while retaining its own rights and responsibilities as the ultimate authority in all areas defined by State laws and regulations.* At the present time, it is abundantly clear that the college administration and constituent groups have different definitions of the phrase “participatory governance” and do not agree upon what constitutes an appropriate balance between the concept of participatory governance and the ultimate authority of the Board of Trustees. Particularly with regard to the Board’s actions to discontinue academic programs and lay off classified staff members, many faculty and staff members believe that consultation with constituent groups was inadequate and that the Board acted without consideration of the alternative proposals presented by these groups.

It is simply not possible at this time for the college community to speak with one voice about issues of leadership and governance. Therefore, in the interest of clearly depicting the current state of the College, the response to this standard includes the various, often conflicting, perspectives on controversial issues.

IVA. 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.

IVA.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.***

IVA.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.***

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

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

IVA.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.***

Description—IVA.1, IVA.2, and IVA.3

Vehicles for constituent participation in planning and policy development at Santa Monica College fall loosely into three categories—major planning bodies including the Academic Senate joint committees and various district committees and *ad hoc* task forces; operational planning through the College's administrative/departmental structure; and the various constituent organizations, including the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, the Associated Students, the Management Association, and, for collective bargaining, the Faculty Association and Chapter 36 of the Classified School Employees Association (CSEA).

Board Policy 1610 recognizes the Academic Senate “as the body which represents the faculty in collegial governance relating to academic and professional matters.” This policy stipulates that the Board will “rely primarily” upon the advice and judgment of the Academic Senate regarding faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes and in the assessment of faculty professional development needs. Other academic and professional matters are subject to the “mutual agreement” process through Academic Senate joint committees. These include the following:

- Academic Senate Joint Curriculum Committee (See Standard IIA.)
- Academic Senate Joint Program Review Committee (See Standard IIA.)
- Academic Senate Joint Professional Development Committee (See Standard IIIA.)
- Academic Senate Joint Personnel Policies Committee (See Standard IIIA.)
- Academic Senate Joint Information Services Committee (See Standard IIIC.)
- Academic Senate Joint Student Affairs Committee (See Standard IIB.)
- Academic Senate Joint Sabbaticals and Fellowships Committee (See Standard IIIA.)
- Academic Senate Joint Distance Education Committee (See Standard IIIC.)
- Academic Senate Joint Occupational Education Committee (See Standard IIA.)
- Academic Senate Joint Environmental Affairs Committee - The committee promotes exploration of environmental and urban issues and provides leadership for campus recycling, energy and resource conservation, and educational planning regarding environmental issues. The committee advises the Center for Environmental and Urban Studies, plans activities for the “Eco House,” and organizes a Thursday evening speaker series.
- Academic Senate Joint Equal Opportunity Committee - In response to changes in state law since the College’s last accreditation self-study, the committee’s charge has evolved from promoting affirmative action to ensuring equal opportunity, especially in hiring practices.

All of these joint committees have both faculty and administrative representation, most include classified staff representation, and some include student representatives as well. The Academic Senate has a number of committees whose charge is faculty-oriented, and thus membership consists of faculty only:

- Adjunct Faculty Committee - Representing the concerns and needs of part-time faculty, this committee works to improve the participation of part-time faculty in the life of the College.
- Department Chairs Committee - Comprising elected department chairs, this committee considers issues that affect departments and proposes policies and programs to the Academic Senate.

- Elections and Rules Committee - This committee secures nominations for Academic Senate positions, conducts elections during spring semesters, and reviews the Academic Senate constitution and by-laws.
- Fiscal Affairs Committee - Committee members meet with the fiscal planning personnel of the College to represent the views of faculty in fiscal matters and act as a resource to the faculty and administration. Members of the committee represent the Senate on the District's Budget Committee and submit an annual budget for the Academic Senate.
- Legislative Action Committee - This committee makes recommendations to the Academic Senate regarding federal, state, and local legislation affecting the welfare of the college and its students; develops relationships with other constituencies on campus and statewide.
- Professional Ethics and Responsibilities Committee - Since the last accreditation self-study, the committee proposed (and the Academic Senate adopted) a Statement on Professional Ethics. The committee publicizes and supports the statement, hears and investigates allegations of unethical conduct, and recommends policies related to academic freedom and other rights and responsibilities of the faculty.

Board Policy 2130 authorizes the Superintendent/President to form representative groups, and Board Policy 1610 establishes that the Academic Senate will appoint faculty members to serve on district committees and task forces, with specific reference to the Collegewide Coordinating Council and Budget Committee, among others. However, there is no adopted Board policy or administrative regulation to define the composition and charge of such committees. Recent events have highlighted this as an issue to address. Nevertheless, the Collegewide Coordinating Council, Budget Committee, and District Technology Committee play a major role in institutional planning.

The Collegewide Coordinating Council has evolved considerably since first being formed as part of an institutional planning process initiated after the College's 1986 accreditation. The original group had representatives from the Academic Senate, Classified Forum (the predecessor of the Classified Senate), Associated Students, and, predominantly, administration. There was no union representation, since the Council was formed to address issues outside the scope of collective bargaining. Today, the Coordinating Council consists of nineteen members—6 faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate, 2 faculty members appointed by the Faculty Association, 2 classified staff members appointed by the Classified Senate, 2 classified staff members appointed by CSEA, 2 students appointed by the Associated Students, and 5 administrators appointed by the Superintendent/President. The Vice President, Academic Affairs serves as the chair, and the other three vice presidents are among the current administrative appointees. To ensure appropriate overlap among major planning groups, the Academic Senate appointees generally consist of the Academic Senate President, Past President, and President-Elect, the chairs of the Academic Senate Joint Curriculum and Program Review committees, and the chair of the Department Chairs Committee.

The primary role of the Collegewide Coordinating Council is to make recommendations to the Superintendent/President on planning issues. Council members have a representative duty in reporting back to and soliciting input from their constituencies. The Coordinating Council annually reviews and approves the *Master Plan for Education*, which includes the development of institutional objectives based upon the College's Vision, Mission, and Goals statements and a report of the College's progress toward accomplishing the prior year's institutional objectives. At least once every six years, the group also reviews the Vision, Mission, and Goals and recommends revisions, if appropriate. (This was last done in Spring 2002.) The Collegewide Coordinating Council also reviews the *Master Plan for Technology*, assists in facilities planning, and deals with other college-wide issues. In recent years, these have included institutional effectiveness measures, prioritizing student-learning projects for Partnership for Excellence funding, and making recommendations based upon a study of college tutoring services. In practice, the Council has assumed the role of recommending new faculty positions; these recommendations generally have been approved, with little modification, by the Superintendent/President and, ultimately, by the Board of Trustees. Administrative Regulation 5113 assigns the Collegewide Coordinating Council a role in the program discontinuance process.

Since the last accreditation self-study, the Budget Committee has evolved considerably. Formerly, the committee had an information-disseminating purpose and met infrequently. Over the past three years, the Budget Committee, which is chaired by the Executive Vice President, Business and Administration, has met regularly on a monthly basis. It includes representation from all constituent groups, and its membership somewhat overlaps that of the Collegewide Coordinating Council. In April 2001, the Budget Committee established, after much debate, a statement that defined the committee's charge:

“The committee shall:

- Have recommending authority on budget matters to the Superintendent/President. Final recommending authority to the Board of Trustees rests with the Superintendent/President; final approval authority rests with the Board of Trustees.
- Review, in a timely manner, tentative and final budgets for consistency with annual institutional goals and objectives, strategic institutional plans, and the college vision, mission, goals, and master plans, and forward recommendations to the Superintendent/President.
- Review all financial resources available to Santa Monica College.
- Review institutional expenditure practices, policies, and categories—not specific budget items—for consistency and compliance with the college vision, mission, goals, and master plans and federal and state laws.
- Review and recommend funding requests and allocations that require institutional budget amendments.

- Report back to their respective constituencies on a regular basis.”

Budget Committee meetings have served to inform the campus about the rationale for actions the administration has taken, as well as to explain budget reports and the fiscal state of the College. Occasionally, the committee has forwarded recommendations to the Superintendent/President. However, aside from information sharing, the committee’s role in decision-making is nebulous. The connection between the Budget Committee and the Collegewide Coordinating Council remains unclear, despite efforts to clarify how the two committees might collaborate to aid in planning. For example, the Budget Committee recommended, over a year ago, that the Collegewide Coordinating Council develop an annual process to evaluate classified staffing needs. Presumably, such a process would involve cooperation between the Budget Committee (to evaluate the level of fiscal resources available) and the Collegewide Coordinating Council (to assess college needs). To date, the Coordinating Council has not acted upon that recommendation. However, the 2003-2004 *Master Plan for Education* includes an institutional objective (Objective 12) for the Collegewide Coordinating Council “...to develop criteria for assessment of classified staffing needs.”

The District Technology Committee is responsible for updating the *Master Plan for Technology*. In this process, the committee integrates the instructional computing recommendations of the Academic Senate Joint Information Services Committee with student services, administrative services, and infrastructure technology needs into a recommended list of institutional priorities. This committee meets at the call of the Vice President, Academic Affairs, and its membership and meeting schedule have been somewhat loosely defined. (See Standard IIC for discussion of the *Master Plan for Technology*.)

The district committee structure also includes two committees that exist for purposes of grant oversight:

- The VTEA Committee meets to review proposals for federal Vocational and Technical Education Act (VTEA) funds and to monitor the progress of funded projects. (See Standard IID.) Currently chaired by a Dean, Academic Affairs, its membership includes faculty, administrators, and classified staff. Although the efficacy and integrity of this process is generally acknowledged, the composition of the committee is a source of disagreement between the Academic Senate and the administration. The Academic Senate has recommended that occupational faculty be more prominently represented, as is the case at other colleges. The Vice President, Academic Affairs maintains that the recent composition diminishes the likelihood of acrimony and conflict of interest.
- The Matriculation Advisory Committee, currently chaired by a counseling faculty member, assists the Dean, Enrollment Services in the oversight of state categorical matriculation funds and in preparing the annual report submitted to the Chancellor’s Office. To accomplish this, the committee evaluates the roles of assessment, counseling, admission, and orientation in supporting student access

and success. Through the efforts of the committee chair and the Academic Senate, membership issues have been recently addressed to provide for a wider spectrum of faculty and administrators.

District task forces are *ad hoc* committees whose scope and timeframe are particularly focused. Since the last self-study, the Superintendent/President, with the support of the Academic Senate President, has created two task forces to address important issues:

- The Student Retention Task Force, co-chaired by the Dean, Counseling and Retention and a Dean, Academic Affairs, had a broad representation of teaching and counseling faculty as members. The task force met several times during 2001-2002, read research, listened to presentations, and advanced a dozen recommendations. (See Standard IIA.)
- The BAE Task Force (named for British Aeronautical Engineering Systems, the previous owner of a site recently purchased by the College), was chaired by the Associate Vice President, Planning and Development, and its membership included approximately twenty faculty, classified staff, and administrators. The group met to recommend potential uses of a newly purchased 10.4-acre property, now called the Bundy Site. During approximately ten meetings held from February through July in 2002, the group discussed how the site could best be used to enhance student learning in terms of which academic programs and services might be placed there. Although the task force developed a series of preliminary recommendations and submitted them to the Collegewide Coordinating Council in Fall 2002, no action was taken because of the severe reduction in course offerings for 2003-2004. (See Standards IIIB and IIID for further discussion.)

The College's administrative structure is described in Standard IVB.2 and illustrated in the organizational chart. Within this structure, departmental units play a key role in operational planning. All faculty members belong to academic or student services departments, most of which elect a full-time faculty member to serve as department chair for a four-year term. (The Health Sciences Department, Library, and Emeritus College are led by assistant or associate deans. The Health Sciences Department and the Library each elect a faculty leader, who performs those leadership functions exclusively within the province of faculty members. The Emeritus College, a noncredit education program designed for senior citizens, is exclusively composed of part-time faculty members.) Within the strict parameters regarding weekly teacher hour allocations determined by the vice presidents of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, department chairs have great discretion in recommending the course offering and faculty assignments for their individual departments. They work very closely with the Academic Affairs and Student Affairs deans to develop their recommendations. With the College's rapid growth and sudden contraction over the last six years, this task has been anything but routine, and the specific discipline expertise of the chairs has been invaluable in assisting the College with meeting its enrollment goals. The determination of the course schedule and the services to support it not only has the greatest direct impact upon student access and success, but also translates into the College's largest single annual expenditure.

In addition to Board Policy 1610 (Academic Senate), the Board of Trustees has adopted classified staff and student participatory governance policies, developed in consultation with the Classified Senate and the Associated Students. These Board policies define how classified staff and students participate in college governance and planning activities. Board of Trustees Policies 1620 (Classified Senate) and 1630 (Associated Students) recognize each of these organizations as the primary voice of its constituency in participatory governance.

Each college constituent group has elected leaders who participate in college decision-making, sometimes advancing proposals on behalf of their organizations and, at other times, on collegewide matters. In addition to participation in decision-making processes through the various joint Academic Senate and district committees, individual groups may take action on their own. For example, in 2002, the Academic Senate adopted an ethics statement for faculty. The collective bargaining organizations, of course, have their own unique relationships with the District in accordance with state law.

Since the last accreditation self-study, the Academic Senate has revised its constitution and by-laws, approved an ethics statement to guide faculty conduct, established a student relief fund, put on—with campus-wide support—two Fall *Follies* attended by 350 people, raising approximately \$4000 for the relief fund. It also forwarded proposals that were not supported by the administration. The Academic Senate proposed having the department chair or the Academic Senate President attend the Superintendent/President's final interviews of candidates for new faculty positions. It proposed—and the Collegewide Coordinating Council supported—a full-time position in the field of education, partly to teach education courses, partly to oversee professional development. In both cases, the proposals were not supported by the administration. In the first case, the Superintendent/President felt that another person being present would interfere with the rapport she sought to establish with candidates; in the second case, the administration indicated that the education program was not yet ready for a full-time position.

As described above, the College has clear structures for leadership of the College as a whole and for its constituencies. Decision-making is guided by the College's Vision, Mission, and Goals statements, recently revised by the Collegewide Coordinating Council. Directly tied to these statements are the institutional objectives and the report on the progress made toward accomplishing the prior year's objectives, which together form the annual update to the *Master Plan for Education*. Some processes for decision-making are formal, such as the curriculum approval process, the approval of administrative regulations through the various Academic Senate joint committees, and the process for recommending new faculty positions through the Collegewide Coordinating Council. Many decisions, however, do not evolve through a formal process. Leaders of three major college constituent organizations (the Classified Senate, the Associated Students, and the Academic Senate) meet regularly with the administration's leadership. At those meetings, leaders raise concerns and consider possible responses. Sometimes a constituent group responds through its organization; sometimes department chairs work through departments to address an issue; sometimes—either through overt or passive resistance—one

side or the other does not act, and the matter does not receive attention. In short, this informal process can result in a multitude of responses.

As is typical for colleges, Santa Monica College's decision-making is loosely coupled; that is, decisions do always have a clear cause-effect relationship, and, particularly with the passage of time, it is not always possible to track just why a particular final decision emerged as it did. For example, in the early 1980s, a study undertaken by faculty leaders and administrators determined that decentralization of tutoring services would enhance the relationship between academic departments and the tutoring services supporting their programs. (At the time, most tutoring services were delivered through what was then called the Learning Resources Center in the Library.) This decentralization of tutoring became a long-term plan for the College, but more than ten years passed before changes in the physical plant allowed the moves to begin. When the efficacy of decentralization was questioned during the Collegewide Coordinating Council's Spring 2002 review of a comprehensive study on tutoring, it became clear that very few Coordinating Council members were aware that the relocation of tutoring centers within academic departments had been the result of implementing a long-term college plan.

Within the administrative structure, decision-making occurs hierarchically by requests flowing from departmental units through deans and managers to the senior administrative staff. The district planning committees and the organizations also recommend courses of action to the Superintendent/President. For major decisions, the sole decision-making authority rests with the Superintendent/President and the Board of Trustees.

Until recently, college constituencies viewed the administration's record on effective leadership and decision-making as mixed. All campus groups are proud of the College's success in transferring more students to the University of California than any other California community college. All groups are proud of having worked together to pass Measure U, which resulted in an influx of \$160 million to expand and improve campus facilities. Most college constituents approve of the purchase of the 10.4-acre Bundy Site, which will provide much needed space for academic programs and support services. However, negotiations with both the faculty and classified unions had been characterized by hostility and legal recourse, to the regret of both sides.

This "mixed record" view has given way to sharp division between college constituents and the Superintendent/President and Board of Trustees, as a result of actions taken by the Board of Trustees to address 2003-2004 budget constraints—specifically the discontinuance of academic programs and the layoffs of classified staff members—and the processes preceding these actions.

Administrative Regulation 5113 establishes the Coordinating Council as the body to oversee what is basically an appeal process for programs being considered for discontinuance. The Superintendent/President, the Academic Senate leadership, and members of the Collegewide Coordinating Council agreed that the Academic Senate Executive Committee, augmented by the Vice President, Academic Affairs, would serve as a subcommittee of the Collegewide Coordinating Council for the initial review of the ten pro-

grams under consideration. This group reviewed information prepared by the offices of Institutional Research and Academic Affairs and materials submitted by faculty in the impacted programs and recommended to the Collegewide Coordinating Council that none of the programs be discontinued, but rather that the offerings, for some, be temporarily suspended and, for others, “pruned” for the 2003-2004 academic year.

At the Collegewide Coordinating Council meeting that followed, the chair attempted to proceed with a plan to have the Council develop a ranking of the programs to recommend priorities to the Superintendent/President, in the event of a decision to discontinue some, but not all, of the programs under consideration. The majority of Council members were not willing to proceed with the ranking process, but wanted instead to call for a vote to support the subcommittee’s recommendation. The Council then agreed to ask the Budget Committee to consider the matter in terms of budget priorities, since the subcommittee’s recommendation was based strictly upon academic criteria. The majority of Budget Committee members voted to support faculty-proposed budget scenarios that did not include program discontinuance as an option, and the next scheduled meeting of the Collegewide Coordinating Council was canceled by the chair. Faculty members contend that, because the Coordinating Council did not take an official vote on the matter—either before or after the consideration in the Budget Committee—the program discontinuance process was never completed. The Superintendent/President maintains that she knew the recommendation of the subcommittee, had been informed that a majority of Collegewide Coordinating Council members supported the recommendation, had been informed of the Budget Committee action, and therefore duly considered all of these in developing her recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

Evaluation—IVA.1, IVA.2 and IVA.3

The College has many examples of effective decision-making that is anchored in student learning. There is general agreement that the curriculum approval process is effective; that the processes for reviewing the Vision, Mission, and Goals statements and annually updating annually the *Master Plan for Education* through the Collegewide Coordinating Council provide appropriate participation in planning; and that the process for recommending new full-time faculty positions works well. Also, the college community takes pride in the institution’s recent success in receiving grants and implementing these projects into the curriculum or student support services.

Judging the quality of any particular decision depends on the eye of the beholder. Some decisions have broad support, while others have generated widespread criticism. The purchase of the Bundy Site, for example, had virtually no consultation beyond the college vice presidents. Given the large commitment of resources, many faculty and classified staff members felt that there should have been some consultation. However, the Superintendent/President believed that she needed to act with speed and in confidence to assure that the purchase could be made. Furthermore, purchase of property is a central focus of the College’s *Comprehensive Facility Master Plan*, the development of which had broad participation. Therefore, the decision was supported by most campus groups. In addition,

because of the initial leaseback arrangement and innovative financing, the property has drawn little upon Measure U funding.

As previously stated, the program discontinuance issue has generated a great deal of discussion about the role and operations of the Collegewide Coordinating Council. Constituent groups have expressed concern that there is neither written authority for the Coordinating Council, nor a clear charge of which issues are within its purview (and which are not). Until recently, meetings did not necessarily have an agenda, minutes were irregularly kept, and—aside from its processes for ranking new full-time faculty positions and updating the *Master Plan for Education*—its way of operating was fairly informal. There is no established way to handle situations in which a majority of the members favors a particular course of action, but no consensus is reached. There is also the belief that, if the Collegewide Coordinating Council is the College's central planning body, it should have had a role early on in the plans to address 2003-2004 budget problems and that it should have a more clearly defined understanding with the Budget Committee.

Similarly, there are no written Board policies or administrative regulations concerning the establishment, membership, or authority of either the Budget Committee or the District Technology Committee. It has been pointed out that the authority of the Budget Committee to define itself by resolution is dubious and that, since the original authority for the Collegewide Coordinating Council itself is obscure, the power of the Council to create lesser planning bodies, such as the District Technology Committee, must also be doubtful. Many representatives of classified staff and faculty believe that the informality of establishment and operation of these bodies impedes trust and governance on the campus.

Many of the operational issues for the Collegewide Coordinating Council have already been addressed for the 2003-2004 academic year, and the newly developed College Policy and Planning website (<http://www.smc.edu/policies/>) has great potential for addressing acknowledged communication issues. It currently includes the *Master Plan for Education* annual updates from 1999 through 2003, a link to Board of Trustees policies, and the 2003-2004 Collegewide Coordinating Council minutes, agendas, and related documents. It is designed to eventually include Administrative Regulations and the minutes and agendas for the Budget Committee and District Technology Committee. The *Master Plan for Education* includes the following institutional objective (Objective 12) for 2003-2004:

To refresh and refine the institutional planning process by conducting a Collegewide Coordinating Council self-evaluation of the performance of its functions and its relationship to and interaction with other college committees (such as the Budget Committee and the District Technology Committee), Academic Senate joint committees, and the College's departmental structures.

Upon completion of this self-evaluation process, the concerns regarding the written authorization for these district committees need to be addressed.

As stated in the preface to this standard's response, the current rift between college constituent groups and the administration makes it impossible for the college community to speak with one voice regarding issues of leadership and governance. Therefore, the perspectives of the various groups are included here:

Classified Staff Perspective:

Since the last self-study, classified staff members have had an increasingly critical view of campus decision-making. Two central concerns emerge—mutual respect and effective participation in college governance. Many classified staff members, especially those active in the local chapter of California School Employee Association (CSEA) contend: that the District routinely ignores classified advice on projects that could save the District money; that the District has contributed to poor morale by its decisions to cut the workforce without adequate consultation and under threat of further layoffs; that administration representatives have not bargained in good faith; and that CSEA has been harassed, as evidenced by a disproportionate number of its executive board members being among the eighteen classified employees laid off in Fall 2003. Results from a survey distributed to classified staff found numerous problems related to mutual respect and morale. In 2002, partly in response to the survey findings, a consultant met with representatives of the classified staff and management in an effort to mediate the conflict. The result was a series of recommendations, which have become part of an objective adopted by the Collegewide Coordinating Council for 2003-2004—belatedly, according to CSEA representatives.

The issue of classified representation is complicated further by Senate Bill 235, which became Section 70901.2 of the California Education Code, effective January 1, 2002. That section states, in part, that any organization of classified employees consulted by the District on governance issues shall not “receive time, rights or representation on shared governance task forces, committees, or other governance groups exceeding that offered to the exclusive representatives.” CSEA contends that Santa Monica College is in violation of this section of the Education Code by not including a seat for CSEA on the advisory dais at Board of Trustees meetings, as well as a designated report on the agenda. (Currently, the Classified Senate President is seated at the dais and gives a monthly report.)

Student Perspective:

Board Policy 1630.9 guarantees that the Associated Students President or designee will be accorded a regular opportunity to present “positions and recommendations” of the Associated Students to the Board of Trustees. The Student Trustee sits on the Board as an advisory voting member and serves as liaison between the Associated Students and the Board of Trustees; the Student Trustee also sits on the Associated Students Board as a non-voting, non-director member of the Associated Students. The relationship between the Associated Students Board and the Student Trustee is not fully specified, and this sometimes has led to questions regarding who speaks for the students. (See Standard IVB.)

In current practice, the college administration primarily deals with student government through the Associated Students President. Some Associated Students directors believe that they should interact directly with the college administration about matters within their specific areas of responsibility. The formal, written description of the duties of the Associated Students President does not preclude the administration from working with other Associated Students directors.

Faculty Perspective:

Faculty, as recently as Spring 2002, felt that participation in decision-making with the administration was improving. After settling a lawsuit over the 50% Law filed by the Faculty Association (discussed in Standard IIID) and agreeing on a new contract for faculty, the administration showed signs of seeking to collaborate with the faculty. This collaboration extended to the two task forces discussed above. One leader from the Faculty Association even went so far as to proclaim the time “The Era of Good Feelings.” Unfortunately, the era was short-lived.

In Spring 2003, the Board of Trustees supported the Superintendent/President’s recommendation to eliminate several long-standing programs (including automotive technology and architecture) and lay off eight full-time professors, and that decision has led to a deep rift that continues into Spring 2004. In January 2003, with the Governor proposing severe funding reductions, senior staff began planning for a series of program cuts, without meaningful participation from the Academic Senate or the Faculty Association until March, when the proposals had already been prepared for action by the Board of Trustees. Although not commonly known until Summer 2003, the District was facing not only the Governor’s proposed cutbacks, but also a \$6 million shortfall. The shortfall was the result of inaccurate projection of expenses, some of which had been carried forward from previous annual budgets. Had the campus community understood that expenses were underestimated by \$6 million, the discussions and decision-making processes would have been different.

Faculty leaders from the Faculty Association and the Academic Senate urged the District to consider using three budget scenarios—a worst case, mid-case, and best case—as a way to plan for the financial uncertainty of the legislature reconsidering the state budget shortfalls. Faculty advanced numerous proposals designed to achieve the necessary level of cuts to expenditures. Faculty Association and CSEA representatives reported that in exchange for salary concessions, the District would make no commitments for program continuance (or for commitments to prevent layoffs); the District’s stance was to ask what level of cutbacks the unions were willing to offer.

Simultaneously, the Academic Senate agreed to a review process for program discontinuance in keeping with Administrative Regulation 5113. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, supplemented by the Vice President of Academic Affairs, found no academic reason to eliminate any of the programs and recommended to the Collegewide Coordinating Council that they not be elimi-

nated. When the Coordinating Council took up the matter, the chair (the Vice President, Academic Affairs) sought to rank programs; faculty, classified staff, and students maintained that the administrative regulations did not call for ranking of programs and urged that the Coordinating Council recommend to the Superintendent/President that programs not be eliminated. (Administrative Regulation 5113 stipulates that the Collegewide Coordinating Council act as a review board and recommend action to the Superintendent/President.) The chair and other administrators present stated that the Coordinating Council acted by consensus and that, in this case, there was no consensus. The Coordinating Council then agreed to refer the matter to the Budget Committee, which would be meeting two days later, to evaluate whether cost-cutting proposals would be able to avert the program discontinuance. Members of the Coordinating Council then expected to meet again. The Budget Committee met and voted to adopt three scenarios, which could address the anticipated shortfall. The next Coordinating Council meeting was canceled by the chair. On May 15, 2003, the Board of Trustees voted to end the Transportation Technology (Automotive Technology, Automotive Collision Repair, and Welding), Architecture, and Public Safety (Fire Technology, Emergency Management, and Administration of Justice) programs, thereby cutting access to 500 students in these occupational programs. Fifteen full-time faculty positions were considered initially for termination. The Board withdrew seven of these positions; in each of the seven, the faculty member had a faculty service area that allowed him or her to continue teaching in another discipline. Because no public discussion took place over the rationale for the administration's recommendation and for the Board's decision, most faculty members thought that the initial recommendation of programs had been ill-conceived.

As a result of the decision-making that led to the program discontinuance, faculty responded with a vote of "no confidence" in the Superintendent/President (as well as a "call for action" on the part of the Board of Trustees). Among other things, the "Resolution of No Confidence" alleged that the Superintendent/President "ignored procedures articulated in Administrative Regulation" and that her actions "reflect a larger pattern of disregard for the spirit of collegial governance." Eighty-six percent of the faculty voted in favor of the resolution of no confidence.

Administrative Perspective:

The Board of Trustees and the Superintendent/President regret the necessity for the program discontinuance and classified staff layoff actions, but maintain that they were warranted to ensure the College's fiscal viability. The Superintendent/President duly considered the Collegewide Coordinating Council majority view on program discontinuance and the budget scenarios approved by the Budget Committee in developing her final recommendation to the Board. In fact, this recommendation discontinued only half of the programs originally under consideration. For the remaining programs, the College has implemented the advice of the Academic Senate to temporarily suspend or "prune" their course offerings for 2003-2004. Although eight full-time faculty positions were eliminated, five of the affected faculty members took advantage of the retirement incentive offered to

all eligible faculty members. Board of Trustees members were aware of the objections to program discontinuance and of the alternative budget proposals through information from the Superintendent/President, written communications from constituent groups, and the extensive public comments at several Board meetings. The fact that trustees did not engage in dialogue with speakers and discuss the content of their presentations publicly does not mean that they did not individually consider this input.

The May 14, 2003 Collegewide Coordinating Council meeting was canceled because the chair had a commitment in Sacramento. The chair of the Budget Committee declined the Academic Senate President's request to substitute a joint Coordinating Council/Budget Committee meeting for discussion of the May Revise, because there would be insufficient time to prepare an analysis for a meeting scheduled the same day as its release. The administration consulted, both formally and informally, with faculty leaders at each step of the program discontinuance process, and the plan to have the Collegewide Coordinating establish priorities among the programs was part of these discussions. The three scenarios approved by the Budget Committee included cost savings that required collective bargaining agreements. By May 15, the legal deadline for Board action, no such agreements had been reached with the Faculty Association and CSEA. The lack of clear delineation, on the part of the Academic Senate and Faculty Association, between collective bargaining issues and academic and professional matters exacerbated communication problems throughout the process.

The administration supports efforts of the classified staff to take an active role in the formation of district policies and procedures that will have a significant effect on them; however, it is not always possible to grant the amount of release time requested by classified employees to participate in governance because of those employees' job responsibilities. The District is perfectly willing to deal with CSEA's concerns regarding the provisions of SB 235 through the collective bargaining process.

Decision-making relies upon information. Campus constituent groups believe that information has not been shared in an open, timely manner to allow them to participate effectively in decision-making processes. Decision-making also relies upon trust, especially in times of uncertainty. For many faculty and classified staff, trust will be restored only with new leadership at the College. Others look for signs that the administration and the Board of Trustees seek a new compact with the campus groups.

It is clear that the College has the appropriate structures and processes in place to address the procedural and communication concerns highlighted during this last very difficult year; in fact, some efforts are already underway. Unquestionably, the College's greatest challenge, for the foreseeable future, will be to deal with the issues of organizational trust.

Plan–IVA.1, IVA.2 and IVA.3

- ◆ The Collegewide Coordinating Council will complete the 2003-2004 institutional objective calling for an examination of suitable structures for planning. Upon completion of the objective, the Council will evaluate what written expressions of authority for it and other district committees would best serve planning and decision-making.
- ◆ All college constituencies will work together to determine the best strategies to address the problems of trust and morale and implement them;
- ◆ All college constituencies will work together to determine better ways of sharing information in a timely fashion to aid in decision-making.

IVA.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.***

Description–IVA.4

Santa Monica College encourages a broad base of participation in the preparation of the accreditation self-study. This participation reflects the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students and the belief of the institution that a fair and accurate self-study is one of the best tools for improving the quality of education the College offers its students. Steering committee and standard subcommittee members carefully research each section of the standards and meet numerous times to put together a balanced self-study that accurately depicts the institution.

The College's mid-term report, submitted in 2000, clearly demonstrates that accreditation recommendations are integrated into institutional planning and evaluation activities. Each instructional program, student services area, and college support operation addresses these recommendations directly through the program review process every six years. The College is in full compliance with the standards, policies, guidelines, and public disclosure requirements of the Accrediting Commission. The Accreditation Liaison Officer prepares the annual institutional reports through which compliance with Commission standards is reaffirmed, and substantive institutional changes are described. When a 1999 substantive change proposal to establish an agreement with Midrand University in South Africa for a joint academic program was not approved by the Commission, the College acted upon the advice of Commission staff to instead enter into an agreement to provide technical assistance.

In 1999, the co-chairs for Santa Monica College's 1998 Accreditation Self-Study participated in workshops to assist other institutions in the development of their institutional self-studies. Santa Monica College Board of Trustees members, faculty members, and administrators regularly serve on accreditation visiting teams. Although the College had the option to base this self-study on the previous accreditation standards, administrators and faculty members decided that serving as a pilot institution for the emerging standards would promote meaningful dialogue across the institution.

The Santa Monica College nursing program is accredited through both the Board of Registered Nursing and the National League for Nursing. As a result of its last National League for Nursing review, it received eight-year accredited status. The respiratory therapy program, offered through a partnership with East Los Angeles College, has consistently received commendations through its accreditation processes. In addition to responsibly meeting the requirements of agencies such as the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, the California Post-Secondary Education Commission (CPEC), and the U.S. Department of Education, the College maintains excellent relations with many granting agencies.

Evaluation–IVA.4

The College has consistently demonstrated honesty and integrity in its relationships with the Accrediting Commission and the many other external agencies with which it has relationships.

Plan–IVA.4

None

IVA.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.***

Description–IVA.5

There is currently no formal process in place to evaluate the integrity and effectiveness of the College's governance and decision-making structures and processes in a global manner. The setting of institutional objectives through annual updates of the *Master Plan for Education* consistently yields initiatives to evaluate portions of the structure. For example, over the last two years, institutional objectives have included evaluative activities involving the restructuring of academic departments, the Information Technology organizational structure, and the aforementioned Collegewide Coordinating Council self-evaluation. Academic Senate joint committees prepare annual reports that summarize their accomplishments and recommend goals for the following year.

In 2000, the Superintendent/President commissioned an internal study of the College's administrative structure, as a follow-up to the more extensive 1995 study that involved the participation of all college constituencies and resulted in an administrative reorganization. However, the study was abandoned in its initial stages because of fiscal constraints. In Fall 2002, the Academic Senate proposed that a Psychology faculty member with training in evaluation be given reassigned time to develop a survey designed to evaluate administrative work. Several meetings of Academic Senate leaders with the Superintendent/President and the vice presidents of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs resulted in agreement that the initial survey would focus on operational functions rather than on individuals and that the leaders of the various administrative units would receive the results of this feedback in confidence. However, when it became clear in Winter 2003 that the College's worsening budget condition would likely result in the elimination of administrative positions and therefore in unintended changes to administrative structure and functions, the Superintendent/President determined the timing to be inappropriate for such a project.

Evaluation—IVA.5

The College is weak in this area. There is currently no formal process in place to evaluate the integrity and effectiveness of the College's overall governance and decision-making processes and structures. Historically, the evaluative activities undertaken through implementation of the institutional objectives developed in the annual *Master Plan for Education* updates have resulted in improvement of the structures or processes being focused upon; but, by nature, these are developed on a piecemeal basis, generally to address already identified issues or problems. Although the annual reports from the Academic Senate joint committees have sometimes resulted in structural or operational changes, this is not their deliberate purpose, and the Academic Senate has not consistently published the reports. Studies of the administrative organization and the proposed evaluation of administrative functions can be beneficial, but these focus on only one aspect of the College's leadership and governance structure.

The current self-evaluation being undertaken by the Collegewide Coordinating Council has the potential to evolve into a global process, since it already includes an examination of that body's interactions with the Budget Committee, District Technology Committee, Academic Senate joint committees, and the College's administrative/departmental structure. Given the current impasse of purpose and atmosphere of mistrust regarding governance, it is clear that the College would benefit from a systematic evaluation of its decision-making processes and structures. Such a process would need to include both quantitative and qualitative components, and particular care would need to be taken to avoid the excessive complexity that has caused similar past endeavors to collapse under their own weight.

Plan–IVA.5

- ◆ The Superintendent/President, in consultation with the senior administrative staff and constituent group leaders, will develop a global evaluation process for the College’s governance and decision-making structures and processes.

IVB. 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.

IVB.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.

IVB.1(a) The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

IVB.1(b) The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.

IVB.1(c) The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

Description—IVB.1(a), IVB.1(b), and IVB.1(c)

The Santa Monica Community College District Board of Trustees, elected at large by Santa Monica and Malibu residents, consists of seven members who represent the local community. Their terms of office are staggered, expiring in December of each even-numbered year. In accordance with state law, a student is elected each year by the Associated Students to serve on the Board of Trustees for the purpose of objectively and effectively representing student issues and concerns to the Board and the Superintendent/President. The Student Trustee participates in all regular Board meetings, may make or second motions and join in Board discussions, and has an advisory vote.

The Board of Trustees is the governing body that establishes policies to support the College's mission to provide quality and affordable educational programs in an environment that is supportive, respectful, and reflective of an open and diverse community. It is also the Board's responsibility to maintain the College's financial integrity and stability.

The Board meets on the first Monday of each month, unless a holiday moves the meeting to the following week, and additional special meetings are scheduled as needed. All regular and special meetings are open to the public, in compliance with the Brown Act. All Board actions are taken in public, except where state law provides otherwise. As stated in

Board Policy, members of the public may address the Board “on any subject that lies within the jurisdiction of the Board.” Each speaker is given a time limit of five minutes. Individuals who wish to speak on Consent Agenda items may address the Board during the Public Comments portion of the meeting, while those who wish to speak on Major Items of Business are called upon at the time the Board reaches the specific agenda item. Rules for public participation (which restrict all comments to relevant district business) are included on copies of the agenda. It is the prerogative of the Board of Trustees Chair to exercise authority by discontinuing presentations.

The Superintendent/President, as secretary of the Board of Trustees, prepares the agenda for each Board meeting. The Board Chair reviews the agenda with the Superintendent/President at regularly scheduled meetings. Any member of the Board may request that an item be placed on the agenda no later than one week before the Board meeting. In keeping with the procedure defined in Board Policy 1551, members of the public may also place items on the Board agenda, provided that the requested items are related to district business and are submitted at least ten days before the Board meeting.

Board members receive copies of the agenda prior to public distribution. The Superintendent/President also sends a weekly information packet to all Board members. Printed Board agendas are posted at designated campus sites, may be requested from the Superintendent/President’s office, and are available, in limited number, at Board meetings. They are also posted on the Santa Monica College website seventy-two hours before each regular meeting. Similarly, Board minutes are posted in designated locations and are available on the college website.

During each Board meeting, the Superintendent/President reports about current college programs and events. The Academic Senate President, Classified Senate President, and Board members, including the Student Trustee, have an agendaized opportunity to deliver reports and comments. When making decisions that affect student programs and services, the Board of Trustees consults with the Superintendent/President. (As stated in Board Policy 1220, the Board “shall seek the recommendation of the Superintendent/President prior to adopting, amending, repealing, or suspending any policy.”) The Board performs its function and complies with policy by acting as a whole on all matters once a vote is taken, even though members may not always agree with one another.

The College’s Vision, Mission, and Goals statements are included at the beginning of the Board Policy Manual. Although these documents are not explicitly stated as guiding principles for Board decisions, Board Policy 1270 states that, in its annual self-evaluation, the Board will consider, among other things, “the effectiveness of the performance of the trustees in achieving the District’s goals” and “assess accomplishments relative to the *Vision, Mission* and *Goals* of the District.” Board policies related to participatory governance (Board Policy 1600) provide for the involvement of the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Associated Students in the development of Board policies that impact and affect these groups. In the case of the Academic Senate, both new and revised Board policies (and supporting administrative regulations) that affect faculty are discussed in the appropriate Academic Senate joint committees, which include members

from both faculty and administration and, in some cases, classified staff and students. Upon approval by the Academic Senate and the Superintendent/President, recommendations for new and/or revised policies are forwarded to the Board of Trustees for final approval. The Board Policy on Participatory Governance for faculty (Board Policy 1610) stipulates those areas in which the Board relies primarily on the advice of the Academic Senate and those in which mutual agreement is used.

Evaluation—IVB.1(a), IVB.1(b), and IVB.1(c)

The Board of Trustees carries out its responsibility for educational quality through the establishment of policies consistent with the College's mission and meets its legal and fiduciary obligations. However, members of the college community have expressed concern that the Board does so in a manner that minimizes the ability of constituent groups to influence decision-making.

The Board of Trustees public meetings are held in a room dedicated exclusively to Board meetings. The single-use space has about 30 seats available to the public. Members of the public who are unable to secure a seat in the Board Room are directed to an adjoining room that has a capacity of about 60 and, when necessary, an outdoor patio. Although there is a live video feed into the overflow spaces, there is no direct line of sight, causing some to be concerned that Board members may not always be aware that there are people in the other room or outside. At least two Board meetings per year are held at college off-campus sites, and meetings expected to attract large numbers are sometimes scheduled in larger venues.

Meeting the seventy-two-hour requirement for posting the agenda results in the fact that Board agendas are generally not available to the public until the Friday preceding the Monday Board meeting. Some interested parties have expressed concern about the lack of time to prepare statements in response to agenda items. In keeping with provisions of the Brown Act, Board members do not respond to public comments. The fact that this practice frequently extends to comments on agenda items as well creates the perception for some college constituents that agenda items are sometimes approved without adequate consideration of related issues.

Individual constituent groups have expressed concern regarding their level of participation at Board meetings. Some Associated Students directors have complained that their concerns are not getting through to the Board of Trustees. Although the Student Trustee serves as the liaison between the Associated Students and the Board of Trustees according to Board Policy 1411.4, this role is not defined in the Associated Students Constitution. The Classified School Employees Association (CSEA) contends that, as a result of the passage of SB 235, which became Section 70901.2 of the California Education Code, effective January 1, 2002, CSEA should have a seat on the advisory dais, as well as a designated report on the Board agenda.

Representatives of most constituent groups believe that the Board Dialogs, held during the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 academic years, were valuable and enabled direct commu-

nication between the constituent groups and the Board. Groups felt they were able to speak to the Board without their words being filtered or interpreted. This created a sense of communication and temporarily reduced the perceived sense of distance between the college community and the Board. However, both the faculty and classified staff underscored the importance of the Board taking action based upon the information received in the dialogs. Because most faculty and classified staff perceive that such action has not been forthcoming, the dialogs may have had the unintended effect of confirming the Board's distance.

Plan–IVB.1(a), IVB.1(b), and IVB.1(c)

- ◆ Facilities planning will include consideration of a Board meeting venue that is more accommodating to public participation.
- ◆ The District will review the timelines for posting Board agendas, balancing the public desire for a longer posting period with the time requirements for producing agendas that are as complete and accurate as possible.
- ◆ The Associated Students will formally define the role of the Student Trustee in its Constitution.
- ◆ The District and CSEA will develop a mutually agreeable way to address the issues related to SB 235.
- ◆ The Board will re-evaluate the effectiveness of the Board Dialogs and use this information to devise formats for future interaction with college constituent groups.

IVB.1(d) The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.

IVB.1(e) The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

Description–IVB.1(d) and IVB.1(e)

All Board policies are aimed at supporting the College's mission to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services. The Board periodically evaluates its policies and practices and amends or repeals those policies by a majority vote. In fact, all Board policies and many administrative regulations have been updated since the 1998 accreditation. Board Policy provides for the participation of the Academic Senate, the Classified Senate, and the Associated Students in the development and revision of Board policies that directly affect each respective group.

Copies of the current Board policies are available to the public from the Superintendent/President's office, the Library, and the Santa Monica College website. Printed cop-

ies of Board Policies are also distributed to administrators and department chairs. At the time of this report, the process of revising administrative regulations is still in progress.

During the biannual Board of Trustees retreats, Board members choose agenda items they wish to discuss in depth, such as the fiscal state of the College, the *Master Plan for Education*, the *Master Plan for Technology*, the *Comprehensive Facility Master Plan*, and accreditation processes. This time is also used to provide analysis and feedback with respect to faculty, curricula, and other significant issues.

Evaluation–IVB.1(d) and IVB.1(e)

Although Board policies are available on the College’s website, a survey of department chairs revealed that they have not received printed copies of revised Board policies. The ongoing revision of administrative regulations has created some confusion in that there is no readily accessible source of information either on the status of administrative regulations as they are taken through the appropriate participatory governance processes, or on the final content of those for which revisions have been completed. The Board Policy Manual is truly a “work in progress.” After completing the complete revision of the manual in 2000, the Board of Trustees recently took action to revise its By-Laws to reflect recent changes in law.

Plan–IVB.1(d) and IVB.1(e)

- ◆ The District will distribute printed copies of the revised Board Policies to all administrative and department offices and to the leaders of college constituent groups.
- ◆ The District will post on the college website all revised administrative regulations, along with the current version of those that have not yet been updated.

IVB.1(f) *The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.*

IVB.1(g) *The governing board’s self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.*

IVB.1(h) *The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.*

Description–IVB.1(f), IVB.1(g), and IVB.1(h)

The term of publicly elected Board members is four years, and elections are staggered. Historically, with the exception of the annual change in student trustee, there has been limited turnover in the membership of the Board. Since the last accreditation, there have been two new Board members elected and a recent one-year appointment to fill a va-

cancy. According to the Chair of the Board, the new Board member orientation consists of the following activities: an initial meeting with the Board Chair to discuss issues pertaining to the College such as the status of the budget, academic programs, and other internal and external issues; meetings with the Superintendent/President and the vice-presidents to provide the new Board member with an orientation to the various units and divisions that make up the College, such as Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Business Services, Human Resources, Facilities, and Planning and Development. The new Board member is issued a New Trustees Handbook, developed by the Community College League of California (CCLC). New trustees are urged to attend the California Community College Trustees (CCCT) orientation for new trustees.

To some degree, the biannual Board retreats function as Board development. However, Santa Monica College also sets aside an additional \$20,000 for trustee conference attendance. Board members attend annual conventions of the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), the Community College League of California (CCLC), and the California Community College Trustees (CCCT), as well as legislative conferences sponsored by ACCT and CCLC.

Board Policy 1270 specifies that “no less than once a year the Board shall evaluate the functioning, strengths and weaknesses of the Board and identify specific functions working well and those needing improvement.” During the summer Board retreat, the Board conducts a self-evaluation in which each member completes a questionnaire regarding how that member individually and the Board of Trustees as a whole have met responsibilities.

In order to assist the Board of Trustees in achieving its goals, all members are expected to adopt and adhere to the principles and standards defined by its Code of Ethics (Board Policy 1230). As elected officials, Board members are expected to uphold the highest standards of integrity, honesty, tolerance, and responsibility and to act in the best interest of the College and its community.

Evaluation—IVB.1(f), IVB.1(g), and IVB.1(h)

The Board is consistent with the standard regarding Board development and member orientation. Interviews with the two most recently elected Board members suggest that the orientation process could be improved by including, as part of the process, introductions to constituent group leaders. They have also advised that it might be useful to acknowledge the different backgrounds of new trustees in respect to knowledge about the College by scheduling a meeting of each new trustee with the Superintendent/President to decide jointly on an orientation plan specifically suited to the needs of the individual. Student leaders believe that the student trustee orientation should include greater emphasis on the responsibility for being a liaison to the Associated Students, as defined in Board Policy 1411.4.

The obligation for a Board self-evaluation is met at the annual summer Board retreat. While it is stated that accomplishments relative to the *Master Plan for Education* institu-

tional objectives, along with other criteria, are central to this self-evaluation, the Board does not make the specific format, criteria, or outcomes public.

Board Policy includes a Code of Ethics, but the Board meets this standard only partially, because the policy does not specify a process for dealing with behavior that violates the code.

Plan–IVB.1(f), IVB.1(g), and IVB.1(h)

- ◆ The Board of Trustees will consider revising the trustee orientation process in light of the comments of the more recently elected or appointed Board members.
- ◆ The Board of Trustees will consider revising its self-evaluation policy to ensure that the specific criteria are clear to the public.
- ◆ The Board of Trustees will revise its Code of Ethics to include a clear policy for dealing with code violations.

IVB.1(i) The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

Description–IVB.1(i)

Since the recommendations of the 1998 accreditation visiting team and the planning issues identified in the 1998 institutional self-study were central to the institutional objectives developed for the *Master Plan for Education* over the last six years, the Board has been informed of the College's progress through the annual report on institutional objectives presented at each summer's Board retreat. In 2000, the Vice President, Academic Affairs reviewed the accreditation mid-term report with the Board.

The Board of Trustees has been informed of the status of the 2004 accreditation process through periodic updates at Board meetings. The accreditation self-study co-chairs provided a more in-depth progress report at the Summer 2003 Board retreat and will review the final report with the Board at the January 2004 Board retreat.

Evaluation–IVB.1(i)

The Board of Trustees is appropriately informed about and involved in the accreditation process. However, it should be noted that college controversies during Spring 2003 severely impeded the progress of self-study development to the degree that completion of the document has occurred much closer to the submission deadline than planned, thereby limiting the frequency and depth of the interim progress reports to the Board.

Plan–IVB.1(i)

None

IVB.1(j) *The governing board has the responsibility for selecting and evaluating the district/system chief administrator (most often known as the chancellor) in a multi-college district/system or the college chief administrator (most often known as the president) in the case of a single college. The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district/system or college, respectively.*

Description–IVB.1(j)

The Santa Monica College Board of Trustees has the responsibility for hiring and evaluating the Chief Executive Officer of the College and delegates full authority to the Superintendent/President to administer Board policy and to oversee the general operations of the institution. However, the Board does not relinquish its responsibility to make final decisions.

Board Policy 1280 identifies three general criteria for the evaluation of the Superintendent/President: Board of Trustees relationships, institutional leadership, and constituency building. The policy also states that “the performance criteria will be drawn each year from goals and objectives identified by the Board of Trustees.”

Evaluation–IVB.1(j)

The Board of Trustees appropriately delegates district operations to the Superintendent/President and refrains from micromanaging the institution. The Board annually evaluates her performance and reports the general results of this evaluation through its effect on her contract.

Recent events have caused college constituencies to question the precise criteria used for the evaluation of the Superintendent/President and to request the ability to provide input for this process. Specifically in question is the Board’s renewal of the Superintendent/President’s contract in light of the July 2003 vote of no confidence in her leadership by the faculty and staff. The Board of Trustees responded to the vote of no confidence through the unanimous approval of a July 2003 resolution of confidence in the Superintendent/President’s leadership, and the Board Chair and Vice Chair drafted a letter to the Academic Senate when that organization requested a more specific response. However, faculty and staff leaders maintain that the Board should judiciously investigate and consider the underlying cause of the vote of no confidence. They have also suggested that the Board consider enhancing the process for evaluating the Superintendent/President by integrating the Community College League of California (CCLC) *CEO Evaluation Resource Guide* and including input from campus constituent groups through a “360 Degree” format.

Plan–IVB.1(j)

- ◆ The Board of Trustees will consider revising the evaluation process for the Superintendent/President to make the criteria more specific and the accountability factors more transparent.

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

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

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

- *establishing a collegial process that sets values, goals, and priorities;*
- *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.*

Description–IVB.2(a) and IVB.2(b)

The Superintendent/President is the Chief Executive Officer of the District and provides leadership and guidance in policy development and strategic planning to the College's various units of governance. She is directly supported by a senior staff consisting of the Executive Vice President, Business and Administration and the vice presidents for Academic Affairs, Human Resources, and Student Affairs. They are responsible for providing vision and leadership for all college operations. The Superintendent/President meets frequently with senior staff members, both individually and as a group, to discuss various issues and to provide direction in planning.

The Executive Vice President, Business and Administration is the chief business officer, is responsible for college facilities, and is the designated alternate for the Superintendent/President in the event of her absence. He is supported by two associate vice presidents—for Business Services and Facilities. They, in turn, supervise various directors and other managers for specific areas such as Accounting, Payroll, Purchasing, Risk Management, Auxiliary Services, Maintenance, Operations, and Facilities Planning.

The Vice President, Academic Affairs is responsible for all instructional areas of the College and is supported by three deans—two dealing with general instruction and one specifically responsible for the College’s several off-campus sites. Associate and assistant deans head specific instructional programs, including Learning Resources, Emeritus College, Distance Education/Media Services, and Health Sciences. Twenty-one full-time faculty members are elected by departmental faculty to provide leadership for academic departments and to serve as liaisons to the administration. (A departmental reorganization in 2002 increased the number of department chairs from seventeen to twenty-two. One position was eliminated with the discontinuance of the Transportation Technology programs in 2003.) Because of the vacant Associate Vice President, Information Technology position, the Vice President, Academic Affairs is also responsible for the Information Technology area of the College. The Dean, Information Technology provides operational leadership for that area, and she is supported by directors and other managers for Management Information Services, Academic Computing, and Network Services and Telecommunications.

The Vice President, Human Resources is responsible for all faculty and staff personnel services, staff development, and staff diversity and is supported by the Dean, Human Resources (currently on medical leave) and the Assistant Dean, Human Resources. The Personnel Commission, responsible for classified position classification and recruitment, operates separately from the District in accordance with the laws governing merit systems. Three appointed personnel commissioners provide policy direction to the Commission staff, headed by the Director, Classified Personnel.

The Vice President, Student Affairs is responsible for all student services. He is supported by four deans—for Counseling and Retention, Enrollment Services, International Education, and Student Life. Assistant deans, directors, and other managers provide operational leadership for specific student services programs such as Financial Aid, Athletics, College Police, Child Care Services, and Equal Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS). Student services faculty leaders include the elected Counseling Department Chair and three Coordinators—for Disabled Students Programs and Services (DSPS), Health Services, and Psychological Services.

The Superintendent/President takes direct responsibility for the areas of Planning and Development and Public Programs. The Associate Vice President, Planning and Development is responsible for Governmental Relations, Institutional Research, Contracts and Grants, and Continuing Education and is supported by an assistant dean, a director, and several project managers (categorically funded administrative positions). The Public Programs area includes directors for Community Relations, Institutional Advancement (the Santa Monica College Foundation), Marketing, Events and Contracts, and Special Projects Development, as well as the Public Information Officer.

Although the administrative structure described above resembles that created as a result of a study on administrative organization commissioned in 1995, it also reflects the results of the College’s recent budget constraints—unfilled vacancies and positions eliminated as part of the response to 2003-2004 funding reductions. In some cases, the vacant

or eliminated positions have been addressed through suspension of services or functions. In most, the responsibilities have simply been reallocated to existing administrators as additional duties, thus making the structure less logical. (The complete Spring 2004 organization chart is included in the appendices.)

Upon her arrival at Santa Monica College in 1995, the Superintendent/President challenged the College to develop Vision, Mission and Goals statements to form the basis for annual institutional objectives. These statements have been established and refined in consultation with all college constituencies and presumably reflect the values and priorities of the institution. Each year, the vice presidents draft area institutional objectives to be considered for the *Master Plan for Education*. These institutional objectives are reviewed and refined by the Collegewide Coordinating Council. In addition, constituent groups may propose additional institutional objectives through their representatives on the Council. The vice presidents are held accountable through an annual evaluation process that asks them to clearly identify which objectives were accomplished, explain why others were not, and provide the Superintendent/President with a follow-up plan.

Institutional data is now far more available and accessible than it was six years ago. Much of it is available to both internal and external users online (<http://www.smc.edu/research/research1.htm>). These data have played a major role in grant development, program review, prerequisite justification, and the analysis of student success and retention. Until recently, two full-time administrators—Dean, Institutional Research and Dean, Institutional Effectiveness and Planning—were responsible for collecting and summarizing data and coordinating its use for institutional improvement. Both positions were eliminated, effective July 1, 2003, as part of the College's response to budget reductions. In Fall 2003, two administrators had 50% assignments to maintain the College's research function. Other administrators have absorbed some of the functions of the Dean, Institutional Effectiveness and Planning position.

The Collegewide Coordinating Council, which includes representation from the administration, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Faculty Association, CSEA, and Associated Students and is chaired by the Vice President, Academic Affairs, serves as the primary recognized vehicle for discussion of college values, goals, and priorities. The Coordinating Council is scheduled to meet twice a month during fall and spring semesters and recently decided to meet during winter and summer intersessions as well. The Superintendent/President does not participate in the Collegewide Coordinating Council directly. Recommendations from the Council are submitted to her, either in writing or orally, through the chair. The Budget Committee, chaired by the Executive Vice President, Business and Administration and including a membership that resembles and somewhat overlaps that of the Collegewide Coordinating Council, reviews resource planning and makes recommendations to the Superintendent/President. (See Standard IVA for a more detailed description of these committees.)

Evaluation–IVB.2(a) and IVB.2(b)

The Superintendent/President delegates authority to administrators. Faculty and staff have voiced concerns that the administration is larger than necessary. Although the number of academic administrators decreased from 47 to 34, effective July 1, 2003, due to budget cuts, concerns about the size of the administration and the delineation of responsibilities remain. The reductions in administration through elimination of positions and unfilled vacancies have made both the structure and delineation of functions less clear.

Although the College has stated goals in line with its Vision and Mission statements, many faculty and staff members believe that it is not always clear how these are applied in decision-making. Recent decisions related to the 2003-2004 college budget cause them to question whether the administration and college constituencies truly embrace shared values and priorities.

Until recently, the Collegewide Coordinating Council tended to operate somewhat informally with no established way for members to place items on the agenda, no distribution of minutes, no agenda provided in advance, and no recognized procedure for taking action other than through consensus. While a membership overlap exists between the Budget Committee and the Collegewide Coordinating Council, the two groups have no formal interface. Due to the dissatisfaction expressed about its operation during the Spring 2003 budget response, the Collegewide Coordinating Council is re-evaluating its role within the College and ideally will recommend a role that is amenable to the Superintendent/President.

The operation of the Budget Committee has improved since the last accreditation. However, Faculty Association representatives believe that there is a lack of credibility in District-generated data, because there appear to be discrepancies between the financial information presented to the Budget Committee by the Office of Business and Administration and data independently acquired through such sources as the Chancellor's Office. Since Faculty Association representatives are no longer attending Budget Committee meetings, administrators are concerned about the difficulty in reconciling these differences.

Plan–IVB.2(a) and IVB.2(b)

- ◆ The Superintendent/President will involve college constituencies in an organizational study to determine whether the College's administrative and management structure is appropriate.
- ◆ The Superintendent/President's office will enhance the Administrative Organizational Chart posted on the College's website by developing a means of delineating the responsibilities and functions of the various positions.
- ◆ The Collegewide Coordinating Council will further develop the planning process to ensure that the Vision, Mission, and Goals reflect the shared values and priorities of all constituencies.

- ◆ The Collegewide Coordinating Council will adopt a formal process for its meetings, whereby procedures are developed for putting items on the meeting agenda, agendas are provided in advance of the meeting, minutes are kept and posted on the committee website, a recognized procedure for taking action is defined, and an effective liaison relationship with the Budget Committee is implemented.
- ◆ Members of the Budget Committee will work collaboratively to resolve the credibility gap between various sources of information regarding the financial state of the College.

IVB.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.

Description–IVB.2(c)

The Superintendent/President generally informs the Board of Trustees about new or proposed statutes that may affect the College. She receives legal advice on college compliance with federal and state laws from attorneys retained by the district and discusses this advice with the senior staff. She seeks input from Academic Senate joint committees on the governing Board policies within their purview, and some draft policies have been sent to the Classified Senate for comment. When institutional practices appear to deviate from institutional policies, the Superintendent/President may discuss the relevant issues with leaders of governance groups, collective bargaining units, and Associated Students representatives.

Evaluation–IVB.2(c)

Faculty and staff members do not always agree with the Superintendent/President on how well institutional practices reflect institutional mission and policies, as exemplified by the reaction to the recent discontinuance of academic programs and layoffs of classified staff members, with the accompanying questions about general resource allocation. Constituent groups sometimes disagree with the administration’s legal interpretations, as illustrated by the Faculty Association’s lawsuit alleging violation of the 50% Law (addressed in Standard IIID) and CSEA’s contention that the District is not in compliance with SB 235, which addresses the appointment of classified staff to “a college or district task force, committee or other governance group.” Administrators believe that the program discontinuance and classified layoff actions were regrettable, but necessary in light of the College’s budget constraints. They also point out that the Chancellor’s Office found Santa Monica College to be in compliance with the 50% Law and that the discussions between the District and CSEA regarding the provisions of SB 235 have not yet taken place through the collective bargaining process.

Plan–IVB.2(c)

- ◆ The college community will explore new avenues to resolve conflicts over the interpretation and implementation of statutes, regulations, and policies.

IVB.2(d) The president effectively controls budget and expenditures.

Description–IVB.2(d)

The Superintendent/President presents balanced budgets that support personnel and operational expenditures to the Board of Trustees on a yearly basis. She provides regular reports that outline to the Board of Trustees and the college community the budget's possible impact and ramifications from the administration's perspective. She receives input from the vice presidents, as well as the Budget Committee and the Coordinating Council, before making budget and expenditure recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

The Office of Planning and Development has the responsibility for identifying new funding opportunities to support educational programs, and the College has successfully increased grant awards from \$940,000 in 1995 to more than \$5,000,000 in 2002. Recent economic conditions have made grants more competitive due to the lack of funds available from state, federal, and private agencies. The Santa Monica College Foundation augments college funding through donations, capital campaigns, and solicitations.

Evaluation–IVB.2(d)

Concerns exist about effective budget control, as illustrated by the College being listed as one of three California community colleges in the most severe category of the Chancellor's fiscal stability watch list. Cost overruns and financial forecasts that vary widely over short periods of time have caused campus constituencies to question the accuracy of the budget data provided. In light of decreased funding, they believe that efforts seem focused more on building physical infrastructure than on supporting educational programs. They are concerned that expanding the physical plant generates additional operating costs for which no revenue stream has been identified. Although the administration asserts that generation of funds to cover operating expenses is not an appropriate role for the Santa Monica College Foundation, some faculty and staff members continue to advocate for the Foundation or another auxiliary group to become involved in directly supporting educational programs.

Plan–IVB.2(d)

- ◆ The District will effectively and realistically project and budget for the anticipated costs of plant expansion, acquisitions, and property development, including the increased operating expenses these generate.
- ◆ The college community will investigate additional sources of revenue enhancement.

IVB.2(e) *The president works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the institution.*

Description—IVB.2(e)

The Superintendent/President meets separately with the leadership of the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, CSEA, Faculty Association, and the Associated Students, as well as attending meetings of deans, department chairs, and the Management Association. She also meets with the General Advisory Board and the Associates, the college-affiliated community advisory groups. The Superintendent/President is a member of many community-based and national organizations and boards, including the American Council of Education, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, National Conference for Community and Justice, League of United Latin American Citizens, Rand Corporation, St. Monica's Church, Rotary Club of Santa Monica, Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce, and the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities. She has also supported all four vice presidents in assuming leadership positions for their respective statewide organizations in the Chancellor's consultation process. The College's many cultural events serve as an attraction for community members, and thousands attend *Celebrate America*, Santa Monica's annual July 4 celebration, which is held at Santa Monica College.

The Superintendent/President conferred with local leaders during the Measure U capital campaign, a \$160 million dollar district bond issue authorized by a 69.99% vote on March 5, 2002. The bond funds were earmarked for the construction of new college facilities. The City Redevelopment Agency recently authorized a \$10.2 million allocation to Santa Monica College for the College's share of redevelopment funds.

Evaluation—IVB.2(e)

In addition to her responsibilities on many national boards, the Superintendent/President has taken a very active role in the Santa Monica community and has been honored for her community leadership by three organizations—the YWCA, the National Conference for Community and Justice, and the League of United Latin American Citizens—during the last six years. The recent passage of Measure U demonstrates strong community support. However, some faculty and staff members are critical that she has not been able to change a longstanding conflicted relationship between the City of Santa Monica and the College, mostly stemming from the concerns of immediate neighbors of the College about its size. In addition, some community members expressed concern over the recent discontinuance of academic programs.

The Superintendent/President recommended that an Education Authority be formed in combination with the City of Santa Monica and the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District. While this proposal was rejected, it resulted in the revitalization of a Liaison Committee of the College, the City of Santa Monica, and the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District and a joint publication promoting education.

The threat of a lawsuit brought by Santa Monica College against the City Redevelopment Agency brought the Santa Monica Mayor, City Attorney, and many angry city officials to a Spring 2000 Santa Monica College Board of Trustees meeting. Although faculty and staff members are appreciative of the \$10.2 million eventually allocated to Santa Monica College to be used toward the new facility to replace the earthquake-damaged Liberal Arts Building, some are critical of the tactics used in securing it. Administrators respond that, after many years of unsuccessfully attempting to deal with the City more collaboratively, the intention to file a lawsuit proved to be the only approach remaining to secure these funds to which the College, because of the substantial damage it suffered in the 1994 Northridge Earthquake, is entitled.

Plan–IVB.2(e)

- ◆ The Director, Community Relations will assess the community’s expectations of Santa Monica College and lead efforts to further enhance the College’s function as a cultural center for the community.