

# LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: 2010, 2012, 2014 Comparison

## 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 includes 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

Survey administration methods varied across years. In 2010-11, paper surveys were distributed at the District Academic Senate Leadership Summit and LACCD/AFT Department Chairs workshop. Also the following group meetings were visited and invited to complete an online version: district-level administrative councils, all nine college governance councils, all nine college academic senates, other stakeholder groups. In 2012-13 an online survey was administered for 3 months. In 2014-15 an online survey was administered for 3 weeks.

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 Agree (Strongly Agree + Agree) and Disagree (Disagree + Strongly Disagree). All results are reported in percentages.

## DEMOGRAPHIC

	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15
Total number of survey respondents	311	212	138

Which college are you from

	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15
City	13.5	5.7	7.2
East	11.6	9.4	10.9
Harbor	9.0	7.1	13.8
Mission	7.1	5.7	10.1
Pierce	12.5	31.1	10.9
Southwest	5.1	6.6	5.8
Trade-Tech	11.0	7.1	6.5
Valley	11.3	9.0	20.3
West	13.2	6.6	8.7
District	2.2	11.8	5.8

What is your role at the college

	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15
Administrator	20.0	22.9	18.1
Classified Manager	2.6	4.8	4.3
Classified Staff	11.0	58.1	19.6
Department Chair	21.0	3.3	13.0
Faculty	39.9	11.0	42.8
Student	2.9	0.0	2.7

## LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: 2010, 2012, 2014 Comparison

### **REPRESENTATION**

	2010-11		2012-13		2014-15	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
Administration is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	73.5	9.0	59.1	16.5	79.3	11.1
District Academic Senate is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	74.7	5.8	58.0	11.4	77.0	12.6
Associated Students is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	46.2	22.0	22.7	49.5	45.2	34.0
Managers, classified staff, and other employees are appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	*	*	34.7	50.3	43.3	36.6

\*The survey was revised in 2012-13 and this question was not in the 2010-11 version.

### **COLLECTIVE BARGAINING UNITS**

	2010-11		2012-13		2014-15	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
LA College Faculty Guild, 1521 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	78.5	4.4	60.9	11.1	82.3	6.6
AFT College Staff Guild, 1521A is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	55.3	5.3	45.5	31.8	66.4	14.6
Buildings and Construction Trades Council is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	30.4	6.9	26.1	19.7	30.6	22.3
LA City and County Schools Employees Union, 99 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	29.8	5.2	23.9	23.4	27.4	24.4
Supervisory Employees, 721 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	33.4	4.4	29.7	17.6	35.9	17.2
CA Teamsters Public, Professional, and Medical Employees Union, 911 is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making	39.8	7.2	39.0	16.2	45.3	13.8

### **EFFECTIVENESS**

	2010-11		2012-13		2014-15	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
District-level decision making is effective in relation to budget development and resource allocation	38.6	42.9	30.2	55.1	39.4	51.1
District-level decision making is effective in relation to enrollment management and FTES target setting	49.5	31.2	29.8	47.0	53.0	36.0
District-level decision making is effective in relation to strategic planning and strategic goal setting	51.3	26.4	41.8	40.8	46.3	38.1
District-level decision making is effective in relation to Bond Program planning and oversight	44.7	39.0	25.4	60.5	28.7	55.8
District-level decision making is effective in relation to employee benefits (JLMBC)	66.3	20.7	56.7	29.2	68.9	19.3

## LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: 2010, 2012, 2014 Comparison

### **PARTICIPATORY**

	2010-11		2012-13		2014-15	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are based on research and data	42.6	25.8	26.2	37.2	50.4	28.1
Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders	38.7	47.6	23.5	58.5	32.5	57.7
Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are followed through on effectively	39.5	33.3	25.7	41.0	30.3	51.5

### **OVERALL**

	2010-11		2012-13		2014-15	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
The district-level governance webpage, LACCD 411, is an excellent resource for communication and information sharing	*	*	27.8	23.5	21.7	26.1
The results of decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are assessed for effectiveness**	36.4	30.5	19.3	41.5	35.1	37.2
The LACCD Board of Trustees supports participatory governance	68.3	15.1	39.2	39.2	46.4	39.1
The district / college administration support participatory governance at the district level.	64.2	16.7	46.9	31.5	58.1	30.2
Overall, I feel that district-wide decision making is effective in supporting the district's mission and goals.	56.2	27.2	34.8	46.9	40.9	45.3

\*The survey was revised in 2012-13 and this question was not in the 2010-11 version.

\*\*The survey was revised in 2012-13 and in 2010-11 the question was "The results of decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are assessed by appropriate committees".

## LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment: 2010, 2012, 2014 Comparison

### **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?"**

	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15
Total number of coded responses	146	94	75

Category	% Total Occurrences		
	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15
Lack of communication or transparency	35.2	26.2	31.0
Issues related to the size and scope of District; BOT micromanaging	10.3	22.4	23.8
Insufficient representation or unbalanced participation from stakeholders	17.9	32.7	19.0
Process-related problems; implementation issues	2.1	9.3	10.7
Miscellaneous and college-specific issues	6.9	5.6	8.3
Need for accountability and leadership	9.0	2.8	4.8
Need for more college autonomy; decentralization	18.6	0.9	2.4

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

	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15
Total number of coded responses	*	95	81

\*2010-11 data not available.

Category	% Total Occurrences		
	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15
Enhance professional development on district governance; encourage stakeholder participation	*	54.7	42.0
Streamline district-level governance and planning processes; limit BOT micromanaging	*	13.7	29.6
Improve communications and information dissemination related to district-level decision-making processes	*	26.3	24.7
Review district budget process	*	5.3	3.7

\*2010-11 data not available. However, these categories were created from the 2010-11 data, with slight modifications in subsequent years.