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STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

In its letter of June 30, 2009, to President Ernest Moreno, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) informed the College of several deficiencies reported by the accreditation evaluation team during its visit in March 2009 to validate the College Self Study. The Commission directed the College to report on our efforts to correct these deficiencies in two Follow-Up Reports.

Following the outcome of the March 2009 visit from the accreditation evaluation team, the College formed the Accreditation Response Group (ARG) in July 2009 to begin to address the issues raised by the visiting team. Initially an ad hoc committee, ARG was approved as a standing shared governance committee by the East Los Angeles College Shared Governance Council (ESGC) on November 23, 2009. ARG is co-chaired by the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and the Faculty Chair for Accreditation. The Accreditation Response Group is charged with overseeing the creation of Commission-required reports and the response to Commission recommendations. ARG is also the primary vehicle for promoting a campus culture that is concerned with accreditation and is focused on student learning (E.1).

The first task undertaken by the group was to begin the initial preparation of the Follow-Up Report required for Recommendation 1 in October 2009. The second task was to document all college decision-making processes through the creation of the East Los Angeles College Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook for distribution to the campus community (see Recommendation 6). Through this effort, administrative and faculty leaders identified gaps in the college’s current decision-making processes and developed ways to further improve college planning and governance. The third task was to complete the Follow-Up Report for March 2010.

The two follow-up reports were prepared with input from the appropriate college personnel, including the ALO, the faculty chair for accreditation, the faculty co-chair of the Budget Committee, the Academic Senate Executive Board, and the Associate Dean of Research. The draft was reviewed by ARG and the Academic Senate (E.2), and was posted on the College website (E.3) and sent as an attachment in campus email (E.4) for college community review before final approval by the Shared Governance Council on February 22 (E.5) and the Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees on March 10.

The second part of this Follow-Up Report is devoted to the District’s response to the three recommendations made specifically to the District by the visiting team in March. The report was distributed to the members of ARG, the Academic Senate, and the ESGC as well as to the campus at large in an email blast (E.6), therefore giving all campus constituencies the opportunity to respond to the District report during a two-week review period. The District Vice Chancellor for Institutional Effectiveness then presented the report to the ESGC for approval on March 8, 2010, and Academic Senate for approval on March 9, 2010. Both bodies approved the report. The Los Angeles Community College Board of Trustees approved the College report and the District Report on March 10, 2010 (E.7).
Evidence

E.1 Shared Governance Council, Minutes of November 23, 2009 (see item V.D.1)
E.2 Academic Senate, Minutes of February 9, 2010 (see item V.A) and February 23, 2010 (see item V.A)
E.3 Notice for campus review of ELAC Follow-Up Report 2 on College Administrative Portal
E.4 Notice via email for campus review of ELAC Follow-Up Report 2
E.5 Shared Governance Council, Minutes of February 8, 2010 (see item V.C) and February 22, 2010 (see item IV.A)
E.6 Notices via email for committee and campus review of District Follow-Up Report
E.7 Board of Trustees Actions, March 10, 2010, Approved College and District Follow-Up Reports
FOLLOW-UP REPORT 1: EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE

College Recommendation 1: Mission

The team recommends that in order to meet standards, the college ensure that the revised mission statement receives board approval. (Eligibility Requirement 2, Standard I.A.2)

The first Follow-Up Report to address the issue of Board approval of the college mission statement was submitted in October 2009 and provided evidence that the College has taken the appropriate steps to remedy this deficiency. The college mission statement, along with the College Strategic Plan, was approved by the Los Angeles Community College District Board of Trustees on May 13, 2009. Further, the College has now adopted a policy that is detailed in its recently developed Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook that clearly states the process by which all future revisions of the mission statement will be undertaken, including forwarding of the statement to the district for approval by the board (E1.1).

The Accrediting Commission notified the College on January 29, 2010, that Follow-up Report 1 had been accepted (E1.2).

Evidence

E1.1 Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook, pp. 25-26
E1.2 ACCJC Letter, January 29, 2010
FOLLOW-UP REPORT 2: EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE

The second Follow-Up Report, presented in this document, addresses four additional recommendations made by the Commission that the College focus on improving institutional effectiveness (Recommendation 2), the program review process for instructional programs (Recommendation 4), student support services (Recommendation 5), and decision-making roles and processes (Recommendation 6). Progress on student learning outcomes (Recommendation 3) will be covered in the college midterm report in March 2012.

College Recommendation 2: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

As noted by the 2003 team, the current team recommends the previous recommendation given to the college in 2003: The college should integrate planning with decision making and budgeting processes to ensure that the decisions to allocate staff, equipment, resources, and facilities throughout the college are based on identified strategic priorities and to ensure a continuous cycle of evaluation and improvement based upon data. (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.6, IV.B.2.b)

The College Planning Structure

ELAC has clearly articulated in written format its planning structure, the integration of planning with the decision-making and budgeting processes, and the evaluation of the planning processes in its recently adopted Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook (E2.1; see also Recommendation 6). The following narrative describes how these processes are accomplished.

The college planning structure at East Los Angeles College reflects the college’s commitment to shared governance and to obtaining campuswide and community input on the college goals and objectives that will shape the college’s future. The ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC) serves as the central governing body for all planning decisions and makes recommendations directly to the college president as part of the shared governance process. In addition to the ESGC, the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC), Educational Planning Subcommittee (EPSC), Facilities Planning Subcommittee (FPSC), Technology Planning Subcommittee (TPSC), Program Review and Viability Committee (PRVC), and the Budget Committee also play key roles in the development and implementation of the college planning agenda. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE), formerly the Office of Research and Planning, facilitates the development of the college planning documents and assists in the implementation and evaluation of the planning agenda.
As part of a multi-college district, East Los Angeles College is guided by the strategic planning agenda provided by the district office. The first formal Strategic Plan in the history of the Los Angeles Community College District was adopted by the Board of Trustees on January 24, 2007. The result of a year-long districtwide effort, the plan sets priorities that will guide district actions and initiatives during the next five years. It also serves to align district goals and priorities with those established in the California Community College System Strategic Plan. The District Planning Committee (DPC) oversees the plan's implementation and works to coordinate the future planning efforts of all nine district colleges. The Strategic Plan outlines five overarching goals and 33 related objectives for the nine LACCD colleges and the District Office. The five major planning goals are

I. **Access**: Expand Educational Opportunity and Access
II. **Success**: Enhance all Measures of Student Success
III. **Excellence**: Support Student Learning and Educational Excellence
IV. **Accountability**: Foster a Districtwide Culture of Service and Accountability
V. **Collaboration and Resources**: Explore New Resources and External Partnerships

ELAC utilizes the District Planning Goals to guide the development of its own planning agenda. The College produces four planning documents, which are formally revised regularly on a six-year schedule.

1. The **East Los Angeles College Strategic Plan** (E2.2) serves as the central planning document for the college and contains the **College Mission, College Vision**, and **College Strategic Directions and Values**. The Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) is responsible for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the Strategic Plan and reports to the ESGC. The Strategic Plan is used to guide the development of the other planning documents.
2. The Educational Master Plan (E2.3) details all academic and educational planning objectives, including student and administrative service objectives that relate to educational goals. The Educational Planning Subcommittee (EPSC) is responsible for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the Educational Master Plan.

3. The Facilities Master Plan (E2.4) describes all planning objectives related to facilities and college infrastructure. The Facilities Planning Subcommittee (FPSC) is responsible for the development, implementation and evaluation of the Facilities Master Plan.

4. The Technology Master Plan (E2.5) describes all objectives related to educational technology and technology infrastructure. The Technology Planning Subcommittee (TPSC) is responsible for the development, implementation and evaluation of the Technology Master Plan. All objectives are aligned with the strategic directions and values of the Strategic Plan.

All college planning agenda are created through data-driven processes that include national, state, local, and campus-level data. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness provides comprehensive college data on student outcomes and college core indicators of success. In addition, the Program Review process is used to substantiate the efforts made by departments to improve student learning and to identify the needs of ELAC students and the surrounding community. The Program Review and Viability Committee reviews and updates the college’s Program Review Plan every six years. This plan includes the schedule for conducting comprehensive program review and annual update plans. The Comprehensive Program Review Questionnaire focuses on the manner in which each program is supporting the agenda items listed in the Strategic Plan. In addition, the Comprehensive Program Review (E2.6) and Program Review Annual Update Plans (E2.7) utilize Student Learning Outcomes to assess the degree to which departments and programs are working to improve the student learning process and creating improvements in student outcomes. Annual Update Plans are completed in between comprehensive reviews to determine the progress made in responding to Comprehensive Program Review recommendations and the program or department’s own unit goals. The Annual Update Plans serve as the basis for resource allocation decisions, such as the hiring of new faculty and staff, purchases of new equipment, and increases or decreases to a unit’s base budget. The Comprehensive Program Review and Annual Update Plans are essential data in the development, implementation, and evaluative planning processes.

All college planning is conducted using evaluation cycles focused on continuous quality improvement for all instruction, student services, and administrative programs. ELAC enters into six-year planning cycles in which the college progresses through phases of Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation (PIE). By incorporating formative evaluations into operational decision-making, ELAC ensures that these annual processes are subject to self-reflective examination on an ongoing basis and that lessons learned contribute to improvements in these processes. Data-driven measures and formative evaluations contribute to a summative evaluation of the strategic plan implementation at the end of its six-year cycle. The link between the formative evaluations and summative evaluation ensures that continuous quality improvement is ongoing and is the driving force for revisions to the strategic plan. Through this model, the college ensures that all programs, as well as the college’s governing and decision-making processes, are regularly and thoroughly evaluated.
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The preceding chart illustrates the college’s cycle of Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation (PIE). This cycle is the core of the institution’s planning efforts and serves as the basis for long-term and operational decision-making. The College Mission serves as a guide through which all planning at ELAC takes place. Using the College Mission Statement and relevant data, the SPC develops the ELAC Strategic Plan which ensures that college strategic directions and values lead the college to fulfill its institutional mission. This Strategic Plan is used to drive the EPSC’s development of the Educational Master Plan, which provides the specific objectives and action items. Following this, the Facilities Master Plan and Technology Master Plan, developed by the FPSC and TPSC respectively, are aligned with the Educational Master Plan to ensure that all facilities, technology, and infrastructure planning is aimed at improving the educational opportunities of ELAC students and is consistent with the goals expressed in the ELAC Strategic Plan. The action items and objectives of each plan serve as the detailed guides that allow the college to implement each of its six-year master plans. Finally, the college’s Program Review structure is used to assess department/unit efforts to fulfill the college mission and planning objectives.

In addition to six-year strategic planning, the college utilizes annual operational planning to ensure that the college is making adequate yearly progress on accomplishing the general planning agenda. Operational planning includes the annual implementation and evaluation efforts that take place through the use of Student Learning Outcomes, Annual Update Plans, resource allocation, operational decision making, and formative evaluation using an implementation matrix. These yearly decisions and their respective evaluations are used to improve the connection between strategic planning, daily decisions and resource allocation and to gather regular data regularly on campus efforts toward accomplishing its planning agenda and in the overall summative college evaluation.

Meeting the planning needs of the college requires a staggered planning structure that allows the Strategic Plan to be developed prior to the master plans. In this manner, the global planning directions and values can be used to drive the completion of the specific master plan objectives and action items. Following the development of the master plans, the Program Review structure is revised using the college’s new priorities and planning objectives. The following Planning Calendar describes the college planning and evaluation sequence and its integration with the college’s accreditation process.
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East Los Angeles College
Short-term and long-term planning at ELAC is accomplished using the skills and expertise of college faculty, administration, staff, and students. As a college invested in the shared governance process, ELAC has sought to develop and implement its planning agenda through the use of representative committees. The following paragraphs describe the major campus committees involved in the creation of strategic and master plans and their approval processes.

The Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) is a newly formed shared-governance standing committee that will be in full operation by the middle of spring 2010 semester. The SPC will oversee the creation, implementation, evaluation, and revision of the strategic plan. Membership on this committee will ensure representation from all vital constituent groups and those with the requisite knowledge to formulate the college planning agenda. The SPC will initiate a review of the Strategic Planning documents, including the Mission, Vision, and Strategic Directions and Values. Formal reviews of the documents are conducted every six years; however, the committee can initiate a review of the strategic plan any time that changes in the college environment warrant possible revisions. The Educational Planning Subcommittee, Facilities Planning Subcommittee, Technology Planning Subcommittee, and Program Review and Viability Committee will all report to the SPC to ensure alignment of the planning and implementation process. The SPC will be responsible for overseeing the implementation process of the strategic and master plans and reviewing ongoing formative evaluations (E2.8 and E2.9).

In addition, during the summative evaluation cycle of the current strategic plan (see Planning Calendar), the Strategic Planning Committee will review relevant data to be used in the strategic planning process. This data includes

1. District and state strategic plans
2. The formative evaluations and implementation history of the previous strategic plan
3. The college external scan, internal scan, college profile, and core indicators
4. Student surveys
5. Program review and annual update results
6. Program student learning outcomes and college core competencies
7. Any additional information relevant to the revision of the strategic plan.

The revision of the next Strategic Plan will begin with the committee’s review of the College Mission Statement, which in the past has been completed by the ESGC. Although the Planning Calendar calls for a formal review of the mission every six years, the Strategic Planning Committee can initiate a review any time that changes are needed. Requests for such review can be made directly to the committee or through the ESGC. This review of the mission statement takes into account all relevant data and the expert opinions of the committee members. The committee will analyze the current mission statement to determine its continued relevance and the manner in which it fits the needs and assets of the current and projected student body. Based on this review, the committee will make recommendations for any needed changes and submit a revised mission statement for approval. Upon completion of revisions to the College Mission Statement, the Strategic Planning Committee will vet the mission through the campus community, including but not limited to the Academic Senate, the Associated Student Union, and the faculty, staff, and general student body. The goal of the vetting process is to receive input from all constituent groups in a manner that promotes the development of a revised mission with collegewide support. Upon completion of the vetting process, the Strategic Planning Committee
will submit the final draft of the revised mission and vision statements to the ESGC for approval. The ESGC approves the mission and vision statement or sends them back to committee with instructions for further revisions. If the ESGC approves the changes to the College Mission Statement, the chairpersons of the ESGC will notify the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO). The ALO is responsible for ensuring that all revisions of the College Mission Statement are formally approved by the college and Board of Trustees prior to inclusion in any campus publications. The ALO will formally request that the campus-approved mission be placed on the Board agenda for approval on the soonest possible Board meeting date. Following Board approval, the ALO will release the revised Mission Statement for use in all official college documents, including the college schedule and catalog.

Using the mission statement as a guide, the Strategic Planning Committee will review the college vision. The vision focuses on the future and serves as a statement of the college’s commitment to student success. The SPC will seek to ensure that the mission statement is the driving force behind the creation of the college vision.

The mission statement and vision are used as guides for the process of setting the strategic directions and values for the campus. The strategic directions and values represent the broad goals of the college that are used in the development of the educational, facilities, and technology plans. These strategic directions and values take into account the current and future needs of the college, its faculty, staff, and students.

The complete Strategic Plan includes a college profile that describes pertinent aspects of the college, the results of the previous strategic plan evaluation, the process for the strategic plan development, and a description of the reasons for selecting the current strategic directions and values. A matrix describing the alignment between the college, district, and state strategic plans is included in the final strategic plan.

The completed Strategic Plan is vetted to the campus community following the same process as the college mission statement. Upon completion of the vetting process, the committee meets to finalize the draft to be sent to ESGC for approval. The ESGC-approved draft is forwarded to the president, who upon acceptance forwards it to the Board of Trustees for approval. Board approval will be attained prior to October of the first year of the college strategic plan. The approved strategic plan is posted on the college’s Institutional Effectiveness website and forwarded to college planning subcommittees for use in the development of college plans.

The Strategic Planning Committee has three subcommittees: the Educational Planning Subcommittee, the Facilities Planning Subcommittee, and the Technology Planning Subcommittee. Each committee is made up of college faculty, administrators, staff, and students. An additional committee that is crucial to the planning process is the Program Review and Viability Committee. Formative evaluations for all of these committees are conducted annually (E2.10).

The Educational Planning Subcommittee (EPSC) serves as the central planning committee for all educational matters, including those administrative and student service areas that overlap with or support educational goals. The EPSC completes and oversees the Educational Master Plan,
determines the needs of the college, and makes recommendations for its revisions and funding for components from ESGC. In order to include leadership committees related to the educational needs of students, the following committees report to the EPSC: Distance Education Committee, Matriculation Advisory Committee, Off-Site Committee, Student Learning Outcomes Committee; Student Success Committee, and Transfer Committee. In January 2010, the ESGC approved the formation of an Enrollment Management Committee (E2.11).

The **Facilities Planning Subcommittee (FPSC)** addresses issues regarding college facilities planning, completes and oversees the Facilities Master Plan, determines projected space needs, reviews bond projects and related programming, provides solid documentation of funding requests to the State, restructures current facilities to conform with State Utilization Standards, and meets objectives articulated in the Strategic and Educational Master Plans. The committee serves as the central planning committee for all facilities matters, including those educational, administrative, and student service areas that overlap with or support educational goals. The Facilities Plan is developed using the strategic plan as a guide. The FPSC works in conjunction with the EPSC to ensure the primacy of educational planning objectives.

The **Technology Planning Subcommittee (TPSC)** addresses issues regarding the college’s technology use, completes and oversees the Technology Master Plan, determines the technology needs of the college, and meets the technology objectives articulated in the Strategic and Educational Master Plans. The committee serves as the central planning committee for all technology matters, including those educational, administrative, and student service areas that overlap with or support educational goals. The Technology Plan is developed using the strategic plan as a guide. The TPSC works in conjunction with the EPSC to ensure the primacy of educational planning objectives.

During the summative evaluation cycle of the current plans, the subcommittees evaluate and revise each master plan. The subcommittees review relevant data to include district and state strategic plans; the formative evaluations and implementation history of the previous plans; the College external scan, internal scan, college profile, and core indicators; student surveys; bond initiatives; recent literature on technology trends in education; reports from related committees; program reviews and annual update results; program student learning outcomes and college core competencies; and any additional information relevant to the revision of each master plan.

Following the completion of the data review, the subcommittees construct planning objectives using the college mission, vision, strategic directions and values as a guide. Planning objectives are developed so that meeting these objectives will lead to the fulfillment of the college’s strategic directions and values. Each objective has accompanying action items that describe the manner in which the objective should be accomplished. Specific measurable outcomes are assigned to responsible entities and collaborators to assist in the implementation process. Each completed plan is vetted through the campus community, including but not limited to the Academic Senate, the Associated Student Union, and the faculty, staff, and general student body. The goal of the vetting process is to receive input from all constituent groups in a manner that promotes the development of the revised plans with collegewide support. Upon completion of the vetting process, the subcommittees meet to finalize each draft to be sent to ESGC for approval. The ESGC-approved drafts are then forwarded to the Board of Trustees for approval.
The approved plans will be posted on the college’s Institutional Effectiveness website and forwarded to the campus community.

A key component to the College planning processes is the **Program Review and Viability Committee (PRVC)**. The Program Review and Viability Committee has the primary responsibility of developing the policies and structure related to comprehensive program review, annual updates, and program viability. The program review plan and documents are revised in the second year of the strategic plan and the first year of the master plans to reflect the changes in the college’s planning agenda. The PRVC is made up of college faculty, administrators, and staff. The committee meets on a monthly basis to review and discuss comprehensive program review, annual update, and program viability processes. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness works with the PRVC to develop and refine the structure, process, and documentation of program review. The office is also the contact liaison for all constituencies involved in the program review process: the units under review, the validation committees, the ESGC, and the college president.

Upon completion of the college’s Strategic Plan and Educational, Facilities, and Technology Master Plans, the PRVC creates a Program Review Plan. The plan consists of the schedule for the assessment and validation of all campus departments, units, and clusters. In addition, the PRVC revises the Comprehensive Program Review Questionnaire to reflect the changes in the planning documents and to assess the contribution that each unit is making toward fulfilling the college’s plans, mission, and vision. The PRVC is responsible for direct oversight of the Program Review Plan. Yearly formative evaluations will be conducted on an ongoing basis.

The Comprehensive Program Review Questionnaire and program review process will be evaluated and revised following the revision of the Strategic Plan in 2012. The annual update form and process were evaluated and revised in the 2009-2010 academic year and will continue to be revised annually through the formative evaluation process. Additionally, the Budget Committee evaluated how the annual update helps to inform the budget development process, and a taskforce of the Budget Committee developed a streamlined process that incorporated general resource requests into the annual update (E2.12).

Following the creation of ELAC’s planning agenda (Strategic, Educational, Facilities, Technology and Program Review Plans), the campus is actively involved in implementing the college’s objectives. The college’s Educational Master and Strategic Plans guide the prioritization of resource allocation, including hiring and equipment purchases. In addition, the plans serve as a guide in daily decision-making regarding all aspects of ELAC policies and governance. As a campus dedicated to shared governance, many decisions are made through committee processes. This section describes the manner in which decisions are made through the roles and structures of the various groups and committees that play integral roles in the overall functioning of the college. General timelines for implementation of the committee’s decisions or recommendations are also included to guide the stream of decision-making activities.
Linking Planning and Resource Allocations

The college **Budget Committee (E2.13)** is a shared governance body through which funding requests are vetted and budget recommendations are made to the ESGC. The committee also recommends budget policies and adjustments to the budget development process and develops policies that link resource allocation with the planning agenda presented in the Strategic and Educational Master Plans.

The ELAC budget development process effectively links resource allocation to planning and provides a general timeline toward achieving that goal. The Annual Update Plan is the central vehicle through which planning and budget are connected. Each year, every unit submits a plan detailing unit activities and future goals related to the Educational Master and Strategic Plans and the efforts made to respond to the unit’s comprehensive program review recommendations. All requests for staffing, equipment and additional resources required for those unit activities are identified in the unit’s Annual Update Plan. College committees, such as the Hiring Prioritization Committee and the State Equipment Grants Committee review resource requests and provide recommendations for allocations. Thus, the Annual Update Plans are an integral part of the college’s budgetary processes.

The Budget Committee remains actively involved in establishing the link between annual planning through program review and the prioritization of budgetary needs: For example, on March 15, 2010, the vice presidents will present their Cluster Update Plans to an open college forum during a standing Budget Committee meeting; the Educational Planning Subcommittee has already developed and presented to the Budget Committee and the ESGC a prioritized list of unfunded or underfunded objectives from the college’s Educational Master Plan; and the Budget Committee in consultation with the college’s fiscal office reviewed and forwarded to the ESGC the potential costs and savings related to the hiring of faculty for growth and replacement positions as prioritized by the Hiring Prioritization Committee and approved by the Academic Senate. The Budget Committee continues to assess the extent to which the budget development process ensures transparency concerning any large expenditures (E2.14).

The Los Angeles Community College District budget is based on a yearly allocation distributed by the state Chancellor’s Office. California Community Colleges state apportionment is primarily driven by the Full-Time Equivalent Student (FTES) workload measure. The following timeline describes the role that the college’s Budget Committee plays in linking the college’s planning efforts to resource allocation:

**September**

- In September, nine months before the start of the fiscal year (July to June), the District Office prepares the fiscal year Budget Development Calendar. East Los Angeles College then initiates its own budget development process.
- At the start of the month, all department chairs and unit managers are provided with the template for the program review Annual Update Plan (AUP). This update includes requests for positions, equipment, and other budgetary needs. Departments and units must demonstrate how their resource requests support the college’s planning agenda and/or align to any comprehensive program review recommendations.
October

- The District Budget Development Calendar is reviewed by the District Budget Committee and adopted by the Board of Trustees.
- Department chairs and unit managers submit the Annual Update Plan, including requests for positions, equipment, and increases to their base budget for the upcoming fiscal year by October 15.
- The Hiring Prioritization Committee (HPC) uses the Annual Update Plan to develop a probationary faculty hiring prioritization list. Following presentations by department chairs, the HPC produces a prioritized list for hiring faculty for new or replacement positions. This list is forwarded to the Academic Senate.
- Based on the college’s Strategic Directions and Annual Update Plans from those units within their cluster, vice presidents begin to prioritize requests for equipment and additional permanent classified staff and administrators. These prioritizations are articulated in each cluster’s Cluster Update Plan and represent each vice president’s priorities from a broad global perspective. This activity also serves as an opportunity for the vice presidents to determine overlapping needs within their clusters and integrate the needs of each department and unit into a comprehensive cluster plan.

November

- Following the Board’s adoption of the District Budget Development Calendar, the ELAC Budget Office, in consultation with the vice presidents, prepares the ELAC Budget Calendar for the fiscal year.
- The ELAC Budget Calendar is presented and distributed to the ELAC Shared Governance Council (ESGC) in November (E2.15). The Budget Committee advises the ESGC and notifies the Academic Senate of the cost to fund the HPC recommended list. The Academic Senate reviews the HPC’s recommendations and prepares and submits the final faculty prioritization list to the president. When state instructional equipment funds are available, the ELAC State Instructional Equipment Fund Committee reviews Annual Update Plans and other supporting documentation for requests to fund instructional equipment based on the department or unit’s ability to align their requests to the college’s strategic directions and/or the recommendations from their comprehensive program review.

December

- The District Office provides the nine college presidents with salary projection data which help determine much of the base budget since approximately 80 percent of the budget goes to salary and benefits.
- The staff in the Budget Office attend a training workshop at the District Office for any new methods and processes in the Budget Preparation System.
- The college president forwards the list of approved positions to the Academic Senate and the HPC.

The vice presidents, in collaboration with their deans and unit managers, continue to develop their Cluster Update Plans. Each plan includes the cluster’s annual goals and priorities for use in the budget prioritization process.
January
• At the start of the month, the Governor proposes the state budget that serves as the initial blueprint for projecting the allocation for the upcoming fiscal year. Throughout the month, the Proposed Preliminary Allocation is developed by the District Budget Office and reviewed by the college presidents and the District Budget Committee.
• Based on its review of each unit’s Annual Update Plan and any other supporting documentation, the ELAC State Instructional Equipment Fund Committee makes recommendations for funding.
• At ELAC, the budget worksheets are given to the vice presidents. Department chairs and unit managers review a printout of their current and prior year budget, mark up changes, and submit their budget requests for the upcoming year on the budget worksheet, which is submitted to the ELAC Budget Office for input into the system. The budget worksheets will reflect decisions on faculty hires and new staffing and equipment purchases.

February
• The ELAC Budget Office enters all of the requests from the budget worksheets into the system. Following notification by the District Budget Office of the preliminary allocation, the ELAC Budget Office reviews budget requests and makes adjustments.

March
• The ELAC Budget Office submits the proposed Preliminary Budget for the upcoming fiscal year to the District Budget Office.
• The Preliminary Budget is available on SAP for review by all department chairs and unit managers. At that point, there is an open period for making adjustments that will result in a Board-approved Tentative Budget.
• The vice presidents communicate their annual cluster goals, including budget adjustments, to the ELAC Budget Committee through an open forum. The forum allows the campus to provide feedback to the vice presidents on the cluster priorities. Cluster goals focus on the ways to improve quality that cut across departments and units. In this manner, the college can establish broad goals that many units can work on throughout the year. Improvements in areas such as basic skills can be identified, and action plans for broad solutions can be initiated. Through consultation with the departments and units within their cluster, the vice presidents also identify unfunded priorities that are directly linked to the college’s Strategic and Educational Master Plans. In this manner, all campus constituents are aware of the cluster goals and priorities that are used in budget allocation adjustments. The ELAC Budget Committee reviews the preliminary budget and expenditure projections as well as the funded and unfunded priorities from each Cluster Update Plan. The Budget Committee makes recommendations to ESGC regarding the proposed budget, including the budget balance and unfunded priorities. When budget decisions are finalized, the vice presidents respond to any Budget Committee inquiries regarding any major funding outside of the established cluster priorities.

April
• The open period for making adjustments that result in a Tentative Budget continues.
• The ELAC Budget Committee reviews the preliminary budget and unfunded priorities and reports to ESGC.
May
• The Governor reports on revised revenue projections and adjustments to the proposed state budget (*May Revise*).
• The District Budget Committee reviews the *May Revise* and is briefed on the District Tentative Budget. The open period for making adjustments that result in a District Tentative Budget closes.

June
• The Board of Trustees adopts the District Tentative Budget.

July
• Following adoption of the state budget, the District Budget Office makes additional revisions to revenue projections and allocations.

August
• The Board of Trustees adopts the Final District Budget.

September
• The ELAC Budget Committee reviews the redistributed budget balance and makes recommendations to ESGC concerning any additional unfunded priorities.

The processes for the acquisition of two major resources, probationary faculty and equipment purchases, demonstrate how planning and resource allocation are linked (E2.16).

The *Faculty Hiring Prioritization Committee (HPC)*, formerly the Joint Hires Committee, convenes annually to evaluate and rank departmental requests for permanent full-time faculty. Through the Annual Update Plan (E2.17), departments evaluate their needs for any additional or replacement full-time, permanent faculty. The needs of each unit or department are aligned to the Educational Master and Strategic Plans or recommendations from the unit or department’s comprehensive program review or program review Annual Update Plan. The unit or department then submits to the HPC by October 15 a “Departmental Request for a Probationary Position” form that is included in the Program Review Annual Update Plan. After deliberating and ranking the applications, based on an established rubric, the HPC forwards its prioritization list to the Academic Senate. The HPC adheres to the following schedule:

February
• The Academic Senate, Chairs’ Council, American Federation of Teachers, and Administration select their Committee representatives.
• The Committee convenes to establish dates for successive Committee meetings and departmental presentations, and the HPC process and the current application form are evaluated to ensure that each addresses the evolving needs of the college.

March
• After evaluation of the HPC process, the HPC makes the appropriate adjustments to the application form and a draft is forwarded to the Academic Senate for approval.

October
• The Program Review Annual Update and the Departmental Request for a Probationary Position form are due October 15.
The Annual Update Plans and data are distributed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to HPC members for review.

**November**
- The HPC convenes. After oral presentations, members individually score each application. The committee then tabulates the scores and calculates an average for each application. In the event that a committee member is also a member of a department requesting a position, the committee member does not vote on that position request. The scores are ranked and include the priority order for growth and replacement positions.
- The HPC then forwards this list and accompanying rationale to the Academic Senate.

The *equipment prioritization and allocation* process begins with departmental requests made in their Program Review Annual Update Plan.

The State Equipment Grants Committee reviews State Equipment proposals used to request funding from ongoing block grant funds and for categorical State Instructional Equipment Funds that can only be spent on classroom equipment. The grant funds, typically allocated by the State each year, can be used for instructionally-related equipment, library materials, and equipment and materials that increase the use of modern technology for instructional purposes. Eligible equipment is used for classroom demonstration, student evaluation or preparation of learning materials in an instructional program. Equipment requests need to fall under the approved General Ledger and functional area codes documented in the proposal. Through the Annual Update Plan, departments evaluate their equipment needs. The needs of each department are aligned to the Educational Master and Strategic Plans or recommendations from the unit or department’s comprehensive program review or program review Annual Update Plan. State Equipment Proposals, included in the Annual Update Plan, are forwarded to the State Equipment Grants Committee on October 15. Proposals need to include a justification for the manner in which the requested equipment will lead to enhanced learning and meet the college’s Strategic Directions and Goals. Funds are subject to local match requirements. The Committee operates under the following timeline:

**February**
- The Committee convenes to discuss roles and responsibilities, establish dates for successive Committee meetings and department presentations in the fall, and evaluate the current application form.

**March**
- The application form is revised if necessary and forwarded to the Academic Senate for approval.

**May**
- Final application forms are delivered to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for inclusion in the Program Review Annual Update.

**October**
- The Program Review Annual Update and the State Equipment Proposal Request form are due October 15.
• The Committee reviews appropriate sections of Annual Update Plans and requests forms for State Instructional Equipment funds, and then meets to discuss budget allocation, rubrics, and rankings.

**November/December**
• Applications are distributed to individual Committee members for review.

**December**
• Department representatives make oral presentations to the State Equipment Grants Committee if the request is over $15,000 (medium allocation) or if the request is over $50,000 (large proposal).
• Final decisions regarding awards are made.
• Debriefing occurs.

**January**
• The Office of Workforce Education and Economic Development notifies recipients of awards and mails results to the Los Angeles Community College District.

**Summary**

The college recognizes that planning structures must be sustainable and implemented throughout the college. In this manner, the *Shared Governance and Decision Making Handbook* calls for both formative and summative evaluations of the planning structures and, based on the results of these evaluations, the implementation of appropriate changes. This section describes the processes which have been established for the formative and summative evaluations; evaluations are just now getting underway.

The OIE reports the degree of implementation annually using each plan’s measurable objectives and timelines. Each planning committee reviews the implementation progress and reports and determines whether any recommendations need to be made to ESGC to improve the college’s ability to meet its planning agenda.

For example, the college’s Educational Master Plan is currently undergoing the formative evaluation process. An implementation matrix of the action items in the Educational Master Plan (E2.18) has been created to determine the degree to which planning objectives have been achieved, the continued applicability of each objective and what additional resources are needed to continue work in each area. The issue of adequate funding was especially vital, given the changes in the economic forecast and the college’s budget allocation.

The Educational Planning Subcommittee convened a special taskforce to examine those objectives in need of additional funding and to develop a prioritized list to be sent to the ESGC and Budget Committee. Through this process, the shared governance committees can make recommendations for funding and budget prioritization, based on the college’s Educational Master Plan, to the President. This process is currently underway and will be integrated into the 2010-2011 college budget.

Also, the college’s planning agenda has been integrated into the probationary faculty hiring process. For example, in October 2010, all units and departments were required to submit an
Annual Update Plan in which they were to provide annual goals, respond to previous goals and comprehensive program review recommendations, and align any requests for resources with the college’s strategic plan and/or program review recommendations. Any department that did not complete an Annual Update Plan by the deadline was ineligible for increased staffing or other resources. Eighty percent of the departments turned in an Annual Update Plan by the October 15 deadline. Twenty-four additional faculty positions from 18 departments were requested. OIE met with the Hiring Prioritization Committee (HPC) and provided training on the use of the Annual Update Plan as a planning document and demonstrated the manner in which each section would provide evidence related to the need for additional or replacement faculty (E2.19).

The HPC convened and used the Annual Update Plan to determine the degree to which faculty replacement and growth requests would enhance the college’s ability to fulfill its planning objectives and make improvements as determined by the comprehensive program review process. A complete prioritized list of probationary faculty hires was finalized and forwarded to the Academic Senate for recommendation to the college president.

Toward the end of the fall 2009 semester, after the work of the HPC was completed, the HPC reconvened, along with the Academic Senate president, to assess the process. The first step in the evaluative process was to review the “Department Request for a Probationary Position” form. The Committee focused on reducing redundancy or unnecessary information, clarifying potentially ambiguous or confusing language, and improving overall usability. At a second meeting in January 2010, the HPC revised the established rubric that corresponds with the “Request” form. Suggested revisions to both forms will be presented to the Academic Senate in spring semester. This revision process corresponds to the timeline described above.

The vice presidents created cluster updates and goals based on the Annual Update Plans of their units and by March 15, 2010, they will communicate those goals to the campus community (E2.20). These goals will be used to determine additional resource allocations through the budget process. The purpose of the Cluster Update Plan is to monitor progress on the cluster recommendations received during the comprehensive program review cycle and to set annual cluster goals for the college. The update runs parallel to the unit annual update planning cycle, but offers a global perspective of the needs of the campus and each individual cluster. This perspective assists in annual college planning efforts by providing a venue through which the vice presidents can identify overlapping needs that relate to the college’s strategic plan and synthesize creative solutions that span multiple units within and between the clusters. To meet these objectives, the Cluster Update Plan includes an analysis of cluster needs, cluster goals, and resource allocation priorities. Cluster leaders seek to assess the broad needs of their clusters by identifying areas of need that cross units. Relevant college- and unit-level data is provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to assist clusters in the evaluation process.

In the final year of each college plan, a summative evaluation will occur to determine the overall effectiveness of a plan’s implementation and its impact on student outcomes. The planning evaluation will include reports of college core indicators and plan-specific quantitative measures. These measures are used to determine the impact of the plan on institutional access, student learning, and student success. The college core indicators are developed using the Strategic and Educational Master Plans as guides, and they serve as quantitative evidence of the impact of the
college’s planning agenda. The core indicators serve as quantitative benchmarks and are developed to have approximately ten dashboard indicators of success.

In addition to quantitative evidence, qualitative assessments will be conducted. These evaluations will include faculty and staff surveys that will be conducted in the final year of each plan to determine the level of satisfaction with the planning process and perceived impact of the plan on program improvement, and to identify any potential areas of improvement in the planning process. The results of these assessments will be used to improve future plans and planning processes. Assessment measures are provided to each planning committee and to the college community. The qualitative data is geared to initiate a dialog of self-evaluation and to stimulate improvements in planning procedures and the roles of the campus leaders that participate in the planning and shared governance process.

The results of formative and summative evaluations will be distributed to the campus community via the Office of Institutional Effectiveness website and through the corresponding governance groups. The evaluations are used to stimulate a campus dialog on decision-making processes and the needs of the campus community. The goal of evaluation is to improve processes and measures of student success. Each committee works to incorporate the results of the evaluation to improve planning processes and as evidence of need in future data-driven planning.

The Shared Governance Decision-Making Handbook has provided valuable guidance in carrying out the resource allocation process and has been instrumental in assisting users in determining the need for clarification of processes. For example, the College is currently working to develop a structured process for the prioritizing of classified staffing requests to be included in the first revision of the Handbook that will begin with the July 2010 ARG meeting. In addition, the College is evaluating the manner in which other budget line items are prioritized. Through the 2010-2011 budget process, it was noted that preliminary expenditures, based on the previous year, were greater than the projected allocation for the college. As a result, the College instituted a process through which previous budget line items would be re-evaluated based on annual update plans, program review recommendations, the college’s Strategic Plan, and priorities noted in the Cluster Annual Plans. Department chairs and unit managers were notified in writing and during a meeting held on January 26, 2010, of the revised budget processes and the need to justify their budget requests using the college’s planning agenda and the departments’ program review documents (E2.21).

Evidence

E2.1 Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook
E2.2 East Los Angeles College Strategic Plan 2009-2011
E2.3 East Los Angeles College Educational Master Plan 2008-2011
E2.4 East Los Angeles College Facilities Master Plan 2008-2011
E2.5 East Los Angeles College Technology Master Plan 2008-2011
E2.6 Comprehensive Program Review
E2.7 Program Review Annual Update Plan
E2.8 Shared Governance Council, Minutes of September 14, 2009 (see item V.B.)
E2.9 Strategic Planning Committee Bylaws
E2.10 Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook (see pp. 25-29)
E2.11 Shared Governance Council, Minutes of January 25, 2010 (see item IV.E)
E2.12 Schedule for PRQ Taskforce’s Evaluation and Revision of Comprehensive Program Review Questionnaire and Process and Revision of the Annual Update Form; Budget Committee’s Evaluation of the Annual Update toInform the Budget Development Process; Budget Committee Taskforce’s Revision of Process to Incorporate General Resource Requests into the Annual Update
E2.13 Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook (see pp. 30-32)
E2.14 Budget Committee, Minutes of February 1, 2010, and Agenda of March 1, 2010 (see item IV.A)
E2.15 Shared Governance Council, Minutes of November 23, 2009 (see item V.C.1)
E2.16 Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook (see pp. 33-34)
E2.17 Program Review Annual Update Form (see Section II, table E and Section III)
E2.18 Implementation Matrix
E2.19 HPC’s Use of the Program Review Annual Update Plan – Training Materials
E2.20 Email Notice of February 22, 2010 – March 15 College Forum for Cluster Update Plans
E2.21 Revised Budget Process distributed at meeting of Budget Committee, January 26, 2010
College Recommendation 4: Instructional Programs

In order to improve, the team recommends the college ensure that the current program review process is transparent and clearly communicated to the college constituencies. (II.A.2.f)

All college units must prepare a comprehensive program review every six years and an Annual Update Plan as the starting point for all decision making regarding the allocation of resources and the measurement of student success. Further, each of the college’s four clusters (Liberal Arts and Sciences, Workforce Education and Economic Development, Student Services, and Administrative Services) must develop annual cluster plans which offer a global perspective of the needs of the campus and each individual cluster. Therefore, it is imperative that this important process be transparent and clearly communicated. The College is undertaking a number of activities to ensure transparency and better communication.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) conducts workshops to assist departments in the preparation of their documents by providing internal and external data and explaining the use of the data. For example, prior to the October 15, 2009, due date for the annual update program review plan, OIE offered seventeen training workshops (a combination of open training and deskside training) for academic departments, Student Service units, Administrative Services units, and the Chairs’ Council (E4.1). Staff are available to provide individual assistance by appointment.

The focus of the August 27, 2009, Opening Day was to assist departments in connecting department/unit planning and subsequent program review recommendations with the college’s strategic plan to promote student success. The OIE staff and faculty provided information to over 300 faculty and administrators on such topics as how to complete the Annual Update Plan, how planning and budget are linked, how data can be used to plan and make decisions, and how Faculty Inquiry can be used to collaboratively investigate and resolve issues that will improve student learning and success. In the afternoon, members of individual departments, using the Faculty Inquiry Group approach, met to collaboratively investigate and resolve issues that were raised in their previous program review that will lead to improved student learning and success (E4.2).

OIE provides continual updates regarding program review at the Shared Governance Council meetings. As part of the program review process, the commendations and recommendations for all departments and units provided by the Program Review Validation Committees are noticed and approved at the ESGC. Minutes of the meetings are posted on the College website (http://www.elac.edu/departments/acadsenate/minutes/ebpac/index.htm). Council members are expected to report proceedings to their constituent groups. When supervisors/deans meet with their units to review requests for positions, equipment, and increases to their base budget for the upcoming fiscal year, the Annual Update Plan and Comprehensive Program Review are the primary documents used during consultation.

In spring 2009, the Program Review and Viability Committee (PRVC) convened a taskforce to review the current Comprehensive Program Review Questionnaire and program review process. The taskforce discussed, among other things, the need and manner in which program review
documents in total should be made public. The taskforce recommended changes to the Planning Schedule that are now incorporated in the *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook*. The PRVC and the taskforce will reconvene in fall 2012, as stated in the Planning Calendar, to revise the program review process and continue discussions regarding the transparency of the program review documents. Currently, the portions of the comprehensive program review that are included in the Annual Update Plan, recommendations, commendations, and department/unit action plans, are available internally. In addition, the Annual Update Plans are available and used by shared governance committees during the budget and resource allocation process.

The newly adopted *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook* clearly describes the program review process, including the roles of the comprehensive program review, the Annual Update Plan, and four cluster plans (E4.3). The Handbook is available online to all campus constituents. During workshops that will be conducted this spring to inform individuals about the Handbook, particular emphasis will be placed on the program review process.

**Evidence**

E4.1 Fall 2009 Training Schedule and Materials for Annual Update Plans  
E4.2 Opening Day Documents  
E4.3 Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook (see pp. 29, 44-51)
College Recommendation 5: Student Support Services

In order to meet standards, the college should regularly evaluate and augment, if necessary, staffing, services and programs in the student services division to ensure student needs are being met. (II.B, II.B.3.c)

The college has multiple methods for the evaluation of student services units. In the same manner as academic and administrative units, student service units undergo a comprehensive program review every six years and complete the Annual Update Plan to justify resource allocations. All student service units completed the comprehensive program review and the 2009-2010 Annual Update Plan (submitted by October 15, 2009). The program review process uses validation procedures that include all campus constituencies. Validated recommendations from this process serve as a regularly occurring evaluation meant to improve student service units. The completed student service Annual Update Plans detail the resources needed to satisfy the recommendations of the Comprehensive Program Review and/or meet college planning objectives. The Vice President of Student Services completes an annual cluster plan that details the priorities of the Student Services Division as related to resource allocation.

Most student services received a recommendation during their program review process to create and administer point-of-service surveys to determine the quality of student services and the level of student satisfaction. In response to this recommendation, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness began a search for an effective software system that could be utilized for regular evaluation of student services and other college units. In summer 2009, the college purchased the Class Climate system, which is capable of administering paper and web-based surveys. The OIE met with the Vice President of Student Services and the directors of each student service unit. Through collaborative work, this group developed quality assurance and student satisfaction measures to be used for all student services. In addition, each unit worked with representatives from the OIE to create additional unit-specific questions to provide data on the work of each unit and the degree to which they are meeting their unit goals. When appropriate, the OIE sought to create measures that would provide data related to the unit’s Student Service Outcomes (SSO).

In fall 2009, each student service unit distributed the point-of-service survey to students seeking their services (E5.1). More than 1,000 surveys were collected. The results indicated a general satisfaction with the services provided. However, each measure was reviewed with the unit directors and college researchers. Any measure ranking lower than the average for that unit is highlighted for follow-up. Point-of-service surveys will continue to be administered each semester, and results will be monitored to ensure continued quality and satisfaction (E5.2).

In addition to the recommended point-of-service surveys, the OIE has determined that a general student survey is needed. Although point-of-service surveys provide indications of overall quality, they only target those already receiving the services and do not assess actual usage among the general student population, nor do they assess whether there are any barriers to service. To complete the evaluation of student service offerings, the OIE has begun to develop a general student survey that will assess a random sample of ELAC students. The need for this type of assessment was confirmed by the results of the point-of-service surveys which indicated that more than 50 percent of students surveyed were full-time students. This trend did not match
the student population which is only 25 percent full-time. The general survey will fill in the gaps in this data.

In January 2010, the college’s assistant research analyst completed a report detailing the methods for administering a general student survey to a random sample of ELAC students (E5.3). OIE has convened a meeting of all student service units to select appropriate questions to assess potential barriers to service and student needs. OIE will review supplied data during spring 2010 and complete the development of the survey using appropriate survey and sampling methodology. Administration of the survey will target 6,267 students based on stratified sampling methods. Given previous response rates, the College will seek to administer 7,373 surveys. Survey administration will occur in April 2010 with data analysis to be completed by summer 2010. All analysis will be provided to the Vice President of Student Services and the ESGC to determine the potential need for service augmentation or other service improvements. Requested augmentations in student service units will go through the College’s resource allocation processes as detailed in the Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook.

Evidence

E5.1 Sample Point of Service Surveys for Student Services Units
E5.2 Sample Report for Results of Point of Service Survey
E5.3 Methods for Administering a General Student Survey
**College Recommendation 6: Decision-Making Roles and Processes**

In order to meet standards and improve communication and continuity, the team recommends the college fully develop a formal written policy describing its governance and decision-making structures and processes. The policy should define the roles and responsibilities of the constituent groups in governance and then develop methods for the regular assessment of governance and decision making structures, widely distributing the results and using the results for continuous improvement. (IV.A.2, IV.A.5)

The *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook* (E6.1) was produced as a result of the college’s planning, implementation, and evaluation cycle. It became clear that procedural knowledge integral to the college’s planning and decision-making processes should be documented and extended beyond those directly involved in campus committees. This need was confirmed by the college’s Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) visiting team. As stated earlier in this report, to address the concerns of the college and the Accrediting Commission, the Accreditation Response Group (ARG) was formed. One of the primary responsibilities of the group was to document all college decision-making processes for distribution to the campus community. Through this effort, administrative and faculty leaders also identified gaps in the college’s current decision-making processes and developed ways to further improve college planning and governance.

The Handbook, one of the first projects undertaken by ARG, was presented to and approved by the Academic Senate on November 24, 2009 (E6.2). It was adopted by the Shared Governance Council on December 14, 2009 (E6.3), after being posted for review by the campus community during November via email blast (E6.4). The approved handbook is posted on the [College website](#). Throughout spring semester 2010, workshops will be conducted to further familiarize the campus community with the contents of the Handbook.

The intent of the Handbook is to illustrate how decision-making processes at ELAC integrate into the overall Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation cycle of the college. ELAC has sought to establish structures and procedures that promote student success and utilize campus shared governance processes. The *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook* serves as a guide for students, faculty, staff, and administrators who desire to be or are already involved in college planning and other campuswide decisions. The Handbook includes descriptions of college processes, college committees, and a schedule of college planning, evaluation, and re-evaluation.

The *Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook* is used as a reference guide for those who wish to participate in the shared governance system or develop the campus’s planning agenda. Each section describes the manner in which decisions are made and the committees responsible for each decision-making area. These processes include thorough and regular evaluation mechanisms for creating a cycle of continuous quality improvement in college practices. As such, the Handbook is a living document that will regularly adapt to any changes made in decision-making processes in an effort to continually improve college governance through the use of regular formative and summative evaluations.
The basic process for how the college planning structure itself will be evaluated is described in the Evaluation section of the Handbook (E6.5). Every planning and governance committee will use formative and summative evaluations to gauge the degree to which it has been successful. For example, after the HPC made its recommendations for hiring probationary faculty in fiscal year 2010-2011, the Committee began to evaluate its operation in December 2009. This discussion is ongoing.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) oversees the formative evaluation process. Each planning agenda item has a responsible entity assigned to ensure that the agenda item is met. Each year, the responsible entities submit a narrative describing the progress made, any obstacles encountered, and whether there is any need for changes associated with the objective or action items. These narratives serve as a historical knowledge base for future planning and college decision-making. In the event that a planning objective is found to no longer be relevant or needs to be modified, the narrative assists the planning committees in understanding the practical limitations faced by those attempting to implement the college’s planning agenda and to create more appropriate goals for the institution.

The results of formative and summative evaluations are distributed to the campus community via the Office of Institutional Effectiveness website and through the corresponding governance groups. The evaluations are used to stimulate a campus dialog on decision-making processes and the needs of the campus community.

Initial evaluations have indicated a need to improve the process for evaluating the effectiveness of committees themselves as well as their planning procedures and successful completion of goals. Among other methods, it is anticipated that revisions will focus on the development of annual committee evaluations that assess the role of the committee in the college planning process and the effectiveness of those serving on the committee. Therefore, a primary task during spring 2010 for the OIE, assisted by the Accreditation Response Group, will be to develop an organized, consistent procedure for the planning committees to self-evaluate their operations. As a first step, the OIE is currently collecting examples of evaluation forms (E6.6) that the OIE and the Accreditation Response Group can review as they develop a form to be used by the committees. Such a form will ensure uniformity in the committees’ review of their operations. This regular review will produce greater continuity in the quality of the decision-making process through a regular and sustainable process of evaluation. A description of these procedures will be included in the first major revision of the Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook, scheduled to begin in July 2010.

Evidence

E6.1 Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook
E6.2 Academic Senate, Minutes of November 24, 2009 (see item VI.C)
E6.3 Shared Governance Council, Minutes of December 14, 2009 (see item IV.A)
E6.4 Email Notice for Review of Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook
E6.5 Shared Governance and Decision-Making Handbook (see pp. 22, 24, 54-55)
E6.5 Sample evaluation forms
FOLLOW-UP REPORT: LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

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 to 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 (D2.8). This template, which appears on the next page, 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
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 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.
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 seven categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment/Suggestion</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decentralize or Rethink District/College Relation</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 42), 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 Committee, a 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/Collegiate 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 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 58.)

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 Midterm 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.B.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 34), 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):
4. The Associated Students are appropriately and adequately represented in district-level decision making.

5. District-level decision making is effective in relation to Budget Development and Resource Allocation.

6. District-level decision making is effective in relation to Enrollment Management and FTES Target Setting.

7. District-level decision making is effective in relation to Strategic Planning and Strategic Goal Setting.

8. District-level decision making is effective in relation to Program Planning and Oversight.

9. District-level decision making is effective in relation to Employee Benefits (JLMBC).

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 feel 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 Indentified</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
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:
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Making Area</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>5. District-level decision making is effective in relation to Budget Development &amp; Resource Allocation.</td>
<td>6.2% (17)</td>
<td>32.4% (89)</td>
<td>29.1% (80)</td>
<td>13.2% (36)</td>
<td>16.5% (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. District-level decision making is effective in relation to Enrollment Management &amp; FTES Target Setting.</td>
<td>5.5% (15)</td>
<td>44.0% (121)</td>
<td>22.5% (62)</td>
<td>8.7% (24)</td>
<td>19.3% (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. District-level decision making is effective in relation to Strategic Planning &amp; Strategic Goal Setting.</td>
<td>7.3% (20)</td>
<td>44.0% (120)</td>
<td>19.4% (53)</td>
<td>7.0% (19)</td>
<td>22.3% (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. District-level decision making is effective in relation to Bond Program Planning &amp; Oversight.</td>
<td>6.1% (17)</td>
<td>38.6% (108)</td>
<td>25.4% (71)</td>
<td>13.8% (38)</td>
<td>18.4% (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. District-level decision making is effective in relation to Employee Benefits (ULMRC).</td>
<td>14.7% (41)</td>
<td>51.6% (144)</td>
<td>12.5% (35)</td>
<td>8.2% (23)</td>
<td>12.9% (36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 on 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 district-wide 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
• 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 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. 37.) This review (already initiated by the Fiscal
Policy and Review Committee, a 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 ongoing 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 shortening meeting times

**Joint Labor Management Benefits Committee (JLMBC)**
- Research rules that cover CalPERS
• 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 p. 54).

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. 33 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 and 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 reassessed 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 Age</th>
<th>Reports To</th>
<th>Progress Report</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Review the District Budget Process</strong>&lt;br&gt;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 Committee, a subcommittee of the District Budget Committee) will be designed to produce mechanisms that:</td>
<td>District Budget Committee (FPRC)</td>
<td>Board of Trustees&lt;br&gt;The Chancellor</td>
<td>Progress Report to BOT&lt;br&gt;due:&lt;br&gt;December 15, 2010</td>
<td>Final Report of recommendations to BTC&lt;br&gt;due:&lt;br&gt;June 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enforce fiscal accountability at the District and college levels&lt;br&gt;• Optimize the distribution of financial resources across the District&lt;br&gt;• Provide adequate funding for basic administrative, educational, and student support services&lt;br&gt;• Link budget and planning priorities&lt;br&gt;• Incentivize innovation and student success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Optimize District/College Administrative Operations</strong>&lt;br&gt;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:</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Optimization Taskforce (to be created after Chancellor’s appointment)&lt;br&gt;Deputy Chancellor</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Progress Report to Chancellor&lt;br&gt;due:&lt;br&gt;December 15, 2010</td>
<td>Final Report to Chancellor&lt;br&gt;due:&lt;br&gt;June 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify and mitigate duplication of effort between District and college administrative units&lt;br&gt;• Identify any functions currently provided by the District Office that can be performed more effectively by the colleges&lt;br&gt;• Identify functions at the college-level that can be performed more effectively from the District Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Implement a District-wide Communications and Transparency Initiative</strong>&lt;br&gt;Over the next year, the District will implement an initiative aimed at improving districtwide 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:</td>
<td>The Deputy Chancellor&lt;br&gt;District Institutional Effectiveness and District IT staff</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Progress Report to Chancellor&lt;br&gt;due:&lt;br&gt;December 15, 2010</td>
<td>Full implementation of 5 component action plans&lt;br&gt;due:&lt;br&gt;June 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Redesign of the District website to make it more user-friendly and to assure that it provides easy access to:
   e. District Office organizational charts, including all personnel by unit
   a. Contact information for all District Office personnel
   b. Process maps with links to required forms for all key administrative processes
   c. 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 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.

4. **Streamline District-level Governance and Planning Processes**
   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 in order to achieve the following:
   - To the extent deemed practicable and needed, align and simplify district-level governance, planning, and decision-making processes and structures
   - Improve the coordination of District goals and budget priorities
   - Assure that district-level planning and decision making are responsive to local college needs
   - Reduce, whenever possible, the number and meeting requirements of district-wide councils and committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taskforce/Committee</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Strategic Plan Taskforce</td>
<td>December 15, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Planning Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Governance Committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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