



## LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment 2010, 2012, 2014, 2018 Comparison

The LACCD District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment is conducted 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.

### SUMMARY

In terms of strengths, for all four years (2010, 2012, 2014, and 2018) over half of respondents said several groups are appropriately and adequately represented in District-level decision making: Administration, District Academic Senate, LA College Faculty Guild, and AFT College Staff Guild. Additionally, participants felt that membership represented the skill set required to fulfill committees’ purposes, and that committees use their time efficiently.

In terms of weaknesses, communication of decisions made through District-level governance continues to be cited as a problem; suggestions were provided to improve efficiency in how decisions are communicated to all affected stakeholders. In addition, the survey found that there was an increased concern, from previous years, about insufficient and unbalanced representation within committees. To improve the governance process, many suggested the need to encourage participation, ensure balanced participation, and to consult more with all stakeholders within the District.

### 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, 2014-15, and 2018-19 years, online surveys were administered.

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 unless stated otherwise.

### DEMOGRAPHICS

	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15	2018-19
Total number of survey respondents	311	212	138	109
<b>Primary Place of Employment</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
City	13.5	5.7	7.2	9.2
East	11.6	9.4	10.9	10.1
Harbor	9.0	7.1	13.8	7.3
Mission	7.1	5.7	10.1	5.5
Pierce	12.5	31.1	10.9	17.4
Southwest	5.1	6.6	5.8	15.6
Trade-Tech	11.0	7.1	6.5	11.1
Valley	11.3	9.0	20.3	6.4
West	13.2	6.6	8.7	11.9
District	2.2	11.8	5.8	5.5

Primary Role	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15	2018-19
Administrator	20.0	22.9	18.1	28.5
Classified Manager	2.6	4.8	4.3	0.9
Classified Staff	11.0	58.1	19.6	25.7
Department Chair	21.0	3.3	13.0	7.3
Faculty	39.9	11.0	42.8	37.6
Student	2.9	0.0	2.7	0.0

## REPRESENTATION

The survey asked respondents whether various groups and collective bargaining units were appropriately and adequately represented in District-level decision making.

- Administration, District Academic Senate, LA College Faculty Guild, and the AFT Staff Guild were rated as being appropriately and adequately represented in District-level decision making
- Associated Students, LA City and County Schools Employees Union, and Supervisory Employees were the lowest rated groups

LACCD Groups	2010-11		2012-13		2014-15		2018-19	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
Administration	73.5	9.0	59.1	16.5	79.3	11.1	72.5	15.6
District Academic Senate	74.7	5.8	58.0	11.4	77.0	12.6	70.6	13.8
Associated Students	46.2	22.0	22.7	49.5	45.2	34.0	33.0	34.9
Managers, classified staff, and other employees	*	*	34.7	50.3	43.3	36.6	41.3	40.4

\*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		2018-19	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
LA College Faculty Guild, 1521	78.5	4.4	60.9	11.1	82.3	6.6	77.0	9.2
AFT College Staff Guild, 1521A	55.3	5.3	45.5	31.8	66.4	14.6	65.1	13.8
Buildings and Construction Trades Council	30.4	6.9	26.1	19.7	30.6	22.3	33.9	20.2
LA City and County Schools Employees Union, 99	29.8	5.2	23.9	23.4	27.4	24.4	31.2	15.6
Supervisory Employees, 721	33.4	4.4	29.7	17.6	35.9	17.2	31.2	17.4
CA Teamsters Public, Professional, and Medical Employees Union, 911	39.8	7.2	39.0	16.2	45.3	13.8	43.2	12.8

## MEMBERSHIP

The survey indicated that membership within shared-governance committees is appropriate and members treat each other with respect and courtesy.

	2018-19	
	Agree	Disagree
Our membership represents the talent and skill set required to fulfill the goals and purpose of the committee.	70.6	20.2
Our members treat each other with respect and courtesy.	74.3	18.4
As a general rule, when I speak I feel listened to and that my comments are valued.	68.8	23.9

## MEETING PROCESSES

The survey suggested that the committees use their time efficiently and are able to handle conflict constructively. However, less than half of the respondents felt that recommendations and decisions made by committees were taken into consideration by the Board of Trustees and administration.

	2018-19	
	Agree	Disagree
The committee uses their meeting time well. Issues get the time & attention proportionate to their importance.	60.6	31.2
The committee has the ability to handle conflict constructively.	63.3	25.7
The LACCD Board of Trustees takes into consideration the recommendation and decisions made by committees.	45.0	28.4
The District and college administration take into consideration the recommendation and decisions made by committees.	46.8	34.0

## COMMUNICATION

About half the respondents indicated that decisions made through participatory governance at the district level were not communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders and that information on the governance webpage is not always up-to-date. However, the majority knew where to find meeting information and that minutes were accurate.

	2018-19	
	Agree	Disagree
I know where to find information about decisions made through participatory governance.	54.1	34.9
The meeting minutes are accurate and reflect the discussion, next steps, and/or action items articulated by the members.	67.9	20.2
The information on the District-level governance webpage is accurate and up-to-date.	26.7	39.4
Decisions made through participatory governance are communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders.	33.0	49.6

## OVERALL

About half the respondents indicated that decisions made through participatory governance are based on research and are followed through on effectively. However, about half of the respondents indicated that decisions were not assessed for effectiveness. Many also signified that District-wide decision making was not effective in supporting the District's mission and goals.

	2010-11		2012-13		2014-15		2018-19	
	Agree	Disagree	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	53.2	34.9
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	49.5	38.5
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	25.7	49.5
The LACCD Board of Trustees supports participatory governance	68.3	15.1	39.2	39.2	46.4	39.1	45.0	28.4
The District / college administration support participatory governance at the district level.	64.2	16.7	46.9	31.5	58.1	30.2	52.3	27.5
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	40.3	43.1

\*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".

## COMMENTS

The survey also included several open-ended questions in hopes of improving the shared-governance process. One area of improvement identified in past years was lack of communication between committees and its constituents. The survey asked, "How can communication of decisions made through participatory governance be communicated more effectively?" The suggestions to improve communication included:

- Improving the District website, making it easier to navigate and find information on decisions made
- Educating people on where to find committee documentation, such as meeting agendas and minutes
- Keep the website consistently up-to-date
- Sending e-mails to stakeholders regarding decisions made through the shared-governance process
- Creating a newsletter, as a way correspond to others on campuses on a monthly basis
- Ensuring the committee members share updates with their areas consistently
- Using Board Docs for all committee meetings

For the following 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?

Although the lack of communication or transparency continues to be an area of concern, the proportion of respondents indicating this is a central problem has decreased. However, 'Insufficient representation or unbalanced participation from stakeholders' and 'Process-related problems; implementation issues' is emerging as a larger concern in 2018-19.

	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15	2018-19
Total number of coded responses	146	94	75	67
Category	% Total Occurrences			
	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15	2018-19
Lack of communication or transparency	35.2	26.2	31.0	23.9
Issues related to the size and scope of District; BOT micromanaging	10.3	22.4	23.8	13.4
Insufficient representation or unbalanced participation from stakeholders	17.9	32.7	19.0	32.8
Process-related problems; implementation issues	2.1	9.3	10.7	16.4
Miscellaneous and college-specific issues	6.9	5.6	8.3	1.5
Need for accountability and leadership	9.0	2.8	4.8	9.0
Need for more college autonomy; decentralization	18.6	0.9	2.4	3.0

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

To improve the district-level participatory governance process, the majority of respondents cited the need to encourage participation, ensure balance participation, and to consult more with all stakeholders within the District. About a quarter of participants suggested that improving communication and dissemination of information could also help.

	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15	2018-19
Total number of coded responses	*	95	81	62

\*2010-11 data not available.

Category	% Total Occurrences			
	2010-11	2012-13	2014-15	2018-19
Enhance professional development on District governance; encourage stakeholder participation; ensure balanced participation; consult with stakeholders outside the committee more often	*	54.7	42.0	53.2
Streamline District-level governance and planning processes; limit BOT micromanaging	*	13.7	29.6	17.7
Improve communications and information dissemination related to District-level decision-making processes	*	26.3	24.7	25.8
Review the District budget process	*	5.3	3.7	3.2

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