

2014-15 LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: Analysis by College

INTRODUCTION

The LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment was conducted as part of a formal assessment of the effectiveness of district-level participatory governance and decision making. Results will be used to improve the structure and processes of current district-level governance committees and councils and to inform the revision of the District Strategic Plan.

The survey was conducted for 3 weeks from June 12 to July 6, 2015. 138 out of 383 people completed the survey, for a response rate of 36%. The distribution list included the following groups: Chancellor's Cabinet, District Council of Academic Affairs, District Council of Student Services, District Administrative Council, District Academic Senate, Executive Board of the American Federation of Teachers Union, Local 1521, Executive Board of the AFT 1521A Staff Guild, Nine College Academic Senates, Nine College Shared Governance Committees, and Student Affairs Committees.

SUMMARY

Areas of strength (at least 50% of respondents):

- Administration is represented in district-level decision making.
- District Academic Senate is represented in district-level decision making.
- LA College Faculty Guild is represented in district-level decision making.
- AFT College Staff Guild is represented in district-level decision making.
- District-level decision making is effective in relation to enrollment management and FTES target setting.
- District-level decision making is effective in relation to employee benefits.
- Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are based on research and data.
- District / college administration support participatory governance at the district level.

Areas for improvement (at least 50% of respondents):

- District-level decision making is not effective in relation to budget development and resource allocation.
- District-level decision making is not effective in relation to Bond Program planning and oversight.
- Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are not communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders.
- Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are not followed through on effectively.

RESULTS

All results are reported in percentages.

DEMOGRAPHIC

Which college are you from

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Respondents	7.2	10.9	13.8	10.1	10.9	5.8	6.5	20.3	8.7	5.8	100.0

What is your role at the college

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Administrator	20.0	26.7	21.1	21.4				14.3	25.0	62.5	18.1
Classified Manager		6.7		7.1	6.7		11.1			25.0	4.3
Classified Staff	10.0		21.1	21.4	6.7	37.5	11.1	35.7	25.0	12.5	19.6
Department Chair	20.0	13.3	5.3	21.4	40.0		22.2	3.6	8.3		13.0
Faculty	40.0	53.3	47.4	28.6	46.7	50.0	55.6	46.4	41.7		42.8
Student	10.0		5.3			12.5					2.2

2014-15 LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: Analysis by College

REPRESENTATION

3A. Administration is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree	70.0	40.0	38.9	42.9	53.3	62.5	44.4	44.4	16.7	28.6	43.7
Agree	20.0	46.7	44.4	21.4	26.7	25.0	33.3	33.3	58.3	42.9	35.6
Disagree			11.1	14.3			22.2	7.4	8.3	28.6	8.1
Strongly Disagree		13.3			6.7				8.3		3.0
No Opinion/Do Not Know	10.0		5.6	21.4	13.3	12.5		14.8	8.3		9.6

- 79.3 said administration is represented in district-level decision making.
- 11.2 said administration is not represented in district-level decision making.

3B. District Academic Senate is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree	40.0	33.3	38.9	42.9	33.3	25.0	22.2	18.5	16.7	57.1	31.1
Agree	40.0	53.3	38.9	35.7	46.7	62.5	44.4	40.7	75.0	28.6	45.9
Disagree	10.0		16.7		6.7		22.2	22.2			9.6
Strongly Disagree		13.3		7.1			11.1				3.0
No Opinion/Do Not Know	10.0		5.6	14.3	13.3	12.5		18.5	8.3	14.3	10.4

- 77.0 said District Academic Senate is represented in district-level decision making.
- 12.6 said District Academic Senate is not represented in district-level decision making.

3C. Associated Students is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree	10.0	6.7	22.2	14.3	6.7						6.7
Agree	30.0	46.7	33.3	42.9	33.3	37.5	22.2	33.3	50.0	71.4	38.5
Disagree	50.0	20.0	11.1	14.3	13.3	37.5	44.4	40.7	16.7	14.3	25.9
Strongly Disagree		13.3	11.1		13.3	12.5	11.1	7.4	8.3		8.1
No Opinion/Do Not Know	10.0	13.3	22.2	28.6	33.3	12.5	22.2	18.5	25.0	14.3	20.7

- 45.2 said Associated Students is represented in district-level decision making.
- 34.0 said Associated Students is not represented in district-level decision making.

3D. Managers, classified staff, and other employees are appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree	10.0	14.3	11.1	21.4	6.7			3.7		14.3	8.2
Agree	30.0	42.9	50.0	28.6	20.0	25.0	11.1	25.9	58.3	71.4	35.1
Disagree	50.0	21.4	16.7	21.4	26.7	50.0	33.3	44.4	8.3	14.3	29.1
Strongly Disagree		14.3	5.6		13.3		22.2	3.7	16.7		7.5
No Opinion/Do Not Know	10.0	7.1	16.7	28.6	33.3	25.0	33.3	22.2	16.7		20.1

- 43.3 said managers, classified staff, and other employees are represented in district-level decision making.
- 36.6 said managers, classified staff, and other employees are not represented in district-level decision making.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING UNITS

4A. LA College Faculty Guild, 1521 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree	40.0	33.3	44.4	28.6	33.3	25.0	22.2	17.9	16.7	57.1	30.1
Agree	50.0	46.7	33.3	50.0	53.3	50.0	66.7	64.3	66.7	28.6	52.2
Disagree			16.7				11.1	3.6			3.7
Strongly Disagree		13.3			6.7				8.3		2.9
No Opinion/Do Not Know	10.0	6.7	5.6	21.4	6.7	25.0		14.3	8.3	14.3	11.0

- 82.3 said LA College Faculty Guild is represented in district-level decision making.
- 6.6 said LA College Faculty Guild is not represented in district-level decision making.

2014-15 LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: Analysis by College

4B. AFT College Staff Guild, 1521A is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree	30.0	33.3	36.8	28.6	33.3	12.5	11.1	7.1	16.7	57.1	24.8
Agree	30.0	53.3	31.6	35.7	33.3	25.0	33.3	57.1	58.3	28.6	41.6
Disagree	10.0	6.7	21.1	7.1	6.7	12.5		10.7	8.3	14.3	10.2
Strongly Disagree	10.0	6.7			6.7	12.5	11.1	3.6			4.4
No Opinion/Do Not Know	20.0		10.5	28.6	20.0	37.5	44.4	21.4	16.7		19.0

- 66.4 said AFT College Staff Guild is represented in district-level decision making.
- 14.6 said AFT College Staff Guild is not represented in district-level decision making.

4C. Buildings and Construction Trades Council is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree	11.1	13.3	11.8	7.1	13.3					28.6	7.5
Agree	33.3	26.7	23.5	7.1	6.7	12.5	22.2	32.1	33.3	28.6	23.1
Disagree	11.1	26.7	35.3	7.1	13.3	12.5	22.2	25.0	16.7	14.3	20.1
Strongly Disagree					6.7	12.5		3.6			2.2
No Opinion/Do Not Know	44.4	33.3	29.4	78.6	60.0	62.5	55.6	39.3	50.0	28.6	47.0

- 30.6 said Buildings and Construction Trades Council is represented in district-level decision making.
- 22.3 said Buildings and Construction Trades Council is not represented in district-level decision making.

4D. LA City and County Schools Employees Union, 99 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree	10.0	13.3	22.2	7.1	6.7				8.3	42.9	9.6
Agree	40.0	20.0	11.1		6.7		33.3	25.9	16.7	28.6	17.8
Disagree	20.0	26.7	38.9		6.7	37.5		25.9	25.0	14.3	20.7
Strongly Disagree				7.1	6.7	12.5	11.1	3.7			3.7
No Opinion/Do Not Know	30.0	40.0	27.8	85.7	73.3	50.0	55.6	44.4	50.0	14.3	48.1

- 27.4 said LA City and County Schools Employees Union is represented in district-level decision making.
- 24.4 said LA City and County Schools Employees Union is not represented in district-level decision making.

4E. Supervisory Employees, 721 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree		13.3	11.1	7.1	13.3	12.5			16.7	28.6	9.0
Agree	50.0	33.3	16.7	7.1	6.7	12.5	50.0	40.7	16.7	42.9	26.9
Disagree	20.0	20.0	27.8		13.3			22.2	16.7	14.3	15.7
Strongly Disagree		6.7				12.5					1.5
No Opinion/Do Not Know	30.0	26.7	44.4	85.7	66.7	62.5	50.0	37.0	50.0	14.3	47.0

- 35.9 said Supervisory Employees is represented in district-level decision making.
- 17.2 said Supervisory Employees is not represented in district-level decision making.

4F. CA Teamsters Public, Professional, and Medical Employees Union, 911 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree	10.0	13.3	27.8	14.3	13.3	12.5	11.1	10.7		37.5	14.6
Agree	50.0	33.3	33.3	21.4	13.3	25.0	22.2	32.1	41.7	37.5	30.7
Disagree	10.0	26.7	11.1		6.7		11.1	14.3	8.3		10.2
Strongly Disagree		6.7	5.6					3.6	8.3	12.5	3.6
No Opinion/Do Not Know	30.0	20.0	22.2	64.3	66.7	62.5	55.6	39.3	41.7	12.5	40.9

- 45.3 said CA Teamsters Public, Professional, and Medical Employees Union is represented in district-level decision making.
- 13.8 said CA Teamsters Public, Professional, and Medical Employees Union is not represented in district-level decision making.

2014-15 LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: Analysis by College

EFFECTIVENESS

5A. District-level decision making is effective in relation to budget development and resource allocation

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree		6.7	5.3	21.4	7.1				16.7	25.0	7.3
Agree	30.0	26.7	31.6	28.6	21.4	12.5	66.7	32.1	33.3	50.0	32.1
Disagree	60.0	20.0	31.6	21.4	57.1	37.5	22.2	35.7	33.3	25.0	34.3
Strongly Disagree	10.0	33.3	26.3		7.1	50.0		21.4	8.3		16.8
No Opinion/Do Not Know		13.3	5.3	28.6	7.1		11.1	10.7	8.3		9.5

- 39.4 said district-level decision making is effective in relation to budget development and resource allocation.
- 51.1 said district-level decision making is not effective in relation to budget development and resource allocation.

5B. District-level decision making is effective in relation to enrollment management and FTES target setting

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree	10.0	6.7		14.3	14.3				25.0	25.0	8.1
Agree	20.0	26.7	55.6	50.0	50.0	37.5	77.8	46.4	33.3	50.0	44.9
Disagree	60.0	20.0	27.8	7.1	28.6	12.5		25.0	16.7	25.0	22.8
Strongly Disagree	10.0	33.3	11.1		7.1	37.5	11.1	14.3	8.3		13.2
No Opinion/Do Not Know		13.3	5.6	28.6		12.5	11.1	14.3	16.7		11.0

- 53.0 said district-level decision making is effective in relation to enrollment management and FTES target setting.
- 36.0 said district-level decision making is not effective in relation to enrollment management and FTES target setting.

5C. District-level decision making is effective in relation to strategic planning and strategic goal setting

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree		13.3		14.3	14.3	28.6			8.3	25.0	8.2
Agree	20.0	13.3	50.0	35.7	50.0	14.3	50.0	39.3	58.3	37.5	38.1
Disagree	60.0	33.3	22.2	14.3	14.3	42.9	25.0	35.7	8.3	12.5	26.9
Strongly Disagree	10.0	26.7	16.7		14.3			10.7	8.3	12.5	11.2
No Opinion/Do Not Know	10.0	13.3	11.1	35.7	7.1	14.3	25.0	14.3	16.7	12.5	15.7

- 46.3 said district-level decision making is effective in relation to strategic planning and strategic goal setting.
- 38.1 said district-level decision making is not effective in relation to strategic planning and strategic goal setting.

5D. District-level decision making is effective in relation to Bond Program planning and oversight

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree		6.7		14.3				3.6		12.5	3.7
Agree	20.0	33.3	33.3	28.6	28.6	25.0	22.2	14.3	25.0	25.0	25.0
Disagree	60.0	13.3	16.7	7.1	28.6	50.0	33.3	32.1	33.3	25.0	27.9
Strongly Disagree	10.0	26.7	33.3	14.3	42.9	12.5	33.3	32.1	33.3	25.0	27.9
No Opinion/Do Not Know	10.0	20.0	16.7	35.7		12.5	11.1	17.9	8.3	12.5	15.4

- 28.7 said district-level decision making is effective in relation to Bond Program planning and oversight.
- 55.8 said district-level decision making is not effective in relation to Bond Program planning and oversight.

5E. District-level decision making is effective in relation to employee benefits (JLMBC)

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree	30.0	13.3	5.6	28.6	14.3		11.1	11.1	25.0	50.0	17.0
Agree	60.0	73.3	38.9	35.7	57.1	50.0	77.8	48.1	58.3	25.0	51.9
Disagree	10.0		33.3		14.3	25.0	11.1	18.5	8.3	12.5	14.1
Strongly Disagree		6.7	5.6		14.3	12.5		7.4			5.2
No Opinion/Do Not Know		6.7	16.7	35.7		12.5		14.8	8.3	12.5	11.9

- 68.9 said district-level decision making is effective in relation to employee benefits.
- 19.3 said district-level decision making is not effective in relation to employee benefits.

2014-15 LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: Analysis by College

PARTICIPATORY

6A. Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are based on research and data

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree		6.7	5.6	14.3	7.1	12.5		3.7	8.3	25.0	7.4
Agree	40.0	20.0	44.4	57.1	57.1	12.5	44.4	51.9	33.3	50.0	43.0
Disagree	40.0	33.3	27.8		21.4	37.5	11.1	14.8	8.3	25.0	20.7
Strongly Disagree		20.0				12.5	11.1	14.8	8.3		7.4
No Opinion/Do Not Know	20.0	20.0	22.2	28.6	14.3	25.0	33.3	14.8	41.7		21.5

- 50.4 said decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are based on research and data.
- 28.1 said decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are not based on research and data.

6B. Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree		6.7	5.3	7.1		12.5	11.1		8.3		4.4
Agree		26.7	36.8	42.9	23.1	12.5	11.1	29.6	25.0	62.5	28.1
Disagree	80.0	40.0	31.6	14.3	69.2	12.5	55.6	40.7	41.7	25.0	40.7
Strongly Disagree	20.0	20.0	10.5	14.3	7.7	50.0	11.1	22.2	8.3	12.5	17.0
No Opinion/Do Not Know		6.7	15.8	21.4		12.5	11.1	7.4	16.7		9.6

- 32.5 said decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders.
- 57.7 said decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are not communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders.

6C. Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are followed through on effectively

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree		7.1	5.6	7.1					8.3		3.0
Agree	10.0	21.4	16.7	35.7	30.8	14.3	33.3	29.6	33.3	50.0	27.3
Disagree	80.0	42.9	38.9	14.3	53.8	14.3	44.4	44.4	25.0	25.0	39.4
Strongly Disagree		14.3	16.7	14.3	7.7	28.6		14.8	8.3	12.5	12.1
No Opinion/Do Not Know	10.0	14.3	22.2	28.6	7.7	42.9	22.2	11.1	25.0	12.5	18.2

- 30.3 said decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are followed through on effectively.
- 51.5 said decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are not followed through on effectively.

OVERALL

7. The district-level governance webpage, LACCD 411, is an excellent resource for communication and information sharing

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree		7.1	5.3			28.6					3.0
Agree	10.0	7.1	31.6		6.7		12.5	25.9	41.7	37.5	18.7
Disagree	40.0	21.4	10.5	14.3	20.0	28.6		29.6	8.3	25.0	20.1
Strongly Disagree		14.3			6.7			11.1	16.7		6.0
No Opinion/Do Not Know	50.0	50.0	52.6	85.7	66.7	42.9	87.5	33.3	33.3	37.5	52.2

- 21.7 said the district-level governance webpage, LACCD 411, is an excellent resource for communication and information sharing.
- 26.1 said the district-level governance webpage, LACCD 411, is not an excellent resource for communication and information sharing.

2014-15 LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: Analysis by College

8A. The results of decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are assessed for effectiveness

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree		6.7		7.1			11.1	3.6	9.1	12.5	4.4
Agree	30.0	26.7	36.8	57.1	20.0	12.5	22.2	25.0	27.3	50.0	30.7
Disagree	40.0	46.7	21.1	14.3	40.0	37.5	33.3	39.3	18.2	25.0	32.1
Strongly Disagree		6.7	15.8					7.1	9.1		5.1
No Opinion/Do Not Know	30.0	13.3	26.3	21.4	40.0	50.0	33.3	25.0	36.4	12.5	27.7

- 35.1 said results of decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are assessed for effectiveness.
- 37.2 said results of decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are not assessed for effectiveness.

8B. The LACCD Board of Trustees supports participatory governance

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree	10.0	6.7	15.8	21.4	6.7	12.5	22.2	3.6			9.4
Agree	30.0	20.0	26.3	42.9	40.0	25.0	55.6	42.9	33.3	62.5	37.0
Disagree	20.0	53.3	15.8	7.1	13.3	25.0	11.1	32.1	25.0	25.0	23.9
Strongly Disagree	10.0	13.3	26.3	7.1	13.3	25.0		14.3	25.0	12.5	15.2
No Opinion/Do Not Know	30.0	6.7	15.8	21.4	26.7	12.5	11.1	7.1	16.7		14.5

- 46.4 said LACCD Board of Trustees supports participatory governance.
- 39.1 said LACCD Board of Trustees does not support participatory governance.

8C. The district / college administration support participatory governance at the district level.

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree	11.1	6.7	10.5	30.8	13.3		11.1	3.6	8.3	25.0	11.0
Agree	44.4	33.3	26.3	53.8	46.7	75.0	33.3	53.6	58.3	62.5	47.1
Disagree	22.2	46.7	31.6		13.3	25.0	22.2	25.0	8.3	12.5	22.1
Strongly Disagree		6.7	10.5		20.0		11.1	10.7	8.3		8.1
No Opinion/Do Not Know	22.2	6.7	21.1	15.4	6.7		22.2	7.1	16.7		11.8

- 58.1 said the district / college administration support participatory governance at the district level.
- 30.2 said the district / college administration does not support participatory governance at the district level.

8D. Overall, I feel that district-wide decision making is effective in supporting the district's mission and goals.

	C	E	H	M	P	S	T	V	W	D	All
Strongly Agree		6.7	11.1	7.1		12.5			8.3	12.5	5.1
Agree	20.0	20.0	16.7	64.3	46.7	25.0	33.3	46.4	25.0	50.0	35.8
Disagree	80.0	53.3	38.9	7.1	26.7	37.5	33.3	32.1	50.0		35.8
Strongly Disagree		6.7	16.7		13.3	25.0		7.1	8.3	25.0	9.5
No Opinion/Do Not Know		13.3	16.7	21.4	13.3		33.3	14.3	8.3	12.5	13.9

- 40.9 said overall they feel that district-wide decision making is effective in supporting the district's mission and goals.
- 45.3 said overall they feel that district-wide decision making is not effective in supporting the district's mission and goals.

FEEDBACK

What do you think are the central problems with district-level participatory governance in the LACCD?

Analysis of open-ended responses in progress.

How can we improve district-level participatory governance and decision making?

Analysis of open-ended responses in progress.

2014-15 LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: Analysis by Role

INTRODUCTION

The LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment was conducted as part of a formal assessment of the effectiveness of district-level participatory governance and decision making. Results will be used to improve the structure and processes of current district-level governance committees and councils and to inform the revision of the District Strategic Plan.

The survey was conducted for 3 weeks from June 12 to July 6, 2015. 138 out of 383 people completed the survey, for a response rate of 36%. The distribution list included the following groups: Chancellor's Cabinet, District Council of Academic Affairs, District Council of Student Services, District Administrative Council, District Academic Senate, Executive Board of the American Federation of Teachers Union, Local 1521, Executive Board of the AFT 1521A Staff Guild, Nine College Academic Senates, Nine College Shared Governance Committees, and Student Affairs Committees.

RESULTS

DEMOGRAPHIC

Which college are you from
What is your role at the college

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
City	2	0	1	2	4	1	10
East	4	1	0	2	8	0	15
Harbor	4	0	4	1	9	1	19
Mission	3	1	3	3	4	0	14
Pierce	0	1	1	6	7	0	15
Southwest	0	0	3	0	4	1	8
Trade-Tech	0	1	1	2	5	0	9
Valley	4	0	10	1	13	0	28
West	3	0	3	1	5	0	12
District	5	2	1	0	0	0	8
Total	25	6	27	18	59	3	138

REPRESENTATION

3A. Administration is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	75.0%	83.3%	80.0%	88.9%	76.3%	100.0%	79.3%
Disagree/Strongly	12.5%	16.7%	8.0%	11.1%	11.9%		11.1%
No Opinion/DNK	12.5%		12.0%		11.9%		9.6%

3B. District Academic Senate is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	75.0%	83.3%	80.0%	72.2%	76.3%	100.0%	77.0%
Disagree/Strongly	12.5%			22.2%	16.9%		12.6%
No Opinion/DNK	12.5%	16.7%	20.0%	5.6%	6.8%		10.4%

3C. Associated Students is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	54.2%	83.3%	40.0%	66.7%	33.9%	33.3%	45.2%
Disagree/Strongly	25.0%		44.0%	27.8%	37.3%	66.7%	34.1%
No Opinion/DNK	20.8%	16.7%	16.0%	5.6%	28.8%		20.7%

2014-15 LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: Analysis by Role

3D. Managers, classified staff, and other employees are appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	58.3%	50.0%	40.0%	55.6%	31.0%	100.0%	43.3%
Disagree/Strongly	25.0%	50.0%	60.0%	38.9%	31.0%		36.6%
No Opinion/DNK	16.7%			5.6%	37.9%		20.1%

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING UNITS

4A. LA College Faculty Guild, 1521 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	83.3%	83.3%	84.6%	94.4%	76.3%	100.0%	82.4%
Disagree/Strongly	4.2%			5.6%	11.9%		6.6%
No Opinion/DNK	12.5%	16.7%	15.4%		11.9%		11.0%

4B. AFT College Staff Guild, 1521A is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	79.2%	83.3%	55.6%	83.3%	57.6%	100.0%	66.4%
Disagree/Strongly			37.0%	11.1%	13.6%		14.6%
No Opinion/DNK	20.8%	16.7%	7.4%	5.6%	28.8%		19.0%

4C. Buildings and Construction Trades Council is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	43.5%	50.0%	30.8%	33.3%	20.7%	66.7%	30.6%
Disagree/Strongly	17.4%	33.3%	42.3%	16.7%	17.2%		22.4%
No Opinion/DNK	39.1%	16.7%	26.9%	50.0%	62.1%	33.3%	47.0%

4D. LA City and County Schools Employees Union, 99 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	41.7%	66.7%	24.0%	22.2%	18.6%	66.7%	27.4%
Disagree/Strongly	20.8%	16.7%	52.0%	11.1%	18.6%	33.3%	24.4%
No Opinion/DNK	37.5%	16.7%	24.0%	66.7%	62.7%		48.1%

4E. Supervisory Employees, 721 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	41.7%	66.7%	46.2%	38.9%	22.8%	66.7%	35.8%
Disagree/Strongly	20.8%	16.7%	26.9%	5.6%	15.8%		17.2%
No Opinion/DNK	37.5%	16.7%	26.9%	55.6%	61.4%	33.3%	47.0%

4F. CA Teamsters Public, Professional, and Medical Employees Union, 911 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	60.0%	83.3%	57.7%	33.3%	30.5%	100.0%	45.3%
Disagree/Strongly	28.0%		11.5%	11.1%	11.9%		13.9%
No Opinion/DNK	12.0%	16.7%	30.8%	55.6%	57.6%		40.9%

2014-15 LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: Analysis by Role

EFFECTIVENESS

5A. District-level decision making is effective in relation to budget development and resource allocation

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	48.0%	66.7%	40.7%	52.9%	30.5%		39.4%
Disagree/Strongly	36.0%	16.7%	51.9%	41.2%	61.0%	100.0%	51.1%
No Opinion/DNK	16.0%	16.7%	7.4%	5.9%	8.5%		9.5%

5B. District-level decision making is effective in relation to enrollment management and FTES target setting

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	60.0%	83.3%	61.5%	88.2%	33.9%	33.3%	52.9%
Disagree/Strongly	28.0%		26.9%	11.8%	52.5%	66.7%	36.0%
No Opinion/DNK	12.0%	16.7%	11.5%		13.6%		11.0%

5C. District-level decision making is effective in relation to strategic planning and strategic goal setting

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	60.0%	50.0%	40.0%	58.8%	41.4%		46.3%
Disagree/Strongly	28.0%	16.7%	48.0%	29.4%	39.7%	100.0%	38.1%
No Opinion/DNK	12.0%	33.3%	12.0%	11.8%	19.0%		15.7%

5D. District-level decision making is effective in relation to Bond Program planning and oversight

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	48.0%	66.7%	23.1%	35.3%	16.9%	33.3%	28.7%
Disagree/Strongly	28.0%	16.7%	61.5%	64.7%	66.1%	66.7%	55.9%
No Opinion/DNK	24.0%	16.7%	15.4%		16.9%		15.4%

5E. District-level decision making is effective in relation to employee benefits (JLMBC)

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	76.0%	83.3%	60.0%	82.4%	64.4%	66.7%	68.9%
Disagree/Strongly	12.0%		28.0%	11.8%	22.0%	33.3%	19.3%
No Opinion/DNK	12.0%	16.7%	12.0%	5.9%	13.6%		11.9%

PARTICIPATORY

6A. Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are based on research and data

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	64.0%	83.3%	57.7%	64.7%	34.5%	33.3%	50.4%
Disagree/Strongly	20.0%		26.9%	23.5%	36.2%	33.3%	28.1%
No Opinion/DNK	16.0%	16.7%	15.4%	11.8%	29.3%	33.3%	21.5%

6B. Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	36.0%	50.0%	37.0%	52.9%	22.8%		32.6%
Disagree/Strongly	48.0%	33.3%	51.9%	47.1%	70.2%	66.7%	57.8%
No Opinion/DNK	16.0%	16.7%	11.1%		7.0%	33.3%	9.6%

2014-15 LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: Analysis by Role

6C. Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are followed through on effectively

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	40.0%	33.3%	36.0%	47.1%	19.6%		30.3%
Disagree/Strongly	40.0%	16.7%	48.0%	47.1%	62.5%	66.7%	51.5%
No Opinion/DNK	20.0%	50.0%	16.0%	5.9%	17.9%	33.3%	18.2%

OVERALL

7. The district-level governance webpage, LACCD 411, is an excellent resource for communication and information sharing

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	25.0%	16.7%	19.2%	17.6%	22.4%	33.3%	21.6%
Disagree/Strongly	20.8%		26.9%	23.5%	31.0%	33.3%	26.1%
No Opinion/DNK	54.2%	83.3%	53.8%	58.8%	46.6%	33.3%	52.2%

8A. The results of decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are assessed for effectiveness

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	48.0%	50.0%	40.7%	44.4%	22.4%	33.3%	35.0%
Disagree/Strongly	32.0%	16.7%	29.6%	27.8%	46.6%	66.7%	37.2%
No Opinion/DNK	20.0%	33.3%	29.6%	27.8%	31.0%		27.7%

8B. The LACCD Board of Trustees supports participatory governance

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	60.0%	66.7%	55.6%	55.6%	32.2%	33.3%	46.4%
Disagree/Strongly	28.0%	16.7%	22.2%	33.3%	54.2%	66.7%	39.1%
No Opinion/DNK	12.0%	16.7%	22.2%	11.1%	13.6%		14.5%

8C. The district / college administration support participatory governance at the district level.

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	75.0%	83.3%	55.6%	66.7%	48.3%	33.3%	58.1%
Disagree/Strongly	12.5%	16.7%	29.6%	22.2%	39.7%	66.7%	30.1%
No Opinion/DNK	12.5%		14.8%	11.1%	12.1%		11.8%

8D. Overall, I feel that district-wide decision making is effective in supporting the district's mission and goals.

	Administrator	Classified Manager	Classified Staff	Department Chair	Faculty	Student	Total
Agree/Strongly	48.0%	50.0%	51.9%	55.6%	27.6%	33.3%	40.9%
Disagree/Strongly	40.0%	33.3%	33.3%	38.9%	55.2%	66.7%	45.3%
No Opinion/DNK	12.0%	16.7%	14.8%	5.6%	17.2%		13.9%