

DOW Recommendations

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

BACKGROUND

In September 2015 the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) of the Los Angeles/Orange County Regional Consortium (LAOCRC) met and discussed the future of the Consortium. The discussion focused on the expanded role the Consortium would be asked to take based on the recommendations from the Strong Workforce Taskforce. The SPC decided to form a workgroup to develop recommendations that would enable LAOCRC to better respond to anticipated changes.

The workgroup was charged with preparing responses that address:

- (1) The organization of the Consortium with particular attention as to whether it should continue to be a combined region or should separate into two separate, county-based regions.
- (2) A regional decision making process in order to carry out regional responsibilities.

To carry out this work volunteers were solicited from the SPC and from the full Consortium. The group adopted a formal name, the Decision Making and Organizational Effectiveness Workgroup (DOW). The members are:

First Name	Last Name	Title	Institution
Alicia	Berhow	Vice President	Orange County Business Council
Laura	Cantu	Director	1070 Project--LACCD
Salomon	Davila	Dean	Pasadena City College
Alex	Davis	Dean	Los Angeles City College
Paul	De la Cerda	Dean	East Los Angeles College
Lyla	Eddington	Director	1070 Project—LA Ring Colleges
Steve	Glyer	Co-chair	LAOCRC
Bart	Hoffman	Dean	Santa Ana College
Nick	Kremer	Co-chair	LAOCRC
Janet h	Manjarrez	Director	Enhancement Funds-LAOC
Bruce	Noble	Deputy Sector Navigator	LAOC
Lori	Sanchez	Director	Center of Excellence
Jan	Swinton	Dean	Glendale College
Tony	Teng	Dean	Saddleback College

As of March 1 the DOW has met five times, four face-to-face meetings and one phone conference. In developing the recommendations the group has considered how the other regions in the state are

organized and how they make decisions. The group also weighed the advantages and disadvantages of these three organizational approaches:

- Remain as is as a combined region with minor tweaks
- Separate completely into an LA County region and an Orange County region
- Blend the two into a hybrid model in which the counties would remain as a combined region but with a degree of autonomy for each county to address its own needs.

In addition to the formal meetings the DOW facilitator has conducted a number of one on one conversations with key players throughout the region . Periodic updates have been provided at the SPC and the full Consortium meetings.

The process for considering these recommendations will include discussion and input at the March meetings of the SPC and the full Consortium. In April the DOW will meet again to consider and integrate the input it has received in order to reformulate the recommendations. Finally approval will be sought at the May Consortium meeting and the June SPC meeting. If approved implementation of the recommendations will be began during the 2016-17 academic year.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Structure of the Consortium: The DOW recommends a hybrid option whereby the 27 colleges remain together as a combined region but have a degree of autonomy at the county level to meet the specific needs of their respective counties. Each county would have personnel and budgeted funds dedicated to carrying out its work.

The LA and Orange colleges should remain together in a combined region but work in manner that allows each county to have a degree of autonomy to meet its unique needs. In the case of LA County the goal is for the ring colleges and the LACCD colleges to work as a unit to meet the workforce needs of the county. Likewise in Orange County the four community college districts would work together to define and meet the needs of the county. The colleges may on an ad hoc basis form regional or sector based alliances to meet specific workforce needs. To further delineate how a hybrid model would work. Some tasks/activities would be the purview of the county-based sub-consortium level , others done primarily at the combined county level, and others would be done at both the county and the Consortium wide. DOW attempted to identify what activities would be primarily conducted at what level as a way of illustrating how the model would work.

Done primarily at the County Level	Done at both the County Level and the full consortium level	Done primarily at the full consortium level
Coordination with Workforce Boards and WIOA Planning	Professional Development	Program approval
Alignment with political entities-city and county government	Capacity for data gathering and analysis capacity	Facilitation of partnerships between colleges

Collaboration with school districts	Marketing	Coordination of DWM assets (COE, DSNs, TAPs)
Collaboration with economic development and business groups	Communication	Website
Coordinating work of DSNs		Communication
		Implementing initiatives launched by the Chancellor's Office such as data unlocked.
		Aligning with the Strong Workforce recommendations

*Full consortium refers to the two counties continuing to work together as in the present model

It may be helpful to be look at the above table in another way, what each entity would be doing

LA County
Professional development (county specific)
Data gathering and analysis (county specific)
Communication (county specific)
Coordination with Workforce Boards and WIOA Planning
Alignment with political entities-city and county government
Collaboration with school districts
Collaboration with economic development and business groups
Coordinating work of DSNs

Orange County
Professional development (county specific)
Data gathering and analysis (county specific)
Communication (county specific)
Coordination with Workforce Boards and WIOA
Alignment with political entities-city and county government
Collaboration with school districts
Collaboration with economic development and business groups
Coordinating work of DSNs,

Full LAOCRC
Program endorsement
Facilitation of partnerships between colleges
Coordination of DWM assets (COE, DSNs, TAPs)
Website
Communication
Implementing initiatives launched by the Chancellor's Office
Aligning with the Strong Workforce recommendations

2. Expand the membership of the Strategic Planning Committee

In order to fulfill the need to collaborate and work strategically at the regional level, the DOW is recommending the Strategic Planning Committee be fleshed out with additional categories of representation and ensuring there is a representative from each county in each position. The positions are grouped by those internal to the community colleges and those from the community.

Categories of representation (one from each county)

A. From colleges

CEO

CIO

CSSO

Academic Senate

CTE Dean/administrator (voting member)

Deputy Sector Navigator

Adult Education/non-credit

1070 Project

B. Community

Business organization

Economic development

Workforce board

Community organization

The recommendation is that the SPC should conduct its work in a flexible fashion. There will be times when it will make sense to work as a full region and times when it should be on a county level. The SPC should determine when it should meet as regional group and when appropriate divide into two groups by county. It will be chaired by two CEOs, one from each county. When the counties meet separately the CEO will chair their respective county meetings.

3. Decision making processes need to be identified and formalized.

In the Consortium the goal is to create a culture of collaboration with consensus being the guiding principal. The colleges voluntarily participate in the initiatives and activities facilitated by the Consortium. While building consensus takes time and effort, it results in a more effective Consortium. Fortunately there is a solid foundation of collaboration as the CTE deans and economic development leaders of the LAOCRC colleges have met and worked together for over two decades.

It is recognized that there will be circumstances where consensus may not work and a formal decision making process will need to be employed. In such cases a decision needs to be made by someone or some group.

The SPC has already recognized three decision-making bodies:

- The voting members of the LAOCRC (one per college as appointed by the college)
- The Strategic Planning Committee
- The community colleges CEOs.

The goal will be to always place responsibility for decisions at the level most prepared to make them. A good example is the program approval function, which is in the hands of the voting members. They are closest to the instructional programs and in the best position to evaluate whether there is a labor market demand for a program and any danger of destructive competition.

Most Consortium operational decisions will be made by the Consortium Director(s) in consultation with the CEO Co-chairs and the voting members of the Consortium. Taking a formal vote will happen only occasionally when necessary and appropriate.

The Strategic Planning Committee will work primarily in an advisory role but may be asked to weigh in by formal vote on occasion. The CEO Co-chairs may call for a formal vote when they agree it is necessary and appropriate.

All the CEOs in the region will rarely be asked to vote. A formal vote will be employed when there is a particularly high profile issue or a contentious issue that has not been settled at other levels. For a vote of the regional CEOs to be called for, the CEO Co-chairs of the Consortium must agree to do it. Alternatively forty percent of the regional CEOs may request that a vote be taken

Formal decision making for major issues

Because a formal decision making process needs to be in place, the DOW has drafted a process for consideration. It proposes the following would be used for significant issues such as the distribution of funds or when consensus fails and a formal decision is needed.

The decision to deploy this more elaborate system will be made by any one of the following:

- The CEO Co-chairs of the SPC agree to use it or
- Forty percent of any of the decision making groups requests that it be used

The decision making process is designed to ensure a thorough step-by-step approach with transparency and participation. When it is deployed it will work in the following sequential steps:

1. A workgroup studies the issue and prepares a recommendation (s) . The workgroup is an ongoing one that is used in each situation and is made up of volunteer representatives from any of the decision-making groups. The membership should be reviewed on an annual basis. The workgroup may request others join them to serve as resources. An alternative is to form an ad hoc workgroup be formed each time it is needed.
2. The workgroup recommendations are forwarded to the full Consortium for discussion and input.
3. The workgroup recommendations are forwarded to the Strategic Planning Committee along with the input from the Consortium. The SPC discusses and provides input.
4. The workgroup receives the input from the Consortium and the SPC and revises the recommendations.
5. The recommendations go back to the full Consortium for further discussion, possible revision and approval.
6. The recommendations go to the SPC for discussion, possible revision and approval.
7. The decision(s) is implemented.

For example, in deciding how to apportion new funds that are channeled through the Consortium (such as the Enhancement Funds). The following would happen:

1. The CEO Co-chairs would put the process in motion.
2. A workgroup would develop recommendations for the criteria to be used in distributing the funds.
3. The full Consortium would receive the recommended criteria to discuss and provide input.
4. The SPC would receive the recommended criteria and the input of the Consortium. It would discuss and provide input.
5. The workgroup would revise the recommended criteria based on the input of the Consortium and the SPC.
6. The revised criteria would be forwarded to the Consortium for discussion and approval by the voting members.
7. The revised recommendations and the Consortium's approval would be forwarded to the SPC for discussion and approval. All members of the SPC will be eligible to vote.

8. An RFP based on the funding criteria will be issued and colleges or partnerships of colleges would be invited to apply.

9. An ad hoc review committee of the colleges and SPC members will be formed to review the funding applications from the colleges and award the fund.

10. The results will be reported back to the full Consortium and the SPC.

Operational points (these apply to all three decision making groups) :

- While discussion and voting in face-to-face meetings is preferable, conference calls and online tools may be used.
- When a decision is to be made there must be a quorum of at least 50% of the respective group.
- A majority of those voting must vote in favor of a proposal for it to be approved
- The body of any of the three decision-making groups may call for a vote on an issue if forty percent of the members request it.

There may be times when decisions need to be made at the county level rather than the full consortium level. When that happens the county members of whichever decision making body is involved will be the group that decides. For example if there is a decision about which sectors to serve in Los Angeles County, the voting members of the colleges in the county would make that decision along with the county sub-group of the SPC. The operational points outlined above would apply.