

**AGENDA #3: GOVERNANCE  
Contents**

College Decision-Making Structures and Procedures..... 129

- Three Pathways in Decision-Making ..... 129
- Shared-Governance Processes ..... 130
- Review of the College’s Decision-Making Processes ..... 132
- Governance Structure..... 134
  - Description ..... 134
  - Evaluation ..... 135
- College President ..... 136
- Compliance with External Agencies ..... 138

District Decision-Making Structures and Procedures..... 139

- Governing Board..... 139
- Chancellor ..... 142
- District/College Communication ..... 143

Summary..... 145



## **AGENDA #3: GOVERNANCE**

*Within the campus community, to review, revise, and document the college's collegial decision-making processes. Within the district, to participate in the review, revision, and documentation of communication paths with the goal of clarifying the divisions of responsibility and authority between the college and the district.*

During the past six years, the college has made significant progress in reviewing and documenting the college committee structure and decision-making processes. The mapping document included earlier in this self-study (Background Materials: Organization of the Ventura County Community College District) reflects the results of dialogue regarding college and district roles and responsibilities.

### **College Decision-Making Structures and Procedures**

Moorpark College's communication and decision-making processes are organized to encourage effective communication among faculty, classified staff, administrators, and students with the intent to govern the college collaboratively.

#### **Three Pathways in Decision-Making**

At Moorpark College, decision-making follows three paths:

1. Decisions on college and district policies and procedures may arise out of collegial dialogue in committees and subcommittees (listed below), which represent all constituent groups. The committees generate recommendations, which are then forwarded to the president for consideration as college policy (G.1). District-level recommendations are either taken directly to the relevant district council or forwarded to the president for consideration by a district management team.
2. Other decisions flow hierarchically through a management structure that includes:
  - college president,
  - executive vice president,
  - vice president of college services (renamed vice president of business services in 2004),
  - deans of student learning,
  - classified managers (director of Auxiliary Services and director of Maintenance and Operations).

This Moorpark College management team uses three organizational groups to discuss district and college policies: the Administrative Council, the Deans' Council, and the Vice Presidents' Council. Descriptions of membership, responsibilities, and meeting times of

these groups are found in *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2004-05* (G.2) and the Faculty Handbook, Appendix F (G.3).

The Moorpark College management team “supports student learning by facilitating a physical and psychological environment conducive to student, faculty, and staff growth” (College Management Annual Program Plan Spring 2004, G.4) The management team has the following specific objectives:

- to maintain quality in the physical plant,
- to maintain a collegial atmosphere that promotes innovation,
- to envision the college’s future role in fulfilling higher education needs in Ventura County.

3. Ad hoc committees are established to deal with specific issues as they surface. For example, the college formed an ad hoc Planning Steering Committee in 1999 to develop the educational master plan and facilities master plan; this planning process was supported by training received in an ad hoc district team called Futures Forum and was embraced by the college as an avenue to making the most effective case for state capital construction funding. The master plans, approved by the board in early 2002, were the foundation for asking voters to support a general obligation bond. The approval of Measure S in March 2002 demonstrated strong public support for students and for the three colleges’ focus on the future “to prepare students for jobs and four-year colleges . . . by repairing/constructing/equipping classrooms, laboratories, libraries, sites” (G.5).

After Measure S was approved, Moorpark College disbanded the ad hoc Planning Steering Committee and formed two shared-governance committees: (1) the Committee on Accreditation and Planning, charged with responsibility for oversight of the college’s strategic planning process, and (2) the Facilities Planning Steering Committee, charged with the task of ensuring that each project adheres to common design standards and that buildings are designed within their proposed budgets. Project-specific committees, consisting of managers, faculty, classified staff, and students, were created for each building project, with membership fluid as the projects evolved. An executive team consisting of the Academic Senate president, the college vice presidents, and the college president oversees all projects, working closely with district staff and construction consultants to develop decision-making processes for seeking approval of building projects by the board and the Division of State Architects.

### **Shared-Governance Processes**

Decision-making at Moorpark College includes all campus constituencies. The following college committees and Academic Senate subcommittees make recommendations that have a broad-based impact on the college community:

### Agenda #3: Governance

---

- Academic Senate Executive Council (ASEC)
  - o Curriculum Committee
    - Technical Review Committee
    - Distance Education Committee
    - General Education Committee
  - o Sabbatical Committee
  - o Student Success Committee
    - Commencement Committee
    - Matriculation Steering Committee
- Career Education Council (CEC)
- Committee on Accreditation and Planning (CAP)
- Facilities Planning Steering Committee
  - o Project-Specific Committees
- Fiscal Planning Committee
- Campus Environment Committee
- Co-Curricular Committee
- Safety Committee
- Campus Wellness Committee
- Staff Development Committee.

Committee membership, responsibilities, and meeting times are widely distributed through *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2004-05* (G.2) and the Faculty Handbook, Appendix F (G.3).

Faculty membership on committees is assigned either through the Academic Senate or within departments or divisions. Classified representation is determined through elections administered by the classified collective bargaining unit, SEIU. Managers agree on committee assignments in the Deans' Council. The Associated Students of Moorpark College designates student representatives to committees.

The Academic Senate has the authority to provide “the faculties of the colleges with a formal and effective procedure for participating in the formation of district policies on academic and professional matters” (Board Policy Manual, Section A.16). The Board Policy Manual further specifies that the district shall consult “collegially” with the Academic Senate and formulate its policies and regulations via written mutual agreement, as derived through the conventions of shared governance, and lists the 11 specific areas required by law in which such consultation will occur (G.6).

The board recognizes SEIU as the employee organization representing classified staff, as reflected in the only reference to classified staff in the Board Policy Manual: “one classified

representative from each college shall be elected to attend board meetings” (Section A.17). However, no Moorpark College classified staff member regularly attends board meetings.

The voice of classified staff in campus governance is articulated by SEIU as the result of a 1994 decision by the Public Employment Relations Board that district/college administrators cease and desist support of the three colleges’ Classified Senates (G.7). The Moorpark College classified staff chose to disband its Senate in mid-2001. Partly as a result of reductions in staff and increased workloads due to budget reductions, as well as other districtwide tensions, the issue of a Moorpark College Classified Senate has remained unresolved for the last three years.

In spring 2004, a group of classified staff began to explore re-forming a Classified Senate, following the example of the other two colleges in the district, who forged a compromise between SEIU and a campus Classified Senate. A meeting among classified leadership at all three colleges occurred in spring 2004, and Moorpark College classified leaders are currently drafting a constitution and by-laws with a goal of reinstating a Classified Senate in 2004-05.

Students’ voice in district governance is ensured by the election of a student trustee who serves as a non-voting member of the board (Board Policy Manual, Section A.10). The manual states:

The VCCCD recognizes and promotes the rights of students under AB 1725 and Title V Section 51023.7 to participate in the governance of the district. The District believes that the recognition of students as full members of the learning community requires their participation in the formulation of district and college policies that have, or will have, a “significant effect on students.” (Section F.01)

At the campus, Moorpark College faculty, staff, and administrators encourage student involvement in campus governance both formally and informally. The Associated Students appoints representatives to key shared-governance committees on campus, such as the Curriculum Committee, Fiscal Planning Committee, Campus Environment Committee, and Safety Committee. A representative of the Moorpark College Associated Students gives a report of student activities at the monthly board meeting.

### **Review of the College’s Decision-Making Processes**

Following the dialogues on the student learning model and strategies for a new organizational structure for the college, as well as an informal recommendation from the 1997 accreditation team that the college document its decision-making processes, leaders in the Academic Senate and administration called for a review in 1998-99 of all college decision-making processes. The task of documenting how the college makes decisions predictably led to questions of whether the current practices were the most effective.

### Agenda #3: Governance

---

These reviews led to numerous changes in committee structures; the current participatory governance structure is documented in *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2004-05* (G.2).

The change with the greatest impact on committee structure and function was in the process for curriculum development and revision. In 1997, the Curriculum Committee's reputation for requiring multiple revisions discouraged faculty from submitting curricular additions and changes. In spring 1998, after self-analysis and dialogue, the committee developed a revised pathway for curriculum.

The goal of the revised process was to devote time in the Curriculum Committee to collaboration on core substantive questions related to curriculum, such as "Does this course fit the college mission?" and "Is there evidence of a need for this course (such as a labor market survey)?" To accomplish this goal of shifting the Curriculum Committee dialogue onto content and away from technical details, a Technical Review Committee process was inserted between the proposal of a course or program by faculty and its review by the Curriculum Committee.

The Technical Review Committee is comprised of five key members:

- Curriculum Committee co-chairs (the executive vice president and the immediate past president of the Academic Senate, or designee),
- librarian,
- articulation officer,
- instructional data technician (currently, the campus data specialist fulfills this responsibility).

As the faculty member and dean present the proposal for a new or revised course or program, the Technical Review Committee members both review the paperwork for technical completeness and consider the proposal from their unique roles in the college. Specifically, the articulation officer considers whether the course is likely to be approved by the state's university systems for the type and category of articulation suggested in the course outline. The executive vice president considers whether the course is likely to require additional equipment or scheduling. The librarian considers whether new electronic or print materials are needed to support the course or program. The instructional data technician reviews state-required codes for accuracy and completeness. The co-chairs in these meetings create a friendly, collegial tone, with a focus on technical assistance rather than technical critique.

The changes in the Curriculum Committee highlight the student learning model: colleagues collaborate as equals across categories (faculty and classified, instructional and student

services) to ensure an effective process in which faculty are encouraged to update and add curriculum, yet are held to standards of academic rigor (excluding frivolous courses that will not articulate). Everyone works together for students.

### **Governance Structure**

#### Description:

The college's adoption of the student learning model in 1997 led to sweeping changes in the assignment of responsibilities to administrators and sparked a collegewide review of the governance structure. The dialogues in the past seven years have been fruitful, reviewing the past and creating processes that put students first, allow the college to efficiently manage daily operations, and ensure that all constituent voices are considered in long-term planning and decision-making.

The president proposed, as a first step in this evolution/revolution, to combine the vice president of instruction and vice president of student services positions into one position, an executive vice president of student learning; the rationale was that when instruction and student services are integrated, college resources, including human energies, are not divided into "two sides of the house." There was initial resistance, continuing dialogue through fall 1996, and finally collegewide consensus to try this approach. The chancellor encouraged the other two colleges in the district to join the Moorpark College experiment. Announcements for the combined positions were released in spring 1997, and the district's first three executive vice presidents were hired in July 1997.

At Moorpark College, dialogue continued throughout 1997-98. During a college retreat in spring 1998, a proposal emerged from the brainstorming that the student learning model be extended to the next level of the college's organizational structure, by creating "student learning divisions" in which each dean's responsibilities would include one or more programs in each of the following categories: student services, occupational, and academic/transfer.

A collegewide dialogue during spring 1998 considered the pros and cons of the student learning model proposal and three other organizational options. Within a year, the college community agreed to proceed with the student learning model, creating the current organizational chart of management responsibilities. All deans' titles were changed to a single title, Dean of Student Learning, the job announcement for dean positions was revised, and the college's recently revised mission statement more clearly identifies this integrated *Students First!* approach (G.2).

### Agenda #3: Governance

---

#### Evaluation:

Success can be measured in a number of ways. First, college committees and subcommittees meet regularly and are well attended. All committees extend an open, *y'all come* invitation to the campus community to attend meetings; an annual meeting calendar is distributed at the beginning of each year (G.8), and minutes of most meetings are distributed by email.

Second, college operations have functioned smoothly, as evidenced by the processes developed by the college to monitor the capital construction fund and communicate during budget crises. *Y'all come*, as an inclusive theme of campus committees and task forces, has been an effective way to gain broad collegial participation to deal with extraordinary events such as midyear budget cuts.

Third, a survey of college employees reveals an increase in satisfaction with college governance. This survey was distributed in fall 2000 with 295 employees responding and again in spring 2004 with 292 respondents. The ratings for "opportunity for campus involvement" increased from 65.5 percent to 69.3 percent. More employees agreed that "I have enough involvement in the decisions that affect my work," an increase from 59.2 percent in 2000 to 63.4 percent in 2004. The most significant increase related to an evaluation of the current college processes for decision-making is the employees' increase in response to the statement "I have enough involvement in decisions that affect the college," a 10 percent increase from 29.2 percent in 2000 to 39.3 percent in 2004, with only 28 percent disagreeing (the remainder expressing neutrality) (G.9).

A fourth, more indirect measurement of college leadership and decision-making structures is the recent change to broader feedback opportunities in the evaluation of managers. Within the past five years, the evaluation process for deans has been revised to include feedback from faculty and staff supervised by the dean being evaluated (G.10). This process has been piloted, revised, and implemented for the past two years consistently across the district. At Moorpark College, feedback on skills in building consensus and effective leadership are central to deans' evaluations by their supervisors. The same general evaluation process, which combines feedback from college constituencies plus self-evaluation, was revised in spring 2004 to be appropriate for senior managers as well; this revision will be piloted in spring 2005.

These four measures of assessment—committee attendance, smoothness of operational functions, survey responses, and management evaluation—combine to provide the college with information needed to improve its processes. Through these means, the college will continue to monitor decision-making processes for effectiveness and inclusiveness at both the college and district. The most direct of these institutional effectiveness measures are the results of student and employee surveys. The results were received on campus in late spring 2004 and will be distributed collegewide in the first fall 2004 Town Hall meeting to celebrate the high points and to brainstorm strategies to address the weaknesses.

### **College President**

Over its 35-year history, Moorpark College has benefited from stable, long-term leadership. The college's former president retired after a tenure of ten years; the current president, Dr. Eva Conrad, has completed two years in office after serving for five years as the executive vice president. The primary roles of the president are to ensure the implementation of board policy, provide leadership for the development of strategic planning for Moorpark College, and delegate responsibility for managing the college throughout the management structure.

One of the challenges facing the president recently has been reduction of and fluctuation among management staff. In the past three years, the college has had three executive vice presidents (one interim) and three vice presidents of business services (two interim). The current executive vice president, although a district employee for several years, has been at Moorpark College for only one year. Moreover, two retired managers job-shared the vice president's job during 2003-04, with one focused on budget and the other on facilities. With a new vice president of business services recently hired, the duties for this position were recombined starting July 1, 2004, and a more stable and experienced senior management team is now in place.

Management of the college involves a collegial process in which individuals are invited to make recommendations to the president on all issues and concerns confronting the college. For example, in the last two years, budget reductions have generated fears over salary reductions, health care reductions, and potential layoffs. Some of these fears were realized, with salary reductions for some faculty and classified staff, layoffs of classified employees, and the loss of positions through attrition. Part-time faculty members have lost income or employment as class sections were eliminated to reduce college spending. In an effort to bring the campus together and minimize concerns, the president facilitated well-attended Town Hall meetings where the campus community discussed individual, program, college, and district concerns. The president also encouraged the Fiscal Planning Committee to conduct open budget meetings, in which participants collaborated on ways to reduce expenditures.

Nevertheless, despite the problems facing the college and its staff, the top five areas of satisfaction in the most recent employee survey of the work environment, taken in spring 2004, were: opportunity for involvement at this college; teamwork and cooperation; support from co-workers; communication within my department, program, or unit; and leadership at this college (G.9). These results suggest that the openness and collegiality that characterize Moorpark College, modeled by the president, are both acknowledged and appreciated by the faculty and staff.

### Agenda #3: Governance

---

The president ensures that educational planning is integrated with resource planning through overseeing the implementation and updating of the college's 2002 education and facilities master plan (G.11). The educational master plan includes the college mission statement, and was updated in 2003-04 using data from three annual program plans (G.12). The Facilities Master Plan (G.13) was also updated as the general obligation bond projects move toward implementation.

Dr. Conrad actively represents the college in the community. She has successfully expanded the Moorpark College Foundation membership to include members from all local communities. She is a member of various community groups, including the Thousand Oaks Rotary Club, the Ventura County United Way Board of Directors, and the Camarillo Health Care District's Administrative Leaders Advisory Panel.

She has also developed a working relationship between the Simi Valley Education Foundation and the Moorpark College Foundation. She attends community events sponsored by organizations such as the Chambers of Commerce for Moorpark, Simi Valley, and Thousand Oaks, Moorpark Relay for Life, Simi Valley Education Foundation, and Project CREATE. Through the public relations office, the president keeps local communities informed on college events. She meets on a regular basis with local media representatives, and meets with community organizations to update local residents on the status of the college's facilities master plan.

At the state level, Dr. Conrad has served on the Commission on Athletics (COA) as a representative of the state's chief executive officers, and in June was selected as the first woman to chair the COA Board. Regionally, she serves on the InTeleCom Board of Directors; InTeleCom is a consortium of 23 colleges/districts formed to provide support and resources for courses taught through distance education. She also serves regularly on WASC accreditation teams, and chaired her first team in spring 2004 at the College of Micronesia.

The president has worked with the board, the chancellor, District Service Center staff, and college staff, faculty, and students to develop plans and define goals and priorities for the college. She documented her first-year goals as president and her level of achievement (G.14), and disseminated her goals for subsequent years (G.15). She also presents her goals at the beginning of each academic year in her "State of the Campus" presentation during the college's mandatory flex day. Under her leadership, the campus has worked collegially to address budget cuts, implement a number of capital budgets for new buildings and renovations, and prepare the college to follow the new standards for accreditation. She has been a strong advocate of collegial governance as a means of developing college policy and conducting college business. Students, classified staff, faculty, and administrators have been involved with identifying college needs, recommending budgetary plans, and implementing college policy.

Dr. Conrad has several times led reorganization efforts on the campus as managers have left and no full-time replacements were possible due to budget reductions. When three deans left within two years, the remaining deans absorbed their responsibilities. This has resulted in a “serious imbalance in division size and management workload” (G.16), with all deans having disproportionately large areas of responsibilities; two of the seven remaining deans together manage roughly two-thirds of the college’s faculty and instructional programs (see Moorpark College Organization of Dean’s Responsibilities in the Background Materials section of this self-study).

The president was also able to control budget and expenditures at a time of severe budget cutbacks. By bringing together two experienced part-time vice presidents (former Moorpark College managers) to fill this role, she placed those with the most expertise and experience in positions immediately. However, this was strictly a temporary solution to deal with a crisis in the state budget; a permanent vice president of college services (renamed vice president of business services) was selected by the president in consultation with the chancellor, hired by the board, and took office in July 2004.

One significant leadership strategy is the president’s ongoing implementation of the student learning model, the primary goal of which is to integrate instruction and student services as a unified, equitable college community. Through this process, faculty, classified staff, and managers find stronger voices in governance. Positive change has occurred at the administrative and collegewide level, but some academic and student service programs and staff have yet to become fully comfortable with the new organizational structure. Non-teaching faculty and staff in the student services areas, in particular, continue to be concerned about their ability to influence college decisions without a specific spokesperson (e.g., a vice president of student services) to represent their particular points of view. Conversely, however, there are many who believe that the cross-pollination of the model confers many advantages; the experiment continues to evolve.

### **Compliance with External Agencies**

Moorpark College works closely with a variety of external agencies when needed to document and assure the public of quality in college programs and services. The college responds in a timely manner to requests from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges: before this present application for reaffirmation of accreditation, the two previous reports were a similar application for reaffirmation of accreditation submitted in fall 1997 (G.17) and the midterm report submitted in fall 2000 (G.18). Members of the Moorpark College staff attended training provided by the Accrediting Commission and willingly serve on accreditation site visit teams when requested.

All college programs accredited by outside agencies comply with appropriate regulations:

- The Nursing program is accredited through both the Board of Registered Nursing and the National League for Nursing. As a result of the most recent National League for Nursing review in fall 2003, the college's Nursing program received an extraordinary affirmation of accreditation for eight years, the maximum extension of accreditation.
- The Radiologic Technology Program is accredited by the Joint Review Committee of Education in Radiologic Technology and by the California Department of Health. A site visit for reaccreditation is scheduled for fall 2004.
- The Certified Nurse Assistant program is accredited by the California Department of Health, and the Emergency Medical Technician program is accredited by the Ventura County Emergency Medical Services.
- The United States Department of Agriculture and the California Department of Fish and Game annually review the Exotic Animal Training Management Program as the basis for permit renewal.

### **District Decision-Making Structures and Procedures**

The mapping document "Organization of the Ventura County Community College District," which appears in the Background Materials of this self-study, describes the district structure in detail. This section addresses the governing board, chancellor, and district/college communications.

#### **Governing Board**

As an independent policy-making institution, the Ventura County Community College District board of trustees is accountable to the residents of Ventura County. The board is composed of six elected trustees, five elected by the community and one student representative elected by students at the three colleges. Each board member, other than the student representative, is "a qualified elector and legal resident of the trustee area which he or she represents." Four-year terms of office are staggered and expire in December of each even-numbered year. Officers are elected among the board members at the annual organizational meeting (Board Policy Manual A.10-11).

The board meets at least monthly to conduct the routine business of the district. Study sessions to discuss specific issues are scheduled as needed. Board meetings are generally held at a site close to the district office, with at least one meeting per year held on each campus.

A board subcommittee reviews the agenda with the chancellor a week prior to each meeting. Any board member can request an agenda item one week prior to meeting. The public also can request placement of agenda items that relate to district business. Before

public dissemination of the board agenda, members receive copies of the agenda and informational packets one week prior to a meeting. Agendas are posted on the district Web site ([www.vcccd.net](http://www.vcccd.net)) 72 hours prior to a meeting. Minutes are also posted on the Web site.

The Board Policy Manual contains sections on board organization, duties and authority, a trustee ethics code, censure policy, and board structure and operating procedures (G.6). Revisions are made in accordance with published policy as the board deems necessary. The board self-evaluation process is published in the Governing Board Handbook (G.19); members are also given a copy of a trustee handbook published by the Community College League of California (G.20), which discusses general duties and responsibilities for trustees, while the Governing Board Handbook deals with district policies and operating procedures. The Board Policy Manual is currently being revised and updated; a copy can be found on the district Web site ([www.vcccd.net](http://www.vcccd.net)).

The principal function of the board is to act as the representatives of the public to ensure that the district's resources are used in a manner that provides for the educational needs of the local communities. As the Board Policy Manual states, "[The board] shall function as the legislative and policy-making body charged with the oversight and control of the District." The board acts toward this end guided by the primary mission of the California Master Plan for Higher Education (1960) and the language of AB 1725. According to the Policy Manual, "It is the goal of this District to join with the California Community Colleges in providing the quality education necessary for our students to have productive and socially responsible lives."

With this student-centered district goal, the board has adopted policies that provide:

- a wide range of counseling and guidance services, as well as classroom instruction and basic skills that will enhance student opportunities for success;
- broad areas of human knowledge and understanding, including an appreciation for the diversity of human cultures and heritages;
- transfer programs that permit successful entry into baccalaureate programs;
- occupational programs for training, retraining, or improvement of skills;
- developmental courses that prepare students to enroll in transfer, occupational, and general education programs. (G.6)

The board is the governing body that establishes policies to support the college's mission to provide high-quality, affordable academic programs and services in an environment that is supportive, respectful, and reflective of an open and diverse community. At the June 2001 board meeting, the board members adopted the Community Colleges of Ventura County Strategic Plan 2001-2005 (G.21), which includes both a long-range districtwide strategic plan and the mission and vision statements of the three colleges. The board reviewed and approved an updated version of the Moorpark College mission statement on February 10, 2004.

### **Agenda #3: Governance**

---

The board also receives reports on accreditation and continues to stay informed through its ad hoc accreditation subcommittee. At its February 2004 study session, the board reviewed accreditation procedures, and in June 2004 reviewed drafts of each college's self-study; in August 2004 the board formally approved each of the self-studies for submission to the Accrediting Commission.

The board orientation is described in the Governing Board Handbook (G.19). The board president and the chancellor are responsible for the orientation of new board members. Retreats are held annually and public study sessions are held when necessary. After the election of two new board members in November 2002, numerous study sessions were held to discuss the Brown Act, the budget process, district policies and operations, and other issues. Many of these study sessions were conducted to modify policies implemented by the previous board and chancellor, which were perceived to delegate too much control to the chancellor and improperly limit board authority.

Since the 2000 accreditation midterm report, three new board members have joined the board, one of whom defeated an incumbent. This election came on the heels of public disclosure involving the previous chancellor's expense account. Public discontent was documented in letters to the editors and public comments during contentious board meetings. Other issues, such as district legal expenses, adverse relations between the chancellor and the faculty and classified bargaining unions, and ultimately the resignation of the chancellor, were also documented in local newspapers prior to the election.

Since the resignation of that chancellor, the board has hired two interim chancellors (for one year each); a new permanent chancellor was hired in June 2004. In the board's 2004 self-evaluation, the trustees unanimously agreed that open communication with the chancellor, and board members' availability to the chancellor for support and feedback, were strengths. They also believe that board members are knowledgeable about the educational programs and services of the district and colleges. In other areas of the self-evaluation—board organization and leadership, policy, community relations, board/chancellor relations, and standards for district and college operations and performance—board members' views diverged, sometimes widely.

Two board seats will be up for reelection in November 2004; one board member is retiring after completing three terms (a total of 12 years on the board), so the election of one new board member is certain. A two-term incumbent holds the other contested seat and had not announced whether he would run again at this writing; a former Moorpark College faculty member and long-time AFT leader has announced that he will run for the seat.

Individual board members have regularly interacted with college constituent groups, visiting Academic Senate meetings and offering their views on how to address problems facing the district. The board president meets regularly with the Moorpark College Academic Senate president.

### **Chancellor**

In June 2004, the board unanimously appointed Dr. James Meznek as chancellor; Dr. Meznek began his service with the district in late August. With his broad background in community college education, both in California and in other states, it is hoped that Dr. Meznek will provide strong leadership to the district, the board, and the colleges.

The chancellor serves as the secretary of the board and prepares the agenda for each meeting. Duties include:

- to notify members of the board of all regular, special, and adjourned meetings;
- to prepare agendas and attend all board meetings;
- to record, prepare, and transmit the minutes of the previous meeting to each member of the board before the next meeting;
- to have charge of all records, proceedings, and documents of the board;
- to file and post copies of financial reports as required by law;
- to make and serve all required notices of the board;
- to conduct all official correspondence of the board;
- to sign and execute all official papers.

The board appoints the district chancellor (Board Policy Manual A.13). There is no written policy describing the hiring process, which is facilitated by the vice chancellor for human resources. In the past, a committee representing constituent groups within the district was formed to review applicants and make recommendations to the board, which then interviewed candidates and ultimately hired a chancellor. A similar process has been used to hire college presidents. In spring 2004, the board searched for a permanent chancellor for the second time, following an unsuccessful initial search. According to the position announcement, the chancellor will:

- support, manage, and resolve complex issues;
- provide student-centered visionary educational leadership;
- provide leadership in the use of voter-approved bond funds to meet current and projected student growth;
- promote cohesiveness, professionalism, and respect among all district constituencies;
- provide sensitivity and responsiveness to special needs and appreciation of diversity in student, staff, and community constituencies;

## Agenda #3: Governance

---

- design training and create synergy for highly skilled staff;
- promote community involvement.

The chancellor reports to the board on current district issues and events. Other constituent groups also have an opportunity to report on college activities. Before acting on agenda items that affect the district and college operations, board members consult with the chancellor. Actions to be considered by the board are submitted to the chancellor for presentation to the board (Board Policy Manual A.26). Board rules and procedures are established in a manner that allows the public to offer advice and assistance on district educational and financial policies; individuals have an opportunity to speak before the board during official meetings and request placement of items that directly relate to the business of the district on the agenda for discussion and possible action (A.27). The board annually evaluates the chancellor (A.13).

### **District/College Communication**

As described in the mapping document contained in the Background Materials section of this self-study (“Organization of Ventura County Community College District”), communication between the District Service Center (DSC) and college campuses is clearly and formally delineated through four districtwide committees:

- District Council of Administrative Services (DCAS),
- District Council on Human Resources (DCHR),
- District Council on Student Learning (DCSL),
- District Safety Committee.

While the Board Policy Manual is silent on committee composition, committee memberships, responsibilities, and meeting times are found in a districtwide memorandum dated October 16, 2003 (G.22). Representatives from management, faculty, classified staff, and the student body are invited to participate on all four committees.

The Academic Senate presidents represent faculty on the Chancellor’s Cabinet, where board agenda items are reviewed and district policy changes and additions are considered (A.16). The Chancellor’s Cabinet reviews all recommendations from districtwide committees. The cabinet acts as a liaison between the colleges and district on the one hand and the board on the other.

During the tenure of the previous chancellor, there was criticism from the colleges that college management had little or no input into the chancellor’s decision-making process. In response to this criticism, an interim chancellor established three new management committees to serve as advisory committees to the chancellor:

- the District Executive Team (DET), comprised of the three college presidents, the chancellor, the deputy chancellor, and the vice-chancellor of human resources, meets weekly;
- the District Administrative Team (DAT), comprised of all senior managers at the colleges and district, meets on an as-needed basis;
- the District Management Team (DMT), comprised of all managers districtwide, meets once each semester.

Whether this organization will continue depends on the new chancellor and his approach to districtwide communication and input to decisions.

In supporting each college's mission, the district provides services and support through the District Service Center (DSC). For example, the Banner system, from which the colleges retrieve vital information for research, reporting, and enrollment management, is managed at the district level and modified as upgrades become available. Fiscally, a budget allocation model and assumptions, adopted by the board, is normally used to distribute financial resources in the district. The model is currently functioning on a fixed-proportion basis because of recent fluctuations in state funding. In addition to monitoring the use of the allocation model to control expenditures, DCAS meets monthly to review ongoing budgetary issues and make recommendations to the chancellor and board.

Every three years the district, through the DSC Institutional Research office, evaluates its decision-making structures and processes by conducting student and employee surveys (G.23, G.9). The results are tabulated by the Institutional Research office and circulated throughout the district for review and comment. The college uses survey results for planning and institutional effectiveness purposes.

Like the colleges, district offices have suffered personnel and budget cuts. Services to the colleges, however, continue. One consequence of reductions is the loss of the district Public Information Officer, which has hindered the board's ability to communicate effectively with local communities and representatives. The position of associate vice-chancellor for student learning was also abandoned because of budget cuts, which hinders districtwide coordination of both instructional and service-related matters.

In implementing the new accreditation standards, ACCJC will visit all three colleges simultaneously for the first time. This has required new coordination among the colleges, and between the colleges and the DSC. Communication between the DSC and the colleges about the accreditation process has been most effective at the senior management level. The deputy chancellor was assigned the responsibility of overseeing the DSC's role within the accreditation process; however, he was reassigned as the interim president at Ventura

## Agenda #3: Governance

---

College early in 2004, and since that time the presidents and other district staff have shared that responsibility.

Some coordination has also occurred among the colleges; for example, the vice presidents of business services shared drafts of financial and physical resources responses and consulted with the associate vice-chancellor for business on district-related responses as the self-studies developed.

### Summary

Moorpark College has a clearly defined governance structure and components. Decision-making follows three paths: through the committee structure, the management hierarchy, and an ad hoc process for specific issues that arise. The college's strategic planning process is an example, beginning with an ad hoc planning task force and developing into a standing committee co-chaired by the college and Academic Senate presidents.

Shared governance works effectively for management and faculty in particular, with a close working relationship making that possible; the classified role in shared governance is less formalized, because of the absence of a Classified Senate, now in the process of possibly being re-instituted by classified staff. College decision-making processes are documented in *Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2004-05* (G.2), which outlines the committee process and participatory governance structure.

Development of a student learning model led to sweeping changes in the structure and organization of the college; its success is measured by committee attendance, the smooth functioning of the college, staff surveys, and positive evaluations of managers. The college president took the primary leadership role in developing the model, first as executive vice president and, for the last two years, as college president.

At the district level, the governing board works with the chancellor to set policies and represent its public constituencies. In June the board hired a new chancellor, who took office in late August after two years of interim chancellors and a public scandal over inappropriate expenditures that led to the departure of the previous chancellor. Two board seats are also up for re-election in November. The college hopes that the new chancellor will provide leadership and effective interface between the board and the college presidents and staffs, and work to create a budget allocation model that incorporates principles of equity and accountability. District/college communication is always challenging; overall, the governance challenges of this district seem similar to those of other multi-college districts, with the usual sibling rivalry and charges of favoritism and inequity.

**Documents for  
Agenda #3: Governance**

- G.1 Minutes of meetings of committees that created recommendations for college president
- G.2 Making Decisions at Moorpark College 2004-05
- G.3 Faculty Handbook (also located on the college Web site: [www.moorparkcollege.edu](http://www.moorparkcollege.edu))
- G.4 College Management Annual Program Plan Spring 2004
- G.5 Measure S bond
- G.6 Board Policy Manual (located on the district Web site: [www.vcccd.net](http://www.vcccd.net))
- G.7 PERS cease and desist order
- G.8 Annual Meeting Calendars 2003-04 and 2004-05
- G.9 Employee Surveys of the Work Environment 2000 and 2004
- G.10 Deans' Evaluation Policy
- G.11 Educational and Facilities Master Plan 2002
- G.12 Educational Master Plan 2003-04
- G.13 Facilities Master Plan
- G.14 President's Report on Achievements
- G.15 President's Goals
- G.16 Management Program Plan 2003
- G.17 Moorpark College Self-Study 1997
- G.18 Moorpark College Midterm Report, November 2000
- G.19 Governing Board Handbook
- G.20 Community College League of California Trustee Handbook
- G.21 Community Colleges of Ventura County Strategic Plan 2001-2005
- G.22 Districtwide memorandum dated October 16, 2003
- G.23 Survey of Student Perceptions 2000, 2003