Final Responses to the Cityside District Accreditation Recommendations

Submitted March 15, 2010

District Recommendation 1: Financial Resources and Board Administrative Organization

In order to improve, the post-retirement health liability should be carefully monitored for the potential fiscal ramifications that could arise over the next few years (IV.B.3.e).

Summary of Actions Taken

The LACCD took significant steps to address the issue of its unfunded liability for retiree health care in Fall 2006 by negotiating an agreement, approved by the District’s six unions and its Board of Trustees, to begin pre-funding a portion of its unfunded obligation. The District annually directs 1.92% of the previous fiscal year’s fulltime employee payroll into an irrevocable trust, managed through CalPERS. In addition, an amount equivalent to the District’s annual Medicare D refund is also diverted from the District’s operating budget into the trust. In 2007, Governor Schwarzenegger’s Commission on Public Employee Post-Employment Benefits issued a report in which the LACCD’s prefunding plan was cited as a best practice (D1.1).

As of December 31, 2009, the balance in the trust was $17,728,778.09 (D1.2).

In 2009, facing a state budget crisis and enormous increases in health benefit costs, the District’s Joint Labor-Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC) took action to reduce the cost of health care coverage for both active and retired employees. After a great deal of research and discussion, the JLMBC voted and the Board approved the move to health care plans administered by CalPERS, to take effect January 1, 2010 (D1.3). Because of the significantly lower retiree benefit costs under CalPERS, the district expects to reduce its GASB obligation by roughly $100 million or more. A new actuarial study is currently being undertaken by the District. When the results of this new study are finalized in spring 2010, the exact amount of the reduction in District liability will be known.

Evaluation and Follow-Up

The decision to move the District’s health care plans to CalPERS was an important step to help control spiraling health care costs and reduce the District’s post-retirement obligation. Reducing the District’s post-retirement healthcare liability by roughly $100 million demonstrates the LACCD’s clear commitment to monitoring this issue. When the results of the new actuarial study are reported later this spring, the District will again reassess the adequacy of its annual contribution.

Evidence

D1.1 Funding Pensions and Retiree Health Care for Public Employees, a report of the Public Employees Post-Employment Benefits Commission (see p. 169-173)
D1.2 California Employer’s Retirement Benefit Trust Quarterly Statement, December 31, 2009
D1.3 http://www.laccd.edu/board_of_trustees/board_minutes/documents/7-15-09minutes.pdf (pages 8-10)
District Recommendation 2: Board and Administrative Organization

In order to improve, both the district and the college need to evaluate the consistent adherence in practice to the recently developed delineation of operational responsibilities and functions. (IV.B.3.a).

Summary of Actions Taken

Accreditation Standard IV.3.a requires multi-college districts to establish “clearly defined roles of authority and responsibility between the colleges and the district/system” and to assess the accuracy of this delineation of functions, roles, and responsibilities in terms of its consistent adherence in practice. As reported in the 2009 Self Study Reports for East Los Angeles College (ELAC), Los Angeles City College (LACC), and Los Angeles Trade Technical College (LATTC), the Los Angeles Community College District has been actively engaged in addressing this standard since it participated in the ACCJC’s first “Multi-College Pilot Program” in 1999 (D2.1). Several generations of “Functional Maps” delineating the mutually-defined operational roles and responsibilities of the district system and the colleges have been produced since that original pilot project (D2.2). This on-going effort to delineate and clarify District/college functional relationships culminated in the publication of the “Los Angeles Community College District District/College Functional Map” in fall 2008 (D2.3). This 130-page document contained the following:

- Descriptions of the functions of the LACCD Board of Trustees and its associated committees;
- Descriptions of the functions and membership of 56 district-wide governance and administrative committees that coordinate district/college policies and activities;
- A concise two-page definition of the functional relationship between the district system and the nine LACCD colleges;
- A 72-page grid of District Office Service Outcomes (DOSOs) detailing the function of each division and administrative unit in the District Office and outlining its relationship with appropriate college constituencies; and
- A series of 26 flow charts documenting District and college participation in critical administrative processes.

The 2009 LACC, ELAC, and LATTC evaluation teams agreed that while the 2008 version of the Functional Map might not have been sufficiently publicized at the campus level, it did successfully delineate the roles and responsibilities of the district system and the colleges. The ELAC evaluation team observed that the District and the colleges “have made significant progress in the areas of decision making and in detailing [their] administrative and governance roles and processes” (D2.4). The LATTC evaluators echoed this judgment by noting that the 2008 Functional Map successfully “provides a framework for clarifying roles and responsibilities of the district office and where they interact with the colleges” (D2.5). All three evaluation teams agreed, however, that in order to improve, the District needed to take the additional step of evaluating the accuracy of the delineation of District/college roles and responsibilities as outlined in the Functional Map, and to use this delineation to improve institutional effectiveness.

The LACCD District Planning Committee (DPC) assumed responsibility for crafting and monitoring the district-wide response to this recommendation. At the DPC’s first meeting in
September 2009, it was determined to build the District’s response around a project that would culminate in a full assessment and revision of the 2008 Functional Map (D2.6). This assessment and revision process was designed to achieve three goals:

- To engage district-wide faculty, staff, administrative, and student leaders in a dialogue on the mutual roles and responsibilities of the colleges and the district system;
- To engage critical district-level stakeholder groups in a formal assessment of the 2008 Functional Map; and
- To produce a revised version of the 2008 District/College Functional Map in the form of the first LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook that would offer a convenient and user-friendly guide to District/college roles and responsibilities and decision-making processes.

As conceived by the DPC, this project included five inter-related supporting activities:

1. Review and revision of the original District Office Service Outcomes (DOSOs)
2. Updating and standardizing descriptions of district-level committees
3. Expansion of the content of the 2008 version of the Functional Map
4. A survey assessment of the accuracy of the formal description of the “District/College Relationship”
5. Replacement of the 2008 Functional Map with a new District Governance & Functions Handbook

The DPC established an ambitious calendar for these activities, with publication of the District Handbook slated for March 2010.

1. Review and Revision of District Office Service Outcomes (DOSOs)

As described above, the 72-page “District Office Service Outcomes” segment of the 2008 Functional Map offered an extremely detailed description of the relationship between district-level administrative units and their college counterparts and constituencies. To guarantee that the DOSOs in the revised LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook would accurately reflect the operational roles and responsibilities of the District Office, in fall of 2009 all administrative units of the District Office updated their sections of the original DOSOs to check them for accuracy, to simplify and condense descriptions of functions when possible, and to assure that effectiveness/outcome measures were feasible and appropriate. This preliminary review resulted in a new, more accurate draft version of the DOSOs that was then circulated among primary user groups during the months of November and December 2009 and January 2010 for critique and comment. The District Planning Committee requested that the following primary user groups review and comment on the accuracy of the DOSOs during this period:
The Chancellor’s Cabinet
The District Council of Academic Affairs
The District Council of Student Services
The District Administrative Council
The Executive Committee of the District Academic Senate

These five primary user groups completed their review of the revised DOSOs in winter 2010 (D2.7). Their suggestions for revision and refinement of the DOSOs were then used to produce a final version of the District Office Service Outcomes which was then included in the revised LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook.

2. Update of District-wide Committee Descriptions

To complement the review and revision of the District Office Service Outcomes, the DPC also asked all standing district-wide committees and councils to revisit and revise their committee descriptions. To structure this effort, the DPC created a new template for the documentation of all district-wide committees (D2.7). This template was designed to provide uniform information on the following:

- Committee description and charge
- Committee reporting authority
- Committee consultation and collaboration
- Committee chair and membership by position
- Committee meeting times and dates
- Date of committee annual self evaluation and goal setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Budget Committee (DBC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Committee Charge** | - Oversees development of the district budget  
- Makes recommendations regarding budget policies  
- Reviews and recommends modifications to the district budget allocation model  
- Recommends annual FTES growth targets  
- Monitors college debt and reduction efforts |
| **Reports To** | The Chancellor |
| **Consults With** | The Cabinet |
| **Meeting Date and Time** | Variable Wednesday, monthly, 1:30 p.m to 3:30 p.m. |
| **Chair(s) Name and Position** | David Beaulieu, District Academic Senate President  
Mark Rocha, President, West LA College |
| **Membership** | 9 College Presidents  
5 Academic Senate Representatives  
6 AFT Faculty Guild Representatives  
AFT Staff Guild Representative  
Local 911 Teamster Representative  
SEIU Representative  
SEIU Local 99 Representative  
Building and Construction Trades Representative  
Supervisors/Classified Local 721 Representative  
ASO Representative  
Deputy Chancellor (Resource)  
Chief Financial Officer (Resource)  
Budget Director (Resource) |
| **Link to Agenda/Minutes** | [www.laccd.edu](http://www.laccd.edu) |
| **Month of Annual Self Assessment** | June |
Revised descriptions with templates of more than 50 district-wide committees were forwarded to the DPC in February 2010 for inclusion in the new LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook.

3. **Expansion of the Content of the 2008 Functional Map**

As part of the revision of the 2008 Functional Map, the District Planning Committee agreed in fall 2009 to expand the original document in order to include more detail on district-wide consultation, governance, planning, and decision-making processes. This was done in conjunction with a DPC-led district-wide effort encouraging the nine LACCD colleges to document all governance and planning processes through the creation of formal governance and planning handbooks (D2.9). During the fall and early winter, the following new segments of the Functional Map were drafted:

- Overview of District-wide Governance and Decision Making Processes
- Philosophy and Principles of Governance in a Decentralized District
- The Role of Annual Board Goals in the District Effectiveness Accountability Cycle
- Consultation and the Roles and Responsibilities of Stakeholder Organizations
  - The Chancellor and College Presidents
  - The District Academic Senate
  - The Associated Students Organization
  - The six collective bargaining units
- Overview of District-level Decision Making
  - Participatory Governance and Direct Collegial Consultation
  - District-level Governance Committees and Processes
    - The District Budget Planning Process (District Budget Committee)
    - The District Strategic Planning Process (District Planning Committee)
    - District Bond Planning and Oversight (District Bond Steering Committee)
    - Benefits Planning (Joint Labor/Management Benefits Committee)
  - The District Management Consultation Process
  - The HR Guide Development Process
  - Personnel Commission Processes
- Overview of District-level Planning Processes
  - District Strategic Planning and its Relation to College Planning
  - The Board’s Annual Effectiveness Review Cycle
  - The District Budget Planning Process
- The process and timeline for evaluating the effectiveness of District-wide governance
- The process and timeline for District Handbook revision

These new segments of the Functional Map were reviewed by the District Planning Committee on February 26, 2010 (D2.10). Relevant sections on participatory governance and stakeholder roles were also reviewed by members of the appropriate stakeholder groups in February and March 2010, including the Chancellor’s Cabinet, the District Academic Senate, and the collective bargaining units. Final versions of these materials were included in the revised LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook before its submission to the Board for review and adoption on March 10, 2010. It is expected that inclusion of these segments in the new District Handbook will contribute to an improved understanding of district-wide decision making.
making and the mutual roles and responsibilities of the district system and the colleges for all LACCD employees.

4. **Survey Assessing the Accuracy of the District/College Relationship**

To complement the review of the District Office Service Outcomes and further inform the revision of the *District Handbook*, in fall 2009 the District Planning Committee also initiated a formal survey of the accuracy of the definition of the District/college functional relationship as documented in the 2008 *Functional Map*. Given the length and complexity of the overall document, it was decided that an extensive survey of the District Office Service Outcomes would be both cumbersome and impractical. Instead, the DPC decided to engage faculty, staff, administrative, and student leaders in an assessment of the accuracy of the definition of “The District/College Relationship” as documented in pages three and four of the 2008 *Functional Map*. It was also agreed that, given the size and scope of District operations, a survey of all employees would not be meaningful because the vast majority are not directly involved in college/district governance, decision making, or other coordinating activity. As a result, the survey was targeted to faculty, staff, administrators, and student leaders who participate directly in administrative or decision-making processes that involve active district/college collaboration.

The survey was piloted in paper form at the annual AFT/LACCD Workshop for Department Chairs, Deans, and Vice Presidents on October 23, 2009 (D2.11). It was then distributed online to the following constituent leadership groups throughout the fall of 2009:

- The Chancellor’s Cabinet
- The District Council of Academic Affairs
- The District Council of Student Services
- The District Administrative Council
- The District Academic Senate (full membership)
- The Executive Board of the American Federation of Teachers Union, Local 1521
- The Executive Board of the AFT Staff Guild, Local 1521A
- The Academic Senates of all nine LACCD colleges (full membership)
- The Shared Governance Committees of all nine LACCD colleges (full membership, including faculty, staff, administrators, and students)
- The District Student Affairs Committee (including the nine ASO college student presidents)

The survey was designed to be as brief as possible (D2.12). This was done because to complete it, respondents were required to read the full two-page description of the “District/College Functional Relationship” as it appeared in the 2008 *Functional Map*. This definition of District/college roles and responsibilities included a brief three-paragraph synopsis of the evolution of the District/college relationship, a 10 bullet-point list of highly centralized functions, a 7 bullet-point list of district system functions, and a 10 bullet-point list of college level functions. Once respondents had read this definition, they were invited to indicate their level of agreement on a five-part Likert scale with the following two statements:

1. *The delineation of district-level functions...from the “District/College Functional Map” accurately reflects the primary roles and responsibilities of the District in relationship to the colleges.*
2. The delineation of college-level functions from the “District/College Functional Map” accurately reflects the primary roles and responsibilities of the District in relationship to the colleges.

In addition, they were invited to offer open-ended “editorial changes” meant to increase the accuracy of the written description of the District/college relationship, and they were given the opportunity to offer open-ended suggestions for additional “administrative or operational changes” that could be made in this relationship that would, in their view, improve District/college effectiveness.

In all, more than 185 respondents completed the survey, including a total of 121 faculty (of whom 50 were department chairs), 32 administrators, 23 classified staff and managers, and two student leaders. The results were compiled and presented to the DPC on January 29, 2010 for preliminary review, analysis and discussion (D2.13). As documented in the “District/College Roles and Functions Assessment Report,” 66% of those responding to the survey indicated their agreement with the description of the District system’s seven major functions, and nearly 68% expressed agreement with the accuracy of the 10-point description of college-level functions (D2.14). Fewer than 8% of respondents indicated any level of disagreement with either of these delineations of District and college functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion/Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The delineation of district-level functions offered below from the “District/College Functional Map” accurately reflects the primary roles and responsibilities of the District in relationship to the colleges.</td>
<td>7.2% (11)</td>
<td>58.8% (90)</td>
<td>5.2% (8)</td>
<td>2.6% (4)</td>
<td>26.1% (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The delineation of college-level functions offered below from the “District/College Functional Map” accurately reflects the primary roles and responsibilities of the District in relationship to the colleges.</td>
<td>8.7% (13)</td>
<td>59.1% (88)</td>
<td>4.0% (6)</td>
<td>2.0% (3)</td>
<td>26.8% (40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly 70 respondents offered specific suggestions for improving the delineation of District/college functions. Editorial suggestions offered to improve the accuracy of the description of the District/college functional relationship included the following:

- Make the delineation of functions as brief as possible
- Include a glossary of terms in the revision of the *Functional Map*
- Include payroll and CalSTRS reporting in District level functions
- Include a more detailed picture of District organization
- Include the names of those responsible for various functions
Respondents’ substantive suggestions for improving the District/college relationship fell into the following 7 categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment/Suggestion</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decentralize or Rethink District/College Relations</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Communications</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline Operations/Processes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Representation in Decision Making</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-related Comments</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A or No Opinion or Unclear</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK at this time</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As might be expected during a severe budget crisis and within the framework of a nine-college district, the largest category of suggestions had to do with improving District Office effectiveness and “decentralizing” administrative functions. Recommendations in this category ranged from cutting the budget of the District Office and providing more college autonomy to elimination of the Personnel Commission:

[What is needed is] An allocation model that truly reflects the student population (FTES) and needs of each college. A model that rewards colleges for innovative and successful programs and allows them to spend their 'balances' on their students rather than on subsidizing poor practices by other colleges.

Treat the colleges as we should treat each student, recognize the individual characteristics and not treat every college according to what is appropriate to the least common denominator.

The District must move down from [the] Administration to discover the needs [of] college programs. Faculty hold the key to the services offered to our product—the students.

While many of the suggestions in this category expressed general discontent with the District Office, a few specific recommendations for improving the District/college relationship did emerge, including the following:

- A reassessment and revision of the District budget process and allocation model to provide a more equitable division of resources and to encourage fiscal responsibility
- Creation of a district-wide ombudsperson to “channel questions and concerns” between and among the colleges and the District Office
- More time spent by District senior staff at the colleges

As in the case with the District-level Governance and Decision Making Assessment (see page ?? below), a number of respondents also suggested that more effective communications would help ease some of the problems caused by the District’s size and complexity. Indeed, the need for more effective communications was often linked to the perceived “over-centralization” of District functions.

As documented by the District/College Roles and Functions Assessment Report, the delineation of District/college functional relationships offered in the 2008 Functional Map appears to be relatively accurate. However, in order to address some of the issues raised by survey respondents, the report included a number of recommendations for improving the description of
the District/college relationship and for substantive actions that could be implemented to improve District/college collaboration and coordination of services. The most important among these final recommendations include the following:

**Action Plan 1. Review the District Budget Process**
As part of the process of renewing the District Strategic Plan, the District’s budget process will be reviewed over the next 18 months. This review (already initiated by the Fiscal Policy and Review Subcommittee of the District Budget Committee) should be designed to produce mechanisms that:

- Enforce fiscal accountability at the District and college levels
- Optimize the distribution of financial resources across the District
- Provide adequate funding for basic administrative, educational, and student support services
- Link budget and planning priorities
- Incentivize innovation and student success

Final results of this review will be reported to the District Budget Committee and to the Board of Trustees by June 15, 2011.

**Action Plan 2. Optimize District/College Administrative Operations**
As part of the new District Strategic Planning process slated to begin in spring 2010, a formal review of the District Office will be undertaken to accomplish the following:

- Identify and mitigate duplication of effort between District and college administrative units
- Identify any functions currently provided by the District Office that can be performed more effectively by the colleges
- Identify functions at the college-level that can be performed more effectively from the District Office

This review is expected to be complete by the time of the adoption of the next District Strategic Plan by June 15, 2011.

5. **The Newly Revised LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook**

Based on input gathered from the DOSO review effort and the “District/College Roles and Functions” assessment—and including newly revised committee templates and additional materials on District governance and decision making—a new, more accurate version of the 2008 LACCD Functional Map was presented to the District Planning Committee for review on February 26, 2010 (D2.15). Titled the LACCD District/College Governance and Functions Handbook, this improved version of the Map was reviewed presented to the Board of Trustees for approval on March 10, 2010 (D2.16). It is expected that this new District Handbook will provide all District employees with a more accurate and informed understanding of the District’s role in relationship to the colleges (D2.17).
Evaluation and Follow-Up

The results of the “District/College Roles and Functions Assessment” survey indicate that most faculty, staff, and student leaders endorse the accuracy of the delineation of District/college operational responsibilities as defined within the original 2008 LACCD District/College Functional Map. It is expected that the additional steps that have been taken to refine upon the 2008 Functional Map, culminating in the publication of the new LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook, will further improve understanding of the District/college relationship within the LACCD.

Over the next 18 months the District will implement the two action plans included in the District/College Roles and Functions Assessment Report, which are meant to enhance the effectiveness of District Office operations and improve the District’s budget planning process. Results of these two efforts will be presented to the Board of Trustees by June 15, 2011. (See the Action Plan Implementation Grid on page 26.)

Beginning in spring 2012, the District Governance and Functions Handbook will be re-assessed and revised on a two-year cycle. In addition, the District will again conduct a formal survey assessment of the accuracy of the delineation of functional roles and responsibilities as described in the District Handbook at that time. The results of this assessment will be reported to the ACCJC as part of the three comprehensive self study reports due at that time from the LACCD “Seaside Colleges” and as part of the Mid-term Accreditation Reports due from the three “Cityside Colleges.”

Evidence

D2.1 ACCJC Multi-College Pilot Project Description
D2.2 2003-4 LACCD Functional Map
D2.3 2008 LACCD District/College Functional Map
D2.4 2009 ELAC Accreditation Team Evaluation Report, p. 49.
D2.5 2009 LATTC Accreditation Team Evaluation Report, p. 48
D2.6 DPC Plan for Responding to Cityside District Accreditation Recommendations
D2.7 Council and Committee Minutes related to DOSO Review Process
D2.8 LACCD District Committee Template
D2.9 DPC Goals for 2009-10
D2.10 DPC Minutes, February 26, 2010
D2.11 2009AFT/LACCD Workshop for Chairs, Deans, & VPs Agenda
D2.12 District/College Roles and Responsibilities Assessment Survey
D2.13 DPC Minutes, January 29, 2010
D2.14 District/College Roles and Functions Assessment Report, 2-26-10
D2.15 DPC Agenda/Minutes, February 26, 2010
D2.16 BOT Planning & Student Success Committee Agenda & Action, March 10, 2010
D2.17 LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook, 2010
District Recommendation 3: Board and Administrative Organization

To meet standards, develop and implement methods for the evaluation of role delineation and governance and decision-making structures and processes for the college and the district. Widely communicate the results of the evaluation and use those results as the basis for improvement. (IV.B.3.g)

Summary of Actions Taken

Accreditation Standard IV.3.g. requires that college districts regularly evaluate governance and decision-making structures and processes “to assure their integrity and effectiveness in assisting the colleges in meeting educational goals.” It also requires that districts communicate the results of such evaluations widely and use them as the basis for improvement. While the Los Angeles Community College District has a long history of active participatory governance at the District level, the effectiveness of the District’s decision-making processes and procedures had not been formally assessed at the time of the 2009 self study site visits to the LACCD “Cityside colleges” (East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles City College, and Los Angeles Trade-Technical College).

Following the receipt of the evaluation team reports for the Cityside site visits, the District Planning Committee (DPC) assumed responsibility for shaping and implementing the District’s coordinated response to this recommendation (D3.1). In September 2009, the DPC designed a series of steps aimed at the implementation of a new cyclical process for this governance self assessment effort (D3.2). The steps taken by the DPC included the following:

1. Institution of a formal biennial survey of stakeholder group assessments of district-wide decision making;

2. Publication to all stakeholder groups of a biennial District-wide Governance Assessment Report, summarizing assessment efforts and including recommendations and plans for improving District-level governance and decision making processes;

3. Institution of a new, annual self-evaluation process for district-level governance committees;

4. Expansion of the contents of the 2008 LACCD District/College Functional Map in the new LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook, to include sections on district-wide governance and decision making.

In addition, to improve district-wide governance and to enhance district-level institutional effectiveness and accountability, the Board of Trustees developed and adopted a new annual “District Effectiveness Review Cycle” in January 2010 which aligns annual Board and CEO goals with the goals of the District Strategic Plan and implements a new series of annual district and college effectiveness reports to the Board. It is anticipated that the District’s newly implemented biennial governance assessment cycle, the annual self assessment of District governance committees, and the Board’s new District effectiveness review cycle will assure that the District has developed and successfully implemented methods for improving District-level governance and decision-making processes.
1. District-Level Governance and Decision-Making Assessment

Survey Overview

To initiate the District’s new Governance Assessment cycle, the District Planning Committee designed and administered a formal survey of stakeholder satisfaction with district-wide participatory governance during fall semester 2009. As with the “District/College Roles and Responsibilities Assessment” described above (see page ??), the DPC targeted its survey efforts to those directly involved in some form of district- or college-level governance activity. This decision was made to facilitate distribution of the survey and to guarantee that those responding would have informed positions on the strengths and weaknesses of district-wide decision making. As a result, survey efforts were focused on faculty, staff, administrators, and student leaders who either play a role in governance at the district-level or who are involved with governance processes at the nine LACCD colleges.

Paper copies of the survey were initially distributed to over 100 faculty and administrative leaders at the annual District Academic Senate Leadership Summit on October 2, 2009 (D3.3). This was done in conjunction with a leadership panel discussion on the quality of district-wide governance which involved the president of the Board of Trustees, the Acting Chancellor, the District Academic Senate President, the president of the Faculty Guild, the president of the Staff Guild, the Student Trustee, and the Vice Chancellor for Institutional Effectiveness (D3.4). Paper copies of the survey were also distributed during an accreditation update to attendees at the AFT/LACCD Workshop for Department Chairs, Deans, and VPs on October 23, 2009 (D3.5). The survey was then distributed online to the following constituent leadership groups throughout the fall of 2009:

- The Chancellor’s Cabinet
- The District Council of Academic Affairs
- The District Council of Student Services
- The District Administrative Council
- The District Academic Senate (full membership)
- The Executive Board of the American Federation of Teachers Union, Local 1521
- The Executive Board of the AFT Staff Guild, Local 1521A
- The Academic Senates of all nine LACCD colleges (full membership)
- The Shared Governance Committees of all nine LACCD colleges (full membership, including faculty, staff, administrators, and students)
- The District Student Affairs Committee (including the nine ASO college student presidents)

Asking respondents to indicate their agreement to a series of 21 questions on a five-part Likert scale, the “District-Level Governance and Decision-Making Assessment” survey was designed by the DPC to provide information on the following:

1. Respondents’ estimations of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the roles played by stakeholder groups, including the administration, the District Academic Senate, the collective bargaining groups, and the Associated Students Organization;

2. Respondents’ estimations of the effectiveness of district-level decision-making processes in relation to five primary governance areas: budget and resource allocation, enrollment
management, strategic planning and goal setting, bond program oversight, and employee benefits;

3. Respondents’ estimations of the “quality” of district-level decision making (e.g., the extent to which decisions are based on data, and are effectively communicated, implemented, and assessed);

4. Respondents’ overall assessment of administrative and Board support of participatory governance; and

5. Respondents’ overall assessment of the effectiveness of district-wide decision making in relation to the District’s stated mission.

In addition, respondents were invited to offer their open-ended assessment of the central problems with district-level participatory governance and to suggest solutions that would lead to improved governance and decision making in the LACCD (D3.6):

---

**Los Angeles Community College District**

**District-Level Governance and Decision Making Assessment**

This survey is being conducted as part of a formal assessment of the effectiveness of district-level participatory governance and decision making. Your responses to the questions below—and your comments—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. Please do not complete this survey if you have already responded to it in a different setting.

Your Location:  
- ELAC  
- LACC  
- LATTC  
- LAHC  
- LAVC  
- LAMC  
- Pierce  
- District

Your Role:  
- Administrator
- Dept. Chair
- Faculty
- Classified Staff
- Classified Manager
- Student

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with all of the following statements by placing an “X” in the appropriate box on the right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The Administration is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The District Academic Senate is appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The following collective bargaining units are appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFT Faculty Guild 1521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFT Staff Guild 1521A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teamsters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors 721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings and Crafts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The Associated Students are appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>District-level decision making is effective in relation to Budget Development and Resource Allocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>District-level decision making is effective in relation to Enrollment Management and FTES Target Setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>District-level decision making is effective in relation to Strategic Planning and Strategic Goal Setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>District-level decision making is effective in relation to Bond Program Planning and Oversight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>District-level decision making is effective in relation to Employee Benefits (JLMBC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are based on research and data.  
11. Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are communicated effectively to all affected stakeholders.  
12. Decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are followed through on effectively.  
13. The results of decisions made through participatory governance at the district level are assessed by appropriate committees.  
14. The LACCD Board of Trustees supports participatory governance.  
15. The District/college administration supports participatory governance—at the district level.  
16. Overall, I find that District-wide decision making is effective in supporting the District’s mission.

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

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

In all, 311 surveys were completed, with the major District stakeholder groups being represented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairs</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (ASO)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Identified</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that department chairs are also faculty members, overall faculty respondents totaled 189 and represented 60.9% of all those submitting a completed survey. Colleges were proportionately represented among respondents, with Los Angeles City College accounting for the highest percentage of surveys completed at 13.5% and Los Angeles Southwest College, the smallest college in the District, representing the lowest at 5.1% (D3.7).

Survey Findings

Results of the survey indicate relatively positive approval of District-level governance overall, tempered with serious concerns about the effectiveness of district-wide communications, the transparency of district-level decision-making processes, and the level of centralization involved in district decision making. In response to the first nine survey items addressing the appropriateness and adequacy of stakeholder group representation in District-level governance,
most of those surveyed either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” with the notion that all stakeholder groups play an appropriate role and are effectively represented in district-level decision making:

![District Level Governance & Decision Making Assessment - Representation](chart)

The Associated Students Organizations represent the only stakeholder category associated with any clear concern about their role in District-level governance. While 46.2% of all respondents felt the Associated Students Organizations were well represented, 22% disagreed—the highest negative rating received by any of the nine stakeholder groups.

Satisfaction with various types of District-level governance and decision-making processes was mixed. Over 66% of respondents either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that District-level decision making is effective in relation to issues involving employee benefits, while roughly half approved the effectiveness of decision making in relation to District strategic planning and enrollment management. However, approval ratings were somewhat lower for decision-making processes related to budget and resource allocation and District-wide bond programs: 39% of
respondents questioned the effectiveness of decision making in relation to district-level bond program oversight, and nearly 43% questioned the effectiveness of district-level budget-related decision making.

Respondents also indicated some concern about the quality of district-wide decision-making processes: 20-30% of those surveyed disagreed that district-wide decision making is based on research, is followed through effectively, and involves appropriate assessment. However, the most serious concern about the quality of district-wide governance arose in relation to communication: nearly half of those surveyed disputed the assertion that the results of district-wide participatory governance are communicated effectively to all stakeholders.
Interestingly, Board and administrative support of participatory governance was rated relatively highly. Nearly 70% of respondents agreed that the Board of Trustees supports participatory governance at the district level, and 64% indicated similar approval of District and college administrative support.

While 56% of those surveyed affirmed that district-level decision making effectively supports the District’s stated mission, a significant percentage of respondents also questioned this claim:

Of the total 311 respondents, 146 offered opinions on problems with district-wide governance. Often touching on a number of different issues in a single comment, their observations were grouped by the DPC into the following topic categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Category</th>
<th># of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of communication/transparency</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more college autonomy (decentralization)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient representation of group</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues related to the size and scope of District</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for accountability and leadership</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process-related problems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous and College-specific Issues</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A or unclear response</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the issues identified, lack of robust communication and transparency were by far the most commonly mentioned. Respondents complained about the lack of “two-way communication” between the district-level governance groups and the colleges. It was widely felt that the results of and rationales behind District-level decision-making processes often fail to “trickle down” to college level.
Frankly it [district-level governance] is opaque unless you are part of the process. The results of the districtwide processes are often a mystery to most faculty, unless they are part of the groups that sit on all of the major college committees.

LACK OF COMMUNICATION. There is a problem with... representatives not communicating back to the constituents. I don't know where is the central information place where news and issues are shown to the public or the colleges in general, agendas, actions minutes, current issues in consideration.

Respondents also offered a number of suggestions for improving district-wide communications and enhancing the transparency of district-level governance processes, including the following:

- More use of video conferencing
- Use of E-bulletin boards
- Pod-casting committee meetings
- Posting meetings on YouTube
- Posting of committee membership, agendas, and minutes online
- Periodic status reports and updates to the colleges
- Weekly emails from the Chancellor
- More quick periodic surveys district-wide
- Open forums on district-level governance issues
- Periodic district-wide retreats and town hall meetings on key issues
- Professional development to enhance communication
- More committee meetings held at colleges
- More visits by District Office personnel to the colleges
- Implementation of a web page dedicated to fiscal transparency
- Periodic district-wide retreats and town hall meetings on key issues
- Professional development to enhance communication
- More committee meetings held at colleges
- More visits by District Office personnel to the colleges
- Implementation of a web page dedicated to fiscal transparency
- Permanent staff dedicated to the general District Office phone

The second most frequently cited problem related to lack of adequate representation of individual stakeholder groups. A few respondents indicated that they felt the unions are overrepresented on district-level governance committees, but in general there was little agreement about which specific groups need additional representation. There were, however, a number of respondents who felt that students need a greater voice in district-level affairs.

The third most frequently noted problem involved the perceived “over-centralization” of District decision making. A significant number of respondents felt that the colleges need additional freedom to make their own decisions in order to better serve local communities. This call for greater college autonomy was frequently linked to perceived inequities in the district budget allocation process and to the sense that the District Office is frequently “out of touch” with the needs and priorities of the campuses:

A one size fits all model is not effective for all the colleges. Colleges that are innovative and effective in serving their community and operating in the black should be able to use their balance to serve the students in their community. Colleges that cannot sustain a full program should cut back on programs/athletic, etc. to run an effective core program.

The district does not take into account what is best for each college; and over compensates for colleges who are not effective.
The fourth most frequently noted problem related to the size of the District and the scope of its operations. A number of respondents indicated that the geographical dispersion of district locations and the large number of stakeholder groups make district-level governance a cumbersome and time-consuming process. The result, according to respondent comments, is to discourage participation, to emphasize the “ceremonial” nature of district-wide governance, and to distance district-level activity from college realities:

*The size, distance and complexity of the district and colleges create built-in problems at almost all levels.*

*District level participatory governance is difficult for college-based employees due to the difficulty with time constraints and the busy schedule that that campus demands.*

2. **Publication of a Biennial District Governance Assessment Report**

The results of the “District-level Governance and Decision Making Assessment” were analyzed by the District Planning Committee on January 29, 2010 (D3.8). Based on these findings, the DPC formulated a series of recommendations for improving district-level decision making. The survey results and the recommendations for improving district-level decision-making processes were then published in early spring 2010 in the first of a series of biennial *District-wide Governance Assessment Reports* (D3.9). This report was subsequently shared among key stakeholder groups, including the Chancellor’s Cabinet, the three administrative councils, the District Academic Senate, the AFT Faculty and Staff guilds, the nine college academic senates, and the nine college shared governance councils. The final report was reviewed by the LACCD Board of Trustees Planning and Student Success Committee and approved by the Board on March 10, 2010 (D3.10).

The 2010 *District Governance Assessment Report* contains the following four action plans designed to improve district-level governance:

**Action Plan 1. Implement a District-wide Communications and Transparency Initiative**

Over the next year, the District will implement an initiative aimed at improving district-wide communications with a particular emphasis on improving communications and information dissemination related to district-level budget, bond, planning, and other critical decision-making processes. This initiative should be designed to include the following components:

A. Redesign of the District website to make it more user-friendly and to assure that it provides easy access to:
   a. District Office organizational charts, including all personnel by unit
   b. Contact information for all District Office personnel
   c. Process maps with links to required forms for all key administrative processes
   d. District-wide committee/council descriptions online with links to agendas and minutes.

B. Use communications technology to facilitate “push reporting” of committee activities and “instant surveys” of campus perceptions and priorities.
C. Monthly posting of all district-level committee/council agendas and minutes on the district website.

D. Implementation of regular District/college informative reports, including a periodic Chancellor’s “Newsletter” and an annual “State of the District” report.

E. Permanent staffing of the District Office general information phone line during regular business hours.

Progress on this initiative will be reported directly to the Planning and Student Success Committee of the Board of Trustees by District executive staff on a bi-annual basis. Full implementation of the five action plans described above will be expected by June 15, 2011.

Action Plan 2. Review the District Budget Process
As part of the process of renewing the District Strategic Plan, the District’s budget process will be reviewed over the next 18 months. (See p. 9.) This review (already initiated by the Fiscal Policy and Review Subcommittee of the District Budget Committee) will be designed to produce mechanisms that:

- Enforce fiscal accountability at the District and college levels
- Optimize the distribution of financial resources across the District
- Provide adequate funding for basic administrative, educational, and student support services
- Link budget and planning priorities
- Incentivize innovation and student success

Final results of this review will be reported to the District Budget Committee and to the Board of Trustees by June 15, 2011.

As part of the assessment and revision of the District Strategic Plan, 2006-11, District leadership will undertake an in-depth review of all District-level governance process and structures in order to achieve the following:

1. To the extent deemed practicable and needed, align and simplify district-level governance, planning, and decision making processes and structures
2. Improve the coordination of District goals and budget priorities
3. Assure that district-level planning and decision making are responsive to local college needs
4. Reduce, whenever possible, the number and meeting requirements of district-wide councils and committees

This review should be completed by the time of the adoption of the new District Strategic Plan in June 2011.

Action Plan 4. Enhance Professional Development on District Governance
District staff will work with the District Academic Senate and college counterparts to develop a district-wide professional development program to acquaint college and District Office
employees and student leaders with district-level governance and decision-making processes, including those involved in strategic and bond program planning, budget development, and enrollment management. This program of enhanced professional development will begin in Fall 2010 and continue during the review and revision of the District Strategic Plan. The effectiveness of this effort will then be reviewed as part of the on-going assessment of district-level governance and decision making.

To close the loop on its biennial cycle of governance assessment and improvement, in September 2011 the District Planning Committee will redesign and re-deploy the “District-level Governance and Decision-Making Assessment” and will use it as the basis for a new round of recommendations for improving district-level governance and decision-making processes. The results of this survey will then form the basis for a new District-wide Governance Assessment Report which will be published in spring 2012.

3. District Governance Committee Self-Evaluation Process

To complement its survey of stakeholder assessments of district-level governance and decision making, the District Planning Committee also designed a process for the self evaluation of district-level participatory governance committees. This process was designed to achieve the following:

1. To assure that district governance committee activities align with committee charges;
2. To structure annual committee self reflection on committee achievements;
3. To generate recommendations for committee process improvement leading to greater effectiveness.

The DPC identified the following four district-level committees as those most directly involved with formal consultation and participatory governance:

- The District Planning Committee (DPC)
- The District Budget Committee (DBC)
- The District Bond Steering Committee (DBSC)
- The District Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC)

To guide each committee’s self-evaluation process, the DPC designed an assessment template that was based on a local best-practice originally piloted at Los Angeles Mission College (LAMC). Responding to a 2007 self study evaluation team recommendation that the college assess and improve its decision-making processes, LAMC devised a self-evaluation form to structure the assessment process (D3.11). This model was later praised by accreditation evaluators during a follow-up visit to the college in 2009 (D3.12). Based on this model, the DPC designed a “District-wide Governance Committee Self Evaluation Form” which requires committees to provide the following information (D3.13):

- A monthly account of meeting dates and attendance
- A monthly account of the posting of agendas and minutes
- A monthly summary of major issues addressed
- A summary of major annual committee accomplishments
- An assessment of problems or obstacles to committee function
- An assessment of recommendations for improvement
- A listing of future committee goals

The four district-wide decision-making committees that performed the self evaluation process in 2009-10 each reported individual issues or problems and outlined various recommendations for improvement (D3.14). As a result of their self evaluations, the committees will implement a number of improvements, including the following:

**District Planning Committee (DPC)**
- Define the committee quorum to reflect multiple college representatives
- Increase use of video conferencing
- Appoint a faculty co-chair
- Provide additional administrative support (if feasible)
- Explore closer alignment of District planning priorities

**District Budget Committee (DBC)**
- Establish annual goals, including review of budget allocation model and development of additional strategies for controlling expenditures while maintaining revenue
- Distribute materials electronically prior to meeting
- Improve dissemination of budget-related information to all district employees

**District Bond Steering Committee (DBSC)**
- Clarify the relationship between the Bond Steering Committee and the Energy Taskforce
- Improve communications with all college stakeholders and constituencies
- Consider lengthening meeting times
Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC)

- Research rules that cover Cal-PERS
- Learn more about “customer” problems with health care plans
- Agendize discussion of committee goals at every meeting
- Enhance committee transparency, including improvement of District website information
- Review and improve committee structure

District-level governance committee self evaluations will be conducted every year under the guidance of the District Planning Committee. Results of these self evaluations will be reported to the Board of Trustees each spring as part of the Board’s annual District Effectiveness Report (see page ?? below).

4. The LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook

As part of its response to this recommendation, in September 2009 the District Planning Committee established the goal of producing college governance handbooks for all LACCD colleges (D3.15). To support this effort, the DPC surveyed models of such handbooks within the District and across the state, and, based on this research, designed a “Governance Handbook Template” that was offered to the colleges as a guide to handbook content and design (D3.16). This process led the DPC to conclude that additional information on district-level governance, consultation, and planning also needed to be included in the revision of the 2008 LACCD District/College Functional Map. As part of this revision effort, the DPC agreed to incorporate additional sections in the newly revised LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook that are meant to clarify the following (see p. 5 above for more detail):

- The principles of governance in a partially decentralized district
- The primary district-level governance, decision-making and policy formulation processes
- The roles and responsibilities of stakeholder groups (including the Administration, the District Academic Senate, the six organized labor unions, and Associated Students Organization);
- The roles and responsibilities of district-wide governance committees
- The process and timeline for the cyclical evaluation of the effectiveness of District-wide governance

It is expected that these new materials will help faculty, administrative, staff, and student leaders navigate district-wide governance and decision-making processes more effectively in the future. As noted above, the newly revised District Handbook was reviewed and adopted by the Board of Trustees on March 10, 2010 (D3.17).

The Board’s “District Effectiveness Review Cycle”

In response to the need to increase both follow-through and accountability at the district level, at its annual retreat held on January 20, 2010, the LACCD Board of Trustees adopted a newly-devised “District Effectiveness Review Cycle” (D3.18). This annual district planning and accountability cycle was designed to achieve the following:
• To assure that District-level strategic goals are implemented and monitored;
• To synchronize the Board’s annual goal setting process with the traditional academic calendar;
• To align annual Board goals with those of the Chancellor, the college presidents, and District Senior Staff; and
• To establish a regular process for college Institutional Effectiveness reporting that aligns with the Board’s District Strategic Plan reports, the Board’s annual ARCC AB 1417 review, and its annual self assessment process.

This annual planning and accountability cycle includes five stages (D3.19):

The recently Board-approved District Effectiveness Review cycle will begin with the publication of new Board goals following the Board’s annual retreat, to be held on July 14, 2010. It is expected that this effectiveness cycle will increase the Board’s ability to monitor district-wide progress on all district-level strategic goals and Board priorities. It is also expected that this new accountability process will help guide district-level decision making.
Evaluation & Follow Up

The Biennial Governance Assessment Cycle

The results of the District Governance and Decision Making Assessment survey indicate that most faculty, staff, and student leaders across the District feel that stakeholder groups are appropriately and effectively represented in district-level governance. The survey also indicates that participatory governance and decision making are relatively healthy in the LACCD.

In order to address areas of concern raised within the survey, the four action plans recommended in the Biennial District Governance Assessment Report will be implemented over the next 18 months.

The results of all of the district-level governance improvement efforts described above will themselves be assessed and evaluated as part of the newly established biennial District-wide Governance Self Assessment process in spring 2012. The results of this assessment, along with specific recommendations for further improvement will be presented to the Board of Trustees as part of the 2012 LACCD District Governance Assessment Report. They will also be reported to ACCJC evaluators at that time as part of the Mid-Term Accreditation Reports submitted by the “Cityside” colleges (East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles City College, and Los Angeles Trade-Technical College) and in conjunction with the comprehensive Self Study Reports due to the ACCJC from the three LACCD “Seaside” colleges (Los Angeles Harbor College, Los Angeles Southwest College, and West Los Angeles College). Thereafter, District-wide governance and decision-making processes will be re-assessed and refined every two years.

District-wide governance committees will monitor their progress toward improving their individual decision-making processes as part of their annual self evaluations, which will be reported to the District Planning Committee each year and included in the Board’s annual District Effectiveness Review Cycle. This follow-up regimen will guarantee that on-going efforts to enhance district-wide decision-making are sustainable and that they will lead to continuous improvement of the District’s governance processes.

The following implementation matrix details the responsible agents and reporting timelines for the five action plans associated with District Recommendations 2 and 3 in this report:
## District Recommendation Action Plan Implementation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-Up Action Plans</th>
<th>Responsible Agent</th>
<th>Reports To</th>
<th>Progress Report</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. **Review the District Budget Process** <br>As part of the process of renewing the District Strategic Plan, the District’s budget process will be reviewed over the next 18 months. This review (already initiated by the Fiscal Policy and Review Subcommittee of the District Budget Committee) will be designed to produce mechanisms that:  
  - Enforce fiscal accountability at the District and college levels  
  - Optimize the distribution of financial resources across the District  
  - Provide adequate funding for basic administrative, educational, and student support services  
  - Link budget and planning priorities  
  - Incentivize innovation and student success | District Budget Committee (FPRC) | Board of Trustees  
| 2. **Optimize District/College Administrative Operations** <br>As part of the new District Strategic Planning process slated to begin in spring 2010, a formal review of the District Office will be undertaken to accomplish the following:  
  - Identify and mitigate duplication of effort between District and college administrative units  
  - Identify any functions currently provided by the District Office that can be performed more effectively by the colleges  
  - Identify functions at the college-level that can be performed more effectively from the District Office | Chancellor’s Optimization Taskforce (to be created after Chancellor’s appointment)  
| 3. **Implement a District-wide Communications and Transparency Initiative** <br>Over the next year, the District will implement an initiative aimed at improving district-wide communications with a particular emphasis on improving communications and information dissemination related to district-level budget, bond, planning, and other critical decision-making processes. This initiative should be designed to include the following components:  
  - Redesign of the District website to make it more user-friendly and to assure that it provides easy access to: | The Deputy Chancellor  
  District Institutional Effectiveness and District IT staff | Chancellor | Progress Report to Chancellor due: December 15, 2010 | Full implementation of 5 component action plans due: June 15, 2011 |
e. District Office organizational charts, including all personnel by unit  
f. Contact information for all District Office personnel  
g. Process maps with links to required forms for all key administrative processes  
h. District-wide committee/council descriptions online with links to agendas and minutes.

G. Use communications technology to facilitate “push reporting” of committee activities and “instant surveys” of campus perceptions and priorities.  
H. Monthly posting of all district-level committee/council agendas and minutes on the district website.  
I. Implementation of regular District/college informative reports, including a periodic Chancellor’s “Newsletter” and an annual “State of the District” report.  
J. Permanent staffing of the District Office general information phone line during regular business hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As part of the assessment and revision of the District Strategic Plan, 2006-11, District leadership will undertake an in-depth review of all District-level governance processes and structures in order to achieve the following:</td>
<td>District Strategic Plan Taskforce</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Progress Report to Board</td>
<td>Final Report of recommendations to BOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To the extent deemed practicable and needed, align and simplify district-level governance, planning, and decision-making processes and structures</td>
<td>District Planning Committee</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>due: December 15, 2010</td>
<td>due: June 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve the coordination of District goals and budget priorities</td>
<td>District Governance Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assure that district-level planning and decision making are responsive to local college needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce, whenever possible, the number and meeting requirements of district-wide councils and committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Enhance Professional Development on District Governance</th>
<th>Deputy Chancellor</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
<th>Program Design &amp; Implementation Plan due: September 15, 2010</th>
<th>Full Implementation with activities at all nine colleges due: June 15, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District staff will work with the District Academic Senate and college counterparts to develop a district-wide professional development program to acquaint college and District Office employees and student leaders with district-level governance and decision-making processes, including those involved in strategic and bond program planning, budget development, and enrollment management. This program of enhanced professional development will begin in Fall 2010 and continue during the review and revision of the District Strategic Plan. The effectiveness of this effort will then be reviewed as part of the on-going assessment of district-level governance and decision making.</td>
<td>Division of Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>College Presidents</td>
<td>Pilot activities begin: October 2010 (DAS Leadership Summit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Academic Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence

D3.1  DPC Minutes, September 25, 2009
D3.2  DPC Process for Addressing District Accreditation Recommendations
D3.3  2009 District Academic Senate Leadership Summit Agenda
D3.4  2009 District Academic Senate Leadership Summit Breakout Sessions
D3.5  2009 AFT/LACCD Workshop for Chairs, Deans, & VPs agenda
D3.6  LACCD District Governance and Decision Making Assessment Form
D3.7  2010 District Governance Assessment Report
D3.8  DPC Minutes, January 29, 2010
D3.9  2010 District Governance Assessment Report
D3.10 Board Action approving 2010 District Governance Assessment Report
D3.11 Los Angeles Mission College Committee Self Assessment Process
D3.12 Los Angeles Mission College 2009 Accreditation Follow-up Team Evaluation Report
D3.13 LACCD Governance Committee Self-Evaluation Form
D3.14 Self Evaluations for the DPC, DBC, Bond Steering, and JLMBC Committees
D3.15 DPC Goals for 2009-10
D3.16 DPC Governance Handbook Template
D3.17 LACCD District Governance and Functions Handbook, 2010 (See D2.17)
D3.18 Board Retreat Agenda, January 20, 2010
D3.19 Board District Effectiveness Review Cycle