Chapter 3
Standards 4, 5, and 6: Leadership, Governance, Administration, and Integrity

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance
“The institution’s system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution” (Characteristics of Excellence 12).

Standard 5: Administration
“The institution’s administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution’s organization and governance” (Characteristics of Excellence 18).

Standard 6: Integrity
“In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support for academic and intellectual freedom” (Characteristics of Excellence 21).

Introductory Overview of Standard 4: Leadership and Governance
LaGuardia Community College is one of twenty-three institutions in the City University of New York. Established in 1971, LaGuardia is one of six (soon to be seven) CUNY community colleges. CUNY has a governing board of 17 trustees, whose selection is directed by New York Education Law (6204). The governor of New York appoints ten trustees, the mayor of New York City five. The chairs of the University Faculty Senate and the University Student Senate serve as ex officio trustees, the former in a non-voting capacity. CUNY’s principal educational and administrative officer is the University Chancellor, appointed by the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees operates according to the provisions of its bylaws and has purview over all educational units of the University and submits the university’s master plans to the New York State Board of Regents. The bylaws of the CUNY Board of Trustees identify the powers of the University Faculty Senate (Section 8.13) and those of the individual colleges (Section 8.14) (04.1.02 CUNY BOT By-laws).

The President of the college is the chief executive, acting as the executive agent of the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees with primary responsibility to the College (FE 4.11). (Sentences and phrases that have been bolded have been taken directly from Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education.) Article XI, Section 11.4 of the CUNY bylaws outlines the powers and duties of the President giving the President full authority over all matters of the college. Under the bylaws, the President can transfer limited executive agency powers to any number of Vice-Presidents, Deans, Executive Directors and Directors. The powers, duties and qualifications of these officers can be found in Article XI. The College's Personnel and Budget Committee (P&B), created under CUNY bylaws, oversees (1) all recommendations for appointments to the instructional staff, reappointments thereto, with or without tenure, and promotions therein, together with compensation; recommending action to the President; and (2) the College’s tentative annual budget (04.1.02 CUNY BOT By-laws). The President is not a member of the CUNY Board of Trustees (FE 4.5). See figure 3.1 below.
As expected by Middle States, the CUNY Board of Trustees policies include regulations on its responsibilities, its role in generating revenues, conflict of interest, orientation of new board members, and assessment of performance (FE 4.4, 4.6-4.10). All board policies are online (05.1.64), including its code of conduct (05.1.65).

Our research confirmed that governance at LaGuardia is well-defined, democratic, reflective of all constituencies, and assigns authority for policy development and decision making (FE 4.1-4.2). A broad range of College policies, especially those concerning curriculum and academic programs, is formulated under the College Senate, an inclusive body of representatives elected by faculty, administrative staff, students, civil service employees, and alumni. In 2009, the College Senate put into effect a new governance plan, replacing the 1978 version. The President consults with the College Senate for vice presidential vacancies and the Senate is involved in presidential searches. Under its bylaws it maintains standing and ad hoc committees (04.1.04 LaGCC Governance Plan 2009). LaGuardia’s Governance Plan Article I, Section II states that the College Senate follows the bylaws of the CUNY Board of Trustees and recognizes
the Faculty Council as an elected body concerned with faculty affairs and the Student Government Association (SGA) as an elected body concerned with student affairs.

Non-executive personnel are organized in several bargaining units, including those for faculty and administrative staff, clerical workers, and technical workers. Salary levels, advancement processes and working conditions are bargained directly with the University. These concerns are generally not part of the purview of college governing bodies.

LaGuardia’s SGA is composed of twelve elected student governors, representing students in policy-making (04.4.04 SGA Constitution, 2010, 04.4.05 SGA By-laws 2010). The SGA has two standing committees, the Student Affairs Committee and the Budget Committee. The Governor of Judicial Review monitors and evaluates the governors. The Governor of Information Services posts public information about the association.

The Standard 4 Working Group investigated how the governance system defined appropriate decision-making roles, whether the system was understood by the college community, whether there were changes in governance in the last five years, how governance was assessed, how students were represented, and how effective selection and development were for governance representatives.

**Findings for Standard 4**

We found that **LaGuardia has a well-defined system of collegial governance and operates under documented, clear lines of organization and authority** (FE 4.1-4.2). Under the 2009 governance plan the College Senate includes a senator elected from each of the College’s twelve academic departments; twelve elected student senators (with a provision for alternates and replacements), six divisional representatives, four at-large senators, and one representative each from the Faculty Council, the SGA, the President’s Office, Civil Service employees, adjunct faculty, and alumni (Article III Sec. I., 04.1.04 LaGCC Governance Plan 2009). The Senate’s agenda is set by its Executive Committee, which is elected annually and composed of the Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, Secretary, two members of the instructional staff/alumni/civil service, and two students. The College President and all Vice Presidents are *ex officio* non-voting members of the Senate. The Faculty Council has its own Constitution and bylaws and is now a formal part of the governance structure (see Appendix 3.1) (04.1.04 LaGCC Governance Plan 2009; 04.1.05 Faculty Council By-laws). The committees of the College Senate are shown on Figure 3.1 above.

In spring 2010, the College Senate added a committee to give voice to the HEOs (Higher Education Officers or administrators), civil service employees and alumni. The committee on Budget and Finance is also new with the 2007 revisions and formalizes responsibility for providing budget input. The new plan simplified the process to update the governance plan and added a provision to regulate its own functioning through bylaws (04.1.14 By-law of Committees-HEO, Al, CS; 04.1.15 Senate Budget and Finance Comm).

One recent issue, however, illustrates the difficulty the College sometimes has in balancing two core values: full participation in governance by all constituencies versus the imperative to maintain faculty control over the curriculum. The Liberal Arts chairs proposed revisions to the curriculum of the Liberal Arts Social Sciences and Humanities: AA Degree to make the co-op experience optional for day students as it has always been for evening students. This major
revision was brought to the College-wide Curriculum Committee, comprised of one member each from the 12 academic departments, the Registrar, and ACE (Article V, Section I, CII). The proposal passed the committee on its second try, over the objections of some faculty who favor continuing to make co-op experiences mandatory. The proposal was then sent to the College Senate. With Senate faculty split, staff and students caused the proposal to fail. However, students then petitioned for a reconsideration, and the proposal subsequently passed, assuring that students in this program would no longer have a mandatory co-op requirement.

The first vote, however, illustrated the ongoing issue over the degree of faculty control over the curriculum. Students and staff (especially when voting with some faculty) can defeat proposals from the faculty-driven Curriculum Committee.

Further, we determined that the College has processes for the appropriate involvement of constituencies and assures input from students (FE 4.2-4.3), as expected by Middle States. The College Senate has its own website which is regularly updated and provides essential Senate information, including a list of current business (04.1.04 LaGCC Governance Plan 2009). Information about meetings and elections are announced in advance through a series of emails submitted by the Senate Secretary to the college community. Furthermore, the Senate keeps minutes of every meeting archived on the Senate’s website. At the May 11, 2011 Senate meeting, a bylaw change was approved to make the Senate Vice Chair responsible for the website to ensure more timely posting of information.

The selection and elections for the SGA positions are presented in the summary of the Powers of the SGA as defined by the CUNY Bylaws (04.4.01 Article XVI CUNY By-laws). As part of the SGA training, the Vice President of Student Affairs assists the SGA in crafting its annual mission and vision (given for 2010-11 in Appendix 3.2). The College President meets with the SGA leader each semester to discuss issues of concern to students and the College community. The SGA President sits on the President’s Cabinet and the College Senate.

As a member of the College Senate, the SGA President ensures formal student participation in governance. Informally, student senators have a close relationship with student governors, and in 2011 several of the student governors and senators were members of the same honors society (PTK), providing opportunities for dialogue. Appendix 3.3 provides more background on the operation of recent SGA administrations.

The SGA has surveyed students on tuition increases, increased student activity fees for earmarked purposes, financial aid, enrollment services, student social space, and library services. Past outcomes of these surveys have included increasing the Library’s service hours, while feedback on fragmented services speeded the evolution of a one-stop model of student services. A recent student focus group (04.4.03 Stu Gov Focus Group Report 2-9-11), reported that the SGA has been very active in issues that directly affect the student life.

In 2009-10, the SGA revised its constitution and bylaws (04.4.04 SGA Constitution, 2010; 04.4.05 SGA By-laws 2010), adding a 13th student governor to oversee College sustainability efforts (“Green Governor”). This position was modified during 2010-11 to represent weekend students. In March 2011, the SGA approved another new constitution, adding a provision requiring any constitutional amendments or revisions be first approved by the Vice President of Student Affairs and the College President, preventing future disruptive rules changes.
To ascertain the apparent transparency of the governance system, the Middle States Steering Committee sent out an anonymous, electronic survey to faculty and staff, and another to students. Fifty-nine percent of faculty and staff viewed the College Senate to be “transparent” or “very transparent.” These results differed among faculty, staff, and full-time, and part-time employees. Transparent/very transparent scores by group were: full-time faculty 68%; part-time faculty 62%, full-time staff 48%, and part-time staff 39% (10.09.08 Faculty and Staff Survey Results).

The student survey was administered in 65 randomly selected classes. The SGA received a 38% transparency rating, while 59.8% indicated an understanding of the SGA. Only 24% of students, however, understood the role of the College Senate (01.3.03 Student Survey Results).

We also examined whether the College seeks to orient new members of governance committees (FE 4.9). Under the new governance plan, the Committee on Professional Development (Article V, section I, subsection E3, 04.1.04 LaGCC Governance Plan 2009) is responsible for overseeing the orientation of its members. This committee, however, has not developed written orientation materials, and the Senate Chair continues to conduct personal new member orientations (04.1.18 Senate Chair Interview).

Finally, we determined that the College periodically assesses its governance (FE 4.12). In early 2006 the President, acting partially on a recommendation from the 2002 Middle States evaluation, which noted that the current governance plan had been in place since 1978, created an ad hoc committee to evaluate the current governance plan and draft a revised plan. The Senate Chair and the Chair of Faculty Council headed this Ad Hoc Committee on College Governance. After broad discussion across all constituencies, the new plan was submitted and ratified in the spring of 2009 (04.1.04 LaGCC Governance Plan 2009). Action on the plan was also propelled by the 2005 Perez v. CUNY decision (a suit brought by two CUNY students against the Hostos Community College Senate and its Executive Committee). CUNY college governance bodies were in violation of the New York State Open Meetings Law and the New York State Freedom of Information Law (see Appendix 3.4 for more discussion of the additions of the new governance plan and of Perez v. CUNY), (04.1.19 Interview with Former Senate Chair, 04.1.20 Interview with Senate Leaders).

The new plan greatly improved the 31-year old former system of governance, providing easier methods of achieving quorum, creation of a consent calendar, smoother procedures for passing amendments, a voting Chairperson, and strengthening the faculty voice through the newly-created Committee on Faculty, representation from the Faculty Council, and by allowing adjunct faculty representatives to vote. Nevertheless, under the Open Meetings Law, all members were newly exposed to public criticism, a particularly difficult situation for untenured faculty members.

We also found, however, that the College governance system as a whole has no formal, periodic assessment process. Article VII, on Bylaws and Amendments, Section II, provides a mechanism through which Senate activities may be revised. As one example, in the fall of 2008, a consent calendar was created to vote on curricula as a block. In another instance, in the spring of 2006, a Degree Certification process was created as part of the Senate’s Committee of Faculty to ensure that faculty oversee the conferral of the LaGuardia degree. None of these revisions, however, have been part of a formal assessment.
**Introductory Overview of Standard 5: Administration**

Administrative oversight of the College is the responsibility of the President under the authority of the CUNY Chancellor and Board of Trustees. The President administers the College through the Executive Council, which is comprised of the President and the College’s six Vice Presidents plus the Executive Director of Organizational Development and Planning, the Executive Director of Government Relations, and the Senior Administrator to the President (the organization chart can be found in 05.2.01). All areas of the College fall under the administrative responsibility of the Vice Presidents. In 2012, a new position of Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will be created and filled. The new Provost will report directly to the President and will be charged with strengthening alignment between the Divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. The Vice President for Student Affairs and the Dean for Academic Affairs will report to the Provost and all three will serve on the President’s Executive Council (see proposed organization chart 05.2.16).

Our review of reporting relationships indicates that **lines of organization and authority in the senior administrative unit of the College are clear** (FE 5.6). Final decision-making responsibility rests with the President; the Executive Council recommends actions to the President after careful review and assessment. These processes ensure that the College has a chief executive whose primary responsibility is to lead the College toward the achievement of its goals and is responsible for the administration of the College.

The College’s Executive Council meets regularly in formal meetings and on a monthly basis in more informal “Stand-up” meetings to discuss college issues and take necessary action. Each Vice President also meets regularly with the President. Each fall the Executive Council reviews strategic target funding requests, prioritizing items for funding and monitoring projects that cross divisions. The Executive Council also reviews letters of intent-to-submit-grant-proposals from the divisions. Additionally, the Executive Council reviews and approves or denies all requests for new or replacement employee positions and personnel searches. At this time, there is no Executive Council Charter or Operating Guideline.

The Standard 5 Working Group ascertained whether the College’s senior leadership possessed the necessary skills, education, training and expertise to lead a large institution of higher education effectively and whether college leadership assessed the adequacy of college structures and services to help the College maintain a quality learning environment to foster student success and inform decision-making. The Working Group also examined the quality of the communications structures set up by the Executive Council.

**Findings for Standard 5**

Our research determined that **the College has a qualified and effective President** (FE 5.2), subject to periodic evaluation. The President has deep experience in higher education administration, teaching, developing innovative pedagogy, fundraising, and community service and has a national reputation as an advocate and innovator for community colleges (05.2.03 Pres). The CUNY policy on presidential evaluation is available online (05.1.62 CUNY Policy on Pres Evaluation). The evaluation is monitored by external experienced college leaders and occurs every five years. CUNY asks internal and external constituents to give anonymous evaluations of the President’s performance (05.2.03a Description of Pres Evaluation).
We also found that the College has leaders with appropriate skills, degrees and training (FE 5.3). All Executive level searches follow the CUNY Search Process for Executive Personnel (06.1.021 CUNY Personnel Rules-Exempt Class). Executive positions are advertised nationally to bring in a wide range of candidates, representative of the College’s student diversity. Search committees composed of faculty and staff at many levels review credentials and formulate questions in compliance with affirmative action policy (06.1.01 Affirm Action Policy). These committees evaluate all résumés from applicants and select those with the necessary qualifications and experience for the position. Final round candidates are asked to appear at a college-wide interview in which faculty, staff and students may pose questions. Accuracy and integrity of submitted credentials are verified at the point of offer. Upon selection of the final candidate, the President of the College sends a letter of recommendation to the Vice Chancellor of the University. Once the candidate is approved by the vice chancellor, the President presents the candidate to the Board of Trustees Committee of Faculty, Staff and Administration (FSA). This committee then forwards their approval to the full Board of Trustees for final ratification.

We reviewed the curriculum vitae of each Executive Council member, looking not only for education and experience, but also the diversity of skills across the Council (05.2.04-05.2.12, 05.2.17 CVs: VP-ACE, VP-AA, VP-IA, VP-IT, ExecDir-Org, VP-Admin, VP-SA, ExecDir-GovRel, Dean-AA, SenAdmin). As anticipated, the review indicates appropriate levels of education, training, skills, and progressively responsible experience to carry out the duties of each Executive Council member’s respective position. The diversity and complexity of skills and experience that constitute the senior leadership of the College is impressive. Almost all have faculty teaching experience (both domestic and international) in their respective fields. A list of the skills and expertise of Executive Council Members is given in Appendix 3.5.

In addition, we determined that the College’s staff members are qualified for their positions (FE 5.4), as expected by Middle States. CUNY hiring procedures are strictly followed, and each position has minimum education and experience requirements (05.2.14 Civil Service Job Descriptions, 05.2.15 HEO Guidelines).

Further, we confirmed that the College engages in periodic assessment of the effectiveness of administrative structures and services (FE 5.7). At every meeting the Executive Council reviews key effectiveness indicators, strategic issues, and divisional requests for decision or action (05.1.27 – 05.1.30 Executive Council Agendas: 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010). Additionally, every meeting includes an update on divisional activities, ensuring a comprehensive view of functional areas across the College and how various activities may, or may need to, intersect or overlap. Sample minutes from Executive Council meetings (05.1.32 – 05.1.35: EC Minutes: 4-25-07, 1-16-08, 10-28-09, and 7-21-10) indicate actions taken or to be taken by various Executive Council members in response to issues discussed at meetings. Appendix 3.6 discusses how the Executive Council uses specific PMP measures and key performance indicators to assess the effectiveness of the College’s administration.

A survey on Leadership Feedback (05.3.06 Leadership Feedback VPHS SGA 03, 05.03.07 Leadership Feedback SGA, Pres) of Executive Council members was developed and sent to key individuals within the College to evaluate the leadership of senior College leaders. The survey focused on six areas: communication, decision making, problem solving, operations/action, and human/public relations. We note, however, that the survey has not been administered since 2003.
The Executive Council has integrated college-wide assessments into its decision-making process, especially the allocation of discretionary resources. Using the strategic planning process, the Executive Council effectively manages and monitors initiatives that cross divisional boundaries. While the Executive Council has periodically sought feedback on the effectiveness of its individual members, it has not yet analyzed its own effectiveness as a decision-making team.

Finally, we determined that decision making is based on adequate information, consultation and effective information systems (FE 5.5). The administration strives to maintain communication and dialogue with internal stakeholders, including students, staff and faculty, in order to develop strategic direction as well as evaluate the impact of past actions. The Executive Council meets on a bi-monthly basis to discuss college issues, review feedback from internal and external constituents, and to take necessary action. Included in the input from internal college constituents are leadership surveys for executive personnel (05.3.06 Leadership Feedback VPHS SGA 03, 05.03.07 Leadership Feedback SGA, Pres), recommendations from the President’s Cabinet (05.1.20, .21, .22, .24: Cabinet Notes: 5-19-06, 3-28-08, 3-27-09, 5-29-09), and a variety of satisfaction surveys related to administrative services at the college (07.5.05 Student Experience Survey, 07.5.06 ASAP Service Feedback DegreeWorks 2009) (addressed more fully in Chapter 2). In addition, since 2005 the Executive Council has hosted two Vision Summits (see Appendix 3.7 for links to all Summit documents and further description of the events).

Information not only flows from internal constituents to the Executive Council, but also flows the other way, using for example, Opening Sessions for faculty and staff each semester, annual Professional Staff Meetings for faculty and staff, student orientation, email blasts, the Live Wire newsletter, website announcements, and press releases (05.4.43 Leadership Agenda 8-29-09). There are also two primary advisory groups that the Executive Council looks to for ideas and reactions to strategic directions, visions and policies. The first is the President’s Cabinet (05.4.01 – 05.4.05 & .44 Cabinet Member List: 05-06, 06-07, 07-08, 08-09, 09-10, and 10-11), which consists of approximately 65 college leaders appointed by the president. The second is the president’s informal advisory group of senior faculty.

The President’s cabinet meets quarterly to solicit feedback from a wide range of stakeholders regarding current issues and future strategic direction (05.1.08 – 05.1.24, see Appendix 3.8 for links). As issues are raised at the Cabinet, task groups may be formed to discuss points, develop possible solutions and make recommendations to the Executive Council for discussion and possible action. The strategic plan target related to faculty professional development mentioned above was an outgrowth of recommendations from the March 2009 President’s Cabinet following the 2009 Vision Summit.

In 2007 the President established an advisory group of governance leaders (Chair of the College Senate, Chair of the Faculty Council, Chapter President of the Professional Staff Congress (the union), and elected representative to the CUNY University Faculty Senate) to meet with her informally on a quarterly basis (05.1.36 Governance Group Info). This group discusses key college, CUNY, city, state and national issues as well as budget-related matters.

The Executive Council also monitors through the division of Information Technology the “hit rate” of internal and external communication. Additionally, the Marketing and Communications department tracks the number of hits to the LaGuardia website as well as which areas of the website are being accessed (07.3.19 Web Site Redesign Presentation). These statistics are used to
make decisions related to additions and improvements to existing electronic communication vehicles.

**Introductory Overview of Standard 6: Integrity**

To assure equity in hiring and promotion, the Legal Affairs, Labor, Compliance & Diversity Office follows federal, state, city and CUNY regulations and determines the form of all hiring and promotion procedures at the College. That office also collects data to determine the equity of the operations and in response to strategic plan targets to improve equity. The Office of Students Rights, Responsibilities and Advocacy is responsible for student disciplinary actions and for assuring that students receive due process. The Labor and Legal Affairs Designee handles all grievances filed under any of the labor contracts and assures that the process is equitable and that its effectiveness is assessed.

The Standard 6 Working Group examined issues involving equity in employment, training, promotion, student recruitment and admission, student and employee grievance and appeals processes, student discipline, academic integrity, and public information.

**Findings for Standard 6**

Our research confirmed that the **College has fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation and dismissal of employees** (FE 6.2), as expected by Middle States. The College follows detailed CUNY hiring, evaluation and dismissal policies and procedures coordinated by the Legal Affairs, Labor, Compliance & Diversity Office within federal regulations to ensure that all individuals are given fair and equal opportunity to obtain employment, continued employment, and promotion. The hiring process is documented in the Affirmative Action Search Process and Procedures manual ([06.1.11 Affirmative Action Search Process & Procedures](#), [03.03.30 Sample Recruitment Plan](#), [03.03.18 AA Certification Form](#)).

Reappointment and dismissal processes are managed by Human Resources. Except at the executive level, all procedures are determined by collective bargaining agreements as codified by CUNY. The manner of evaluation, the weight of evidence, evaluation responsibilities, and rights of appeal are all precisely determined. Evidence on performance may be collected from students, peers and supervisors. Judgments are then made by supervisors, department and division supervisors, departmental and/or divisional Personnel and Budget (P&B) committees, the college-wide P&B and the President. Appeals are coordinated by the College’s Labor and Legal Affairs Designee. The faculty and higher education officer (HEO) appeal process, described in the PSC/CUNY Collective Bargaining Agreement ([10.01.01 2002-2007 PSC Contract.pdf](#)), Sections 9.9 through 9.12, is explained in both the Faculty and Staff Handbook and the Curriculum Committee Policies and Procedures. A summary of the process is in Appendix 3.9.

Further, we found that the **College treats all people equitably and appropriately by policy and practice** (FE 6.4), and the **College periodically assesses the integrity evidenced in these policies** (FE 6.18). In 2011 the Labor and Legal Affairs Designee analyzed five years of faculty and HEO personnel actions and appeals. Out of 456 personnel actions, 369 resulted in reappointments, 53 reappointments with tenure/CCE (Certificate of Continuing Employment), 23 non-reappointments, and 11 non-reappointments for tenure/CCE. In five years there were only 31 appeals ([06.3.06 Quant. Analysis of Grievance and Appeals Process](#)). Four were denied, eight are still pending, twelve were settled or granted, and seven were withdrawn. Of the 12 settled or
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granted, the most common reasons for settlement were a lack of guidance to the employee by the supervisor and a lack of documented concerns against the employee. The Labor and Legal Affairs Designee is working with HR to improve supervisor training on giving appropriate guidance for reappointment and collecting appropriate evidence for personnel actions.

We also determined that the College seeks to promote a climate that fosters respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration for a range of backgrounds, ideas, and perspectives (FE 6.7). The climate of respect for a range of backgrounds begins with the CUNY Non-Discrimination Policy (06.1.13). To press this policy further, the CUNY Council of Presidents issued a policy (updated in 2006) on “Revitalization of the University’s Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity and Compliance and Diversity Programs” (06.1.14).

Respect for a range of ideas and perspectives is further protected for senior employees by CUNY’s commitment to tenure and its equivalent for non-professorial staff, the Certificate of Continuing Employment. CUNY also offers mandatory training in the deterrence of sexual harassment and workplace violence.

The Legal Affairs, Labor, Compliance & Diversity Office (LAO) closely monitors and periodically assesses the extent to which our practices are in compliance with CUNY, city, state, and federal guidelines. This work is coordinated with Human Resources, for example by reviewing exit surveys to examine the reasons why faculty and staff leave their positions. The LAO is responsible for completing the federal workforce composition analysis (EEO-6) and the annual Affirmative Action Plan. As part of its responsibility to promote diversity, the LAO reports on college-wide diversity events (06.1.12 CUNY Pluralism Report 09-10). The LAO is also responsible for assisting HR in evaluating requests for reasonable accommodation. The result of an audit by the Equal Employment Practices Commission of the disposition of these requests is not yet available, but the College does not anticipate any difficulties.

In addition, we found that the College assures that student violations of institutional policies and grievances are addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably (FE 6.1). From 2007 to 2011 the number of discipline cases each year increased somewhat at the College (06.4.03 Disorderly Conduct All Cases 9-01 to 5-11). Factors contributing to this increase include enrollment growth, greater community awareness of the discipline process, and improved cooperation between the Office of Public Safety and the Office of Students Rights, Responsibilities and Advocacy. Students are informed of the process through New Student Orientations and online via the Student Handbook. In addition, articles pertaining to the discipline process are periodically written for the Student News, a monthly Division of Student Affairs newsletter. The majority of cases are resolved through mediation, conciliation, and engagement in behavioral modification agreements. Cases requiring a greater degree of formality and objectivity are resolved through a hearing process conducted by the Faculty Student Discipline Committee (FSDC).

Recently, a growing number of students have been reported for displaying adverse behavior, increasing from 52 cases in 2007-08 to 166 in 2009-10. An assessment of cases by the Office of Students Rights, Responsibilities and Advocacy indicates that student violations of the Colleges’ Conduct Code peak during major exam periods with a greater likelihood of stress-related behavior in a student’s initial semesters (06.4.04 Student Discipline Analysis). For these students
the disciplinary process has worked informally, after determining that the students are under emotional stress. These students have been encouraged to engage in a counseling assessment to determine various strategies to address their situations. The College’s disciplinary procedures emphasize education on standards of civility and on the negative ramifications of adverse behavior on academic progress and on a student’s personal and professional goals. The majority of students who have been charged and processed avoid future infractions.

The Office of Students Rights, Responsibilities and Advocacy maintains a database of cases to spot infraction trends and develop proactive measures (06.02 CUNY By-laws Art. 15.0, Student Disciplinary Procedures; 06.4.03 Art. 15.3 Disciplinary Procedures).

In 2007, the broadly-representative Academic Standing Committee developed a policy covering academic integrity, sanctions for violations, and procedures for filing complaints (Article V, Section 1, D, 04.1.04 LaGCC Governance Plan 2009). This policy revision ensures due process and streamlines faculty reporting of violations. In 2009 the College’s Policy on Academic Integrity and Procedures was formalized and handed out to department chairs and faculty (06.5.01 LaGCC Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures). The policy and procedures were also communicated in colloquia for new faculty and published in the college catalog, on the college website, in the student handbook, and in an Academic Integrity brochure. Further information is given in Appendix 3.10.

In addition, we found that required and elective courses are sufficiently available to graduate fall semester student cohorts within two years (FE 6.9). In general, if student complaints arise in this regard, they are investigated by the Ombudsperson.

Our research also demonstrated that the College pursues honesty and truthfulness in public relations, recruiting and admissions (FE 6.8), including information on assessment and on program graduation, retention, certification pass rates, and other outcomes as appropriate to the programs offered (FE 6.15). Moreover, factual information about the College and the catalog are readily available (FE 6.10, 6.14, 6.16). Information about the College is available from the website. Some examples of these documents include a multiyear study of graduation rates (06.2.03 Six Year Graduation Rate Study) and enrollment statistics (Spring 2011 Enrollment Statistics). The annual Institutional Profile is also online. The public may also download LaGuardia’s 2009 Public Safety Report (05.1.63). College catalogs are available in paper and online, and portions of the college website are available in Spanish and Chinese.

Although most communications that we reviewed were completely accurate, we found that information on the highly competitive nature of admission into the clinical phase of most health sciences majors was not as clearly promulgated as the seriousness of the consequences would demand. On some of the online application materials, students applying initially were only informed in a footnote that acceptance to the College did not mean entry into the clinical phase of the health program. In a number of these programs, the majority of these initial entrants would not qualify for the clinical program and would be asked to choose another major, some after several semesters of study. The University has taken steps to clarify the two-part process for Nursing students by introducing a mandatory initial “Pre-clinical” major. The other health areas are evaluating this option (also see Appendix 4.4).
Finally, we found that the College does not yet uniformly display employment success or licensing pass rate statistics for its career programs online. The College does not have a uniform standard of program information, including graduation, retention and certification rates, to be made available online to the public.

The College adheres to the CUNY Conflict of Interest Policy (FE 6.3) (05.1.66 Conflict Of Interest Policy) and the CUNY Intellectual Property Policy (FE 6.6) (06.1.15 CUNY Intellectual Property Policy). The College’s policies regarding academic freedom (FE 6.5) are examined under Standard 10 in Chapter 5.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions for Standard 4
1. The governance structure of the LaGuardia College Senate provides an essential venue to formulate academic and operating policy. However, there continues to be debate about how to provide all constituencies with an adequate voice while also ensuring appropriate faculty authority over curriculum.
2. In addition to addressing the requirements of the New York State Open Meetings Law, the new governance plan approved in 2009 has enhanced college governance by, among other improvements, making it easier to achieve quorum, creating a consent calendar, and instituting smoother procedures for passing amendments. However, concerns remain that should be addressed under periodic, planned assessments of college governance. These concerns include the role of non-faculty representatives in curriculum approval and the orientation of new Senate members and student governors.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions for Standard 5
1. The President and Executive Council members are highly qualified to carry out their respective responsibilities and lead the College.
2. The Executive Council uses several assessment methods to ensure that all functional areas of the College engage in activities that enable the College to achieve its strategic targets and improve its PMP results. These assessments ensure the integrity and efficiency of overall College structures and services and are used to inform its decision-making. However, at present the Executive Council does not regularly assess its effectiveness as a team.
3. The Executive Council does not currently possess a formal charter.
4. The Executive Council monitors the effects of their communications through a variety of tracking methods and uses this data to improve communication methods.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions for Standard 6
1. CUNY is dedicated to ensuring that its colleges are administered equitably and has promulgated a large number of policies to assure compliance. At the College, employment and promotion opportunities are made available in compliance with these policies. The effectiveness of these policies within the College is assessed by the Legal Affairs, Labor, Compliance & Diversity Office as required by federal law.
2. Resolution of employee grievances and appeals is carried out in compliance with collective bargaining agreements. Minor student disciplinary infractions are handled informally, while the major cases are handled by the Faculty Student Discipline Committee. The Division of Student Affairs insists upon due process for students, and the Student Judiciary Officer allows most violators a fair chance to correct their behavior and redeem their academic career.
3. The means and procedures for disseminating admissions information is communicated well to the general public on the College’s and CUNY’s websites, in the College’s catalog, and in the Student Handbook. However, at present the College does not have a uniform standard of program information to be made available online to the public.

4. Students do not always receive clear information about the highly competitive nature of admission into the clinical phase of most health sciences majors.

5. Protection of general intellectual property rights through enforcement of rules against academic fraud is balanced with due process and an “educational not punitive” system of handling cases of student cheating, the effectiveness of which is attested to by the absence of repeat offenders.

Recommendations for Standards 4, 5, and 6

1. The College should define a periodic review process for college governance that includes a timetable and desired outcomes of governance.

2. The College should develop a formal orientation program for new College Senators.

3. The College Senate should post minutes of its meetings online expeditiously.

4. The College should establish a formal charter and guidelines for the Executive Council.

5. The Executive Council should develop a process to assess its effectiveness as a team.

6. The College should assess the effectiveness of communications on the competitiveness of entry to clinical programs and strive to improve applicant understanding.

7. The College should set standards for the information to be made available online on academic programs to include graduation, retention, transfer, employment and graduate licensing rates.