ORDER OF BUSINESS - REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, April 17, 2013
Public Session 2:00 p.m.
Closed Session
(Immediately Following Adjournment
of Capital Construction Committee)

Educational Services Center
Board Room – First Floor
770 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90017

I. Roll Call (2:00 p.m.)

II. Flag Salute

III. Reports from Representatives of Employee Organizations at the Resource Table

IV. Announcements from College Presidents

V. Public Agenda Requests
   A. Oral Presentations
   B. Proposed Actions

VI. Reports and Recommendations from the Board
   • Reports of Standing and Special Committees
     BT1. Resolution in Support of Marriage Equality

VII. Reports from the Chancellor
   • Reports from the Chancellor regarding District activities or pending issues
     o Presentation on Measure J Technology Projects

VIII. Consent Calendar
   Matters Requiring a Majority Vote
   BSD1. Authorize Professional Services Agreement
   FPD1. Facilities Planning and Development Routine Report
   HRD1. Approve Reduction of Presidents' Transportation Allowance and
        Adjustment of Salary Schedule
   ISD1. Amend Board Rule 18110 – Guidelines for Implementation

   Matters Requiring a Super Majority Vote – None

IX. Recommendations from the Chancellor – None

X. Recess to Capital Construction Committee
   A. Roll Call
   B. Public Speakers
   C. Presentation/Initiative Reviews
      1. Overview of Bond Program Management Transition
   D. New Business
   E. Adjourn Capital Construction Committee
XI. Reconvene Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees

XII. Roll Call

XIII. Notice Reports and Informatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BT/A.</th>
<th>[Notice] Amend Chapter XVII, Article III of the Board Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRD/A.</td>
<td>[Collective Bargaining Informative] Initial Proposal of the Los Angeles College Faculty Guild, AFT Local 1521 to the Los Angeles Community College District Regarding Negotiations as Agreed in Article 17 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement to Discuss Compensation Matters for 2013-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIV. Announcements and Indications of Future Proposed Actions

XV. Requests to Address the Board of Trustees – Closed Session Agenda Matters

| Location: Board Room |

XVI. Recess to Closed Session in accordance with The Ralph M. Brown Act, Government Code sections 54950 et seq., and the Education Code to discuss the matters on the posted Closed Session agenda pursuant to Government Code section 54954.5. Location: Hearing Room

XVII. Reconvene Regular Meeting Location: Board Room

XVIII. Report of Actions Taken in Closed Session – April 17, 2013

XIX. Adjournment

Next Regularly Scheduled Board Meeting

Wednesday, May 1, 2013

(Public Session scheduled for 2:00 p.m.)

Los Angeles Mission College
13356 Eldridge Avenue
Sylmar, CA 91342.

In compliance with Government Code section 54957.5(b), documents made available to the Board after the posting of the agenda that relate to an upcoming public session item will be made available by posting on the District’s official bulletin board located in the lobby of the Educational Services Center located at 770 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90017. Members of the public wishing to view the material will need to make their own parking arrangements at another location.

If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate alternate formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Section 12132), and the rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. The agenda shall include information regarding how, for whom, and when a request for disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services may be made by a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting.

To make such a request, please contact the Executive Secretary to the Board of Trustees at (213) 891-2044 no later than 12 p.m. (noon) on the Tuesday prior to the Board meeting.
CLOSED SESSION
Wednesday, April 17, 2013

Educational Services Center
Board Room – First Floor
770 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90017

I. Public Employee Appointment
(pursuant to Government Code section 54957)

A. Position: Chancellor
B. Position: College Presidents
C. Position: Interim Chancellor

II. Public Employee Evaluation
(pursuant to Government Code section 54957)

A. Position: CFO/Treasurer
B. Position: Deputy Chancellor

III. Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release/Charges/Complaints
(pursuant to Government Code section 54957)

IV. Conference with Legal Counsel - Existing Litigation
(pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9(a))

A. Specialized Builder's Hardware, Inc. dba CFO Door Hardware & Security, Inc.
v. LACCD, Morillo Construction, Inc., David Niemerow

B. Pugliese v. LACCD
Closed Session
April 17, 2013
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V. Conference with Legal Counsel - Anticipated Litigation
(pursuant to Government Code section 54956.9(b)

A. Potential litigation – 1 matter
RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF MARRIAGE EQUALITY

The following resolution is presented by Trustees Svonkin, Veres, and Santiago:

WHEREAS, Same-sex marriage is arguably the most contentious civil rights issue of the twenty-first century; and

WHEREAS, It is our responsibility to protect and defend the rights of students, faculty, and staff on issues that impact their lives on our campuses and in our communities; and

WHEREAS, Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students, faculty, and staff should have all the rights and privileges that the government allows; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 8, a state Constitutional amendment passed by voters in November 2008, provides that “only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California”; and

WHEREAS, This Constitutional provision and similar laws in most other states prevent same-sex couples from being married and, thus, deny them the same rights that opposite sex couples have to marry; and

WHEREAS, Such discriminatory laws on the basis of sexual orientation are counter to the fundamental principle of equal protection that exists in the U.S. Constitution and that is later defined in federal statutes and case law in relation to other immutable characteristics such as race, color, gender, age (40 years and older) and disability; and

WHEREAS, California, unlike most states, prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in an educational setting and in the workplace pursuant to the Unruh Civil Rights Act and the Fair Employment and Housing Act, respectively; and

WHEREAS, California’s legislative and judicial leadership in the area of civil rights should be extended unequivocally and conclusively to marriage equality for same-sex couples; and

WHEREAS, The United States Supreme Court will soon decide two cases pertaining to marriage equality, involving California’s Proposition 8 and the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA); and

WHEREAS, The Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) Board of Trustees strongly supports marriage equality and the rights of same-sex couples to be treated equally under state and federal law; and
WHEREAS, The LACCD promotes an environment, on the colleges campuses and in the District Office, that celebrates cultural difference and fosters mutual respect and tolerance for all; and

WHEREAS, The LACCD has been a leader in providing domestic partnership benefits, offering such benefits to same-sex couples since 1999; and

WHEREAS, Employer benefits afforded to domestic partners and anti-discrimination provisions under state law must not be the sole basis of ensuring equality to LGBT individuals; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of the LACCD hereby urges the United States Supreme Court to conclude that marriage equality for same-sex couples should be permitted and protected in every state in the nation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the LACCD's community—both LGBT and heterosexual—will benefit from the confirmed invalidation of Proposition 8 and from the invalidation of DOMA, by studying, being trained and working in a truly just and fair state and nation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That students, faculty, staff, and members of the surrounding community are encouraged to exercise their First Amendment rights and express their support for marriage equality by holding a rainbow flag or other rainbow symbol in the designated free speech area at an LACCD college.
SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

Agreement with Gonzalez, Quintana & Hunter, LLC., to provide legislative advocacy services. The firm will assist and support existing advocacy efforts on behalf of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) focusing on immediate legislation impacting the District.

Background: Gonzalez, Quintana & Hunter, LLC., has extensive expertise in working with the State of California Assembly and Senate which will serve the LACCD in these efforts during the period of April 18, 2013 to October 30, 2013, inclusive, at $9,000 per month. Total cost not to exceed: $63,000.
SUBJECT: FACILITIES PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ROUTINE REPORT

Action

Authorize Amendment No. 4 to Agreement No. 4500176403 with URS Corporation to provide an extension of time for continued program management services from May 1, 2013 to May 31, 2013 at no additional cost.

Inclusive of this proposed amendment, the total amount of this agreement for the full contract term is not to exceed $21,664,801.

Background

This agreement was authorized by the Board of Trustees on March 21, 2012 (Corn. No. FPD1) with the allowance that it be extended as needed during the Request for Proposals (RFP) process for a new long term program management agreement. On April 3, 2013 (Corn. No. FPD1), the Board of Trustees authorized a new long term program management agreement with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. This proposed amendment provides additional time to complete the transition to AECOM.

Funding and Development Phase

Funding is through Measure J Bond proceeds. Program Management 40J.5J90.05. All Phases.
SUBJECT: REDUCTION OF PRESIDENT'S TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCE AND ADJUSTMENT OF SALARY SCHEDULE

In consideration of the acceptance of a reduced local transportation allowance of $500 monthly, authorize the establishment of a corrected Salary Schedule for College Presidents effective July 1, 2013, with placement of the applicable executive incumbent on the same step except as may be subsequently authorized pursuant to evaluation processes. This shall also apply to other executives placed on the same salary schedule. Additionally, authorize a comparable reduction of transportation allowance and adjustment of salary for the Deputy Chancellor.

Proposed Adjusted Salary Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Monthly Salary</th>
<th>Annual Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$14,638</td>
<td>$175,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$14,883</td>
<td>$178,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$15,132</td>
<td>$181,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$15,386</td>
<td>$184,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$15,644</td>
<td>$187,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$15,907</td>
<td>$190,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$16,175</td>
<td>$194,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$16,448</td>
<td>$197,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$16,725</td>
<td>$200,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$17,008</td>
<td>$204,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended by: Michael Shanahan, Sr. Associate Vice Chancellor
Human Resources

Recommended by: Adriana D. Barrera, Deputy Chancellor
Approved by: Daniel J. LaVista, Chancellor
Background: This action will not result in any net increase or decrease to compensation. College Presidents and other executives who are employed by contract pursuant to Education Code section 72411. The established provisions of the contracts for regular College Presidents, Vice Chancellors, the Deputy Chancellor, and the General Counsel include a provision that salary may not be reduced during the term of the contract, and include a local transportation allowance of $1,530 monthly. Comparison with compensation for other, like districts in California show that the presidents’ salary rate is substantially below average, but the local transportation allowance is above average. This action will appropriately allocate these two forms of compensation. Adjustment of Deputy Chancellor’s current allowance and salary is included because there is no salary range for the position of Deputy Chancellor but a similar reduction in the transportation allowance is desired.
Subject: AMEND BOARD RULE 18110 – GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Amend Board Rule 18110 as follows:

18110. GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION. For purposes of interpretation of this chapter, the Board adopts the attached Guidelines for Implementation of Sections 53200 to 53207 of Title 5 of the Administrative Code of California. These guidelines were agreed upon by the Community College League of California and the statewide Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. In the event the Community College League of California and the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges revise the Guidelines, the Board may adopt the most recently revised Guidelines.

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 53200-53207 OF TITLE 5 OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE OF CALIFORNIA

The Role of Academic Senates in the California Community Colleges

1. QUESTION: What needs to be done to implement the new regulations to strengthen local academic senates?

   The senate and the local board or its designee (usually the chancellor, or president and senior administration) need to “consult collegially” on the development of a new district policy for board action to implement the new regulations. This policy can be very general (i.e., a statement that the district will operate according to the provisions of Title 5, Sections 53200-53207) or more specific in terms of how the district carries out the regulations. Different boards and districts may include different amounts of procedural detail in district policies. (However, see recommendations in the third and fourth answers.)

2. QUESTIONS: In adopting new policies on academic and professional matters, does the governing board have to meet directly with the senate?
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No. The governing board and the senate may each designate appropriate representatives as their voices in the mutual development of policies on academic and professional matters, on a blanket basis or on a policy-by-policy basis. It is the responsibility of the designees to communicate with their respective constituencies on an ongoing basis so as to best represent them in the development of policies.

3. QUESTION: The regulations list ten areas defined as "academic and professional matters." The local board must adopt procedures identifying how it will "consult collegially" in these ten areas. Those procedures include either to "rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate" or to "reach mutual agreement." Must a local board select only one procedure for addressing all ten of the identified academic and professional matters, or can there be a different approach used for the different matters?

Either one of the procedures can be used to address each of the ten areas defined as academic and professional matters; the procedure need not be the same for all ten. It is recommended, although not required, that the specific procedure selected be identified in policy for each of the ten "academic and professional matters."

4. QUESTION: Who decides which of the two processes in the regulations ("rely primarily" or "mutual agreement") should be used on a given issue?

The local governing board. However, it is recommended that the ten categories of academic and professional matters listed in the regulations be the subject of local discussions during the initial implementation of the regulations so that all concerned will know in advance which issues will be dealt with according to which process. These may then be included in adopted policy.

5. QUESTION: If the governing board chooses the option to "rely primarily" on the advice of the academic senate in any of the ten defined areas of "academic and professional matters," is the board required to accept the recommendation of the senate?

No. Title 5 regulations clearly state that in most cases under the "rely primarily" option the recommendation of the academic senate will be adopted. However, there are conditions under which the local board may need to make a decision different from the senate's recommendation. (See next Question and Answer)

6. QUESTION: A district governing board which chooses the "rely primarily" procedure is normally supposed to accept recommendations of the senate in any of the ten defined areas of "academic and professional matters," unless there are "exceptional circumstances" and "compelling reasons." What do these mean?

The regulations do not define the terms "exceptional circumstances" and "compelling reasons," and these terms are not intended to have a legal definition. These terms mean that boards must usually accept senate recommendations, and that in instances where a recommendations is not accepted the board's decision must be based on a clear and substantive rationale which puts the explanation for the decision in an accurate, appropriate, and relevant context.

Boards tempted to reject a recommendation might, instead, ask the senate to reconsider the recommendation in light of the issues that have not been resolved to the board's satisfaction.
7. QUESTION: A district governing board which chooses the “mutual-agreement” procedure is supposed to reach written agreement with the senate in any of the ten defined areas of “academic and professional” matters. When may the board act if it is not able to reach mutual agreement with the academic senate?

If there is no existing policy, the regulations state the board may act without reaching mutual agreement if there are “compelling legal, fiscal, or organizational reasons” why it must do so. Again, the word “compelling” is not defined in the regulations and is not intended to have a legal definition. It means that in instances where mutual agreement with the senate is not reached, a board decision must be based on a clear and substantive rationale which puts the explanation for the decision in an accurate, appropriate and relevant context.

8. QUESTION: When there is an existing policy, is the board permitted to act without mutual agreement?

No. If there is an existing policy, that policy simply stays in effect until mutual agreement is reached. However, there may be cases when the existing policy “exposes the district to legal liability or causes substantial fiscal hardship.” In these circumstances, a board may act without reaching mutual agreement provided that it has made a good faith effort to reach agreement and has “compelling legal, fiscal, or organizational reasons” to act (as the term “compelling” is described in question 7 above) without waiting any longer for agreement.

9. QUESTION: The “mutual-agreement” procedure appears to contain de facto ability to block changes in policy when an existing policy is in place by failing to agree to needed action. What would happen if this occurs?

It would be bad faith to use the regulations in order to block changes in policy when an existing policy is in place by failing to agree to needed action. A senate faced with a board which refuses or fails to participate or consult constructively in the attempt to reach mutual agreement may choose to use the complaint process delineated in question 18. On the other hand, if the senate attempts to use the regulations process to block board action by refusing or failing to participate or consult constructively, it is unlikely that either the Chancellor or a court would object to a board which takes action without mutual agreement under those circumstances.

10. QUESTION: Can the local board choose the academic senate to be the organization that represents faculty in matters that have previously been collectively bargained or are within the legal scope of bargaining? Can the local board accept recommendations from the academic senate or reach agreements with the academic senate which contradict a collective bargaining agreement?

The answer to both questions is no. The governing board may not legally delegate to the senate any responsibilities or functions which belong to the exclusive representative. AB 1725 did not change collective bargaining law (i.e. EERA, Government Code Section 3540 et seq.) nor the legal scope of bargaining. The regulations specifically point out that nothing in the Board of Governors’ regulations may be construed to “detract from any negotiated agreements between collective bargaining and district governing boards.”
11. QUESTION: Can a board and union through a collective bargaining agreement change a policy previously adopted by a board based upon recommendation of the academic senate or mutually agreed to with the academic senate?

Yes. Matters appropriately within the scope of collective bargaining may be negotiated between collective bargaining representatives and district governing boards regardless of previous policies.

12. QUESTION: May the collective bargaining agent delegate matters within the scope of bargaining to the local senate and may the senate delegate matters within the scope of the ten defined areas of "academic and professional matters" to the collective bargaining agent?

Yes, to the extent permitted by collective bargaining laws. The regulations state that the intent is to "respect agreements between academic senates and collective bargaining representatives...."

13. QUESTION: Must the district consult collegially on the administrative organization chart of the college?

No. How the administration is organized may be a matter for shared governance but is outside the scope of the district's responsibility to "consult collegially" with the senate.

14. QUESTION: Another one of the ten areas of "academic and professional matters" is "processes for institutional planning and budget developments." Does this regulation relate to the institutional plans and budgets themselves, or only to the process by which plans and budgets are developed for presentation to the board?

The regulation relates only to the process. The academic senate's role is in helping to shape the process used for developing the plans and budgets to be acted upon by the governing board. The board is not required to either "rely primarily" on the senate's recommendations or reach agreement with the senate on the plans and budgets themselves.

15. QUESTION: If a local board violates the regulations, will the state Chancellor's Office intervene and/or investigate the case for possible noncompliance?

Probably not. While the Chancellor's Office will probably not become involved in a single issue within a college district, if a district board develops a pattern of violating the regulations, the Chancellor's Office has the authority to enforce compliance.

16. QUESTION: Do these regulations have the force of law?

Yes. If a district board does not make a good faith effort and does not ultimately abide by these regulations it would be in violation of law.

17. QUESTION: What powers do the Board of Governors have to enforce Title 5 regulations such as the ones on strengthening local senates?
Education Code Section 70901 mandates that the Board of Governors establish minimum conditions entitling districts to receive state aid. Currently there are some 15 minimum conditions that districts must meet in order to receive state funds. The Board of Governors can withhold funding from any district that does not meet established minimum qualifications. One of these minimum conditions is adoption of procedures consistent with sections 53200-53204 of the Administrative Code. Thus one of the minimum conditions that districts must substantially meet in order to receive state aid is to strengthen local academic senates as per the new regulations.

18. QUESTION: If a local senate feels that it has exhausted all sincere internal efforts to work cooperatively with the local governing board and believes the new regulations continue to be ignored, what remedies can be sought?

First, the statewide Academic Senate should be contacted for useful advice and direct support. Also, the Senate can make some initial contact with the Chancellor's Office to seek informal resolution if possible. The Academic Senate has established a Standards and Practices Committee that will become increasingly active in documenting, publishing and assisting in the resolution of senate role issues.

Secondly, if the local academic senate believes that there is clear and consistent noncompliance, the local senate may contact the Legal Affairs Office of the Chancellor's Office.

19. QUESTION: Does the term “rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate” meant that the governing board should not receive and consider the advice and judgment of others on issues of “academic and professional matters?”

No. Indeed, there are other regulations and laws which address the participation of the public, students, staff and unions in district governance.

20. QUESTION: Should the advice and judgment of the academic senate be accorded greater weight than the advice and judgment of other groups and constituencies in connection with “academic and professional matters?”

Yes. Subject to questions 10, 11, and 12, the intent of the regulations is to ensure that, while all relevant constituencies should have the opportunity to participate, boards must accord the greater weight to academic senates in “academic and professional matters” by “consulting collegially” with the senates, as described in these guidelines.

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 53200-53204 OF TITLE 5 OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE OF CALIFORNIA

Source Document: Participating Effectively in District and College Governance
The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and The Community College League of California
Fall 1998
INTRODUCTION

The following guidelines on local decision-making processes have been developed by a joint task force of representatives of the California Community College Trustees (CCCT), Chief Executive Officers of the California Community Colleges (CEOCCC) and the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges. They have been endorsed by the boards of directors of the CCCT and CEOCCC and by resolution of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The guidelines augment ones developed in 1992 by a similar joint task force.

The guidelines are grouped by issue area and are in the form of questions and answers. The questions and answers are not intended to cover all situations which may be encountered, but address questions most frequently raised. In the answers developed, use of the word "should" refers to a good practice, but one that is not required. The word "must" indicates the action outlined is required by law or state regulation.

The purpose of the guidelines is to provide assistance to trustees, CEOs, academic senate leaders, administrators, classified staff and students which will enable them to fulfill the intent of effective participation in local decision making as delineated in state law and Board of Governors regulations.

PART I. THE LOCAL BOARD POLICY ON COLLEGIAL CONSULTATION

1. QUESTION: What is meant by the term “shared governance”?  

“Shared governance” is not a term that appears in law or regulation. Education Code §70902(b)(7) calls on the Board of Governors to enact regulations to “ensure faculty, staff, and students...the right to participate effectively in district and college governance” and, further, to ensure “the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.”

The intent of the Legislature in enacting this section of AB 1725 was “to authorize more responsibility for faculty members in duties that are incidental to their primary professional duties” and to assure that “increased faculty involvement in institutional governance and decision making” does not conflict with faculty rights in collective bargaining (Section 4n). This shared involvement in the decision making process does not necessarily imply total agreement nor does it abrogate the ultimate decision making responsibility of the local governing board.

Title 5 §§51023.7 and 52023.5 state requirements for the “effective participation” of students and staff, respectively, in the development of recommendations to the governing board. Title 5 §53203 requires the governing board to “consult collegially” with the academic senate on academic and professional matters (defined in §53200).

Consequently, the more precise terms call for the governing board to assure effective participation of students and staff and to consult collegially with academic senates. Later questions will give guidance on these two processes. The term “shared governance” can take on many meanings and it is suggested that its use be curtailed in favor of the more precise terms.
2. QUESTION: What needs to be done by local boards and academic senates to implement the regulations to ensure the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of academic and professional matters?

The senate and the local board or its designee (usually the chancellor, superintendent/president, or president and senior administration) need to "consult collegially" on the development or modification of the district policy for board action to implement the regulations. This policy can be very general (i.e., a statement that the district will operate according to the provisions of Title 5 §§53200-53204) or more specific in terms of how the district carries out the regulations. Different boards and districts may include different amounts of procedural detail in district policy. (However, see recommendations in Questions 4 and 5 on selecting rely primarily/mutual agreement options.)

3. QUESTION: In adopting or modifying policy on academic and professional matters, does the governing board have to meet directly with the senate?

No. The governing board and the senate may each designate appropriate representatives as their voices in the mutual development or modification of policy on academic and professional matters. It is the responsibility of the designees to communicate with their respective constituencies on an ongoing basis so as to best represent them.

4. QUESTION: The regulations list eleven areas defined as academic and professional matters. The local board must adopt procedures identifying how it will consult collegially in these eleven areas. Those procedures include either to "rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate" or to "reach mutual agreement." Must a local board select only one procedure for addressing all of the identified academic and professional matters or can there be a different approach used for the different matters?

Either one of the procedures can be used to address each of the eleven areas defined as academic and professional matters; the procedure need not be the same for all eleven. It is recommended, although not required, that the specific procedure selected be identified in policy for each of the academic and professional matters.

5. QUESTION: Who decides which of the two processes in the regulations ("rely primarily" or "mutual agreement") should be used on a given issue related to academic and professional matters?

The local governing board. However, it is recommended that the eleven categories of academic and professional matters listed in the regulations be the subject of local discussions so that all concerned will know in advance which issues will be dealt with according to which process. These may then be included in adopted policy.

6. QUESTION: Why is it recommended that the governing board policy specify either the rely primarily or mutual agreement mode of collegial consultation for each of the eleven academic and professional matters?
In preparing recommendations to the governing board, it is necessary that all parties know in advance their responsibilities for determining recommendations. It is important for the governing board to communicate its expectations for the process of developing recommendations. Prior agreement on process has the advantage of allowing the board to focus on the content of recommendations rather than on procedural details.

PART II. ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL MATTERS

7. QUESTION: The regulations list eleven areas defined as “academic and professional matters.” What is the scope of each of the academic and professional matters?

The intent of the list of academic and professional matters is to state more specifically the breadth of the legal requirement for the academic senate to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations on “curriculum and academic standards” (Education Code §70901(b)(7)). These guidelines do not attempt to further define the list of academic and professional matters. Often it is the context of the issue which determines if it is an academic and professional matter. To assist in this determination, the companion document “Scenarios Illustrating Effective Participation in District and College Governance” gives examples of particular issues and good practice for their resolution through collegial consultation. Furthermore, the eleventh item allows the academic senate and the governing board to mutually agree on adding other issues as being subject to collegial consultation. Academic senates, along with governing boards and their designees, are encouraged to establish processes through which the status of any issue as an academic and professional matter is determined.

8. QUESTION: Is it helpful to have a process by which issues are determined to be an academic and professional matter?

Yes. Because academic and professional matters are broad in scope, it is important that colleges and districts have an agreed-upon mechanism for clarifying when an item is an academic and professional matter and thus requiring collegial consultation. Good practice for developing this mechanism involves agreement between the academic senate or its representative(s) and the board or its designee.

9. QUESTION: One of the eleven areas of academic and professional matters is district and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles. Must the district consult collegially on the administrative organization chart of the district and/or college?

No. How the administration is organized may be a matter for wide participation by the affected parties but is outside the scope of the district’s responsibility to consult collegially with the senate. However, organizational changes which affect academic and professional matters such as curriculum or faculty role in governance would require consultation with the academic senate.

10. QUESTION: Another one of the eleven areas of academic and professional matters is “processes for institutional planning and budget development.” Does this regulation relate to the institutional plans and budgets themselves, or only to the process by which plans and budgets are developed for presentation to the board?
The regulation relates only to the process. The academic senate is to be consulted collegially in shaping the processes used for developing the plans and budgets to be acted upon by the governing board. The board is not required to either “rely primarily” on the senate’s recommendations or reach mutual agreement with the senate on the plans and budgets themselves.

PART III. MUTUAL AGREEMENT AND RELY PRIMARILY

11. QUESTION: If the governing board chooses the option to “rely primarily” on the advice of the academic senate in any of the eleven areas of academic and professional matters, is the board required to accept the recommendation of the senate?

No. Title 5 regulations clearly state that in most cases under the “rely primarily” option the recommendation of the academic senate will be adopted. However, there are conditions under which the local board may need to make a decision different from the senate’s recommendation. (The circumstances covering such a decision are addressed in the next Question.)

12. QUESTION: A district governing board which chooses the “rely primarily” procedure is normally supposed to accept recommendations of the senate in any of the eleven areas of academic and professional matters unless there are “exceptional circumstances” and “compelling reasons.” What do these mean?

The regulations do not define the terms “exceptional circumstances” and “compelling reasons,” and these terms are not intended to have a legal definition outside the context of this law. (However, these regulations do have the force of law. See Question 35.) These terms mean that boards must usually accept senate recommendations, and that in instances where a recommendation is not accepted the reasons for the board’s decision must be in writing and based on a clear and substantive rationale which puts the explanation for the decision in an accurate, appropriate, and relevant context.

Boards tempted to reject a recommendation might, instead, ask the senate to reconsider the recommendation in light of the issues that have not been resolved to the board’s satisfaction or in cases in which the clarity, accuracy or completeness of the recommendation needs improvement.

13. QUESTION: A district governing board which chooses the “mutual agreement” procedure is supposed to reach written agreement with the senate in any of the eleven areas of academic and professional matters. When may the board act if it is not able to reach mutual agreement with the academic senate?

If there is no existing policy, the regulations say the board may act without reaching mutual agreement if there are “compelling legal, fiscal or organizational reasons” why it must do so. Again, the word “compelling” is not defined in the regulations and is not intended to have a legal definition outside the context of this law. (Again, the regulations have the force of law. See Question 35.) It means that in instances where mutual agreement with the senate is not reached, a board decision must be based on a clear and substantive rationale that puts the explanation for the decision in an accurate, appropriate and relevant context.

14. QUESTION: When there is an existing policy, is the board permitted to act without mutual agreement?
Generally, no. If there is an existing policy, that policy simply stays in effect until mutual agreement is reached. However, there may be cases when the existing policy “exposes the district to legal liability or causes substantial fiscal hardship.” In these circumstances, a board may act without reaching mutual agreement provided that it has made a good faith effort to reach agreement and has “compelling legal, fiscal or organizational reasons” to act (as the term “compelling” is described in the previous question) without waiting any longer for agreement.

15. QUESTION: The “mutual agreement” procedure appears to contain de facto ability to block changes in policy when an existing policy is in place by failing to agree to needed action. What would happen if this occurs?

It would be bad faith to use the regulations in order to block changes in policy when an existing policy is in place by failing to agree to needed action. If a board refuses or fails to participate or consult constructively in the attempt to reach mutual agreement, a senate may choose to initiate the technical assistance process delineated in the Academic Senate/CCLC document “Assistance to Assure Effective Participation in District and College Governance.” (See Appendix A.) On the other hand, if the senate attempts to use the regulations process to block board action by refusing or failing to participate or consult constructively, the board and chief executive officer may seek help through the technical assistance process as well.

PART IV. IMPLEMENTING THE COLLEGIATE CONSULTATION PROCESS

16. QUESTION: Once board policies on collegial consultation and effective participation have been approved, how can the implementing procedures, structures, and committees be developed to ensure the process follows the intent of policy?

Adoption of the governing board policy on collegial consultation is only the first step in complying with the regulations. Procedures, structures, and committees must be reviewed and revised to implement the policy.

The academic senate and the governing board designee should examine existing structures that deal with academic and professional matters. Those committees which are already charged with academic and professional matters, such as curriculum and staff development, should be reviewed to assure that their structures and charges are appropriate. (See Question 17 on committee structure.) Where committees may not exist to deal specifically with an academic and professional matter, a new committee may be needed or, perhaps, the charge of a related committee can be modified. For example, the matriculation advisory committee might be charged with developing proposals for student preparation and success.

Throughout this document, the work products of committees pertaining to academic and professional policies and procedures will be referred to as “proposals.” These proposals are available for review by college groups as part of the process to assure effective participation of those affected by such proposals. As part of their reporting processes, committees forward these proposals to the academic senate for consideration and refinement. After approval by the senate, the “proposal” becomes a “recommendation” of the academic senate. Beyond their charge to develop such proposals, committees also may be involved in implementation of existing policies and procedures. (See Question 19 for a distinction among policy, procedure, and implementation.) For example, curriculum committees implement curriculum policies by reviewing proposals for new and revised courses.
In all procedures, structures, and committees, students and staff should be assured of effective participation in matters which affect them. (See Questions 31 and 32 for more on effective participation of staff and students.)

17. QUESTION: What essential elements need to be defined in order to ensure that the committee structure, used in collegial consultation and to provide effective participation, is functional?

It is recommended that the charge to a college committee be clearly defined. This permits matters within the scope of the charge to be handled by the committee without overlapping responsibilities with other groups. A clear charge also lessens the tendency to create a new committee for every new issue. (For use of a college council to do issue management for committee referrals, see the next question.)

Committees should have definite membership. Members should be chosen for their expertise and area of responsibility, not just to represent a constituent group. For each place on the committee the following should be specified: appointing body, term length, and voting status (if votes are to be taken).

The expected reports or other work products should be delineated, including to whom the reports are submitted. Committee proposals for policies and procedures on all academic and professional matters should be submitted to the academic senate as well as being available for review by other affected groups. (See the previous question regarding how a committee proposal becomes an academic senate recommendation.)

Operation of the college committee structure takes a commitment of the time and effort of the participants as well as a commitment of resources by the institution. All parties should weigh carefully the developmental needs of the college. To the extent possible, there should be consideration of and accommodation for the time required for student, faculty and staff participation which may be above and beyond their regular duties. Examples of accommodation include convenient times and locations of meetings, reassigned time, and granting of flexibility in work schedules. Consideration is also needed for technical and clerical support for committees with special needs. Operational requirements should not be ignored: written minutes should be kept of all committee meetings. Meeting times should be arranged so that all members are available. Agendas should be distributed with adequate time (and all needed reference materials) for members to prepare for meetings. Orientation and training of members should be provided regularly.

18. QUESTION: Some institutions have college or district coordinating councils consisting of representatives of the academic senate, unions, classified staff, administrative staff and students. What is the role of such a council within the dictates of the law and regulations?

Neither the law nor regulations call for any specific committees or structures, nor is a coordinating council prohibited. Many colleges have found coordinating councils useful, but some cautions are warranted.

A forum for communication on common issues and for reporting group activities are important functions coordinating councils can play. Often a particular matter may have implications for other groups that are not evident without discussion.
Issue management can be another useful activity for such councils. Broaching topics when they initially arise can give all parties the opportunity to participate in devising a common strategy for addressing that topic. It can be within this forum that the academic senate may identify issues which are academic and professional in nature. These discussions can assure that topics are properly referred to the committee charged with handling that matter. Coordinating councils also provide a venue to resolve conflicts that may arise as issues work their way through the governance process.

However, a coordinating council is not the appropriate body to make recommendations to the governing board or designee on academic and professional matters. These issues are appropriately within the purview of the academic senate. Furthermore, care should be taken in placing decision-making authority in the hands of coordinating councils. The strength of participatory governance lies in recommendations being made by those who have the necessary expertise and are most affected by the decision.

19. QUESTION: The law and regulations use the terms “district and college governance,” “policies,” “policy development and implementation” and “policies and procedures.” What are the distinctions among policy, procedures and implementation?

Distinctions among policy, procedures, and implementation are not exact, and specific delineations should be made locally on a case-by-case basis. That said, some generalizations may be useful.

Policies give the college general direction to accomplish its mission. They create the context for action as well as foster a positive climate in which change can occur. Policies delineate the conditions which procedures must meet and state the expectations for what is to be accomplished. They are of a sufficient scope and significance that they are adopted by public action of the governing board. Procedures define the steps to be taken to carry out a policy. They specify those responsible for carrying out each step and may include a timeline by which tasks are to be completed. Implementation means carrying out the steps called for in the procedure.

20. QUESTION: For those matters which the governing board delegates to the chief executive officer, does collegial consultation still apply? Is the governing board still responsible to assure the effective participation of affected groups?

Yes to both questions. Education Code §70902(d) gives the governing board authority to delegate certain responsibilities to groups or individuals employed within the district. Those to whom those responsibilities are delegated must themselves consult collegially with the academic senate on academic and professional matters. Before agreeing to delegation, boards should carefully consider whether decisions are of a nature that they should be made in the public forum of the board meeting. Note that the Brown Act, Government Code §54950-54962, specifically requires open meetings of groups to whom boards have delegated authority, such as the academic senate.

Even on matters delegated to others, the governing board still maintains the responsibility to assure effective participation of students, faculty, and staff. The academic senate still retains its right to place issues on the board agenda and to present its views to the board (Title 5 §53203), with the understanding that reasonable, accepted procedures will be followed.
21. **QUESTION:** What features characterize an effective collegial consultation process?

Collegial consultation requires mutual understanding among the faculty, administration, and the governing board. Such understanding requires an awareness of interdependence, a commitment to communication, and the exchange of ideas as well as a commitment to joint action in the interests of solving educational problems or setting educational policy.

There is no one best method for implementing collegial consultation. Each college tends to develop a culture of its own within which collegial consultation takes place. Nevertheless, a few features seem to be common among those colleges with effective processes.

One such feature is a clearly defined governance structure that includes an organizational chart, charges of the councils or committees, and defined memberships and processes. A regular program should be established for old and new members of the governing board, administration, and faculty to acquaint them with the principles and practices of the collegial consultation structure. When everyone understands how the process works, and the structure is used consistently, it allows for success.

Communication is also a hallmark of a good collegial consultation process. Venues are created for key leaders to discuss matters in formal settings such as a coordinating council. (See Question 19 on the role of councils.) Informal meetings can be held between key leaders between formal meetings to further understanding, but official conclusions should be a part of the formal process. All participants must make a conscientious effort to keep one another informed.

The need for trust will often be raised in the context of shared decision-making. Trust is fostered when well established principles and practices of collegiality are adhered to by all. In addition, trust can be built by creating opportunities for individuals to establish professional relationships in a variety of venues.

Collegial consultation works best in well-run districts where expertise and delegation of authority is respected, and where representatives are open and honest and are committed to working together for the benefit of the students.

22. **QUESTION:** Can a CEO make faculty appointments to committees, task forces, or other groups dealing with academic and professional matters?

No. Title 5 §53203(f) requires that appointments of faculty to groups dealing with academic and professional matters be made by the academic senate after consultation with the CEO or designee. Furthermore, consultation is required in establishing committees if the purpose of the committee is to develop policy or procedures related to an academic and professional matter or as part of the basic governance structures set forth in the board's policy on collegial consultation. (See Chancellor's Office Legal Opinion M 97-20, October 23, 1997.)

23. **QUESTION:** What do the law and regulations say about participation in collegial consultation of college and district senates in multi-campus districts?

Delegation of authority and responsibility by a governing board under Title 5 §53203(a) can be to its college senate, district senate, or both. In districts with a district senate established pursuant to Title 5 §53202, governing boards may establish policies delineating collegial consultation with college senates only, district senates only, or to both.
When collegial consultation involves both college and district senates, distinction should be made between recommendations that involve college matters only and those which have district scope. This is a local matter to be worked out among the senates and the board or its designee(s). It is recommended that on district matters the board specify the chancellor as its designee and on college matters the designee be the college president.

24. QUESTION: How can the timelines of collegial consultation be respected while addressing opportunities and requirements to which a college must respond quickly?

Development of effective policies and procedures takes time. Issues requiring the development or revision of policies and procedures should be identified as early as possible and the consultation process initiated right away. Development of proposals in isolation which are then brought into consultation is not a productive methodology. Prolonged debate without constructive recommendations needlessly extends resolution of the issue. All parties should agree to reasonable timelines at the beginning of the consultation process.

Particularly stressful is the need to make a decision in a short timeframe imposed by external considerations. Districts which seem to handle these situations best are those which have a comprehensive planning process. If the institution has foresight and agreed upon goals and objectives, it is likely that new challenges can be more quickly integrated into the district’s plans. An atmosphere of trust in the leadership is critical as well, considering that recommendations on items with short deadlines often necessitate the academic senate president and college president collaborating without opportunity to obtain full input from the various constituents. Even in such circumstances it is expected that the actions of both presidents will not be inconsistent with the established positions of their respective groups.

PART V. ROLES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE AND EXCLUSIVE BARGAINING AGENT

25. QUESTION: Can the local board choose the academic senate to be the organization that represents faculty in matters that have previously been collectively bargained or are within the legal scope of bargaining? Can the local board accept recommendations from the academic senate or reach agreements with the academic senate which contradict a collective bargaining agreement?

The answer to both questions is no. The governing board may not legally delegate to the senate any responsibilities or functions which belong to the exclusive representative. AB 1725 did not change collective bargaining law (i.e., the Educational Employment Relations Act, Government Code §3540 et sec.) nor the legal scope of bargaining. The regulations specifically point out that nothing in the Board of Governors’ regulations may be construed to “detract from any negotiated agreements between collective bargaining and district governing boards.”

26. QUESTION: Can a board and union through a collective bargaining agreement change a policy previously adopted by a board based upon recommendation of the academic senate or mutually agreed to with the academic senate?
Yes. Matters appropriately within the scope of collective bargaining may be negotiated between collective bargaining representatives and district governing boards regardless of previous policies. Citing the Educational Employment Relations Act (EERA) in Government Code §3543.2(a), “The scope of representation shall be limited to matters relating to wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment.” These terms and conditions are then enumerated in the Act. Furthermore, exclusive bargaining agents have the right to “consult on the definition of educational objectives, the determination of the content of courses and curriculum, and the selection of textbooks....” However, the EERA does not supersede Education Code provisions and, as stated in Government Code §3540, “shall not restrict, limit, or prohibit the exercise of the functions of any academic senate or faculty council established by a school district in a community college to represent the faculty in making recommendations to the administration and governing board of the school district with respect to district policies on academic and professional matters, so long as the exercise of the functions does not conflict with lawful collective agreements.”

27. QUESTION: May the collective bargaining agent delegate matters within the scope of bargaining to the local senate and may the senate delegate matters within the scope of the eleven defined areas of academic and professional matters to the collective bargaining agent?

Yes, to the extent permitted by collective bargaining laws. The regulations state that the intent is “to respect agreements between academic senates and collective bargaining representatives....”

PART VI. STUDENTS AND STAFF

28. QUESTION: Does the phrase “rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate” mean that the governing board should not receive and consider the advice and judgment of others on issues of academic and professional matters?

No. Indeed, there are other regulations and laws which address the participation of the public, students, staff and unions in district governance.

Title 5 §51023.7 requires the governing board to “adopt policies and procedures that provide students the opportunity to participate effectively in district and college governance.” Students are to participate in “formulation and development” of policies and procedures that have a “significant effect” on them. The regulation lists ten areas of such significant effect, most of which are quite similar to the senate’s academic and professional matters. Boards are not to act unless students have had the opportunity to participate, with the exception of “unforeseeable, emergency situations” and shall give positions of the students “reasonable consideration.” The regulation states the intent that boards are to respect the agreements with senates and unions while working with students.

Title 5 §51023.5 requires the governing board to “adopt policies and procedures that provide district and college staff the opportunity to participate effectively in district and college governance.” However, areas that affect staff are not defined in the regulation but remain matters “that the governing board reasonably determines, in consultation with staff, have or will have a significant effect on staff.”
The role of the exclusive bargaining agents is explicitly protected in Title 5 and is cited in the Educational Employment Relations Act. (See Government Code §3543.2.) The public is granted access to the governing board through the open meeting provisions of the Brown Act. (See Government Code §54950-54962.)

29. QUESTION: What are good practices to assure effective participation of students and staff in the process of formulating recommendations which affect them?

Student participation can be strengthened in several ways. Student leaders can work with the college leadership to identify committees whose charges incorporate the ten areas of significant effect on students. Student membership can be specified on those committees. The names of those who will participate on committees can be identified early in the year. It is important that committees meet at regularly scheduled times convenient to students interested in being members. Student members can benefit from orientation and training and from having an assigned mentor to assist in getting to know the work of the committee. An effective strategy to strengthen leadership skills is to have a student government course as part of the curriculum. Communication between the student government, the academic senate, and other groups can be improved by having liaisons attend one another’s board meetings.

Administrative staff have a role beyond that of the chief executive officer functioning as the board’s designee. It is advised that committees dealing with specific topics have the participation of mid-level administrators in whose areas of responsibility those topics fall. That participation may be as a resource, as a member, or as chair, depending on the local college decision-making process.

Classified staff should participate in the formation and development of policies and procedures on matters which significantly affect staff. Committees and task forces on campus which deal with those issues should have classified staff as members. As with all committee members, classified staff can benefit from orientation and training and from a mentor relationship with a seasoned committee member.

30. QUESTION: Should the advice and judgment of the academic senate be accorded greater weight than the advice and judgment of other groups and constituencies in connection with academic and professional matters?

Yes. Subject to Questions 25, 26, and 27, the intent of the regulations is to ensure that, while all relevant constituencies should have the opportunity to participate, boards must accord the greater weight to academic senate in academic and professional matters by consulting collegially with the senate, as described in these guidelines.

31. QUESTION: What are the responsibilities of the academic senate to obtain input from staff and students on academic and professional matters that have a significant effect on these groups?
In the creation of the structures, procedures and committees for collegial consultation (see Question 16) provisions must be included for the effective participation of students and staff on matters which affect them. Proposals which come from committees on academic and professional matters are available for review by all college constituencies and are considered in open deliberations at academic senate meetings. When such proposals are heard by the academic senate, every effort should be made to engage affected parties in the deliberations. In this manner the academic senate will have considered the input of students and staff before making recommendations to the governing board (or its designee) on matters which affect students and staff. Of course, all parties may directly address the board as it deliberates on its ultimate decision.

32. QUESTION: What can be done to educate all members of the college community participating in the collegial processes concerning the law, regulations, best practices of decision making and the issues under discussion?

Good practices might include the following. All participants in the governance process should be provided copies of the relevant laws, regulations, and district policies and procedures. It is recommended that each standing governance committee have a handbook of such information as well as reports and minutes generated in previous years. The first annual organizational meeting of each committee should be devoted to orientation and training on the committee charge and procedures. The leadership of constituency groups might get together in a retreat format at the beginning of each academic year to review the governance process, consider priorities for the coming year, and build personal relationships.

PART VII. KEEPING PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE STRONG

33. QUESTION: Are effective participation and collegial consultation policies and practices subject to regular evaluation and revision as necessary by the governing board?

While there is no requirement that such policies be regularly reviewed, it is a good idea. The review process should be mutually agreed upon, and, further, the board policy should specify that recommendations for change should be by collegial consultation with the academic senate (on the board policy affecting the academic senate) and by effective participation of staff and students (on policies affecting them).

It should be possible for any of the parties to initiate the process for review of these policies. It may be the case, for example, that a change in leadership might bring new perspectives to the decision making process that might engender a desire for certain improvements. However, districts should take care that the collegial consultation process is not built on individual strengths that may be idiosyncratic to particular leaders.

34. QUESTION: How can the academic senate and other constituent groups and the local governing board engage in mutually productive dialogue?

Engaging in mutually productive dialogue is based on respect, trust and willingness to seek information. Mutually productive dialogue may take place at regular business meetings of the board, at open college and community forums and board study sessions and retreats, and by sharing written information.
Under the provisions of the Brown Act, governing board meetings are open to everyone. All constituent members have the right to address the board on items on its agenda and matters under the board’s purview.

Beyond legal requirements, boards should recognize the special role that academic senates and student and staff organizations play in developing recommendations for board action. Following are some suggestions to strengthen that role. Organizational representatives may be seated prominently to facilitate discourse with the board. Reports from each organization may be regularly agendized. Items on the board agenda which were developed through significant senate, student, or staff involvement can be jointly presented by the appropriate organizational representatives. Commentary on board agenda items can be solicited from the senate, student, and staff representatives without restrictions such as filling out speaker cards and being subject to short time limitations.

In addition to regular business meetings of the board, other opportunities can be structured for mutually productive dialogue and education. Study sessions, workshops, and college and community forums often provide a more open environment for board members, key community groups, and college leaders to engage in discussion about external trends and broad policy direction and for the board to share its vision and to hear about activities in the district related to achieving the vision and mission. Sessions such as these enable constituent groups to identify and address areas of agreement and concern early in policy discussions.

PART VIII. COMPLIANCE

35. QUESTION: Do these regulations have the force of law?

Yes. If a district board does not make a good faith effort and does not ultimately abide by these regulations it would be in violation of law.

36. QUESTION: What powers do the Board of Governors have to enforce Title 5 Regulations such as the ones on ensuring the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of academic and professional matters?

Education Code §70901 mandates that the Board of Governors establish minimum conditions entitled districts to receive state aid. The Board of Governors can withhold funding from any district that does not meet established minimum conditions. One of these minimum conditions is adoption of procedures consistent with sections §§53200 - 53204 of the California Code of Regulations. Thus one of the minimum conditions that districts must substantially meet in order to receive state aid is to assure the effective participation of local academic senates as per the regulations.

37. QUESTION: What are the responsibilities of the governing board and chief executive officer to implement the regulations to ensure the effective participation of faculty, staff and students in district and college governance? What obligations does a governing board have to ensure that recommendations regarding academic and professional matters have gone through the collegial consultation process?
The board must uphold the requirements of Education Code §70902(b)(7) and Title 5 §53200-204 (academic senates), §52023.7 (students) and §51023.5 (staff). As the designee of the board, the chief executive officer is likewise bound to carry out these regulations. When considering action on an academic and professional matter, the local governing board must first ascertain that the collegial consultation process has been followed. If not, action on the item would then be delayed until such consultation has been obtained.

38. QUESTION: If the regulations are violated, will the state Chancellor's Office intervene and/or investigate the case for possible noncompliance?

Violations of Title 5 Regulations may be reported in writing by filing a written complaint with the Legal Affairs Division of the Chancellor's Office. The General Counsel will investigate credible complaints and determine needed corrective action to assure compliance with the regulations.

39. QUESTION: If a local senate or CEO and governing board feels that it has exhausted all sincere internal efforts to work cooperatively and believes the regulations continue to be ignored, what remedies can be sought?

The following steps are recommended. First, the representative group—the statewide Academic Senate or the Community College League—should be contacted for useful advice and direct support. Secondly, the local academic senate and governing board may mutually request technical assistance through the process established jointly by the Academic Senate and the League. Thirdly, if the local academic senate believes that there is clear noncompliance, it may file a complaint with the Legal Affairs Division of the Chancellor's Office. Finally, the local senate may pursue remedies with the state Attorney General or in court.
Subject: AMEND CHAPTER XVII, ARTICLE III OF THE BOARD RULES

The following motion is presented by Trustees Veres, Santiago, and Park:

Amend Chapter XVII, Article III of the Board Rules as follows:

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
BOND PROGRAM MONITOR

17300 Establishment Retention of the Office of Inspector General Bond Program Monitor

The Los Angeles Community College District board of Trustees and Chancellor authorize the creation retention of the Office of Inspector General a consultant to ensure that its capital program funded by Proposition A, Proposition AA, and Measure J ("Bond Program") is performing with the utmost of integrity, and in furtherance of that objective authorize efficiency and when the Inspector General Bond Program Monitor to investigate and report on circumstances involving action or inaction by an employee, contractor, consultant, or Trustee that the Bond Program Monitor reasonably suspects may involve or aid and abet in the occurrence of misconduct constituting fraud, corruption, has a violation of reasonable suspicion that a non-discretionary law, rule or regulation, an abuse of discretion in rule or district policy has been or is being materially violated by someone affiliated with the exercise of a right or authority granted under a discretionary law, rule, or regulation, gross mismanagement or other actions or inactions occurring in the context of an evident deliberate or reckless disregard of an actual or probable waste or abuse of District funds and its Bond Program.

17300.1 Reporting

A. General Reporting

The Inspector General Bond Program Monitor shall report directly to the Board of Trustees, but be directed and supervised on a day-to-day basis by the Chancellor. To the extent that reports reflect matters under investigation for which a final determination has not been made, such reports shall be treated as confidential pursuant to the "deliberative process" exception of the California Public Records Act.

B. Executive Briefings

As determined by the District, the Bond Program Monitor shall provide periodic briefings and reports to keep executive management for the District apprised of important undertakings by the Bond Program Monitor, their outcomes, and other matters that warrant attention, including timely advice to the Chancellor if any employee, official, contractor, consultant or Trustee attempts to impede or obstruct any investigation or other activity of the Bond Program Monitor.
C. Semiannual Reports

The Bond Program Monitor shall make semiannual reports on its activities, which shall be available to the public and, not later than three days after issuance of any report that is publicly available, post that report on the Bond Program Monitor website. Such website shall include a service that allows an individual to request automatic receipt of information relating to any public report, or portion thereof, by means of electronic transmittal of the information, or notice of the availability of the information, without further request.

17300.2 Generally Authorized Activities

The Inspector General Bond Program Monitor is authorized to interview witnesses, take testimony, and demand the production of any information, documents, reports, answers, records, accounts, papers, and other data and documentary evidence the Bond Program Monitor deemed material, relevant and reasonably related to any audit, inquiry, or investigation of misconduct related to the Bond Program undertaken by the Inspector General.

17301 Powers and Duties

The Inspector General Bond Program Monitor shall have the following powers and duties:

A. To plan, direct, and conduct investigations and audits designed to promote accountability to the public and to ensure the economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity of the Bond Program monitor day-to-day operations of the Bond Program insofar as may involve the detection, prevention, occurrence, or report of misconduct, or the threat of misconduct, related to the Bond Program;

B. To receive and with integrity, objectivity, independence, and confidentiality, investigate complaints concerning incidents of possible misconduct, malfeasance, or violations of laws, rules or regulations by any officer, employee or appointee in any department or contractor firm directly responsible related to the Bond Program; and

C. To investigate the performance of LACCD employees and contract staff, appointees performing work related to the Bond Program, in order to detect and prevent misconduct within the programs and operations evaluate the policies and procedures governing the Bond Program, as well as where appropriate, the performance of work related to the Bond Program, in order to develop recommendations on revisions that would facilitate prevention and detection of possible misconduct related to the Bond Program;

D. To promote integrity in the administration of the programs and operations, identify any potential for misconduct therein, and make recommendations to the Board of Trustees and Chancellor for policies and methods for the prevention of misconduct;

E. To report to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees concerning results of investigations undertaken by the Office of Inspector General.
17302 Creation of Whistleblower Hotline

As soon as practicable after appointment of the Inspector General, the Inspector General Bond Program Monitor is directed to create and maintain a toll-free “Whistleblower Hotline” and a post office box for anonymous reporting, for the purpose of receiving citizen and employee reports of public corruption and misconduct related to the Bond Program. Unless the caller consents to disclosure, the identity of any individual placing a call or submitting a complaint to the hotline providing such reports shall to the maximum extent allowed by applicable law be kept confidential during and after the investigation of any complaint made by the caller, unless the caller consents to disclosure or due process of law otherwise requires disclosure of the caller’s identity and any persons involved in the reporting should not be alerted until an investigation is complete and a corrective action is recommended by the Bond Program Monitor and approved by the District. All reports received shall be prioritized and investigated according to the nature and urgency of the allegation and the credibility of the report. The hotline and post office box will be publicized in a manner reasonably designed to reach all employees, contractors, and consultants, including, without limitation, by posting informative notices at locations where employees congregate and providing links on the websites maintained by the District (including, without limitation, the Bond Program website) and the Bond Program Monitor.

17303 Investigation Reports and Other Documentary Material

A. Public Summary

Upon conclusion of an investigation into possible misconduct, and in the interest of accountability, the Inspector General Bond Program Monitor shall prepare a written report on the investigation as appropriate and such report shall be released to the issue a summary of the report (“Public Summary”); public, subject to any redactions needed to protect witnesses. The Bond Program Monitor’s investigation reports should be provided Public Summary shall be delivered to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, and may be forwarded also be provided to parties affected by or involved in the investigation, if appropriate.

B. Investigatory Materials

In light of the purpose of the Inspector General Bond Program Monitor as stated in Board Rule 17300, the records of the Inspector General Bond Program Monitor are presumptively deemed investigatory records exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act. However, materials provided to the Board of Trustees for a matter that will be discussed in public session must be made available contemporaneously to the public as required by the Ralph M. Brown Act. Materials that relate to potential or existing litigation, employee privacy or other matters exempt from disclosure or subject to a lawful closed session discussion shall not be subject to public disclosure except as required by law.

17304 Duty of Vigilance and Cooperation in Investigations

It shall be the duty of every employee, contract professional contractor, consultant, and or Trustee Board Member to cooperate with extend full cooperation and all reasonable assistance to the Inspector General Bond Program Monitor and his/her designees in connection with any Bond Program Monitor investigation, and all Trustees, employees, contractors, consultants are expected to be vigilant in preventing and reporting fraud, abuse, and corruption undertaken pursuant to this Article.
17305  
Retaliation Prohibited

No employee, **contractor**, consultant, **vendor**, student, or Trustee shall retaliate against, punish, or penalize any person for complaining to, cooperating with, or assisting the **Inspector General Bond Program Monitor** in the performance of his or her duties. Any employee, **contractor**, consultant, **vendor**, student, or Trustee who violates the provisions of this section shall be subject to disciplinary action, in accordance with the due process provisions associated with his or her position.

17306  
**Reports and Referrals of Investigations**

Upon making a preliminary determination that alleged misconduct may involve possible criminal conduct, the **Inspector General Bond Program Monitor**, in consultation with the Chancellor, may refer complaints regarding such misconduct to the appropriate law enforcement authority. **In the event that the Chancellor is the alleged wrongdoer, the Bond Program Monitor shall consult with the Board President.**

17307  
**Conflicts of Interest**

The Bond Program Monitor, and its staff members, must be free both in fact and appearance from personal, external, and organizational impairments to its objectivity and independence. Consistent with the foregoing, all allegations against the Bond Program Monitor or its staff for violations of the provisions of these rules and any matters that the Bond Program Monitor determines cannot be objectively and independently investigated by the Bond Program Monitor shall be submitted directly to the Chancellor and, if appropriate, to proper law enforcement authorities. The Bond Program Monitor and its staff shall submit to periodic background checks and shall submit such conflict of interest disclosures and certifications as may be requested by the District in order to confirm compliance with this requirement.

17308  
**Legal Counsel**

The Bond Program Monitor shall retain, at the expense of the District, its own legal counsel, who shall not be a legal counsel contemporaneously retained by the District on any other matters, to advise the Bond Program Monitor on legal matters related to performance of its functions under these rules and who shall be free of any conflicts of interest. Such legal counsel is not retained to provide advice to the Bond Program Monitor on matters relating to the Bond Program Monitor’s legal or contractual duties to the District or on questions that may arise between the District and the Bond Program Monitor relating to the adequacy of the Bond Program Monitor’s performance. Such legal counsel shall be deemed to be in a direct and confidential client–attorney relationship with the District, and not with the Bond Program Monitor individually, and the District shall be deemed the holder of all related legal privileges.
17309 Internal Principles, Policies, and Procedures

The Bond Program Monitor and its staff shall act with integrity and exercise objectivity and professional skepticism and avoid circumstances that would cause a reasonable and informed third party to believe that the Bond Program Monitor or its staff is not capable of exercising objectivity and impartial judgment or that the Bond Program Monitor’s work has been compromised. Consistent with the foregoing, the Bond Program Monitor shall (1) develop internal rules and procedures for conduct of investigations and for external quality assurance reviews of investigations and other activities of the Bond Program Monitor, (2) identify and assess threats to its independence of objectivity from both external and internal sources, (3) evaluate the significance of threats identified and prioritize them in a manner consistent with the Bond Program Monitor’s obligations under these rules or as other directed by the Chancellor or Trustees, (4) apply safeguards as necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level, (5) not use confidential information for personal gain or in any other manner that is detrimental to the legitimate interests of the District, and (6) establish criteria for the conduct of investigations before commencing investigations, and (7) prepare an “Investigative Manual” that described the principles, policies, and procedures to implement and govern the Bond Program Monitor’s performance of its duties and responsibilities under these rules.

17310 Auditing and Management Functions

It is not the function of the Bond Program Monitor to perform management functions, to give recommendations on management decisions, to evaluate budgets, to set policy, to design internal management controls affecting routine management functions, to perform functions assigned to the District’s auditors performing financial or performance audits (internal or external), or to issue interpretations of or legal determinations on existing policies, rules, or regulations of or governing the Bond Program. Notwithstanding the foregoing, however, the Bond Program Monitor in performing the duties and obligations provided for under these rules shall review, assess, and recommend enhancements to the functions and duties of the District’s auditors and to the District’s program management policies and procedures that will facilitate the prevention, detection, and reporting of misconduct related to the Bond Program.

17311 Training Programs

The Bond Program Monitor shall develop and document special awareness and training initiatives designed to alert the District to systemic weaknesses in its programs or procedures that make them vulnerable to misconduct related to the Bond Program.

Background: The Office of Inspector General (“OIG”) was created by a Board initiative in March 2010 in response to allegations of misconduct in the Bond Program. Unlike such offices for other agencies, there was no legislative direction regarding the framework of the OIG. The current contract was terminated for convenience in order to allow for a reexamination of the scope of the office. In consultation with a qualified technical expert, revisions were developed for the charge of the OIG to focus the operation on fraud or misconduct, in order to minimize unintended overlap with management and the performance auditor. These revisions were reviewed by an ad hoc committee appointed by the Board President and are now recommended to the full Board for adoption.
SUBJECT: INITIAL PROPOSAL OF THE LOS ANGELES COLLEGE FACULTY GUILD, AFT LOCAL 1521 TO THE LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT REGARDING NEGOTIATIONS AS AGREED IN ARTICLE 17 OF THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT TO DISCUSS COMPENSATION MATTERS FOR 2013-2014

Pursuant to Government Code section 3547 and the District’s public notice procedure, the Los Angeles College Faculty Guild, AFT Local 1521, presents its initial proposal to the District regarding negotiations on compensation matters.

The Los Angeles College Faculty Guild shall reopen negotiations on compensation for 2013-2014.

Background: Government Code Section 3547 and Board Rule 101400 require the District to inform the public of the issues to be negotiated with an employee organization by presenting initial proposals that relate to matters within the scope of representation under the Educational Employment Relations Act at a public meeting of the Board. For that reason, this item is being presented as an informative so that the public can review it and be prepared to comment on it.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 3547 and Board Rule 101400, the Los Angeles Community College District proposes that representatives of the District and agents of the Los Angeles College Faculty Guild, AFT Local 1521, re-open the Agreement between the Los Angeles Community College District and the Los Angeles Faculty Guild dated July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2014 for the purpose of renegotiating compensation issues for 2013-2014.

Background: Government Code Section 3547 and Board Rule 101400 require the District to inform the public of the issues to be negotiated with an employee organization by presenting any proposed reopening at a public meeting of the Board. The matter is being noticed on April 17, 2013, with an expected adoption date of May 1, 2013. The public will have an opportunity to comment on May 1, 2013, before the parties begin formal bargaining.