

## Goals of the Policy Review Committee 2005

### A. 2005 Goals:

1. Conduct a full inventory of all board policies and administrative procedures.
2. Post all board policies and administrative procedures on the District's website with links from General Counsel's and Board's web pages.
3. Recommend to the Board of Trustees written procedures on how policies are developed, with clear delineations between Board's role (develop board policies) and Administration (develop administrative procedures).
4. Substantively review and revise all board policies in Chapter One of board manual. Proposals for all Chapter-One policies shall be presented to the Board of Trustees by July 12, 2005.
5. Substantively review and revise all board policies in Chapter Two (Organization for Administration) of board manual. Proposals for all Chapter-Two policies shall be presented to the Board of Trustees by December 31, 2005.

### B. Long-term Goals:

1. Substantively review and revise all board policies in board manual.

## Basic Principles of Management for the Peralta Community College District

1. By widely accepted principles of management, authority can be delegated but accountability cannot. Delegations to the Chief Executive Officer provide the Chancellor with the commensurate authority and resources to implement all policies that fall under his cognizance. He is accountable to the Board for the success or failure to effectively achieve the standards established by the Board and to effectively pursue the promulgated goals and objectives. The Board is held accountable to the electorate of the six cities in our District; the State Board of Trustees; the State Chancellor; the Governor; and the Judiciary of the United States and the State of California. Accountability for performance, at all levels, is limited to the degree to which authority has been provided and the degree to which funding resources have been made available. The Board of Directors does not delegate authority for the final approval of the Budget and therefore are instrumental in the definition of performance levels through the allocation of resources.
2. The same delegation of authority and relationship to accountability cascades down the organizational chain of command (e.g., Chancellor to College Presidents; College Presidents to the Vice Presidents; etc.)
3. Our Board has been formally criticized for interfering in the role of policy implementation and day-to-day operations. When one level in an organization intervenes at a lower level, a disruption occurs between the authority and accountability (i.e., you can longer, legally or ethically, hold the manager at the lower level accountable for achieving standards and goals established for that level). A repetitive and broad scale incidence of interference leads to management by chaos; a reactive process where crisis management is the dominant theme; and where the process to implement policy, maintain standards, and pursue goals and objectives are overshadowed and camouflaged.
4. By the same token, we all recognize that the Board is accountable for the operation and performance of all aspects of the District; that performance standards need be established or mandated ones recognized; that goals and objectives must be established or mandated ones recognized; and that the operation must be effectively monitored to ensure compliance on an ongoing basis. The Board must require that management control systems are put in place and management information systems structured to ensure that the Board is fully informed with respect to policy implementation and on-going performance.
5. We currently have six Standing Committees of the Board, with up to three Trustees assigned to each. The three Trustees will be a resource for the Board

in terms of the specific focus areas involved. The committees should be a set of more intensive eyes and ears in terms of identifying issues, problems and opportunities with respect to policy formulation and implementation. They should be an important element in carrying out our role as Trustees. *However, the Committees of the Board and individual Trustees are not empowered to issue orders; define policy; define policy implementers; nor commit anything to any internal or external party on behalf of the Board of Directors, the District or any sub-element of the District.*

6. All of the above applies to the General Counsel and an Inspector General.
7. The methodology for holding various levels of the organization accountable must be a formalized and codified process and in conformance to provisions of the applicable laws. The expectations for performance must be defined through a negotiation process between the parties and mutually agreed upon for specified periods of time. For example, the committee assigned to evaluate the performance of the Chancellor must negotiate and reach a mutually agreed upon set of standards of performance and goals and objectives to recommend for approval to the full Board of Trustees. The evaluation must be based upon, and limited to, this agreement. A similar process must be followed for the General Counsel and the Inspector General. The evaluations must be held at least annually. The performance agreements must be considered "living documents" and subject to formal modifications when called for by changing circumstances (i.e., funding resources, staffing, etc.).
8. The performance agreements and all evaluations must be considered *Confidential* and all details limited to Closed Session discussions and disseminations.
9. The performance agreements, and subsequent evaluations, throughout the entire Peralta Community College District, must be visible to the higher levels in the chain of authority. For example, one hundred percent of the agreements and evaluations throughout the District would be available for monitoring by the Board of Trustees. The CEO would have visibility and monitoring authority for all performance agreements and subsequent evaluations for the entire organization under his cognizance.