**District Core Inquiry 1**

Based on the team’s analysis during the Team ISER Review, the team identified the following core inquiries that relate to potential areas of clarification, improvement, or commendation.

|  |
| --- |
| **District Core Inquiry 1:** The team would like to better understand how the Board ensures a regular cycle of review of its board policies to ensure their effectiveness in fulfilling the district’s mission and revises the policies as necessary. |
| **Standards or Policies:** IV.C.7 |
| **Description:**  The team reviewed the college’s ISER, which indicated that policies and regulations are created and amended to address changes in law, District operations, and the needs of students. The evidence supports the ISER’s statement that “*On a quarterly basis, the general counsel informs the board of the need to update policies or regulation.”*  The team also confirmed that the Board reaffirms all Board Policies and Administrative Regulations in batch form (1000-9000).  The Board has Board Policy 3112, which addresses the process for adoption of policies.  However, in a random sampling of the Board Policies and Administrative Regulations online, the team found Board Policies that had not been updated since the 1980s and 1990s. The team would like to better understand how the Board ensures a regular cycle of review of its Board Policies and Administrative Regulations to confirm their effectiveness in fulfilling the District’s mission. |
| **Topics of discussion during interviews:**   * Cycle for the regular assessment and revision of Board Policies and Administrative Regulations. |
| **Request for Additional Information/Evidence:** |
| **Request for Observations/Interviews:**   * Individuals responsible for ensuring the regular updating of Board Policies and Administrative Regulations (e.g., Board Office). |

# District Core Inquiry 2

|  |
| --- |
| **District Core Inquiry 2:** The team would like to deepen its understanding of the specific delineation of college and district roles and responsibilities in order to better understand the following:   * The interface between district level governance and college level governance * The autonomy of the colleges * The functions carried out at the district office * The impact of completed reorganizations on the colleges and the district office * The analyses being done for planned reorganizations |
| **Standards or Policies:** IV.D.2, IV.D.3, IV.D.4, IV.D.7 |
| **Description:**   1. The Functional Map uses the accreditation standards to identify primary, secondary, and shared responsibilities between the District and the College. While this approach provides a high-level view of responsibilities relative to each accreditation standard, it does not identify the actual functions and operations performed by the District Office making it difficult to determine the delineation of responsibilities. There are references to District reorganizations and centralizations but it is not clear what the impact on the delineation of responsibilities is. 2. The team read the references to the 80/20 resource allocation formulas; however, it is not completely clear what would happen in the event the district experiences a revenue reduction in terms of impact on personnel and the colleges. 3. The team did not see a district-level decision making guide that would help clarify the roles of the various districtwide committees. 4. District governance and structure are discussed at the Chancellor’s Cabinet. However, it is not evident how improvements are made as a result of these discussions. |
| **Topics of discussion during interviews:**   1. Delineation of responsibilities between the District and the colleges. 2. Resource allocation mechanisms. 3. The evaluation of district/college delineations, governance processes, and improvements. 4. How the colleges place items of interest on the agenda of the Chancellor’s Executive Staff meetings. |
| **Request for Additional Information/Evidence:**   1. Brief description of the functions carried out at the district office. 2. Minutes of Chancellor’s Cabinet meetings when District governance and structure were discussed. 3. Agendas of Executive Staff meetings where college-initiated items of interest were discussed. 4. Evidence of examples of any changes made in District governance. 5. Example of how the 80/20 allocation formula works in the event of a reduction in revenue. 6. Reports or analyses done leading to completed reorganizations, such as the centralization of the Public Information Officers and the Philanthropy office. 7. Analyses of proposed reorganizations such Admissions and Records and Financial Aid. |
| **Request for Observations/Interviews:**   * Members of the Chancellor’s Executive Staff * Members of the Chancellor’s Cabinet * Members of District Academic Senate and other district-level participatory governance committees/councils (e.g., Technology, Curriculum, Research) |