

## INTRODUCTION

The LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment is conducted on a two-year cycle as part of a formal assessment of the effectiveness of district-level participatory governance and decision making. Results are 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 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

The survey was conducted for 3 weeks from June 12 to July 6, 2015. All questions used a 5-point Likert scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, No Opinion/Do Not Know. For easier comparisons, values were combined into the categories Strengths (Strongly Agree + Agree) and Weaknesses (Disagree + Strongly Disagree). All results are reported in percentages.

### DEMOGRAPHIC

	2014-15	Response Rate
Total number of survey respondents	138	36%

Which college are you from	
	Response %
City	7.2
East	10.9
Harbor	13.8
Mission	10.1
Pierce	10.9
Southwest	5.8
Trade-Tech	6.5
Valley	20.3
West	8.7
District	5.8

What is your role at the college	
	Response %
Administrator	18.1
Classified Manager	4.3
Classified Staff	19.6
Department Chair	13.0
Faculty	42.8
Student	2.7

### REPRESENTATION

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion /Do Not Know
Administration is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	43.7	35.6	8.1	3.0	9.6
District Academic Senate is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	31.1	45.9	9.6	3.0	10.4
Associated Students is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	6.7	38.5	25.9	8.1	20.7
Managers, classified staff, and other employees are appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	8.2	35.1	29.1	7.5	20.1

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

### Strength

- 79.3% said administration is represented in district-level decision making.
- 77.0% said District Academic Senate is represented in district-level decision making.
- 45.2% said Associated Students is represented in district-level decision making.
- 43.3% said managers, classified staff, and other employees are represented in district-level decision making.

### Weakness

- 11.2% said administration is not represented in district-level decision making.
- 12.6% said District Academic Senate is not represented in district-level decision making.
- 34.0% said Associated Students is not 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**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion /Do Not Know
LA College Faculty Guild, 1521 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	30.1	52.2	3.7	2.9	11.0
AFT College Staff Guild, 1521A is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	24.8	41.6	10.2	4.4	19.0
Buildings and Construction Trades Council is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	7.5	23.1	20.1	2.2	47.0
LA City and County Schools Employees Union, 99 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	9.6	17.8	20.7	3.7	48.1
Supervisory Employees, 721 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	9.0	26.9	15.7	1.5	47.0
CA Teamsters Public, Professional, and Medical Employees Union, 911 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	14.6	30.7	10.2	3.6	40.9

### Strength

- 82.3% said LA College Faculty Guild is represented in district-level decision making.
- 66.4% said AFT College Staff Guild is represented in district-level decision making.
- 30.6% said Buildings and Construction Trades Council is represented in district-level decision making.
- 27.4% said LA City and County Schools Employees Union is represented in district-level decision making.
- 35.9% said Supervisory Employees is represented in district-level decision making.
- 45.3% said CA Teamsters Public, Professional, and Medical Employees Union is represented in district-level decision making.

### Weakness

- 6.6% said LA College Faculty Guild is not represented in district-level decision making.
- 14.6% said AFT College Staff Guild is not represented in district-level decision making.
- 22.3% said Buildings and Construction Trades Council is not represented in district-level decision making.
- 24.4% said LA City and County Schools Employees Union is not represented in district-level decision making.
- 17.2% said Supervisory Employees is not 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.

### **EFFECTIVENESS**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion /Do Not Know
District-level decision making is effective in relation to budget development and resource allocation	7.3	32.1	34.3	16.8	9.5
District-level decision making is effective in relation to enrollment management and FTES target setting	8.1	44.9	22.8	13.2	11.0
District-level decision making is effective in relation to strategic planning and strategic goal setting	8.2	38.1	26.9	11.2	15.7
District-level decision making is effective in relation to Bond Program planning and oversight	3.7	25.0	27.9	27.9	15.4
District-level decision making is effective in relation to employee benefits (JLMBC)	17.0	51.9	14.1	5.2	11.9

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

### Strength

- 39.4% said district-level decision making is effective in relation to budget development and resource allocation.
- 53.0% said district-level decision making is effective in relation to enrollment management and FTES target setting.
- 46.3% said district-level decision making is effective in relation to strategic planning and strategic goal setting.
- 28.7% said district-level decision making is effective in relation to Bond Program planning and oversight.
- 68.9% said district-level decision making is effective in relation to employee benefits.

### Weakness

- 51.1% said district-level decision making is not effective in relation to budget development and resource allocation.
- 36.0% said district-level decision making is not effective in relation to enrollment management and FTES target setting.
- 38.1% said district-level decision making is not effective in relation to strategic planning and strategic goal setting.
- 55.8% said district-level decision making is not effective in relation to Bond Program planning and oversight.
- 19.3% said district-level decision making is not effective in relation to employee benefits.

### PARTICIPATORY

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion / Do Not Know
Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are based on research and data	7.4	43.0	20.7	7.4	21.5
Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders	4.4	28.1	40.7	17.0	9.6
Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are followed through on effectively	3.0	27.3	39.4	12.1	18.2

### Strength

- 50.4% said decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are based on research and data.
- 32.5% said decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders.
- 30.3% said decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are followed through on effectively.

### Weakness

- 28.1% said decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are not based on research and data.
- 57.7% said decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are not communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders.
- 51.5% said decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are not followed through on effectively.

### OVERALL

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion / Do Not Know
The district-level governance webpage, LACCD 411, is an excellent resource for communication and information sharing	3.0	18.7	20.1	6.0	52.2
The results of decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are assessed for effectiveness	4.4	30.7	32.1	5.1	27.7
The LACCD Board of Trustees supports participatory governance	9.4	37.0	23.9	15.2	14.5
The district / college administration support participatory governance at the district level.	11.0	47.1	22.1	8.1	11.8
Overall, I feel that district-wide decision making is effective in supporting the district's mission and goals.	5.1	35.8	35.8	9.5	13.9

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

### Strength

- 21.7% said the district-level governance webpage, LACCD 411, is an excellent resource for communication and information sharing.
- 35.1% said results of decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are assessed for effectiveness.
- 46.4% said LACCD Board of Trustees supports participatory governance.
- 58.1% said the district / college administration support participatory governance at the district level.
- 40.9% said overall they feel that district-wide decision making is effective in supporting the district's mission and goals.

### Weakness

- 26.1% said the district-level governance webpage, LACCD 411, is not an excellent resource for communication and information sharing.
- 37.2% said results of decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are not assessed for effectiveness.
- 39.1% said LACCD Board of Trustees does not support participatory governance.
- 30.2% said the district / college administration does not support participatory governance at the district level.
- 45.3% said overall they feel that district-wide decision making is not effective in supporting the district's mission and goals.

### **COMMENTS**

The survey also includes two open-ended questions. Responses are coded into categories, with some comments containing more than one category. Categories from the 2010-11 data analysis report were evaluated and applied to the current data. Results are reported in percentage of total occurrences of each category.

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

2014-15	
Total number of coded responses	75
Category	% Total Occurrences
2014-15	
Lack of communication or transparency	31.0
Issues related to the size and scope of District; BOT micromanaging	23.8
Insufficient representation or unbalanced participation from stakeholders	19.0
Process-related problems; implementation issues	10.7
Miscellaneous and college-specific issues	8.3
Need for accountability and leadership	4.8
Need for more college autonomy; decentralization	2.4

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

2014-15	
Total number of coded responses	81
Category	% Total Occurrences
2014-15	
Enhance professional development on district governance; encourage stakeholder participation	42.0
Streamline district-level governance and planning processes; limit BOT micromanaging	29.6
Improve communications and information dissemination related to district-level decision-making processes	24.7
Review district budget process	3.7