

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.

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

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

- A.1 *Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.*
- A.2 *The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.*
- A.3 *Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution's constituencies.*
- A.4 *The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self study and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.*
- A.5 *The role of leadership and the institution's governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.*

B. Board and Administrative Organization

In addition to the leadership of individuals and constituencies, institutions recognize the designated responsibilities of the governing board for setting policies and of the chief administrator for the effective operation of the institution. Multi-college districts/systems clearly define the organizational roles of the district/system and the colleges.

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

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

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

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

Description

The Mesa College President provides leadership to define institutional goals, develop plans, and establish short and long term priorities for the College. The President supports an effective process of participatory governance within the College, with the President's Cabinet acting as the main participatory governance body. The membership of the President's Cabinet includes the President, the Vice President of Instruction, the Vice President of Student Services, the Business Manager, a representative of Deans' Council, the President and Vice President or President-Elect of the Academic Senate, the President and Vice President of the Classified Senate, the Chair of the Chairs Committee, the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee and the President and Vice President of the Associated Students. The meetings of the Cabinet are open and well publicized; members of the College community are welcome to attend and frequently do so (1.5, 4.1).

The President's Cabinet, under the President's leadership, establishes both long-range and immediate goals, considers and acts on recommendations from the faculty, staff, and student governing bodies and such planning committees as the Facilities Planning Committee, ad hoc Committee on Contract Faculty Position Priorities, and the Academic Program Review Committee, among others, and establishes the priorities for the College.

The President's Cabinet sets priorities regarding instruction offerings, facilities, contract and classified hiring, student services, equipment expenditures, and acts as the budget committee for the College. The President works in concert with the respective vice presidents and managers to ensure that the institution's resources are efficiently managed and that the recommendations of the President's Cabinet are effectively implemented. The President immediately conveys to the President's Cabinet the information gained at the weekly Chancellor's Cabinet on state and federal legislation and District policies that affect the College to ensure immediate implementation. The President communicates regularly with the staff, faculty, and students in a variety of printed material such as the regular President Cabinet "Updates" sent to all personnel on campus (1.25).

The Mesa College administration is represented in institutional governance through membership on the Deans' Council, leadership of the schools, and representation on the President's Cabinet and other participatory governance committees (1.5).

The faculty is represented in institutional governance through the Academic Senate, President's Cabinet, Chairs Committee, school meetings, and other participatory governance committees. The faculty exercises a voice in academic programs and curricula and faculty personnel through committees such as Academic Review Committee, Student Services Council, Curriculum Review Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, Academic Program Review Committee, and through the faculty hiring process (1.5, 3.40, 4.44).

There is an annual review of instructional needs of the institution to determine the number and type of new faculty hires required, as well as a similar process in classified staff hiring. The hiring sub-committee of the President's Cabinet, is principally tasked with developing the process and protocols for the rank ordering of discipline hiring requests, evaluating said requests and reporting back its recommendations on hiring to the full cabinet. The sub-committee consists of the Vice Presidents, two deans serving on a rotating basis, the President and Vice President of the Academic Senate, the Chair of the Chairs Committee and the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee. It is the responsibility of the administrators to provide leadership for their units and schools and to work with the department chairs and program managers/supervisors to ensure an effective teaching and learning environment (3.40).

In accordance with Title 5 of the Education Code, Mesa College has a fully cognizant Academic Senate that meets twice a month. It serves as a forum for discussion, and resolutions are carried by the Senate Executive Officers to appropriate councils for consideration. The Senate is composed of senators from all departments and five adjunct representatives. In accordance with provisions of the California Education Code, the faculty at large nominate and elect a Senate president, president-elect, secretary, treasurer, and senator-at-large. The immediate past-president provides continuity by remaining a member of the Executive Committee. Senate authority is derived from the California Education Code, which provides the legal basis for its functions and responsibilities at the College (70901E; Title 5:53200-53202). The Senate is closely coordinated with departments by way of a committee of department chairs, which meets

monthly and whose chair is a member of the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the President's Cabinet. The chairs of two Senate standing committees, the Academic Affairs Committee, the Sabbatical Leave and Professional Growth Committee, also serve on the Senate Executive Committee. The Senate offers extensive and open access to its deliberations. It promotes the interests of the faculty by way of its standing committees, its representation on College and District committees, and its access to the Board of Trustees (1.5, 3.19, 4.2, 4.44).

The California Education Code (Sections 70900-71094, The California Community College) was significantly modified by the passage of Assembly Bill 1725 (AB1725) in 1988. This bill mandated changes in the California Community Colleges, some modifications specifically in the areas of participatory governance. Procedures for enacting these laws are found in the California Code of Regulations Title 5, Article 2. Academic Senates, section 53200. Here the Academic Senates are granted certain responsibilities regarding academic and professional matters. Furthermore, the Governing Board shall consult collegially with the Academic Senate regarding the above issues. The Governing Board can rely primarily on the advice and judgment of the Academic Senates or choose to mutually agree. This process defines roles and establishes a check and balance systems to insure adequate participation of members of the academic community who have a vested interest in factors that affect their careers and the success of students. The above laws, codes, and AB1725 can be found at the website for The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges: www.academicssenate.cc.ca.us (1.5, 3.19, 4.2).

The District participatory governance policy, in accordance with these statutes and Title 5 regulations (53002-5302), clearly defines the role of the Academic Senate in representing the faculty and establishes the areas where the Senates have primary responsibility to advise the Board or its designees. The participatory governance policy also establishes the right of the Academic Senate to appoint all faculty who serve on committees throughout the District. This District policy guides the Mesa College President's Cabinet in its decision-making and in the formation and membership of all College committees. The District policy can be found in the Academic Senate's constitution (1.5, 3.19, 4.2).

The institution clearly states and publicizes the role of staff and students in institutional governance. The classified staff has a Classified Senate that meets regularly to discuss issues, and resolutions from this body are carried forward to the appropriate College governance bodies. The President and Vice President serve as voting members of the President's Cabinet. Classified staff have representation on the various College standing committees (1.5, 4.3, 4.5, 4.6).

The Associated Students Government is the representative body of the students in the participatory governance process at Mesa College. The Associated Students Government provides students with practical leadership experience in the area of budget/financial planning, parliamentary procedures, and in the development of programs and services designed to meet the students' needs. The student leaders and the staff of the Student

Affairs Office encourage students to get involved and take part in the many leadership opportunities available at Mesa College (1.5, 4.4, 4.5).

The student government is comprised of the AS President, Vice-President, Treasurer, Executive Council, nine senators, three Student Judicial Review Board members, and student volunteers. Business meetings are held regularly to enable students to express concerns about the College, promote new ideas, or help with activities (1.5, 4.44, 4.5).

The Associated Students have several goals and objectives on the Mesa College campus, such as empowering students by advocating and safeguarding their rights; developing a more inclusive and responsive campus climate, and facilitating open communications with students, faculty and administration; and developing and implementing student activities.

The Associated Students President and Vice President represent students on the President's Cabinet. Student participation is also strengthened by participation on many College committees. Student leaders work with College leadership to identify those committees whose charges incorporate significant effect on the student body. Student membership can be specified on those committees (1.5).

The Accrediting Commission supplies Mesa College with the standards and guidelines for a successful accreditation. Mesa College has agreed to adhere and comply with these guidelines, policies and standards as it writes the self-study. Commission recommendations sent to the College after the site visits are reviewed by the President's Cabinet, then a letter is sent to the Accrediting Commission acknowledging receipt of the recommendations. The College then moves expeditiously to address these recommendations. Progress to mitigate concerns is noted in annual reports sent to the Commission. Mesa College encourages and employs reciprocal communication with the Commission which is essential to achieve and demonstrate honesty and integrity (1.9, 3.16, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, 4.10.).

Mesa College's institutional governance structure encourages the process of independent and critical thinking based on good observation, questioning and research protocols. This governance process is participatory, meaning that all vested interest groups or individuals have the opportunity to voice opinions. When decisions are formulated based on these standards, the College benefits from the creativity of participating groups. This process to some degree is self-evaluative, for if a group is absent from the decision making process their voice is encouraged to be conspicuous at future meetings, providing a check and balance mechanism that augments an inclusive nature. Aside from this informal evaluation, Mesa College participated in recent District-wide employee opinion survey and its own accreditation survey. Questions in both surveys specifically targeted governance structure and function. Answers were compiled and tabulated. The process of evaluation is a work in progress. This work includes the identification of processes that Mesa does well, those that can be improved and the strategies for improvement (1.35, 1.9).

Evaluation of governance structure and function is also a fundamental process during the weekly proceedings of the President's Cabinet and at the President's Cabinet retreat held

once a year near the end of the semester. Evaluation and review of the College vision, mission, goals and objectives is thus ongoing with a comprehensive focus during the retreats. Communication of these evaluations and processes for improvement is accomplished in a timely manner to the Mesa College community and to the District with the use of documents, distribution list emails, and publication on the Mesa College and District web sites (1.16, 1.25, 1.26, 1.27, 4.11).

The accreditation standards prescribe that the role of leadership and the institution's governance and decision-making structures and processes be regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. Also, the institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as a basis for improvement. In the fall of 1996, the Academic Senate passed a resolution regarding evaluation of administrators. This resolution occurred during a period of organizational stress and need for change that led the Senate to a position which favored the creation of a District-wide committee with faculty senate representation in order to establish the role of faculty in the evaluation of administrators. The resolution also sought that this committee issue a preliminary report to be presented to the senate at the end of the fall 1996 semester. Further, the previous 1998 accreditation self-study plan recommended that the Board and the District evaluate the leadership and management style evaluation instruments at the end of the pilot project. From the review of the results, a permanent formal evaluation process would be developed for all administrators and the Board that would ensure faculty, staff and students had input into those evaluations. The implementation of this tool was to address the faculty's concern that they did not have a formal role in evaluation of administrators. However, the management contract does not specify a process for formal comprehensive and ongoing evaluation of management by subordinates. As the result of the Academic Senate resolution in 1996 and other District-wide concerns, the District commissioned a survey of administrative leadership style and performance. The survey was conducted by a consultant firm and the results communicated to the President and to each affected manager. The President met with each individual to discuss the results. Following continuing expressions of concern, the Board commissioned an Employee Opinion Survey that was carried out in fall 2002. The survey included questions about the District and about individual colleges. The results were disseminated to all employees District-wide. The President's Cabinet reviewed these results and developed appropriate plans for the areas of concern (1.35, 4.7, 4.12, 4.15).

Appraisal

The previous Mesa College President is a recognized educational leader of national standing who provided strong leadership for the College and represented the College effectively at the national, state, and local levels. In July 2004, the President moved to the position of Chancellor of the San Diego Community College District. An Interim President was selected to serve while a search for a new permanent president is conducted. The President has done an excellent job in supporting the roles of participatory governance of both academic and classified senates. According to the District Employee Opinion Survey 2002, 86.4% of those surveyed believe that the Academic Senate is receptive to the opinions and thought of employees and 91.1%

believe that the Classified Senate is making sound decisions in the best interest of the District. The President has firmly supported the principle that decision-making at Mesa College will be collaborative with staff, faculty, administrators and students fully involved in all decisions (1.35).

The weekly two-hour meetings of the President's Cabinet are open to any interested observer; deans and many chairs regularly attend. Agendas are set ahead of time, any Cabinet member may add to that agenda, and any faculty, staff or students may ask their representatives on the Cabinet to introduce an agenda item. The appropriate Senates and Councils make no decisions until there has been time for consultation and review.

The make-up of the President's Cabinet assures that the entire Mesa College community is represented as it acts as the main participatory governance body. In the case of the current budget crisis in California, Mesa College has had to include its share of budget cuts of a total of two million dollars for fiscal year 2002-2003. Those who had a concern regarding the cuts did have a vehicle to voice their concerns. Though their suggestions or plans may have not been the one chosen in the final decision, they did have a mechanism to be heard in such venues as school meetings, department meetings, Board of Trustees, and President's Cabinet, Chairs Committee, and in the Academic/Classified Senate. Lastly, the AFT sent out an employee survey by email requesting comments and suggestions about how the District should respond to the cuts in the District budget. (4.13, 4.14)

During the annual President's Cabinet retreat, the group works diligently to formulate goals and a strategic plan. The College views planning as an essential feature of institutional development, both as a set of activities designed to determine directions for the future and as an ongoing conversation within the institution regarding its history, values, strengths, weaknesses, needs, challenges and opportunities. It is committed to a planning process that ensures the systematic, annual development of plans to guide the immediate, strategic and long-term activities of the institution. The College's planning processes complement the planning directions of the District, although the focus is the institution. The process features the integration of instructional, student services, facilities, operational and budget planning. The goals and the strategic plan are shared with the Mesa College community through such activities as the President's annual convocation for both faculty and classified staff and school meetings (1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.25, 4.46).

Mesa College has well-developed and extensive decision-making processes that include representative leadership from within the College's governance structures. However, results of the Accreditation Survey 2003 conducted by the District Institutional Research and Planning Office indicated that questions related to the evaluation of leadership roles and decision-making structures and processes received lower agreement ratings than the other questions related to College leadership and governance. The responses indicated that over three-quarters of respondents agree that: College leaders encourage participation in improving institutional effectiveness; faculty exercise a substantial voice in professional matters and institutional policies; faculty and staff are sufficiently involved

through committees; and that they are aware of the roles faculty and staff play in various governance, planning and policy-making bodies at the College. However, in contrast, less than 50% of respondents agree that the role of leadership is regularly evaluated and the results are widely communicated to all stakeholders. Similarly, 55% of all respondents agree that the decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated and the results communicated to the College community (1.35, 4.12, 4.15, 4.17, 4.18, 4.19, 4.20).

In the Employee Opinion Survey conducted in 2002, questions about the President's Cabinet received average ratings of 74% in contrast to the same questions about the Chancellor's Cabinet with an average rating of 55%. Furthermore, Employee Opinion Survey questions related to communication at the College indicated lower ratings by faculty and classified staff with an average of just under 60%. When asked about work environment, supervisors, managers, and department chairs gave a lower rating of just under 50% to the question of workload than did other employee groups. The College's participatory governance structures are excellent places for good communication, between and among faculty, administrators, classified staff, and students. School meetings, school leadership meetings, department meetings, Chairs' Committee meetings, and Deans' Council meetings also contribute well to leadership, communication, and decision-making. Some assessment may be needed to determine how well leadership roles, structures, and functions are working and this information needs to be communicated to the College. Such a feedback mechanism would aid in ensuring that all members of the College are aware of what needs to be done to build the most effective learning environment for Mesa's students (1.35, 4.12, 4.15, 4.17, 4.18, 4.19, 4.20).

The Vice Presidents of Instruction and Student Services have been strong supporters of participatory governance at Mesa. They have been active in encouraging input from staff, faculty and students on the College committees they chair, and have led in the move to give faculty a strong voice at District councils. The Deans' Council also plays a crucial role as a forum for discussion and review of proposals on the President's Cabinet agenda. The Academic Senate leaders, Academic Affairs Committee, and the Chairs have worked well in determining and setting priorities for the filling of faculty vacancies (1.39, 4.21, 4.46).

Since the last self study in 1998, the President has completed her 11th year at Mesa, and Mesa College has had ample time to secure its structure of governance. The College has created a governance policy in accordance with the legislative reform regulations (AB1725) with the leadership of its President. Faculty and staff generally express a positive view about the governance structures, process and practices in facilitating effective communication (83.9% of the faculty agreed and 77.2% of the staff are in agreement). Since the 1998 self-study, a leadership style evaluation was disseminated by management and supervisors as part of their evaluation seeking comments from a broad representation of persons they work with, including staff, other administrators, and faculty (1.35, 4.9).

Plans of Action

The College is in the process of a change in leadership as well a major expansion of the infrastructure. The current governance processes have been effective in developing plans of action for the securing of funds, strategic planning, and establishing short and long-term goals. Critical elements in the decision-making processes have been the President's Cabinet, the Chairs Council, The Deans' Council, Academic and Classified Senate representation, and the filtering down of communication via the leadership cabinets (deans and chairs), Associated Students, curriculum meetings, Academic Affairs and other informal communication channels. The College is facing concerns about the on-going need to include students in all phases of the governance structure in order to ensure that the lines of communication are open and feedback available to realize student success.

The College has identified two areas to address within the scope of this standard and recommends:

12. the adoption by the District of appropriate staffing ratios for supervisors, department chairs, and managers to support the nature of the colleges and their individual missions.
13. the increase of student involvement in participatory governance through publicizing their role.

B. Board and Administrative Organization

B.1 Governing Board

Description

The San Diego Community College District Governing Board is an independent, policy-making body composed of five duly elected Trustees from the five San Diego regions and the position of Student Trustee is shared by the three Associated Student Presidents on a rotational basis during the academic year. Each Trustee serves a four-year term. Terms are staggered to provide continuity and mentoring for new members. Orientation and mentoring for new Board members is promoted along policy guidelines. In addition, the Community College League of California provides orientation, leadership and professional development seminars for new Board members (4.5, 4.22, 4.23).

In its decision-making capacity, the Board reflects the interests of the public and abides by local, state and federal constitutional and educational laws and guidelines.

The Board schedules bi-weekly general meetings for the public at the Mission Valley District Office location. Closed sessions dealing with legal and personnel matters are also scheduled, usually before and or after general sessions. Meetings are also scheduled

at all campus locations enhancing accessibility for employees and members of the general public that cannot come to other venues. Board members are invited to speak and engage in discourse with the academic, classified and student organizations. Board members often attend significant College events and programs. These heightened profiles are encouraged in order to augment accessibility and promote familiarity (4.13, 4.14, 4.16).

Concurrence on issues and resolutions is accomplished by Board vote, with each member having one vote. The Associated Student Government presidents of the three District colleges rotate during the year in the position of Student Trustee and have the right to cast an advisory vote at public meetings of the Board of Trustees. The Board acts as a unit once a decision is made, and is responsible for defending the institution from undue outside pressure and influence.

The Board operates on a written code of ethics, structure, operating duties, policies and by-laws published on the District web site <http://hr.sdccd.net/hr/boardtoc.htm> as District Policy 1000.0. The code of ethics includes defined policy for the mitigation of violations to this code. These policies are regularly reviewed and modified as necessary and Board actions are consistent with their requirements. All Board members receive a monthly stipend (4.24).

The ultimate financial integrity and stability of the District educational quality and legal issues and strategies rest with the elected Board. It reviews and approves the proposed yearly budget including monthly and quarterly reports thus retaining congruency with state budget reporting requirements. The Board seeks advice and recommendations from the Assistant Chancellor for Business Services. New or modified curriculum is initiated by the instructional departments and approved by the Academic Senate through the work of the Academic Affairs and Curriculum Review Committees. Curriculum then arrives at the District's Curriculum Instructional Council for approval prior to Board approval. All curriculum processes follow a participatory governance pathway. These steps assure that the legal parameters of Title 5 are invoked. Organizational structure and modifications to this structure are reviewed and approved by the Board after initiation through the participatory governance process (4.13, 4.14).

The performance of the Board is evaluated by many methods; each process follows established policy guidelines. As an elected body the Board members are ultimately evaluated and held accountable by the San Diego Community College District electorate. The governing Board uses self-evaluations, employee opinion surveys and reflective Board retreats to encourage and reaffirm best practices and suggest positive changes in the dynamic educational realm (1.35, 4.22, 4.25, 4.26).

District governance leaders introduced the Board to the accreditation process. Trustees have been apprised of the accreditation cycle, timetables and progress towards the creation of the self studies through regular status reports on a timely basis. They are informed of their responsibilities for active participation in this process. The Board accepts the College self study before it is released to the Accrediting Commission (4.27).

The San Diego Community College District is a multi-college organization with a mixture of centralized and decentralized functions. Under this format the Board is responsible for the selection and regular evaluation of the Chancellor as per his/her contract, and is likewise engaged in the selection and evaluation processes for the presidents of the colleges. Evaluations of the college presidents are reviewed with the Board. Selection and regular evaluation of top level management follows District published policy and guidelines. The governing Board delegates full responsibility to administer its policies, without Board interference, to the Chancellor and college presidents and holds them accountable for the operation of their assigned responsibilities (4.24).

Appraisal

The Board's constituencies include members of the public from the five San Diego regions and the District community. Board members continue to be visible and vocal advocates in both local and remote venues. These appearances have gone far to make members of the public and political entities aware of the District's visions and needs.

The staggering of trustee service terms has worked to the benefit of the Board and its constituency. The previous two election cycles have provided the Board with "new blood" from diverse sources while still retaining trustees who are able to mentor effectively. These last elections have produced a Board that is enthusiastic and energetic and has vision tempered with the fiscal realities at hand. In spring 2004, the Board reviewed and updated its Code of Ethics and developed a new self-evaluation instrument and scheduled a special self-evaluation retreat for July 2004. To their credit and courage, some Board members have used ancillary methods to aid in their ongoing orientation such as workshops and meetings provided by such organizations as the Community College League of California (CCLC) (4.24).

The Board, at its regular bi-monthly meetings, encourages and enables discussion of docketed items. The meetings are open, reflecting adherence to the Brown Act and supplemental District policy. The members of the public have the opportunity to share their opinions at the open microphone. College presidents, assistant chancellors and academic senate presidents may voice their opinions by taking the podium and are subsequently recognized by the President of the Board. Meetings at the District offices in Mission Valley are conducted in accordance with published policies. In general the Board agrees that the agenda and the high quality and quantity of informational resources for these meetings are derived from its constituents. Board members are well informed from multiple sources such as e-mails, District publications, internet, political clubs, debates, current legislative reports and surveys. Board members exhibited greater mutual respect this past year. All of these factors have led to an enhanced meeting focus and efficiency. Regular monthly meetings with the Chancellor and the Academic Senate Presidents have proved to be a valuable venue for sharing current information and concerns (4.13, 4.14, 4.24, 4.28).

Meetings held at the colleges often have greater attendance with an enhanced opportunity to showcase campus accomplishments, visions and goals. The members of the Board have been very complimentary about the value of these campus programs. They mention the high quality and the worthwhile educational nature of the presentations. Generally there are more members of the District community that speak at these functions. Meetings at campuses also encourage greater numbers of the public to voice their thoughts. Board members are professional, congenial, affable, and are sincere in their attempts to augment accessibility and familiarity with their constituency (4.13, 4.14, 4.28).

District voting policy is followed very closely with each member having only one vote. Members of the Board are generally knowledgeable of their operating duties and District policies regarding codes of ethics. The Board Code of Ethics along with a self-evaluation instrument was reviewed and revised in spring 2004. If a trustee voices unfamiliarity with a policy, senior members of the Board are often asked for their interpretation or elaboration. It is expected that there will be a period of orientation and mentoring as new members become familiar with these operating duties. This Board seems to be sensitive and respectful of one another's points of view, which facilitates professional discussions that have meaningful conclusions. The modified Code of Ethics should be published and broadcast to all members of the District community. The Board under the leadership of the Chancellor has made remarkable strides in defending the institutions from outside pressure. The severe pressure of fiscal turmoil that has beset education in California, especially the community college system, has been relieved somewhat by the advocacy of our Board members. Their well planned, well informed meetings, deliberations and testimony have convinced some members of our state leadership of the imprudence of drastic cuts in community college education. On October 2, 2003, there was a special meeting of the Board of Trustees and Chancellor with the members of the self-study teams from Mesa, City and Miramar colleges. The purpose of this meeting was to interview the Board members using a question and answer format. Board members were asked questions relating to their degree of familiarity with District policies and procedures. Additionally, they assessed their roles in the District and community and how well they felt they were accomplishing their tasks. In addition to general questions, each college compiled a few college-specific ones to affirm the Board's understanding of the unique nature of each college (4.13, 4.26).

Members of the Board take their tasks very seriously. The Board is well informed on the specifics of the accreditation standards and views accreditation as a priority. Members of the Board have been introduced to the concepts, guidelines and importance of a comprehensive, well-crafted accreditation self study on several occasions. Presentations by college presidents and academic senate leadership have outlined the tasks associated with the accreditation process including the major differences between the last set of standards and the present ones. Workshops have been scheduled to orient and apprise Board members of their responsibilities under the Accrediting Commission guidelines. The Board realizes its responsibilities to follow-up to Accrediting Commission suggestions and is taken seriously.

The Board views itself as having open communication with all of its District and community constituents. The Board feels that it is able to identify and respond to the most important issues. Members feel that they participate adequately in District functions and maintain appropriate visibility. The Board understands its role to hire one employee, the Chancellor or CEO, and communicates through that individual as a unit. The Board further affirms that the Chancellor delegates responsibilities to the assistant chancellors and college presidents. The Board understands that its role is legally codified based upon educational, governmental and business laws and codes. The Board does not hide problems but prefers to deal with them. The Board understands the binding elements of the Chancellor's contract including standards and time lines set for performance. They agree that the Chancellor's performance is based on the performance of the staff to which responsibilities are delegated. The Board recognizes that if there are difficulties with the performance of the Chancellor, the Board must intervene. It agrees that the prime mechanism for resolution of problems is through the participatory governance processes (4.24).

The Board agrees that regular review of policies is essential to proper governance and many are reviewed on a yearly basis. The Board understands and affirms that policies and procedures are geared ultimately to successful student outcomes and that these policies follow published mission statements. The processes for introducing new or modified curriculum have followed essential participatory pathways to the Board. This process has occurred efficiently. With the ultimate responsibility for educational quality, fiscal and legal integrity, the Board often seeks input and information from the expertise within its constituency such as the assistant chancellors. The Board deliberates carefully on all issues especially the yearly budget. The Board has scheduled special meetings where the intricacies of budget construction are explained and reviewed. Minutes of these meetings confirm that there is a sincere attempt by the Board to understand and weigh factors contributing to a balanced budget that is congruent with state policies and mandates. The Board agrees that the District's fiscal stability, student transfer and learning outcomes and its fine rapport with management are demonstrations of its success (4.22).

In fall 2002 the Board released the Employee Opinion Survey. The intent of this survey was a broad, self-evaluation of the District community. A District-wide group facilitated by a respected outside consultant constructed the survey along participatory governance guidelines. This survey was initiated by the Board and contained specific questions related to Board function. Thus the Board accepted this part of the survey as an evaluation itself, a progress report towards achieving best practices (1.35).

Results of this survey were shared with the members of the Board in spring 2003. Among the lower rated questions some were related to Board and District communication. More than forty percent (43.2%) responded favorably that communication flowed effectively from senior District leaders to employees; 53.2% responded they trusted the Board to make sound decisions in the best interest of the District; and 47.5% indicated that members of the Board are receptive to the thoughts and opinions of employees. Although these overall response ratings were lower than responses to some other

questions, in all fairness, this survey was taken at a time of significant transition for the Board. Two new Board members were elected in fall 2002, so it could be concluded that the results of this most recent Employee Opinion Survey may have evaluated past leadership styles rather than present ones (1.35).

During the construction of the District Employee Opinion Survey, various members of the committee voiced opinions that management personnel should be evaluated on a regular basis by those from the District community who have a stake in that evaluation, as is the case for some other employee groups. However, the topic of personnel evaluation was not the purpose of the survey (1.35, 3.13).

Management evaluations do not include provision for formal feedback from subordinates and such input is not possible unless contract changes are agreed upon by the District and the Management Association. With the inclusion of input from subordinates and others, there would come greater possibility of formal recognition of administrative job excellence and suggestions for improvement. In the absence of such evaluation methods, perhaps there will be a way for administration, management, and supervisors to access information that will facilitate improvement in communications, management of the team, and increase trust at all levels (1.35, 4.5, 4.12, 4.29).

The Board expresses interest in continuing to learn about their roles and responsibilities. Facilitating this learning the Board feels that there is a high level of trust among them, relationships are collegial and positive and they work as a team. With reference to enhancing accessibility with its constituency, the Board takes the position that too much accessibility might damage the hierarchical nature of the system. Disproportionate accessibility by certain groups or individuals to the Board may foster the appearance of micromanagement. The Board must find a critical balance in this respect. The Board agrees that any follow up to the Employee Opinion Survey is to be accomplished through the participatory processes (4.5, 4.24).

The District Executive Council (DEC) and the Chancellor's Cabinet delegate responsibility from the Chancellor to the college presidents. Representing the participatory governance structures from each college and the Educational Cultural Complex (ECC), the DEC has become a meeting place to discuss and approve the next Board meeting agenda. At times, the DEC has been used as a forum for discussion, clarification and elaboration of issues. Most recently, under the incoming Chancellor, DEC is evolving into the District's participatory governance body. Chancellor's Cabinet membership includes the Chancellor, college presidents, assistant chancellors and other administrative personnel as necessary. The links among these high-level decision-making groups and the interpretation of Board decisions is not clear. Different interpretations exist regarding the quality and quantity of formal and meaningful participatory governance dialogue necessary to produce District-wide acceptance of final, critical decisions. Decision-making processes, delegation of responsibilities and participatory governance routes to and from the Board/Chancellor level, need clarification and reaffirmation (4.5, 4.16, 4.24).

Although a document entitled “San Diego Community College District Principles and Priorities”, published in 2001, established general District values, there is no District-wide Strategic Master Plan to drive resource allocation. Lately major planning has been driven by reactions to declines in State revenues and prevailing politics of each segment of the District. The Board realizes the difficulty in creating a master plan in a multi-college District as well as the prospect of a newly hired Chancellor in the spring of 2004 bringing new planning concepts and criteria to the table. With respect to questions that were unique to Mesa College, the Board understands the different strengths, needs and challenges of each college. The Board displayed its knowledge of Mesa’s comprehensive curriculum, greater options for students, and the greater transfer function of this College (4.22, 4.26).

Plans of Action

In accordance with accreditation protocols, the Board of Trustees was apprised of the current standards for the self study. Interviews of key administrators including Trustees are very valuable instruments to assess their points of view that relate to all three sections of the self study: description, appraisal and plans of action. A special Board meeting held October 4, 2003 provided a wealth of information for Mesa’s self study. The question and answer session and the discussions that followed demonstrated mutual concerns to be resolved. Objectives towards a District vision were suggested by the Board members, including a comprehensive District plan and the mechanics for the synthesis of that plan. These included a Trustee Advisory Council, enhanced dialogue with faculty representatives, establishment of evaluation tools and how best to use those data. All of the plans of action below are derived directly from this interview and are congruent with Mesa College’s mission and vision.

The College has identified two areas to address within the scope of this standard and recommends that the Board of Trustees:

14. develop a comprehensive, integrated, strategic master plan for the San Diego Community College District.
15. implement the recently adopted code of ethics and a self-evaluation tool and use this tool on a regular basis to assess its performance.

B.2 Role of College President in Leadership and Governance

Description

After serving Mesa College for eleven years, the President was selected to become the Chancellor of the San Diego Community College District effective July 1, 2004. The President of Mesa College was instrumental in providing critical leadership at the College, in the community, the state, and nationally. She provided leadership in all aspects of the College day-to-day operations, personnel decisions, and the overall assessment of financial, social and academic effectiveness of the College. Mesa College

continues to be a model in the District and throughout the state in implementing the theory and practice of participatory governance per AB1725 (1.5, 4.1).

The President led the College's participatory governance group in dialogue about all aspects of college life. Prior to 1999, the President focused her leadership efforts around four principles that were used to guide Mesa College. The principles were governance, and decision-making regarding goals, plans, priorities, the efficient management of resources, and implementation of policies. These principles were successfully established and over the course of the past four years, she led the College through active discussions and planning at the weekly President's Cabinet meetings and at the annual Cabinet Retreat. As a result of the dialogue, the focus of her leadership shifted to themes that incorporated learning goals and objectives. The President used four themes as the foundation for her leadership and planning with the Mesa College participatory governance groups. These four themes were improvement of services for students, comprehensive educational experiences provided by the instructional/co-curricular programs and services, physical facilities, and representation in the community (1.16, 1.25, 4.9).

Improvement of services for students was the first important theme. Supporting their immediate needs, such as ensuring that there is financial aid, health care, child care services and providing enhancements to their academic success were vital. Examples of these services included: increasing the numbers of counselors, increasing articulation services and developing and encouraging the new Transfer Center and Student Orientation Program. The President also desired to provide experiences that challenge students and develop leadership skills. As these challenges and skills were realized the College observed an even better student newspaper, the fruition of the new Speech and Debate Team, the revival of the Literary/Art Magazine, and an increase in athletic activities, to name a few (1.26).

Her leadership also focused on enhancing academic quality and innovation, often despite some very lean budget years. When funds became available, 15 new faculty positions were filled in 2001-2002. In spring 2004, an additional 17 faculty positions were approved for 2004-2005. An effective process for reallocating positions vacated by retirements has been developed so that faculty positions followed departmental and program needs. Often these requests have been identified via the academic program review process. The Honors Program has been strengthened and institutionalized within the College. The President has been a consistent advocate of San Diego Community College District's unique Accelerated College Program based at Mesa College which has offered college courses to honor seniors in the San Diego Unified School District for 40 years. New programs have been developed to meet community needs, such as the Chemistry Technician Program, and the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Program, and as a result of academic program review and enrollment management, some programs have been moved to other colleges and/or districts, such as Electronics, Waste Water Management, and Apprenticeships. New formats of instruction at the College such as Open Entry/Open Exit and on-line courses have been supported where these directions were compatible with departmental strengths and philosophies. Because the President

took a serious interest in the instructional programs, the institution is following a sound path of educational review and improvement (1.14, 1.26, 1.27, 4.29, 4.30).

The President played a central leadership role in developing the physical facilities of the College. Substantial progress has been made in this area. Advancements included short-range improvements such as providing air conditioning for the College buildings. Interim improvements have been achieved such as relocating programs to make them more effective in their interactions with similar programs. Long-range projects were achieved, such as construction of the LRC in 1998, the Humanities Building in 2003 and the difficult and lengthy acquisition of the Muir School site from the San Diego Unified School District in 2003 (1.25, 1.26, 1.32, 1.33).

The fourth leadership focus was to ensure that Mesa College is not only well represented in the community but also interactive with neighborhood businesses and agencies for planning purposes. The President approached this leadership theme in two ways: personal service to the community, state and national boards, and encouragement and support for faculty, administrators and staff to participate in local, state and national activities, conferences and boards. The President also served as a role model for student leaders as they learn needed skills in advocating for community college students' needs with local and state legislators. She provided leadership ensuring that decisions regarding all aspects of the College operations are discussed, analyzed and disseminated to the College community.

In the past four years, the President led the Cabinet and the College in a long-range enrollment management plan that includes College goals and objectives as well as the review of the mission statement. Decisions that impact planning were made using information from District Institutional Research and Planning, an in-depth dialogue between the cabinet members, the deans and faculty of each school. Critical documents that support this effort are the College's new mission statement outlining learning success indicators, general education guidelines per Title 5, and the dynamic Master Planning Handbook. Faculty, classified staff, and students hold voting membership representation on the President's Cabinet, the leadership and decision-making organization of the College (1.1, 4.3).

The College utilizes ongoing planning processes that integrate instruction, student services, operations and facilities with each other and with the budget. These plans are published annually and guide the institution, along with strategic planning initiatives that are periodically adopted in response to opportunities and challenges. At Mesa College planning occurs in every segment of the College. Starting in 1998, the Student Services Council prepared an "integrated" planning document called The Student Services Master Plan (1999-2000) that was developed collaboratively by the Student Services faculty and staff. The belief of the committee members in preparing the document was that there was a need to implement careful and thoughtful planning that incorporated a common and unified approach in assistance and advocacy for students. The committee reviewed many in-house planning documents as they developed the Student Services Mission and Vision statements. The 1999 Student Services Master Plan was updated during summer 2001

and the New Student Services Master Plan was developed for 2001-2004. This document contains the vision statement goals and planning assumptions. During the 2002-2003 academic year, the new Vice President of Student Services led the Council in developing a Student Services Strategic plan and goals that was presented to the President's Cabinet, Academic Senate, faculty and staff during fall 2003. This strategic plan incorporated the College's learning outcomes at the Associate degree level and the newly developed student outcomes and tracking mechanisms developed by the Dean of Matriculation and Student Development (1.1, 1.37, 1.39).

Moreover, the President and the Vice President of Instruction have been actively collaborating with the Academic Senate, the Academic Affairs Committee, and the cabinet in updating and reviewing the College's Educational Master Plan. The Office of Instruction has disseminated the 1999-2000 Educational Master Plan and the 1999-2001 Executive Summary as well as the fall 2000 Educational Master Plan Progress Report. The Educational Master Plan was developed to advance the institution's mission, goals and objectives. It is the College's tool for identifying trends which impact educational delivery as well as plans and activities designed to serve students and community needs. It is an attempt to assess the past and anticipate future needs and developments (4.31, 4.34).

The College is informed of its accomplishments in the form of Instructional Updates that are disseminated at the faculty and classified staff annual breakfast and orientation meetings. The planning process continues throughout the academic year in school and department meetings and is solidified in the form of academic program review and facilities planning, curriculum balance and numerous other integrated participatory governance processes. Finally, the Associated Students under the leadership of the Dean of Student Affairs also participates in planning outside of the activities that occur in the Cabinet. The student leadership participates in an annual retreat and planning process each year. Documents are prepared and used as a guide to move through the academic year (1.17, 1.30, 1.34).

During the 2001-2002 academic year, following a series of extensive discussions by participatory governance groups of the College and the District among themselves and with external consultants, the District and the Colleges launched a successful capital construction bond measure campaign. The President played the lead role in the planning and execution of fundraising and efforts for the Mesa College segment of the campaign. The Mesa campaign raised \$110,000, including a significant contribution from the Associated Students, which was the largest amount raised of any of the units within the District (1.16, 1.17, 1.25, 4.32, 4.34).

Known on the San Diego ballot as Proposition S, the measure passed in November 2002 by a 68.6 percent margin – well over the required 55 percent. The final vote tally was 140,404 in favor and 64,148 opposed. The city's voters approved issuance of \$685 million in bonds for construction of a variety of facilities at the College and throughout the District (4.32).

An estimated \$180 million of the total bond issuance is earmarked for specific construction projects at Mesa College. These include a 500-space parking structure, a 60,000 square foot Instructional Technology building, a 72,000 square foot Math and Science building, a 3,000 square foot police substation, a 3,500 square foot remodel for visual arts, a 55,000 square foot Social and Behavioral sciences building, an 11,000 square foot shipping/receiving co-generation facility, a 12,000 square foot Health Services/Physical Conditioning classroom and lab building, and major remodels of the I-300 and I-400 buildings (2.17, 1.30, 1.34).

Information about College governance decisions and other activities are disseminated to the College using multiple types of media: newsletters, e-mail, flyers, the Mesa College web site and School meetings. Communication continued to be a top priority of the President, which was appreciated by the College community and the community-at-large. Communications were frequent, relevant, and timely. Weekly, the President communicated through the District-wide Chancellor's Cabinet and the College's President's Cabinet. As a follow-up, the President published the President's Cabinet Update once a month. It is produced by President's Office staff, supervised by the President's Executive Assistant, and distributed throughout the College. Five times a year, the President published The Mesa News, a 12-page newsletter for faculty and staff. The newsletter is produced by the Communications Services Department, supervised by the Public Information Officer (1.25, 1.26, 4.32).

Under direction from the President, Communications Services also produced a variety of informational and promotional publications, posters, and brochures. Through the Public Information Officer, the President communicated with local, state, and national news media.

Annually, except for 2003-2004, a 60-page Student Handbook is published. The handbook was not published for 2003-2004 because of deep state budget cuts. Also published annually is a 26-page Faculty & Staff Handbook. Occasionally, special event publications are produced. For example, a 16-page booklet was published to commemorate the College's 40th anniversary. In 2001-2002, a recruitment CD web card was produced. In 1999, a general brochure was published. Both the CD and general brochure have been distributed at a wide variety of events and meetings, and by mail (2.17, 4.33).

Prior to the beginning of every new academic year, the President hosted "welcome back" breakfasts – one for faculty, one for classified staff, and one for managers. The President, both vice presidents and the Administrative Services Director presented "State of the College" reports at these functions. Just before every spring semester begins, she hosted a state-of-the-college forum for faculty. Quarterly, she hosted breakfasts for all managers and supervisors (4.30).

The President also attended an adjunct faculty dinner, A.S. retreat, and beginning-of-the-year school meetings. She met with the executive officers of the Academic Senate at least once a month. On occasion, she attended meetings of the full Academic Senate. By invitation, the President met with the Classified Senate.

Every December, the President and Academic Senate co-hosted a Holiday Buffet for all employees. Informal communications were frequent and were typically executed when the President walked across campus and/or dropped in at various offices.

The President's focus was leading the College in defining its learning outcome goals (student success goals) that support the goals and objectives of the College. This process was handled thorough formal and informal meetings. The President worked closely with faculty leadership (Senate) and the Senate Executive committee for periodic meetings and discussions, met each semester with all adjunct and contract faculty and classified staff, and hosted with the Senates the Annual Cabinet retreat, management retreat (administrators), student senate retreat and on-going planning group meetings across the College campus (1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.25).

Appraisal

The President continued to be a recognized leader and political force in the community college system, the San Diego community, across the state and nationally. She was an advocate for San Diego Mesa College and its students as well as all community college students in California. She demonstrated her commitment to participatory governance by continuing to engage the President's Cabinet in on-going discussion related to all aspects of the College. The Cabinet with her leadership explored options related to enrollment management and implementation of a "Zero-cap" course enrollment system, budget reduction scenarios that provide options for facilities planning, and the Associated Students submit and propose activities that impact students and the community college system.

The President reviewed the budget, issues related to the College and facilities planning projects weekly with the business officer and in the President's Cabinet with the vice-presidents and business officer. She also met with the Academic Senate executive committee and maintains on-going communication with the Academic Senate President. As noted in the previous self-study, the concept and practice of participatory governance is embraced in the San Diego Community College District and at Mesa College (1.5).

The President continued to be the driving force behind the development of the College's annual goals as well as the creation and publishing of the planning document. The President's Cabinet Retreat, coordinated via the President's Cabinet and planned in collaboration with the Academic Senate Executive Committee, is held annually. During the retreat participants review the past year's goals and objectives and evaluate the effectiveness of each and its impact. This is also the time the participatory governance group reviews and finalizes plans for the following academic year.

While participatory governance is institutionalized within the President's Cabinet and Academic Senate, challenges continue to reside in administrative leadership, staffing, and communication. The interim President continues the past practices of her predecessor.

Since the last self-study, deans have been moved out of the “deanery” and are housed with discipline faculty around the campus site. Administrators are more accessible to faculty and students. However, the workload of the deans has continued to increase since the last self-study despite the changes in the contractual agreements for department chairs regarding release time. Budget cuts and demands for teaching and enrollment management, academic program review, curriculum review as well as on-going evaluation for contract and adjunct faculty impact the ability of administrators and department chairs to meet the numerous demands of participatory governance.

The District Employee Opinion Survey (EOS) of fall 2002 and Mesa College’s Accreditation Survey (MCAS) of spring 2003 did not directly ask questions that would evaluate the college presidents. There does seem to be a gap in the bi-directional communication at the Chancellor’s Cabinet level. There is receptivity of employee suggestions, thoughts and ideas at Mesa (MCAS question #63) yet there appears to be less of this occurring at the Chancellor’s Cabinet level (EOS #89). The reasons for this differential of communication are opaque but relate directly to the roles and abilities of the college presidents to set and maintaining the same high levels of participatory governance at the Chancellor’s Cabinet that is evident at the College level (1.9, 1.35).

To a large degree the President’s has facilitated an environment where Mesa College faculty have a substantial voice in educational matters including curriculum development (MCAS # 60, 61). Staff also agree that they have a substantial voice in College policy making (MCAS staff Q52). Communication by the President to the Mesa College community was rated as excellent, as was the leadership in fiscal planning and budget development. (MCAS # 72, 73). Very high marks were also given for the President’s ability to select and develop personnel (MCAS #71). As with the EOS, Mesa College does desire regular evaluations of the leadership and the decision-making processes (MCAS #64, 65). The MCAS showed that there is a need for more effective District support and communication among the colleges (MCAS # 75,76). It is unclear what role the President may play in ameliorating this concern (1.9, 1.35).

Decisions about enrollment management, budget and facilities planning are guided by information from District Institutional Research and Planning office. The Office of Instructional Services and Economic Development has the responsibility for coordinating all research projects at the College. Research needs of the College and the Cabinet are coordinated through this office. The Dean of Instructional Services and Economic Development reports to the Vice-President of Instruction (VPI) and serves as Acting Vice-President in the absence of the VPI and also as Acting President in the absence of both the VPI and President. The President also receives data independent of this process from the Assistant Chancellor of Student Services, various boards (SDVICCA) and policy organization at the state and national level.

The academic program review process has gone through several modifications in the past six years. The process approved in 1997 was lengthy and a bit cumbersome in that there were many questions, many of them overlapping. All College programs went through this process at least once and their reviews were evaluated by the Academic Program Review

Committee, a sub-committee of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Mesa College Academic Senate. Many suggestions were given in order to affect positive changes in the process. This evolution has produced a process that is much more user friendly. The cycle for reporting has been lengthened to five years from the original three, measurably decreasing the required work. It incorporates a mentoring segment that orients lead writers and gives constant support to their task. Yearly updates are required but are relatively simply to record since reporting forms have been shortened and improved. Many questions have been eliminated producing a much more workable and succinct outcome. It should be noted that the Academic Program Review Committee does not evaluate a program but reviews the evaluation of that program or department to assure that the guidelines have been followed. This year will be the first implementation for this new program. The Academic Affairs Committee has approved the documents. They will then go to the Academic Senate and the President's Cabinet for their approval (4.33).

The President acted in accordance with many extrinsic and intrinsic regulations. California State Education code and Title 5 regulations are primary. These set the guidelines and parameters for curriculum development and in fact participatory governance practices so that curriculum may be balanced and address student needs. District policies and procedures are congruent with state and local laws. Intrinsic College rules and governance processes overlap with the above extrinsic regulations to provide a climate that is conducive to the maintenance of the highest standards of education, student learning, success and ultimate transfer to other institutions. Although the President had the ultimate authority and accountability for College function, there are many pragmatic checks and balances that are in place to assure that regulations are implemented. The President acted in concert with many members of the College community to assure that the implementation of regulations is consistent with Mesa's mission. It is the vitality of this dialogue that facilitates appropriate system functioning and therefore faculty and staff do take some measure of this accountability. The College mission follows naturally from the outcome of this framework. The President's role is to facilitate the understanding of the regulations so that a foundational mission is produced. Mesa College's mission statement is such a document. It is a testimony of a firm understanding of framework and parameter and is as adaptable as necessary, within bounds, to assure student success.

The control of budget and expenditures follows a similar process as the adherence to statutes and regulations mentioned above. The participatory governance process works just as well in this arena as in formulating a mission statement or adjusting curriculum balance. At Mesa the budget process is driven by the desire to accommodate students' needs. The President relies on many sources to gather the budget pieces. Each department and or program submits a list of items or personnel to the school dean. These requests are often prioritized and on many occasions expense rationales are attached. Realistic and edited requests are discussed at the administrative level and with consultation are further prioritized. Committees may be created to deal with special concerns such as faculty hiring prioritization or facility planning. Thus, by this process, budget control, to some degree, has already been accomplished. Faculty and staff have then accepted responsibility for creating a rational budget and its implementation. The

President's Cabinet is the appropriate venue for discussion and approval of the process. Day to day monitoring of the expenditures is done by the Director of Administrative Services and his staff. There are weekly meetings between the President and this Director so that budget modifications can be implemented without excessive lag periods. Members of the President's Cabinet and other governance groups are treated to comprehensive and educational explanations by the Director on a regular basis. This adds support and credibility to a complicated process. All of this accommodated within a state budget model that funds the SDCCD and Mesa College at a per student rate well below the average of the other California community colleges and districts (1.16, 1.17, 4.46).

The President communicated regularly and often with selected constituents at the local, state and national levels. Communications are accomplished by a variety of methods, including personal appearances, mailings, and College events. She attended a considerable number of local events and public meetings. This ranged from attendance at San Diego Unified School District board and San Diego City Council meetings to benefit dinners for the Union of Pan Asian Communities, the YMCA, the Neighborhood House, Chicano Federation, Barrio Station and the San Diego Urban League.

Further, the President serves on various local, state and national boards. Locally, she is president of the San Diego Youth & Community Services Board and is a member of the following boards: the San Diego Opera; the National Conference for Community and Justice; the NFL Youth Education Town; and the San Diego Catfish Club, a forum for public discussion. On occasion, she organizes and moderates Catfish Club panel discussions.

The President's affiliations also included the Board of Directors of the American Association of Community Colleges, the California Council for the Humanities (as Chair), the Super Bowl XXXVII Host Committee, the Automobile Club of Southern California Advisory Board, and other organizations. In 1998, she was listed in "Who's Who" by the San Diego Business Journal and was named one of San Diego Magazine's "50 People to Watch."

The President is a member of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.

The President's professional history includes service on boards serving higher education. Accreditation is one of the president's key interests. She served on the Council on Higher Education Accreditation Committee on Transfer and the Public Interest and she is past Chair of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

At present, the President is Chair of the Community College Leadership Development Initiative Board of Directors, a member and immediate past Chair of the National Institute for Leadership Development Board of Directors, and a member of the Community College Humanities Association Board.

Under the President's direction, the Public Information Officer cultivates and maintains relationships with local, state, and national news media. He also provides press releases, personalized pitch letters, photographs and completed feature stories to media. This includes print and broadcast media (primarily newspapers, TV stations and magazines operating in the San Diego region), and state and local media (primarily higher education publications such as the Community College Times, Community College Week, the Chronicle of Higher Education and the Community College League of California News.). The communiqués to news media from the Public Information Office promote the College's students, faculty, staff, programs, and special events (1.26, 1.27, 4.32, 4.33).

Under the President's leadership, the College's participatory governance groups have participated in dialogue that has focused on student learning outcomes, the College's commitment to services and resources, the establishment of infrastructures to support the academic and co-curricular activities and methods for evaluation. The focus of the dialogues and planning has been centered upon four themes: leadership for students, counseling services, speech and debate and a comprehensive educational experience provided by the instructional/co-curricular programs and services (1.1, 1.25, 4.45).

Student participation in the co-curricular programs is based upon their ability to manage their work and personal responsibilities around the demands of academic life and leadership development. The College has had a series of strong, active Associated Student leaders and the number of club and activities has grown. The Student Affairs Office under the Direction of the Vice-President of Student Services has played an instrumental role in reaching out to students at the College. Despite these efforts it continues to be difficult to ensure that every committee in the participatory governance structure will have a student participant.

Services for students was one of the important themes that both the president and the participatory governance groups review and discuss in order to ensure support for student success. She has effectively guided the College in expanding services to meet students' immediate needs such as financial aid, child care and health services. The College Financial Aid Office has been able to expand its services and provide outreach to needy students. Health Services is located in a new building with a nurse and staff to assist both student and staff. Flu shots are available to students and staff for a nominal fee. The Child Development Center has continued to outreach to students and provided needed services for day and evening students despite severe budget cutbacks. Mesa is a strong transfer institution and she actively encourages the pursuit of strong articulation and transfer agreements, increased counseling staff, the newly expanded Transfer Center, and Student Orientation Program, etc. In the last four years the student newspaper has been revised and provides needed information to students and the community at large. Other changes that occurred during this review cycle were the new Speech and Debate Team, reviving the Literary/Art Magazine, and increased athletic activities with winning teams (1.27, 1.29, 1.39).

The Speech and Debate team was revived at Mesa under the President's leadership. The President was actively engaged in restoring this program and activity to the College.

From the first moment after the hiring of the new faculty in this area, the President has been supremely supportive. She made it clear even during the recruitment process that she wanted the program and would support it. The President was also very helpful in supporting the need to identify a team meeting/practice room. G-203 has become the team room, partly because of the President's support and encouragement. The clearest indicator of excellent support for the debate team was in the financial support provided by the President so that the team would be able to participate in the national tournament. The five thousand dollar contribution made the trip a reality. More recently, the President has been focused on the expansion of the Service Learning Program, Education Abroad and other related activities. Despite the lean budget and heightened resource demands, she is supporting the expansion of these activities (1.17).

The President takes a serious interest in the instructional programs of the College. Academic quality and innovation is the second theme and despite some very lean budget years, new faculty positions were added in critical areas. This is a participatory governance process that provides for reallocating positions vacated by retirements so that faculty positions follow needs which are often identified via the academic program review process. The Honors Program was strengthened and institutionalized within the College. New programs were developed to meet community needs (such as the Chemistry Technician Program, the Geographic Information Systems Program, etc.) while other programs were transferred to other colleges or districts (e.g., Electronics, Waste Water Management, Apprenticeship). Finally, the president supported a new format of instruction at the College (Open Entry/Open Exit, and on-line courses) when these directions were compatible with departmental strengths and philosophies (1.17).

The development of the physical facilities of the College has always been a keen interest and focus of the President. The College has made tremendous strides in this area. Progress includes short-range improvements (such as providing air conditioning for the campus, building by building) to interim improvements (such as relocating programs like Interior Design to make them more effective in their interactions with similar programs like Architecture) to long-range projects (such as construction of the LRC in 1998, construction of the Humanities Building in 2003 and the acquisition of the Muir site in 2003, after years of effort and negotiation with the San Diego Unified School District) (1.30, 1.32, 1.33, 1.34).

Her fourth leadership theme is related to the community at large. She actively works to ensure that Mesa College is well represented in the community and interactive with community businesses and agencies for planning purposes. She also emphasizes a high profile for Mesa College in the state and in the nation, so that the College may share its successful models with professional colleagues and benefit from the experiences of other institutions. She accomplishes this theme in two ways: service on community, state and national boards and projects; and support and encouragement for faculty, administrators and staff to participate in local activities, as well as state and national conferences and boards.

Plans of Action

Since the last Mesa College accreditation review, there have been several changes in leadership and expansions in planning. A new Vice President of Instruction, Vice President of Student Services and two new Associate Deans have been hired. The Academic Senate leadership has changed and the President has been actively recruiting Senate leadership, faculty, administrators, Classified Senate members, staff and students to participate in the Community College Leadership Development Initiative (CCLDI). Leadership opportunities are announced in Cabinet and the information is made available to the College leadership (1.25).

The President's Cabinet is the central representative governance structure of the College from which all decision-making emanates. There is a broad range of governance structures at the College within the Academic and Classified Senates organizational structures as well as Cabinet sub-committees. The President chairs the Cabinet with members of the representative participatory governance groups participating.

Over the past six-years, the Cabinet has effectively planned and reviewed curriculum balance recommendations, hiring priorities for faculty, student led initiatives, strategic budget planning, transfer plans, proposed College foot-print, the awards of the Speech and Debate team, expanded Honors Program, the acquisition of the Muir parking and an array of educational, cultural and social program that make the College a comprehensive learning environment for students. With all of the success and future planning that is imminent, on-going dialogue will continue to be critical along with prioritization of projects that will eventually serve the growing demands of future students at the College. As a result, the College will use participatory governance groups to continue reviewing and planning for the "Future Mesa College."

No plans of action are identified at this time.

B.3 Multi-college Districts/Systems

Description

The Chancellor is appointed by the Board of Trustees and is evaluated annually. She supervises the preparation of the dockets for all Board meetings and conducts official correspondence for the District. The Chancellor makes her recommendations on all matters pending before the Board acts, and the Board delegates the administration of the District to the Chancellor. Under this authority the Chancellor is responsible for providing leadership for the District in the planning, setting priorities, managing the District resources, ensuring compliance with state statutes and regulations, and implementing all Board policies. In accordance with the District mission statement, the District convenes District-wide groups and takes the lead in the audit and compliance issues of the colleges. The District has established a centralized curriculum process and centralized student services to provide the consistency and continuity needed for the integrity of the curriculum across the District. In turn, the Chancellor delegates to the colleges and continuing education presidents authority for local administration and

operations. The District includes recognition of its leadership in the educational, economic and social life of the community as a primary principle of the strategic plan. The District also embraces diversity, professional growth, and college and community involvement as another strategic principle. The District acts as a liaison between the colleges and the governing Board (3.19, 4.5).

The Chancellor meets weekly with the Assistant Chancellors and the college presidents, as part of the Chancellor's Cabinet, to analyze data, discuss issues, set goals, monitor implementation of Board policies, and solicit recommendations. Two presentations were made to the Board of Trustees on the accreditation process by the presidents of the Academic Senates in the past year. Representatives of the Academic Senate, Classified Senate, and Associated Students meet regularly with the Chancellor and her Cabinet in the District Executive Council (DEC). The Chancellor meets with the Associated Student Government at their annual retreat to discuss the organizational structure of the District. In addition, the various District councils, such as the Curriculum Instructional Council and the Budget Development and Planning Committee, make their recommendations to the Chancellor, who then presents her recommendations to the Board. Regular and frequent meetings of the Budget Committee have been held each year due to changing statewide budget recommendations that affect appropriate planning of instruction and services. Information from the Chancellor's Cabinet meeting is conveyed to the College at weekly President's Cabinets. A District-wide Employee Opinion Survey was completed in fall 2002 to collect feedback on some of the District policies and their outcomes. Results were distributed to all District personnel. Priorities were identified for the highest rated areas (diversity, adequate training, access to Senate representatives) and lowest rated areas (early problem identification, receptiveness of employee opinions, flow of communication from District and opportunity for advancement) (4.5, 4.24, 1.35, 4.27).

The District services are divided into separate divisions, each headed by an Assistant Chancellor, with clearly delineated responsibilities for carrying out specific functions of the District administration. Currently these include Facilities Services, Student Services, Human Resources, Business Services, Instructional Services, and Information Technology Services (currently vacant). A recent reorganization has eliminated 14 District positions. No plan has been discussed in relation to the effective control or improved allocation of resources with this reorganization. Copies of the organizational structure of the District, Board and the College are available in the District Office of the Chancellor. They are subject to change (4.5, 4.24).

The District councils, under the leadership of the Assistant Chancellors, have the responsibility for monitoring financial management and reviewing and making recommendations regarding policies and procedures in their areas of operations. The District has regular fiscal audits and follows accepted practices of fiscal management. The District has scheduled Board presentations to inform members on a budget that is comprehensive and comprehended by administrators, faculty and staff. The District Budget Planning and Development Committee discuss the presentation components to provide clarity as needed. Dialog about institutional quality and improvement take place

at the Board meetings and at College visits. The institution consistently ends the fiscal year with a positive balance. That balance is slightly reduced this year with the fiscal changes of the state of California. Discussions of how to approach the anticipated deficit are continuing through the above mentioned committee and other College and District meetings (4.13, 4.14).

The District communicates to the Colleges through the e-publication “Communicator”, the e-publication “WE”, the college presidents, and other College personnel who serve on District committees and report back to their respective constituencies. The Academic Senate presidents meet monthly with the Chancellor. Representatives of the Academic and Classified Senates as well as other College personnel serve on standing and ad hoc District committees and councils (4.11).

There is no formal instrument to evaluate District services to the College. The District is clear about the desire to look at District-wide policies and procedures and allow the colleges the ability to review their own functions.

Moreover there was a significant difference in the results from the Employee Opinion Survey in regard to Board, Chancellor and District purpose, function and overall satisfaction. The District survey’s lowest ranked areas included early problem identification, receptiveness of employee opinions, flow of communication from District, and opportunity for advancement (1.35).

Appraisal

The administrative organizational structure, dockets and minutes indicate a clear delineation of role and function between the Board and the Chancellor. The Chancellor is an effective leader with a commitment to participatory governance and principles of collegiality who demonstrates the ability to gather the community in support of the needs of the District as demonstrated by the recent passage of Proposition S, a bond that provided facility funds for future buildings and infrastructure on all District college sites (1.30).

The planning for the facility needs was discussed in participatory governance groups throughout each College and continuing education site as well as within the District offices. The groups worked with a variety of external sources to prioritize the needs and develop the plan that the Board accepted and the proposition supported in the community.

Processes for planning through participatory governance groups exist and employees are knowledgeable about the processes and responsibilities of the various groups for governance. As described above for the district’s facilities planning and for curricular issues, these processes have worked successfully. But there remain challenges to incorporating this governance style into all issues that are subject to participatory governance. In 2003-03, in response to budget cuts, 14 positions within the District were eliminated and a plan to restructure the Centers for Educational Technology was

presented to the Board by the Chancellor. While the restructuring was discussed by the Board, it was not discussed in the District's or College's participatory governance groups.

The Board is supportive of the participatory dialog on issues and has established special meetings to cover Board training, site visits, teambuilding, and this self-study process.

Board members agree that they are provided with the amount and quality of information in a timely way to make sound decisions. Board members and college presidents confirmed that the Board evaluation process is informal and relies on the annual review of the District mission and College planning processes during the annual retreat. Board members have discussed the desire to have a District vision and strategic plan. The Academic Senates support the development of a formal Board evaluation process.

The Assistant Chancellor of Instruction has been responsible for curriculum developments that allowed for the use of technology to improve the integration of all college courses, facilitate course articulation and maintenance of the general education database. Under the Assistant Chancellor's leadership, the approval of curriculum has been streamlined and the process has been adopted by other colleges outside of the District. This technology, CurricUNET, has institutionalized a process that had previously been quite cumbersome (1.24).

The Assistant Chancellor of Student Services has been responsible for the development of the Institutional Research and Planning Office at the District and a variety of systems for online access of registration for students, online grades for faculty, and a professional development data collection system for Flex. These systems were necessary for the proper record keeping of state data and necessitated various modifications to meet the needs of each of the colleges. The District worked with the College participatory governance committees to make modifications. The District responded to the changes that had been demanded and worked to adjust to the differences within each college. These have included such procedures as the use of prerequisites, establishment of the course wait lists, and the recording of independent Flex projects (see CD Rom).

The Assistant Chancellor of Business Services coordinates the District Budget and Planning meetings that convene bimonthly. This Committee has worked over the past years to demystify the budget reports and present a discussion of budget assumptions for the colleges. The budget model uses a distribution that is similar for each college in the District. In the review of fiscal reports, the District has been successful in maintaining a reserve that is satisfactory to plan for the unexpected fiscal condition of California. The District was able to adjust to the directive for mid-year cuts and the colleges were able to develop a plan that allowed the District to maintain contract employees. The budget model has not been an area of negotiation, but the method of distribution of resources has been similar for each college. Beyond that actual distribution of the budget, each college has maintained the independence of determining the allocation of resources within its own campus (4.46).

Along with the participatory governance committees at the District level is the ability of the Academic Senates to speak directly to the Board of Trustees as a standing element of the Board agenda. This feedback opportunity has been valuable for many issues, from mid-year budget reductions and their effect on categorical programs to selection committee membership for the search process in seeking a new chancellor. Although the feedback mechanisms are in place, the opportunity to use some of the participatory governance groups at the onset of a project has been limited, with a resultant need to move to modification of initial projects mentioned above in order to incorporate necessary changes.

Plans of Action

There are many participatory governance committees in the District. Some function to a high degree and others may need enhanced participation from those with vested interest. Committees, their membership and participation are the foundation of this process. By and large, Mesa's governance proceeds very well indeed with appropriate membership and motivated participation. District committees such as those that are concerned with curriculum are models for governance. Others may enjoy a modicum of refreshment to encourage greater participation and delegation for the sharing of responsibilities.

It is well understood that the charge of many District committees is advisory in nature and that final responsibility for action rests with the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. This is codified in policy and is irrevocable. Solutions to the most difficult problems, perhaps those of finance, personnel and structural change, should be synthesized from a pool of those with vested interest. Mesa College sees a great opportunity to utilize the District Executive Council as a committee where problems and concerns of this magnitude may be openly discussed and resolved. For this to occur there needs to be a reaffirmation of this council's charge and a solicitation for members with the courage, commitment and leadership to invest in the job. The solidification of such a committee should prove to be an indispensable link with all other participatory bodies and begin to address other issues identified in Mesa's Plans of Action.

The College has identified two areas to address within the scope of this standard and recommends that:

16. the District Executive Council be reorganized as an effective participatory governance body to encourage enhanced participation of its membership and reaffirm its responsibilities for the discussion, debate and resolution of District-wide matters.
17. the District Budget and Development Committee continues to be called upon during both routine and emergency fiscal times. Additionally, any reorganization of the District services or personnel will be through participatory governance with a plan that includes improved allocation of resources showing a direct correlation to student success.

List of Evidence

- 1.1 Mesa Mission Statement
- 1.5 Academic Senate Committee Handbook
- 1.9 Mesa College Accreditation Survey, 2003
- 1.14 Academic Program Review Handbook
- 1.16 President's Cabinet Accreditation and Planning Retreat 2003
- 1.17 President's Cabinet Planning Retreat, Sample Packets, 1999-2004
- 1.18 President's Cabinet Retreat Minutes, 1999-2004
- 1.24 CurricUNET, Website Address: <http://www.sdccdcurricu.net/sdccd>
- 1.25 President's Cabinet Agenda and Updates, 1999-2004
- 1.26 Mesa News
- 1.27 Mesa Press
- 1.30 Proposition S Bond Election Capital Projects Materials
- 1.32 Facilities, Strategic Plan for Proposition S Projects
- 1.33 Facilities, Master Facilities Needs List
- 1.34 Priorities for Proposition S Projects
- 1.35 Employee Opinion Survey, 2002
- 1.37 Student Services Master Plan
- 1.39 Student Services Master Plan, 2001-2004

- 2.17 Faculty and Staff Handbook

- 3.13 Managers Evaluation Materials
- 3.16 Mesa College Annual Accreditation Reports, 1999-04
- 3.19 Policy 0003
- 3.40 Contract Faculty Positions Priority Hiring Process

- 4.1 President's Cabinet Membership
- 4.2 Academic Senate, Constitution and By-Laws
- 4.3 Classified Senate Governance Documents
- 4.4 Student Senate Governance Documents
- 4.5 SDCCD Governance Publications and Policies, Website Address: <http://hr/pubtoc.htm>
- 4.6 Classified Senate By-Laws
- 4.7 ACCJC Four Standards, Final Draft
- 4.8 Handbook, Development Accreditation Self-Study
- 4.9 Standard 10, Self-Study, 1998
- 4.10 ACCJC Guide to the Self-Study, 1996
- 4.11 District Communicator, Selected Copies
- 4.12 Mesa Academic Senate Resolution, Evaluation of Administrators
- 4.13 Selected Board Dockets, 1999-2004
- 4.14 Selected Board Minutes, 1999-2004
- 4.15 Leadership Styles Survey
- 4.16 District Executive Council Agendas
- 4.17 Selected School Meeting Minutes/Agendas

- 4.18 Selected Deans' Council Minutes/Agendas
- 4.19 Selected School Leadership Minutes/Agendas
- 4.20 Selected Classified Senate Minutes
- 4.21 Selected Student Services Committee Minutes/Agendas
- 4.22 Board Interviews
- 4.23 Transcript of Accreditation Board Interviews
- 4.24 Board Code of Ethics and By-Laws, Website Address: <http://hr/hr/pubtoc.htm>
- 4.25 Agenda for Board Retreats
- 4.26 Accreditation Workshop, Board Presentation Docket/Minutes, Fall 2003
- 4.27 Shared Governance Team Building Activity, SDCCD Board of Trustees, October 9,2003
- 4.28 Mesa College Presentation, Board Site Visit (City College), 2003
- 4.29 Selected Academic Senate Agenda/Minutes
- 4.30 President's Mid-Summer Planning Packet
- 4.31 Educational Master Plan
- 4.32 Mesa News Clips, February 2003-June 2004
- 4.33 College's 40th Anniversary Booklet
- 4.34 Mesa College Strategic Planning Directions, 2003-2005
- 4.44 Mesa Guide to Governance
- 4.45 Accreditation Self-Study Materials
- 4.46 Business Services, Annual Budgets

Supplemental Documents

Academic Resolutions, Governance
 Curriculum Instructional Council (CIC) Goals/Objectives, Agenda/Minutes
 Facilities Planning Committee Agenda/Minutes
 Fact Book, 2001
 Mesa Organizational Charts
 Position Paper #2, Curriculum Balance
 Program Review Template
 SDCCD Organizational Chart
 SDCCD Principles and Priorities, 2001-2005