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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a final report on a Management Audit of the Pasadena Unified School District (Pasadena USD). This study was commissioned by the Management Audit Advisory Council, and was conducted from September 2006 through February 2007 by Gibson Consulting Group, Inc. of Austin, Texas.

The objectives of this study were to:

- Evaluate the Central Office organization structure at the director-level and higher to ensure that it effectively supports decision-making throughout the district.
- Evaluate Board of Education (Board) and district-level decision-making from both policy and process perspectives. The analysis includes sub-systems of decision-making, including management information systems, communications, stakeholder input, as well as procedures and controls.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of procedures provided by the Pasadena USD Classified Human Resources Department staff and the Personnel Commission in the recruitment and hiring of classified employees.

The objectives of the project did not include the performance audit of any departments or schools, or the identification of savings. Instead, the focus was on how the district and the Board make decisions and what improvements can be made in this regard.

There are several major findings of the report:

- At the director-level and up, the Central Office is not overstaffed. There may be opportunities for savings at lower levels of the Central Office, but there are necessary investments as well. The organization structure should be realigned to support improved accountability and control over operations, and functions should be added for the Central Office to meet school and community needs. While many of the realignments can be done without additional cost, the estimated investment required for new positions is approximately $500,000 per year.

- There have been examples of good decisions made by Pasadena USD, the most notable being the implementation of the standards-based curriculum and benchmark testing system. The Board and district focused on academic needs, analyzed data, developed options to improve, and dedicated resources to begin a successful implementation. Teachers and principals now have access to student performance results throughout the year to help improve scores on standardized tests taken annually in the spring. While many challenges still exist, this initiative represents Pasadena USD decision-making at its best.

- The teacher’s contract should be renegotiated to remove language on site-based decision-making. This provision currently allows schools to be “site-based” contingent on an election by teachers. The provision is not being applied at any of the schools, and it is inconsistent with Board policy requiring a single system of decision-making. Further, there are other decision-making structures at the schools that include teachers and are effective in supporting school decisions.

- The district’s technology infrastructure is highly unstable and outdated, and is not effectively or efficiently supporting the decision-making process. Reporting tools...
were purchased before the infrastructure could support their use, duplicative data systems exist, software applications have become increasingly fragmented, and significant manual procedures and duplicate systems continue to be used in the day-to-day operations. The district has identified and estimated costs for many of these needs ($4.5 million one-time and $4.0 million annually), but funding has not been allocated to meet them.

- Other aspects of the decision-making process need attention, including communication systems, stakeholder input and communication, and planning and management of major initiatives. The lack of current job descriptions, documented procedures, and annual performance evaluations are also limiting accountability for decisions and performance at Pasadena USD.

- For several reasons, the Pasadena USD Human Resources Department does not work effectively with the Personnel Commission. The HR Department should take primary responsibility for improving the coordination and communication between the two entities in order to increase their collective effectiveness. Pasadena USD management does not believe that the current process is yielding the highest quality candidates, and efforts are sometimes made to circumvent the process. Pasadena USD and the Personnel Commission should adopt a governance philosophy applied by other California school districts that provides better coordination between the two entities and accountability to the Pasadena USD Board of Trustees.

While this report, like other consultant reports provided to Pasadena USD, should be useful to the Board and district management, its value will be limited until the Pasadena USD determines how to reallocate its resources to fund the recommended changes without jeopardizing student achievement.

Below are brief descriptions of the specific recommendations made in this report, organized by section.

**CENTRAL OFFICE ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE**

*Recommendation 1-1: Restructure Central Office functions to support improved communications, accountability, and decision-making.*

Pasadena USD should keep its Chief Academic Officer Model for its organization structure but realign functions to improve accountability and equity. The human resources and technology functions should report directly to the superintendent, and all academic programs and school operations should be under the responsibility of the chief academic officer. The transportation function should also be moved to Business and Support Services where the other auxiliary operations reside.
BOARD LEVEL DECISION-MAKING

Recommendation 2-1: Improve the format and content of information provided to the Board, starting with the budget.

The most frequently stated concern by Board members regarding management information was the annual budget. The Board receives information and correspondence throughout the year relating to the budget, but the most important is the formal budget document. The district’s annual budget provides an excellent example of too much data and not enough meaningful management information. The district should implement performance-based budgeting to increase the usefulness of budget information. The board should also define information specifications for other routine and non-recurring information requests to ensure that the content and format meets or exceeds board member expectations.

Recommendation 2-2: Increase Board technical training.

While there is considerable room for improvement in the provision of information to the Board, there is also a need for additional Board technical training. Currently, Board orientation is held for all Board candidates prior to elections. However, post-election training is not being held for all new Board members at Pasadena USD. The board should establish its own standards and minimum hour requirements for board member professional development.

Recommendation 2-3: Reconstitute Board committees.

The effectiveness of Board committees has been limited for some of the same reasons relating to management information provided to the Board directly. Based on observations of Board meetings, many of the same issues discussed in the committee meeting are rehashed in the Board meeting. The Board should reconstitute its committees by establishing more specific decision-making expectations for each. The Board should make it clear to each committee when it wants information versus a recommendation on a decision.


The Board should develop a Code of Conduct for all participants in a Board meeting, including community members, staff and Board members themselves. This Code of Conduct should prohibit inappropriate conduct including the accusations against specific members of the Board or employees of the district. Comments made against any individual that the Board wishes to entertain should be treated in the same manner as a personnel matter in Executive Session. This recommendation should be reviewed by the district’s legal counsel before implementation.

Recommendation 2-5: Conduct Board-Superintendent teambuilding sessions at least annually.

To improve its ability to work together, the entire Board should participate with the superintendent in an annual teambuilding session facilitated by a registered provider. The purpose of the teambuilding session would be to enhance the effectiveness of the Board-Superintendent team and to assess the continuing education needs of the Board-Superintendent team. The Board-Superintendent team should attend
additional teambuilding workshops when there is turnover of the Board or the superintendent.

**Recommendation 2-6: The Pasadena USD Board should adopt the California School Boards Association (CSBA) Professional Governance Standards for School Boards.**

The CSBA has standards designed as a proactive way to engage School Board members and the public in discussions about the importance of School Board accountability. They are meant to enhance the public’s understanding about “responsibilities of local Boards and to support Boards in their efforts to govern effectively.” Pasadena USD should formally adopt these standards and subscribe to their principles.

**DISTRICT LEVEL DECISION-MAKING**

**Recommendation 2-7: Pasadena USD and the teachers’ union should negotiate to remove site-based provisions from the teacher contract.**

The scope of decision-making in the teacher contract is not specific enough to avoid confusion over who has the authority to make what decisions. Pasadena USD and the teachers' union should negotiate to remove site-based decision-making from the employment agreement, and both should be involved in the implementation of a single decision-making framework to be applied district-wide.

**Recommendation 2-8: Adopt a policy that documents a single decision-making framework for all schools.**

Some decisions need to be made centrally in order to provide consistent application and efficient operations at the schools and Central Office. Other decisions can and should be made at the school-level. Documentation of a single decision-making framework will help ensure that all principals and Central Office administrators understand the ground rules for decision-making. Adopting it as policy will ensure its consistent use regardless of who is superintendent. Reference should be made in this framework to existing site-based decision-making structures, including School Site Councils and campus leadership teams.

**Recommendation 2-9: Create a technology steering committee.**

The committee should have ten to 12 members and include teachers, principals, various administrative and instructional department staff, Board members, parents, and community members. ITS management and staff should also be part of the committee but they should serve mostly in an advisory role. The committee should meet on a monthly basis in order to provide the necessary guidance and oversight.

**Recommendation 2-10: Upgrade Technology Infrastructure.**

Pasadena USD should dedicate resources to address needs identified on the ITS list to upgrade the district’s network infrastructure and server environment, and phone system. The current infrastructure is highly vulnerable, experiences excessive downtime, and is not effectively or efficiently supporting decision-making.
**Recommendation 2-11: Implement a network operating system and role-based security structure.**

The lack of a network operating system is limiting the ability to allow users efficient access to data needed to support decision. Security is currently designated at the workstation level, as opposed to a position/user or role level. This impairs the ability of ITS to effectively manage access to reports and software applications needed to support decisions.

**Recommendation 2-12: Refine long-term plan for application software and reporting.**

Application software used to support student information, business operations, and human resource needs has become more fragmented over the past five years, with new systems developed or purchased to address deficiencies of other software. Reporting software was purchased before the infrastructure was ready for it, prompting the purchase of additional reporting software. Transaction processing throughout the district is paper-intensive, duplicative, and requires extensive reconciliation to ensure data accuracy. Certain software is dictated by the Los Angeles County, but the district must take a fundamentally different approach to application software to effectively support operations and decision-making.

**Recommendation 2-13: Require all teachers to use district email.**

The vast majority of Central Office staff and school leaders (76 and 90 percent, respectively) use email as the primary means of communication. However, only 51 percent of teachers use email as the primary means of communication. There are several reasons for this, including insufficient hardware, lack of user identifications and passwords, and the inclination of some teachers to use personal email instead of district email. To ensure effective communications, all teachers and administrative personnel should be required to use and periodically check their email.

**Recommendation 2-14: Upgrade the district’s phone system to Voice-Over Internet Protocol.**

Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP) uses the district current network infrastructure (as opposed to telephone lines) to carry voice communications. This allows the district to consolidate and better manage its investments in communications and technology. Since VOIP is digital, the quality of communications is also better. Pasadena USD uses an outdated analog system that is limiting the effectiveness and efficiency of district communications.

**Recommendation 2-15: Reconstitute all recurring staff meetings and establish standard for ad-hoc meetings.**

Meetings represent another means of communicating information. However, in many instances meetings are conducted only to share information that could be transmitted via email or other means. According to employee responses to a survey question regarding time spent in meetings, more employees believe that too much time is spent on meetings. District management should carefully evaluate each meeting to determine if it is necessary to achieve objectives.
**Recommendation 2-16: Identify and include decision stakeholders in the decision-making process and the communication loop upon implementation.**

For each decision identified in the decision-making framework, internal and external stakeholder types should be identified and listed for each decision in a documented procedure. When decisions are being made at any level in the organization, this procedure can be used as a checklist to ensure that all stakeholder groups are appropriately included in the decision-making process and in communications throughout implementation.

**Recommendation 2-17: Adopt formal project management techniques and train project managers.**

Project management training is available through sources outside public education. For certain types of decisions or initiatives, such as technology, there are certification programs for project management. The district has initiated several attempts to train on project management, but the discipline has not been consistently reflected in the implementation of several major district initiatives.

**Recommendation 2-18: Update and document all operating procedures and job descriptions.**

Many job descriptions are out-of-date and/or incomplete, limiting management’s ability to hold individuals accountable. Job descriptions should reflect the current duties and responsibilities assigned to the position, and should contain specific, measurable performance objectives to support an evaluation of performance. Procedures should be documented initially through process maps to better understand and communicate the processes that run across the organization. The development of job descriptions, process maps, and procedures should be done in concert with each other to ensure internal consistency.

**Recommendation 2-19: Prepare performance evaluations annually for all personnel.**

Some employees, even higher level administrators, have not been evaluated in five to six years. Performance evaluations need to be conducted at the same frequency as district goals are established. Performance evaluations should meet all minimum legal and contractual requirements, and also be used to support accountability for performance on an annual basis.
CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES – PASADENA USD HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT AND THE PERSONNEL COMMISSION

Recommendation 3-1: District management should establish and give continuing support for cooperation between the Personnel Commission and Classified Human Resources Department staff.

The Classified HR Department and Personnel Commission currently function as two disconnected entities, instead of an integrated human resources function and there is no regularly scheduled, meaningful communication between the Classified Department staff and the Personnel Commission staff. A contributor to the lack of communication between the Personnel Commission and the Classified HR Department is the physical proximity of the staff; they are located in separate offices, although they did recently move to the same floor. It is more difficult to coordinate activities and cultivate communication channels under these circumstances.

Recommendation 3-2: Increase the frequency and value of communication regarding classified personnel policies and procedures.

The Classified Personnel Handbook can be a good introduction for new hires. However, district employees need supplementary targeted documentation to better understand any related regulations, policies, or procedures that affect them when applying for transfers, promotions, or reclassifications.

Recommendation 3-3: Create and execute a plan to conform to and maintain established administrative requirements related to classified job descriptions and their classifications.

The Personnel Commission director is responsible for maintaining and keeping job descriptions current. However, it is critical that the district provide new information to the Personnel Commission director as soon as it is received in order to keep job descriptions up-to-date.

Recommendation 3-4: Investigate ways to increase the quality and number of candidates for classified positions.

Some classified employees participating in focus groups felt that flyers for open positions do not consistently reach all employees who may wish to apply. The Classified HR Department and Personnel Commissions should develop a plan to work collectively to determine the best approach to reach the largest number of classified employees and candidates.

Recommendation 3-5: The Personnel Commission should investigate methods to compress the time that it takes to complete the hiring process.

The Personnel Commission staff should examine common recruitment patterns within the district and begin instituting proactive staffing activities during those times. Additionally, it is essential that the recruiting process for frequently hired positions be initiated prior to the expiration of the related eligibility list.
Recommendation 3-6: Increase the Personnel Commission’s accountability to the district and to the Board.

The Personnel Commissioners, Personnel Commission director, and the Board should meet to determine appropriate information to include in this monthly report. In addition to providing the Board with needed information, this report may also be used by the Personnel Commission director and the Personnel Commission to proactively identify potential issues and make modifications to procedures and processes.

Attached to this report are templates for job descriptions, process maps, and procedures to help guide the district in its implementation efforts. Sample performance measures to support Performance-Based Budgeting are also included.

* * * * *

Acknowledgements

Gibson Consulting Group, Inc. would like to thank the Pasadena USD School Board, district and school leadership, teachers, and all other staff who contributed to this study. Particular thanks go to:

- Kathleen Duba, who served as the district liaison for our work and took primary responsibility for gathering requested data and scheduling district and campus-level meetings.

- Michi Oba and Diane Orona, who were both vital in managing the communications between the district and Gibson Consulting Group, Inc. throughout the project.

- To the 488 administrators, teachers and employees who took the time out of their day to respond to our online survey.
CHAPTER 1:  
**ANALYSIS OF CENTRAL OFFICE ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE**

**BACKGROUND**

**Analysis Approach**

The organizational analysis focuses on the functional effectiveness of the district’s Central Office management structure, with particular attention given to the top four administrative levels in the organization—superintendent, deputy superintendent, assistant superintendent, and director. A limited number of subordinate positions that have assumed director-level responsibilities are also included. Department-level organization structures and staffing-levels were not included in the scope of this project.

Several documents were reviewed for this analysis, including:

- District and department-level organizational charts;
- Organizational assessments completed by groups external to the district;
- District policies and administrative regulations;
- Department operational procedures;
- Job descriptions of all Central Office senior and mid-level management positions and school leadership positions;
- Board of Education (Board) meeting minutes, agendas, and Board packets;
- Budget information provided to the Board;
- Various information relating to the site-based decision-making process and school site councils;
- District Strategic Plan;
- District planning documents;
- Sample copies of the campus-prepared Single Plan for Student Achievement; and
- School surveys conducted by outside consultants.

Site work was conducted over a two-week period — November 13-17 and November 27-30, 2006. During this time, the review team conducted interviews with all Central Office senior and mid-management administrators, and visited 13 of the district’s 27 campuses. Interviews and/or focus groups were conducted with principals, teachers, other school staff, and community members. For schools or areas not visited, principals, other staff, and community members were offered the opportunity to participate in one or more focus groups.

While on site, the review team requested and received additional information concerning district operations. The review of the documents provided in the initial data request identified other materials important to the review team’s work. In some cases, the review team became aware of other documents, reports, surveys, and communications during scheduled interviews or in informal conversations with district employees or members of the greater Pasadena community. A sample of these supplemental informative materials includes:
The review team examined two elements in assessing the effectiveness of district’s Central Office organizational structure - the logical alignment of functions and span of control.

The logical grouping or alignment of functions refers to how effective the organization is in grouping functions or tasks of a similar nature in order to keep supervisory responsibilities within manageable limits. Span of control refers to the number of direct reports a supervisory position has.

**Responsibility for Organization Structure**

As the governing Board of the Pasadena USD, the role of the Board of Education is provided in the *Bylaws of the Board, BB Policy 9000(a) Role of the Board* which states, “The Board shall work with the superintendent to fulfill its roles, which include...Establishing and maintaining a basic organization structure for the District....” This language appears to imply that the Board should be involved in development of the district’s organization structure. All other policies, however, suggest it is the superintendent’s responsibility. *Administration BP 2100 Administrative Staff Organization* states that:

- The superintendent shall organize the administrative staff in a manner that best enables the District to provide an effective program of instruction; and

- The superintendent or designee may adjust staff responsibilities temporarily or permanently to accommodate the workload and/or individual capabilities.
Separate provisions in BP 2110 discuss organizational charts and lines of authority:

- The superintendent shall maintain a current District organization chart. The organization chart shall clearly designate lines of primary responsibility and the relationships between all District positions; and

- The superintendent or designee shall ensure that all personnel understand to whom they are responsible and for what functions. Lines of responsibility should in no way prevent staff members at all levels from cooperating to develop the best possible school programs and services.

The policy language clearly places the bulk of the responsibility for establishing the organization structure with the superintendent. Since the Board must approve new or terminated positions, they are also involved. In practice, the superintendent seeks Board approval of all major organizational changes.

**Overview of Organization Structure**

There are several organizational models used in public education systems. These models can generally be grouped into four categories:

- **Assistant / Associate Superintendent Model** – This model has numerous assistant superintendents, associate superintendents and/or executive directors reporting directly to the superintendent. These are generally flatter organizations, and the superintendent is involved in the day-to-day operations of the district. This model is generally found in smaller school systems.

- **Deputy Model** – As districts grow, the ability of the superintendent to be involved in day-to-day operations declines and more responsibility is delegated to deputy superintendents who run the day-to-day operations. The organizations are not as flat as the Assistant / Associate Superintendent Model, but allow the superintendent to focus more on Board and public responsibilities. In the strict application of the Deputy Model, two deputies (one for instruction and one for operations) report to the superintendent. However, in practice some districts also include assistant superintendents as direct reports.

- **Chief of Staff Model** – This model is used in a few very large school systems around the country. Under this model, the chief of staff reports to the superintendent, and many assistant superintendents, associate superintendents, executive directors and possibly director positions report directly to the chief of staff. This model essentially assigns all day-to-day district operations responsibilities from the superintendent to the chief of staff.

- **Chief Academic Officer Model** – this model is similar to the deputy model, but places the chief academic officer slightly higher in the organization than a traditional deputy. The chief academic officer is responsible for all activities and programs relating to the education of students. In this model, the positions responsible for managing the district’s finances, technology, and operations are part of a different arm of the organization, and have slightly less power and influence than a traditional deputy. The recent trend to hire “non-traditional” superintendents, who come from backgrounds other than education, has contributed to the growth of this type of organizational structure in large school districts. This model is applied by Pasadena USD, and represents an emerging best practice in public education.
A school district’s organizational structure should reflect the mission of the school district and consider the desired role of the superintendent. If the superintendent’s role requires him or her to be more involved in supporting the Board and meeting external demands, the position should have fewer direct reports. If the superintendent is to be closer to the day-to-day operations, the organization should generally be flatter, with more direct reports to the superintendent.

Under Pasadena USD’s current organization structure, the superintendent has four (4) direct reports: chief academic officer, deputy superintendent; assistant superintendent, Teaching and Learning Secondary Schools; assistant superintendent, Business Services; and the Communications Team. **Exhibit 1-1** on the following page presents the district’s current organization chart.
The chief academic officer, deputy superintendent has four (4) direct reports: assistant superintendent, Teaching and Learning Pre K-8 Schools; director of Human Resources; director of Program Evaluation and Assessment; and director of Accountability and Special Programs.

The assistant superintendent, Teaching and Learning Secondary Schools has ten direct reports: principals, Grades 9-12 (4); Resource teacher, Parent Education/Partners in Education; director, Secondary Curriculum; director, Academies/Regional Occupational Programs (ROP)/Adult Education; coordinator, Health Services; director, Student Support Services; and coordinator, Transportation.

The assistant superintendent, Business Services has six (6) direct reports: director, Food Services; business manager, Accounting; director, Purchasing; director, Facilities; risk manager, Risk Management; and director, ITS.

The assistant superintendent, Teaching and Learning Pre K-8 Schools has 27 reports: principals, Grades Pre K-8 (22); teacher assistant, BTSA/NBC/Learning Materials and Librarians; director, Special Education; teacher specialist, English Language Learners; director, Childhood Development; and teacher specialist, Elementary Literacy. This position has administrative responsibility for Gifted and Talented Education (GATE), but program oversight is assigned to a high school principal who reports to another position.

**Recent Departmental Organizational Changes**

A number of changes were made during the past 18 months to the district’s organization structure. Based on the organization charts provided by the district, the following changes occurred between August 2005 and September 2006:

- Principals, Grades 9-12: Reassigned from the superintendent to the Teaching and Learning Secondary Schools (formerly Operations);
- Parent Education/Partners in Education: Reassigned from Accountability and Special Programs (formerly, Teaching and Learning Government Funding and Accountability) to Teaching and Learning Secondary Schools;
- Secondary Curriculum, Secondary Literacy, and Academies/ROP/Adult Education: Reassigned as above;
- BTSA/NBC Learning Materials and Librarians: Reassigned from Accountability and Special Programs to Teaching and Learning Pre K-8 Schools;
- Food Services: Reassigned from Operations to Business Services;
- Assistant superintendent for Planning, Research, and Evaluation: Position eliminated;
- School Police: Office eliminated;
- Safety Compliance Officer: Position eliminated; and
- Communications Department: Department eliminated.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Sections 41101-41407 of the California Education Code limit the ratio of teachers to district and campus-level administrators in school districts. A financial penalty is imposed on districts that employ more administrators than allowed, unless waived by the State Board of Education. For unified districts, the ratio of teachers to administrators cannot be less than 8.0, or one administrator for every eight teachers. A higher ratio reflects lower administrator staffing levels relative to the number of teachers. In 2005-06, the number of teachers per each administrator in Pasadena USD, Los Angeles County, and the state was 13.2, 10.7, and 11.4, respectively. Pasadena USD currently employs 81 district and campus-level administrators, 52 fewer than the maximum allowed by law.

Exhibit 1-2 presents district-level administrator ratios for Pasadena USD and unified school districts of similar size. Like the teacher to administrator ratio, lower ratios indicate higher staffing levels; higher ratios reflect lower staff levels. When compared with the 20 unified districts that have comparable enrollment sizes to Pasadena USD, the students to district-level administrators ratio for Pasadena USD is the seventh lowest and is approximately 18 percent lower than the average for the comparison districts. This suggests that Pasadena USD has a higher number of Central Office administrators than the average peer district. The ratio of teachers to district-level administrators is the eighth lowest among the 20 peer districts and approximately 9 percent lower than the average for the districts.

Exhibit 1-2
2005-06 Ratios of Students and Teachers to District-Level Administrators
Pasadena USD and Unified Districts of Comparable Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unified District</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Students Per District-Level Administrator</th>
<th>Teachers Per District-Level Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield-Suisun</td>
<td>23,377</td>
<td>417.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajaro Valley</td>
<td>19,324</td>
<td>623.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>22,236</td>
<td>712.2</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport-Mesa</td>
<td>22,122</td>
<td>737.4</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvord</td>
<td>19,869</td>
<td>764.1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk-La Mirada</td>
<td>23,230</td>
<td>967.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pasadena</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,321</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,066.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemet</td>
<td>22,368</td>
<td>1,177.3</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrieta</td>
<td>20,164</td>
<td>1,186.1</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conejo Valley</td>
<td>22,456</td>
<td>1,247.5</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>20,195</td>
<td>1,262.1</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer District Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,458</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,293.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacienda la Puente</td>
<td>23,241</td>
<td>1,367.1</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>21,188</td>
<td>1,412.5</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td>21,326</td>
<td>1,424.1</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>21,367</td>
<td>1,424.4</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperia</td>
<td>20,267</td>
<td>1,447.6</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa</td>
<td>21,043</td>
<td>1,618.3</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>22,584</td>
<td>1,737.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Park</td>
<td>19,684</td>
<td>1,789.4</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simi Valley</td>
<td>21,454</td>
<td>2,145.4</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>21,660</td>
<td>2,406.6</td>
<td>108.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gibson Consulting Group, Inc. from Ed-Data @ www.ed-data.k-12.ca.us/
Because of the wide-range of efficiency, several district organization charts available online were reviewed to understand the differences. For districts at both ends of the range, the organizations are much more similar than the above data suggests. The disparity appears to be due to variances in position titles rather than functional differences. Varying interpretations on state data standards may also be contributing to the wide variances among school systems.

While the scope of this work did not include campus administrators, it is important to analyze these ratios in conjunction with district-level administrators. Some districts apply different organizational strategies and may shift some administrative functions to the schools. At Pasadena USD, some Central Office functions have in fact been transferred to school principals.

Exhibit 1-3 presents ratios of students and teachers to campus-level administrators for Pasadena USD and peer districts. The results are only slightly different from ratios for district-level administrators. The number of students per campus-level administrator in Pasadena USD is the fourth lowest among the 20 peer districts; the number of teachers per campus-based administrator is the sixth lowest. The number of students per campus-level administrator in Pasadena USD is approximately 19 percent lower than the average for the comparison districts. Similarly, the number of teachers per campus-level administrator is approximately 12 percent lower than the peer district average. These lower ratios suggest that Pasadena USD has a higher number of campus administrators than most of the peer districts. Many factors could be contributing to this, including the average school size. Pasadena USD has several low-enrollment campuses, and the district closed schools at the beginning of the 2006-07 school year. While enrollment has declined in recent years, the closure of schools should result in slightly higher staffing ratios for 2006-07.
Exhibit 1-3
2005-06 Ratios of Students and Teachers to Campus-Level Administrators
Pasadena USD and Unified Districts of Comparable Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unified District</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Students Per Campus-Level Administrator</th>
<th>Teachers Per Campus-Level Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pajaro Valley</td>
<td>19,324</td>
<td>292.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>21,660</td>
<td>338.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemet</td>
<td>22,368</td>
<td>338.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pasadena</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,321</strong></td>
<td><strong>349.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport-Mesa</td>
<td>22,122</td>
<td>351.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperia</td>
<td>20,267</td>
<td>361.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvord</td>
<td>19,869</td>
<td>389.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacienda la Puente</td>
<td>23,241</td>
<td>400.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>20,195</td>
<td>403.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperia</td>
<td>20,267</td>
<td>361.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvord</td>
<td>19,869</td>
<td>389.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacienda la Puente</td>
<td>23,241</td>
<td>400.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>20,195</td>
<td>403.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer District Average</td>
<td>21,458</td>
<td>432.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conejo Valley</td>
<td>22,456</td>
<td>440.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>22,236</td>
<td>463.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa</td>
<td>21,043</td>
<td>467.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Park</td>
<td>19,684</td>
<td>492.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk-La Mirada</td>
<td>23,230</td>
<td>494.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>21,188</td>
<td>516.7</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>21,367</td>
<td>534.1</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>22,584</td>
<td>537.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td>21,326</td>
<td>546.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gibson Consulting Group, Inc. from Ed-Data @ www.ed-data.k-12.ca.us/

Because of differing state laws and regulations, comparisons to districts outside California is limited in some respects. Comparison to other states is also limited because “central administration” is defined differently. The State of Texas uses a similar definition as defined in its Public Education Information Management System. In 2005-06, Texas’s ratio of students to central administrators was 762 to 1. This benchmark comparison suggests that Pasadena USD has 40 percent fewer Central Office administrators than the average Texas school district. Pasadena USD students to campus-level administrator ratio of 349.5 to 1 is 30 percent higher than the Texas state average of 269 to 1 indicating that Pasadena USD has 30 percent fewer campus administrators relative to the number of students than does Texas.

Based solely on the number of Central Office administrators, Pasadena USD does not appear to be overstuffed at the director-level position and up. However, there are several instances of misaligned functions and inappropriate span of control. These are discussed further below.

**Alignment of Functions**

Several functions in the Central Office organization are not logically aligned, or clustered, to support effective accountability. Exhibit 1-4 references specific alignment problems with the Pasadena USD organization structure. Each of these are discussed below. Misalignment can occur when there is an attempt to match the backgrounds or personalities of individuals.
with the tasks or task clusters. In addition, the necessity to reassign responsibilities for one or more major functions, due to reductions in staff, can contribute to a misalignment of functions.

### Exhibit 1-4
Pasadena USD Organizational Misalignments

1. **Not all academic functions are aligned under the chief academic officer (CAO).** The assistant superintendent for Teaching and Learning - Secondary Schools is responsible for overseeing secondary schools, Student Support Services and a host of other programs. This position reports directly to the superintendent. The job responsibilities for the CAO include all academic programs and student performance. Under the current organization structure, the CAO position is being held accountable for functions that are not under the direct control of the position. This mismatch of...
responsibility and authority is the direct result of the current organizational alignment.

2. The position of the assistant superintendent for Teaching and Learning - Secondary Schools includes responsibilities for Health Services, Student Support Services, and Transportation. These functions, particularly transportation, are not normally associated with the other curriculum and instruction-related tasks assigned to that position. Transportation is an auxiliary service, and is more commonly grouped with facilities, maintenance, custodial and food service functions. Student Support Services and Health Services are usually found under - and logically to – an assistant superintendent of Business Services position, but they are grouped together to consolidate the responsibility of all non-academic student services.

3. Human Resources, a district-wide function not solely related to curriculum and instruction, currently reports to the chief academic officer (CAO). The current CAO has Human Resources experience that prompted the current alignment. The practice of building an organization chart around the people you have is a common practice in public education. In many cases there is no harm done. However, in the long-term, a logically aligned organization will help the school district place the best people in the best roles in support of long-term objectives. In states with organized labor, as well as others, many districts elevate the Human Resources function to a direct report to the superintendent. The fact that greater than 80 percent of district expenditures relate to salaries and benefits also justifies higher visibility of a Human Resource function in the organization. This does not necessarily mean the position must be upgraded, just that the alignment should be changed.

4. The Office of Program Evaluation and Assessment reports to the chief academic officer. In order to ensure independent program evaluations, this function should not report to (and have their performance evaluation completed by) the position making decisions on program design and implementation. Evaluation functions are commonly found under academic programs in school district organization structures, but this does not represent a best practice.

Pasadena USD currently aligns schools and other functions under two assistant superintendent positions. The alignment of individual schools is complicated by the unique grade structure of Pasadena USD schools.

**Span of Control**

The optimum span of control depends on the nature and diversity of functions and the level of responsibility and authority. Spans of control generally range from four to nine positions at the top levels of an organization. Acceptable spans of control increase if the direct report positions are similar or homogeneous. Within Pasadena USD, as with most school systems, the only similar positions that report to an assistant superintendent position or higher are the school principals. At lower levels in the organization it is not uncommon to see 50 or more positions, such as bus drivers or custodians, reporting to the same supervisor.

Within Pasadena USD, the span of control for Central Office administrators ranges from four to seven direct reports, excluding school principals. Four positions report directly to the superintendent, who reports to seven Board members. As shown in Exhibit 1-5, this span of control is consistent with other California unified districts of a similar size, although
several of the other districts have fewer Board members. These districts were also selected based on the availability of a current organization chart on their website.

### Exhibit 1-5
Number of Positions to Superintendent
Pasadena USD and Other California Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2004-05 Enrollment</th>
<th>Direct Reports</th>
<th>Board Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena Unified</td>
<td>22,336</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rialto Unified</td>
<td>30,887</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Unified</td>
<td>21,944</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona Unified</td>
<td>34,657</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Port Mesa Unified</td>
<td>22,487</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ramon Valley Unified</td>
<td>22,857</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: School district organization charts and websites.*

Three of the five peer districts above have a Human Resource function reporting directly to the superintendent. One district has Human Resources under administrative services, and one – other than Pasadena – has the function aligned under instruction.

In addition to having direct staff reports, the superintendent also works on a daily basis with the seven members of the Board of Education. While the Board does not report to him, the superintendent spends a considerable amount of time with Board members. Excluding members of the Board, the superintendent’s span of control is lower than all other peer district superintendents, but by only one or two positions.

The span of control for the superintendent reflects, implicitly or explicitly, the organizational strategy of the school system. Superintendent positions with fewer direct reports rely more on other members of the management team to run day-to-day operations, and devote more time to Board and community demands. Superintendents with more direct reports are closer to the day-to-day operations, and generally dedicate a lower percentage of time to Board and community demands. Pasadena USD’s current organizational structure, like the selected peer districts listed above, apply the former approach.

With one exception, other spans of control in the Pasadena USD organization structure are in an acceptable range.

- Chief academic officer/deputy superintendent (4). This position has four direct reports, within, but at the lower end of the acceptable range for span of control.
- Assistant superintendent, Secondary Schools (10). This position has ten direct reports; however, four of the direct reports are school principals; seven are separate programs or services.
- Assistant superintendent, Business Services (6). This position has six direct reports within the acceptable range for span of control.
- Assistant superintendent, Pre K through Grade 8 (27). This position has 27 direct reports, 21 of which are school principals. Given the nature of the other programs and services reporting to this position, it is overloaded relative to other high level positions in the organization.
Overall, the span of control is not significantly out of line at the high levels of the Pasadena USD organization structure. There is room for increased span of control for the superintendent and chief academic officer positions, and organizational equity could be improved if some functions were reallocated from the assistant superintendent for Pre K through Grade 8. Span of control will be addressed in the context of other organizational recommendations later in this report.

**Missing Functions**

Several functions are missing from the Central Office organization chart. In some cases, responsibility has been pushed down to lower levels of the organization. In other instances responsibilities were pushed to the schools. Below are brief descriptions of these functions.

- **Community Relations/Involvement.** Pasadena USD previously had an Office of Communications that was eliminated due to budget reductions. Currently, there is no position or office with responsibilities relating to managing all public and internal information activities, developing and maintaining media relations, and coordinating marketing and community outreach efforts. There is no Pasadena USD office serving as a liaison with the Pasadena Education Foundation, an organization that assists the district with grant proposals and in securing over $8 million in awards for Pasadena USD schools or programs. Prior studies have recommended an ombudsman position to serve as the point person for these functions as well as a mediator for staff to go to for problem resolution. However, budget constraints have kept Pasadena USD from acting on this recommendation. The district’s Communication Team has invited a Pasadena Education Foundation representative to its monthly meetings and has noted that her attendance has helped information sharing and also pointed out the need for a liaison.

- **Professional Development.** There is no office with the responsibility for coordinating all aspects of the district’s professional development efforts. Research on effective districts emphasizes the importance of embedded staff development that is focused, intensive, and ongoing. One reason given by teachers in a 2000 retention study for wanting to come to Pasadena was its Professional Growth Center. With its closure, due to budget constraints, the role of planning and conducting staff development for professional staff has been appropriately assumed by the Curriculum Department. However, currently there is no office that manages the process for all district employees, including all tracking and record-keeping functions.

- **Internal audit.** Pasadena USD no longer has a separate internal audit function reporting to the Board. This position was cut in May 2001 when the district made major cuts of $6 million. Internal audit functions are rarely found in school districts with less than 10,000 students, are more common in districts with 10,000 to 25,000 students, and are usually found in larger school systems. For a district the size of Pasadena USD, the existence of an internal audit function would represent a best practice, particularly in light of the data and process issues raised later in this report.

- **Other.** A number of important functions have been pushed down to other district positions or have been outsourced. Responsibilities for coordination of the at-risk program, elementary writing, gifted and talented, and mathematics programs are assigned to school principals. Coordination of the fine arts program is the responsibility of part-time staff provided through a grant from the Los Angeles Arts Commission. The time principals must dedicate to providing campus-level
instructional leadership precludes their ability to address district-level program responsibilities effectively.

**Recommendation 1-1: Restructure Central Office functions to support improved communications, accountability, and decision-making.**

In developing recommendations regarding the modification of the organization structure, the review team considered the following:

- Align all functions more logically;
- Improve the span of control;
- Place the superintendent closer to district operations/decisions;
- Improve communications and coordination of related functions in making decisions;
- Establish a clear chain of command; and
- Improve accountability.

Pasadena USD should keep its Chief Academic Officer Model for its organization structure but realign functions to improve accountability. **Exhibit 1-6** presents the proposed organization structure for Pasadena USD. Following this chart are brief descriptions and justifications for the proposed changes.
Assign All Academic Functions to the chief academic officer. Assign all functions related to developing, coordinating, implementing, and monitoring instructional programs to the chief academic officer in order to focus resources most effectively on improving the academic achievement of students. A new position reporting to the chief academic officer, assistant superintendent for Instructional Support, should be created to coordinate all instructional support functions (see below).

Redefine existing assistant superintendent positions over schools. The two current assistant superintendents over schools should be converted to one position over all Pre K – 8 schools, and the other position – an assistant superintendent for Instructional Support – over academic programs and support services. High school principals should report directly to the CAO. Special Education, because it is a larger program, should also be a direct report to the CAO. This will more equitably distribute schools, programs and support services, and provide reasonable spans of control for the assistant superintendents and the CAO.

An assistant superintendent for Instructional Support should oversee all other instructional programs and instructional support services (at-risk, after-school and early childhood, English language learners, fine arts, guidance and counseling, gifted and talented, learning material/libraries, literacy, mathematics, science, and social studies programs). An assistant superintendent for School Operations should oversee all Pre K–8 school principals and be responsible for completing their annual performance evaluations.

Reassign Human Resources to the superintendent. Reassign Human Resources, a district-wide function, as a direct report to the superintendent rather than the chief academic officer. A new coordinator’s position reporting to the director of Human Resources should be established to coordinate all professional development programs and initiatives. Coordination of BTSA/NBC should be reassigned to Human Resources. Consideration should be given to re-establishing the Professional Growth Center in the future.

Reassign Program Evaluation and Assessment to the superintendent. Reassign Program Evaluation and Assessment as a direct report to the superintendent rather than the chief academic officer. The major responsibilities of the position—directing all district-wide testing activities and preparation and review of all federal and state program evaluations related to student performance outcomes—are district-wide functions. Those with the responsibility for the evaluation of programs should not report to those with oversight responsibilities for the design and implementation of the programs.

The Office for Accountability and Special Programs has responsibilities for administration and supervision of state and federally funded projects including development of all project applications and maintenance of effort related to the Consolidated Funding Program. This office should continue as a direct report to the chief academic officer since there is no conflict of interest. The unit should be re-named Accountability and Federal Programs to clearly distinguish its function from Special Education.

Reassign Information Technology Systems to the superintendent. Technology is not misaligned currently, but its position under the Division of Business Services does not represent a best practice in public education. Because of technology’s increasing importance to student performance and administrative efficiency across the entire organization, more school districts are elevating technology to a direct report to the superintendent. This does not immediately require a position upgrade, but over time this position should be upgraded to reflect the increased importance of technology to the school system.
Add a community involvement function that reports directly to superintendent. This report, as prior consultant reports, recommends the addition of a community involvement position. This position should report directly to the superintendent and serve as the district ombudsman, as well as fill other responsibilities relating to public information and associations with external entities and partnerships such as Partners in Education.

Reassign Student Support Services and Transportation to the assistant superintendent, Business Services. Reassign Student Support Services, Transportation, and Health Services, non-instructional district-wide functions, to the assistant superintendent, Business Services. Currently, these offices are assigned to the assistant superintendent, Teaching and Learning Secondary Schools. The title of assistant Superintendent, Business Services should be expanded and renamed the assistant superintendent for Business and Support Services.

Add internal audit function that reports directly to the Board. An internal audit position should be added and report directly to the Board. The internal auditor should develop a district risk assessment and develop an audit program that conducts audits of areas based on risk levels. Due to its budget constraints, Pasadena USD may consider proposing to the other members of the 5-Star Coalition that the internal audit position in the short term be shared through a shared services arrangement. This position could serve as the internal auditor, or part of a larger internal audit function, for all five school districts members of the coalition – Pasadena USD, South Pasadena USD, Glendale USD, Burbank USD and La Canada USD. This coalition works in partnership with elected officials and business and community leaders to endorse and improve educational programs for the students that they serve.

Provide interim support positions to fill other missing functions at the Central Office. Teacher specialists, individuals with program/content expertise, should be used to provide assistance for program development and coordination for fine arts, guidance and counseling, and gifted and talented. The positions should be established as two or three-year, 11-month teacher contracts (plus stipend), renewable based on performance and program status.

Implementation Strategies

The intent of the proposed organization structure is to provide a target for the district to work towards. The district’s new superintendent, as provided by Board policy, should make his own refinements and suggestions based on his personal management style.

New positions for community involvement, internal audit, professional development and instructional support will obviously require funding and may take time to implement. Each of the other elements of the recommendation could be implemented at the beginning of the 2007-08 school year, if not sooner.

The estimated fiscal impact of the new positions is approximately $500,000 per year.
CHAPTER 2: DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

BACKGROUND

Analysis Approach

As part of this study, an online survey was conducted to obtain perceptions of Pasadena USD employees regarding decision-making. Survey response statistics are provided in Appendix A of this report. The following charts present survey responses by four categories of employees: (1) principals and assistant principals; (2) teachers; (3) other campus employees; and (4) Central Office employees. Most of the survey questions regarding decision-making were positive statements that the respondent could agree or disagree with to varying degrees. The response options for these survey questions are listed below:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No opinion

Context of Decision-Making at Pasadena Unified School District

There are several examples of Pasadena Unified School District (Pasadena USD) district-level decisions that provide representative case studies. The purpose of these case studies is not to second-guess the decision, but rather to place the analysis of decision-making in the context of actual decisions. Later sections in this chapter analyze specific components of decision-making at the Board and district-levels.

Standards-Based Curriculum

The implementation of standards-based curriculum and benchmark testing represents Pasadena USD decision-making at its best. Student performance data was collected and analyzed, options were evaluated, stakeholders were involved in the planning, Central Office leadership over the initiative was established, the program was implemented, and desired results were achieved. This decision continues to be implemented, and significant challenges still need to be addressed, but this decision shows what Pasadena USD is capable of when focused on a specific objective.

Movement of Police Department Function

The City of Pasadena came forward with an option to provide police services to the district. The district’s decision to quickly act on this provided immediate financial savings. The district also worked effectively with the City of Pasadena in the transition – and most input received from the schools was favorable regarding the decision and the results.
Closing of Facilities

The closing of schools is perhaps one of the most difficult decisions faced by school systems. In periods of declining enrollment, these decisions are necessary to maintain financial stability and space utilization. District management collected capacity data for each school, incorporated enrollment projections, and made recommendations to close specific schools. A committee that included parents and other stakeholders reviewed the information and made recommendations to the Board that were not consistent with the data, but considered more politically expedient. The more significant problems, however, occurred after it was announced that schools were to be closed. When school started, some students were enrolled in two schools; others were not enrolled at all. The school choice process was also affected by the school closings without sufficient and timely communication to parents. Further, it was the understanding of many school staff that the supplies and equipment would follow the students to their new schools. This was perceived as an unorganized, uncontrolled, and inequitable process. The closing of facilities was an example of a good decision – schools needed to be closed – that was poorly planned and executed.

Instructional Decisions in the Classroom

Decision-making in public schools systems occurs at the Board, central office, principal, and teacher-levels. Teachers perhaps face the most important decisions as they address student needs on a day-to-day basis. Teacher decisions have been recently affected by the implementation of a standards-based curriculum and benchmark testing. While most Pasadena USD teachers commented favorably on the value of new benchmark testing reports, the decision of what to do about the information created difficult and stressful situations for teachers and students. If students were found to be behind based on the reports, a teacher had a decision to make – repeat the instruction or keep moving for the benefit of others. Teachers felt pressure to meet target dates established for meeting learning objectives, but needed to address those students who were unable to keep up with the pace of the class. In this instance, teachers had the relevant information to make a decision, the options were clear, but both options had unacceptable and conflicting results in their mind. This is one of the most important decisions made by teachers on a day-to-day basis.

The remainder of this chapter provides assessments and recommendations of decision-making at the Board and district-levels.
BOARD DECISION-MAKING

Board decision-making is analyzed separately from district-level decision-making in this report. The decision-making dynamics are fundamentally different for the Board, as a majority vote is required to implement decisions. At the district-level, the superintendent, department heads, and school leaders can make decisions without a vote, although input from stakeholders may occur.

An appointed superintendent and a seven-member School Board comprise the governance team for the Pasadena USD. The seven Board members are elected to their seats city-wide, not by geographic location. Each member is elected to a four-year term with elections held every other March. These eight individuals are responsible for guiding the district’s budgeting, planning, and policymaking.

Board members make decisions based on information provided to them by district staff, consideration of public input, and deliberations among themselves – all within a set of ground rules established by California laws and regulations.

The approach to evaluate decision-making at the Board-level included interviews with Board members, review of Board and committee meeting minutes, review of Board meeting video tapes, attendance at a November 2006 Board meeting, and review of applicable laws and policies affecting Board decision-making. Interviews with district management also provided input as to how information is prepared for dissemination to the Board.

Pasadena USD employees were asked about their perceptions of Board decision-making. Exhibit 2-1 reflects employee opinions about Board decision-making within the boundaries established by state law. Approximately 40 percent of all employee groups were neutral or had no opinion. Of the remaining responses, Central Office, principals and assistance principals’ responses were more favorable than unfavorable. However, responses from other campus employees and teachers were more unfavorable than favorable.
The survey also asked about whether the Board provided appropriate oversight of school district programs and decisions. As shown in Exhibit 2-2, more respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that the Board provides appropriate oversight.
The survey question did not indicate whether the oversight was too much or too little, only whether it was appropriate or not. There were some concerns expressed by Board members and Pasadena USD management that the Board was too involved in the detailed operations of the school system. Other Board members stated that digging deeper into decisions was required because of incomplete information or lack of trust in the process that generated the information.

**Exhibit 2-3** provides an overview of the decision-making process at the Board-level. Information comes to the Board from district management in Board packets that are distributed before each Board meeting. Other information may be sent to Board members based on special requests. Board committees may also provide information and/or verbal reports to the Board on selected topics. During Board meetings the public is provided the opportunity to provide input into the decision-making process. Board members assimilate this information, may deliberate among themselves, ask questions of district management, and then vote on action items to execute a decision. For certain situations allowed by law, the Board may convene privately in an executive session for deliberations; however, no decisions can be made in executive session. All of these steps are to be conducted within the parameters of California state law, Board bylaws, and Board policy.

**Exhibit 2-3**

*Board-Level Decision-Making Framework*

In addition to two regular meetings a month (except for July and August), the Board may conduct special meetings and study sessions (also considered special meetings) for specific Board discussions or actions. On February 6, 2007, for example, the Board conducted a study session that included discussion of the district’s 2007-08 Annual Budget.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Information provided to Board

The Board is provided a vast amount of information throughout the year. Information relating to student performance, attendance, discipline, the annual budget, staff counts, facilities, departmental and school information, and a host of other information related to approximately 13 different functional areas of school operations. This information can be overwhelming, even to the experienced Board member.

Interviews with Board members surfaced several concerns with respect to the information they receive:

- **Information too complex.** Some information was described as “incomprehensible” in its form. The most frequent example of this was the annual budget. The Pasadena USD budget packet is a very lengthy document that meets state reporting requirements, but does not meet Board member information requirements. Prior consultant studies have recommended performance-based budgeting, a process that demonstrates the connection between district goals and the budget process. This process has not been implemented.

- **Incomplete or skewed information.** Some information was described as being incomplete or skewed to highlight only the favorable results. An example of this was student performance information. Some Board members expressed concerns that increases in standardized test scores failed to account for all factors that could have contributed to the improvement, such as low performing students moving out of the district.

- **Lack of confidence in decision-making process.** In some instances, Board members did not have confidence that the district applied the right process in recommending a decision, and accordingly made deeper inquiries. The decision to close schools last year was an example of this decision. Some Board members felt that the process relied too little on actual facilities capacity data and bended to community pressures. Other Board members expressed concerns that the community was not involved enough in the decision process from the beginning.

All of these factors have contributed to perceptions that the Board is micromanaging, or extending their realm of responsibility down to district operations – responsibilities normally assigned to the superintendent or the management team. District management perceives a lack of trust by the Board; the Board is frustrated by being told they just do not understand. This “disconnect” between district management and the Board is adversely affecting the decision-making process at the Board-level.

During this study, documents provided to the Board were analyzed. Questions were also asked of Board members regarding training, and Board members’ training records were requested. Based on analyses of this information, several recommendations are being made to improve the quality of information provided to the Board and to improve Board member’s ability to understand it.
**Recommendation 2-1: Improve the format and content of information provided to the Board, starting with the budget.**

The most frequently stated concern by Board members regarding management information was the annual budget. Adopting the budget is one of the Board’s most important decisions it makes each year. The Board receives information and correspondence throughout the year relating to the budget, but the most important is the formal budget document. Pasadena USD’s 2006-07 Annual Budget is a one-inch thick document. The first four pages of the budget describe:

- Text summaries of the Unrestricted and Restricted General Fund budgets
- A listing of revenue assumptions, such as the Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) percentage.
- A listing of expenditure assumptions, such as the average percent compensation increase.
- A list of outstanding items, such as a pending actuarial report for workers’ compensation.

The remainder of the budget provides very detailed schedules of historical expenditures and budget amounts for 2006-07, checklists for state compliance and certification, and detailed worksheets supporting budget assumptions and calculations.

The district’s annual budget provides an excellent example of too much data and not enough meaningful management information. Below is an assessment of the 2006-07 Annual Budget.

- The budget includes a three-year history of actual financial information, plus a projection of actual data for the current year. Including the 2006-07 budgeted amounts, the budget contains a five-year trend for review. This is a best practice, as most school systems provide only a three-year trend.
- There are no graphical representations of revenue or expenditure trends, or of the distribution of revenues and expenditures by function, program, or other attribute.
- There is no historical or budgeted information on number of staff shown by department, school or district-level.
- There are no per-student expenditure measures or trends, or any other measures that might demonstrate improved or deteriorating efficiency at the district, department, or school-level, such as utilities cost per square foot, ratios of students to school clerical staff by school, or percentage of total expenditures devoted to direct instruction. These measures can be analyzed over time for trends, and in some cases industry standards exist for comparison. (See Appendix B for a list of sample performance measures.)
- There are no definitions of terms used in the budget document.
- There are no descriptions of major changes over prior year amounts or descriptions of expenditures relating to district goals and priorities.
The annual budget must contain legally required documents and supporting schedules, but
the district should not be limited to this format in providing the Board information it needs
to render judgment on the adequacy of the budget. The Association of School Business
Officials’ (ASBO) Meritorious Budget Award and the Government Finance Officers
Association’s (GFOA) Distinguished Budget Presentation Award are award programs for
schools that meet the programs’ established best practices criteria. These programs are
designed to encourage and recognize excellence in school system budgeting. These
programs help school systems build a solid foundation in the skills of developing, analyzing,
and presenting a budget. The associations have websites that link the user to award winning
schools’ budgets. Reviewing these schools’ budgets can provide Pasadena USD Board
members and staff with good examples of best practices for the budget manual format and
the types of exhibits and graphs that are most informative. The following are the
associations’ website addresses:

- **ASBO Meritorious Budget Awards Criteria Link:**
  http://asbointl.org/ASBO/files/ccPageContentdocfilename000370705546criteria.pdf
- **ASBO School Links:**
- **GFOA Distinguished Budget Presentation Award Program Criteria Link:**
  http://www.gfoa.org/forms/documents/BudgetCriteriaLocation_001.pdf
- **GFOA School Links:**
  http://www.gfoa.org/services/documents/Budget_Winners_2005_002.doc

There are other documents and correspondence sent to the Board regarding the budget
throughout the year, but no document was found that provided a comprehensive view of
the budget that had the characteristics listed above.

For other major pieces of information provided to the Board, the Board and district
management should agree in advance on the content and format of the information. Data
should not be given to the Board without explanation of what it means, and summaries and
graphs should be used whenever possible. In several instances, the district does a better
job in getting information to the Board in a useful format.

**Recommendation 2-2: Increase Board technical training.**

While there is considerable room for improvement in the provision of information to the
Board, there is also a need for additional Board technical training. Currently, Board
orientation is held for all Board candidates prior to elections. However, post-election training
is not being held for all new Board members at Pasadena USD. **BB 9230** of the Pasadena
Unified School District’s **Bylaws of the Board** states that, “The Board and the superintendent
or designee shall help each new member-elect to understand district operations and the
Board’s functions, policies, and procedures as soon after election as possible.”

The district tracks participation in pre-election Board orientation, but there is no district
tracking of Board participation in additional training for continuing education purposes.

Many states legally require a minimum number of hours of training for Board members,
generally with higher requirements in the first year. California state law does not require
Board member training, but suggests that it be done and funds be allocated for this
purpose. Several Pasadena USD Board members interviewed were disappointed with early
training sessions and did not actively pursue additional training. More recently Board
members have been more active in taking courses, but acknowledged that more is needed.
The California Association of School Boards provides a wide-range of training programs for Board members on all aspects of school system governance. The Board should establish its own annual requirements for new and experienced Board members. First year members should be required to take no less than 20 hours of training. After the first year, no less than ten hours should be required. The Board should collectively develop a training plan so that not all Board members take the same courses. Certain core courses should be taken by each member; other courses should be distributed among the members, perhaps based on committee assignments or areas determined by the Board to be more complex.

**Board Committees**

**Recommendation 2-3: Reconstitute Board committees.**

Pasadena USD has three active Board committees for facilities and capital, budget and finance, and student safety and conduct. Each of these committees is a standing committee, meaning that it continues until terminated by the Board. In prior years, the Board had a program assessment and accountability committee, but this was disbanded after all Board members expressed an interest in reviewing the curriculum. Each Board committee consists of three board members, and staff members supporting the committee efforts are appointed by the superintendent. Like Board meetings, agendas for the committee meetings are posted, minutes are maintained, and the public is invited to attend and make comments.

As established in the June 22, 2003 board meeting, each committee has a designated purpose and scope:

**Budget and Finance**

- Review fiscal matters, as well as other related matters which the committee chair or Board determine are within the scope of the committee's review.
- Develop long-range financial plans as well as yearly operating and capital budgets.
- Ensure a smooth and effective process for creating the annual budget and making the budget understandable to the general public.

**Facilities and Capital Projects**

- Develop and maintain facilities master plan and monitor all expenses associated with the upkeep and maintenance of all school facilities.
- Assess current and future needs in terms of student capacity and enrollment for the purpose of maximizing the efficient use of school facilities in ways that promote district goals, including recommendations for the sale or purchase of real property.
- Provide oversight of all construction projects.

**Student Safety and Conduct Committee**

- Provide oversight responsibilities for the safety of students and school facilities, including all programs both on and off campus.
- Ensure that there are effective processes in place for ensuring optimum student conduct, including a process for individual student expulsions.
The effectiveness of Board committees has been limited for some of the same reasons discussed above relating to management information provided to the Board directly. Committees at times make recommendations to the Board; on other occasions a verbal or written report is made without a recommendation. Based on observations of Board meetings, many of the same issues discussed in the committee meeting are rehashed in the Board meeting. For example, in one Board meeting last year, a recommendation by the Budget and Finance Committee was made to accept the 2005-06 unaudited financial report on the consent agenda of the regular Board meeting. The item was pulled from the consent agenda, and many of the same topics discussed in the committee meeting were repeated in the Board meeting. In another example, the Facilities Committee discussed but did not recommend action by the Board on a lease of facilities for a charter school. Much of the same discussion was repeated at the Board meeting during an information item, including the same public input. These examples convey some degree of duplication of effort during committee meetings and Board meetings.

On other occasions there was miscommunication as to what the Board committee was to provide to the Board. The Facilities and Capital Committee made a recommendation to the Board regarding the re-designation of developer fees to technology projects. At the Board meeting, the Board requested that this topic be presented as an information item. The Board decided that it wanted to discuss this issue as a group after the committee had invested time analyzing it.

External ad-hoc committees or task forces have been better used by the Board to support decision-making. For example, the City of Pasadena Charter Reform Task Force was formed eight years ago to evaluate school district governance. Last year the Management Audit Advisory Council, which included city representatives from Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre, as well as Pasadena USD Board members, was formed to initiate and follow through on this management audit. The Board seems to be more comfortable in acting on recommendations from committees that are more independent of school district operations.

The Board should reconstitute its committees by more specifically defining their purpose and establishing clear decision-making charges for each. The Board should make it clear to each committee when it wants information versus a recommendation on a decision. Pasadena USD Board committees will not be effective, however, until the Board begins to more consistently accept the recommendations and work of the committees without rehashing the issue. One of the objectives of Board committees is to reduce the amount of Board meeting time spent on topics that can be better handled in committee meetings.

Public Input


California state law requires school districts to allow public input to the Board decision-making process. This is common in all states, but California is unique in that it specifically allows for public input for each action item to be voted on by the Board.

Based on attendance at one Board meeting and review of other meeting videotapes, the public input at Pasadena USD is at times disruptive to the decision-making process. In most states, members of the community are offered one opportunity to address the Board for a limited period of time. In California, the same individual may address the Board multiple times throughout the Board meeting. Further, there were instances observed where visitors made inappropriate verbal comments about specific individuals employed by the district. Many states allow School Boards to establish Codes of Conduct for public participation.
However, in California, the courts have upheld twice that restricting criticism of district employees is a violation of First Amendment rights. Government Code 54957 specifically states that the Board may not prohibit criticism of district employees. However, it also states that whenever a member of the public initiates specific complaints or charges against an employee, the Board president shall inform the individual that such discussions are reserved for closed sessions to protect the rights of the employee.

It appears that the intent of California law was to ensure public access to decision-making. The law does that, and most individuals that come to the podium understand and respect this privilege.

The Board should develop a Code of Conduct for all participants attending Board meetings, including community members, staff and Board members themselves. This Code of Conduct should prohibit inappropriate conduct including the accusations against specific members of the Board or district employees. Comments made against any individual that the Board wishes to entertain should be treated in the same manner as a personnel matter in Executive Session.

By subjecting everyone to the same set of ground rules, Board meetings will be more constructive and efficient, and the decision-making process will work better. The Board should seek the advice of legal counsel before implementing this recommendation to ensure that it is not in violation of state or federal law.

**Board Deliberations**

**Recommendation 2-5: Conduct Board-Superintendent teambuilding sessions at least annually.**

Several of the Board members acknowledged that they do not work very well as a group. The dynamics of group decision-making are often more complicated than the decision itself. Effective Boards have to learn how to work together, and this can best be achieved by learning more about their colleagues.

The entire Board, including all Board members, should participate with the superintendent in an annual teambuilding session facilitated by a registered provider. The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LCOE) and the California School Boards Association (CSBA) hosts teambuilding workshops throughout the year. The purpose of the teambuilding session would be to enhance the effectiveness of the Board-Superintendent team and to assess the continuing education needs of the Board-Superintendent team. The assessment of needs should be based on the framework for governance leadership and shall be used to plan continuing education activities for the team for the upcoming year. The Board-Superintendent team should attend additional teambuilding workshops when there is turnover of the Board or the superintendent.

The CSBA has a Masters in Governance course for individual Board members, and one of Pasadena USD’s Board members has graduated from this course. However, the CSBA does not have a certification program for the Board as a whole. The State of Florida has one of the best Board certification programs in the country. In addition to individual Board member certification, the Florida School Boards Association has an optional designation called the Master Board Program. Through this program, Board members and the superintendent are required to conduct 40 hours of teambuilding and training as a group within the first 12 to 18 months of application. The objectives of this structured program are:
To focus on the School Board and the superintendent as a collective unit and develop their ability to work effectively as a governance team.

To learn and build skills for effective team functioning.

To identify areas for leadership development through self-evaluation of the leadership team.

If one member of the Board or the superintendent leaves, additional group teambuilding and training must be done to reinstate the designation as a Master Board. It is important to note that Board members in Florida are compensated at higher levels than most states, including California.

The School Board of Hillsborough County, Florida is a Master Board, and the effects of this program are visible in its highly efficient and effective Board meetings. The Pasadena USD Board should consider the level of teambuilding that makes sense, and should draw on principles applied successfully in Florida.

**Recommendation 2-6: The Pasadena USD Board should adopt the California School Boards Association Professional Governance Standards for School Boards.**

The Pasadena USD Board does not have a formal standard of governance in order to provide consistent and equitable School Board management. The Professional Governance Standards, included as Appendix C, establish three components the CSBA deems vital to effective School Board management.

- The attributes of an effective individual trustee
- The attributes of an effective governing Board
- The specific jobs the Board performs in its governance role

These standards were designed as a proactive way to engage School Board members and the public in discussions about the importance of School Board accountability. They are meant to enhance the public’s understanding about “responsibilities of local Boards and to support Boards in their efforts to govern effectively” (CSBA Professional Governance Standards).

Approximately 39 percent of the 1,054 school districts in the state of California have adopted these standards.

**DISTRICT DECISION-MAKING**

The previous section discussed decision-making at the Board-level. In this section, the school district decision-making process is analyzed from several perspectives. These include policies and procedures that govern the decision-making process and the specific components of the decision-making process – from the collection and analysis of data to the implementation and monitoring of the decision. This section also presents employee perceptions of the district decision-making process at Pasadena USD.

While several findings and recommendations are made in this chapter regarding decision-making, it is important to note that Pasadena USD has made, and implemented, some good decisions. In other instances parts of the decision-making process broke down, but without adverse consequences. The purpose of this section is not to second guess decisions that have been made, but to provide suggestions to improve both process and policy so that
decisions can follow a more consistent and defensible path in order to improve student achievement and management efficiency and effectiveness.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Policies and Procedures Governing District Decision-Making

Pasadena USD Administration Board policy provides the superintendent with broad authority to make district-level decisions and influence the decision-making process throughout the school system. Board policy 2000 states that:

> The Superintendent or designee shall develop decision-making processes which are responsive to the school community and to the specific needs of individual students. He/she shall provide means by which staff, students and parents/guardians at each school may participate in decisions related to school improvement and matters which the Board identifies as appropriately managed at the school site level.

Other Board policies address decision-making and school-level decisions, requiring a single administrative system that supports decision-making at various levels. Administrative Board Policy 2000 Concepts and Roles states that:

> All schools and departments shall form a single administrative system organized so that appropriate decision-making may take place at various levels in accordance with Board policy.

Most Pasadena USD employees believe that the district’s decision-making process is not well documented. Exhibit 2-4 shows responses by employee categories. Principals and assistant principals had the highest positive response rate of 31 percent and the lowest negative response rate of 45 percent.
Pasadena USD employees differ on their perceptions of how the district strategic plan influences decision-making. **Exhibit 2-5** shows that 55 percent of Central Office employees believe that it does guide decisions, while 10 percent of teachers shared the same opinion.
The district's strategic plan is used to guide major decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Employee</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campus Employee</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Assistant Principal</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several sources that address site-based decision-making. Site-based decision-making is a decision-making framework that determines what decisions can be made at a school site versus the Central Office, and who should be involved in the decision-making process. There are several components of site-based decision-making at Pasadena USD.

In California, schools are required by law (Education Code 47605) to have School Site Councils. These councils are established for the purpose of developing, recommending, monitoring, and evaluating the Single Plan for Student Achievement at the school, as well as decisions regarding categorical funds received through the Consolidated Application. These categorical funds, such as Title I funding, are generally designated for specific educational purposes, and their use is restricted by the funding source. School site councils consist of the principal, teachers, other school staff, parents, and other community members, elected generally for two-year terms. With the exception of the principal, school council members are elected by their peers. Based on visits to campuses conducted during this study, the councils appear to meet the legal requirements.

Pasadena USD schools have internal management or leadership teams that work closely with School Site Councils. These teams are chosen by the principal, and the composition of the leadership teams vary by school type and within school type based on the discretion of the principal. While Board policy does not specifically address leadership teams, they represent a common and effective means for decision-making at schools.

A third element of site-based decision-making relates to provisions in the teachers’ contract. Article XIX of the current teacher contract provides for the designation of a "Site-Based Decision-Making School." Teachers at each school, with a two-thirds majority, may elect to initiate or terminate such a designation. The contract provides for a Site-Based Decision-
Making Team consisting of teachers, administrators, parents, community members, and students – with a charge of developing a site-based decision-making plan. There is no reference in the contract regarding how this decision-making structure is to interface with other decision-making structures at the schools.

Article XIX, section 19.3.5 of the teacher contract provides general guidance on the scope of decision-making for these teams.

*Suggested examples of topics that the School Site-Based Decision-Making Team may wish to consider include but are not limited to: student discipline policy, staff development opportunities, school site schedules, instructional programs, support programs, community programs, communication networks, and creative and innovative site programs.*

*Areas outside the scope of School Site-Based Decision-Making Teams decisions include topics such as: employment personnel decisions, employee discipline, district leave policies, etc.*

Pasadena USD provided a list of 15 schools reported as “site-based” under these provisions. However, only one school visited had a “site-based” decision team as set forth in the contract. Some schools acknowledged being site-based but teachers did not see the need for a separate team. One other school had formed site-based team in recent years, but disbanded it within a year because of its ineffectiveness. In two schools, there were differing perceptions by teachers and school administrators as to whether or not the school was site-based.

In the survey, Pasadena USD employees were asked about site-based decision-making. **Exhibit 2-6** presents responses by employee group.
There are several interesting attributes of this response. Fifty-one percent of principals and assistant principals believe that the elective site-based decision-making is successfully applied, while 25 percent of teachers shared the same opinion. Sixty-two percent of Central Office employees were neutral or had no opinion, as well as 52 percent of other campus employees. Based on information obtained from campus site visits, principals viewed site-based decision-making, generically, as an integral part of the campus decision-making framework, but used other decision-making structures to apply it.

**Recommendation 2-7: Pasadena USD and the teachers’ union should negotiate to remove site-based provisions from the teacher contract.**

There are several factors supporting this recommendation:

- The concept of a site-based election for each school is inconsistent with the Board policy that requires a single administrative system supporting decision-making.

- Having multiple decision-making options at schools – that can change annually based on an election – creates the potential for a dual and unstable decision-making environment. All schools should operate under the same decision-making framework.

- Teachers and other school staff have the opportunity to serve on School Site Councils or school leadership teams – and be involved in decision-making.

- Article XIX, Section 19.3.4 of the teacher contract specifies that 90 percent of the Site-Based Decision-Making Team must agree to recommend an action. Further, the School Board can override the action with a majority vote.
The scope of decision-making in the teacher contract is not specific enough to avoid confusion over who has the authority to make what decisions.

The practice is not being applied now at Pasadena USD, and there were no significant complaints about its absence.

There is no discernible difference in how Central Office oversees or supports the currently designated site-based versus non-site-based schools – nor should there be. Pasadena USD and the teachers’ union should negotiate to remove site-based decision-making from the employment agreement, and both should be involved in the implementation of the following recommendation.

**Recommendation 2-8: Adopt a policy that documents a single decision-making framework for all schools.**

There are fairly wide opinions about how Pasadena USD makes decisions. Employees were asked whether they viewed decision-making as balanced, too centralized, or too decentralized. Exhibit 2-7 presents the results by employee group.

**Exhibit 2-7**

*Pasadena USD Employee Survey Response*  
*Site-Based Decision-Making*

During campus visits, a checklist of representative decisions was reviewed with each principal to identify to what degree the Central Office or the schools have the authority to make what decisions. This same list was also reviewed with Central Office leaders. The checklist addressed the following decisions:
There were some variations from school to school, but overall the perceptions of school leaders were fairly consistent with that of the Central Office. There were also variances based on the tenure of the principal in the district. Newer principals are less familiar with the authority they have than more experienced principals.

The perceptions of how decisions are actually made in the district were similar between Central Office and school staff; however, the opinions about whether the decision-making framework was too centralized or decentralized varied significantly. This is common in public education as school systems have struggled to implement an appropriate balance.

Some decisions need to be made centrally in order to provide consistent application and efficient operations at the schools and Central Office. Other decisions can and should be made at the school-level. Documentation of a single decision-making framework will help ensure that all principals and Central Office administrators understand the ground rules for decision-making. Adopting this framework as policy will ensure its consistent use regardless of who is superintendent. At a minimum, decisions should be identified in the following four categories:

- **Site-based decisions not requiring Central Office approval.** Decisions that can be made or approved independently by principals or their designees without intervention or approval required of the Central Office. These decisions might include teaching strategies used, certain disciplinary actions, and assignments of special projects to staff.
- **Site-based selection from a list of district provided options.** Examples of this might include computer and instructional software purchases. Schools can be given choices of computer brands and software as long as they meet minimum specifications established by the Central Office technology function. Buying outside the list could result in the inability of the technology function to effectively support hardware or software. Selecting from a list provides decision-making flexibility within a framework that helps ensure district-wide efficiency and effectiveness.

- **Site-based decisions requiring Central Office approval.** Certain decisions, such as hiring or terminating school staff, should require the approval of the Central Office, as the Human Resources Department should be involved in these decisions to ensure compliance with state and federal laws and district policy.

- **Central Office decisions.** There are certain decisions that should be made by the Central Office and enforced at all the schools. A single standardized curriculum and the school bell schedule are examples of decisions that should be established, or standardized, by the Central Office. In making these decisions, however, the Central Office should solicit the input from schools to ensure that they make sense for the schools as well as the district. Obtaining stakeholder input in the decision-making process is discussed later in this section.

**Analysis of the District Decision-Making Process**

Different from the preceding analysis of policy, a “process” analysis of decision-making supports a more mechanical view of the various steps involved. This section provides findings and recommendations regarding process improvements for district-level decision-making.

Pasadena USD employees’ view of the district decision-making process was largely negative. **Exhibit 2-8** shows that district and school leaders differ significantly on how they view the process, suggesting that the process is not well understood.
Both the School Leaders and District Leaders have a Consistent View of the Decision-making Process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Employee</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campus Employee</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Assistant Principal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More employees also believe that the decision-making process does not work as well as it did five years ago. Exhibit 2-9 shows that more Pasadena USD employees – in all categories - disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that the decision-making process was better than it was five years ago. A large percentage of the respondents, particularly teachers, were neutral or had no opinion.
The district's decision-making process is better than it was 5 years ago.

Most employees – regardless of the employee group - do not believe that the district decision-making process supports efficient operations. **Exhibit 2-10** shows the response rates by employee grouping.
While each decision may follow a different “process” of being made and implemented, the approach used to analyze the Pasadena USD decision-making process was to map observations against a “best practice” approach. Exhibit 2-11 depicts high-level diagram of a best practice decision-making process. This diagram will be used throughout this section to reference specific observations.

Exhibit 2-11
High Level View of a Best Practice Decision Process

An effective decision-making process begins with the district goals. These goals drive specific, tangible measures of performance, and ultimately drive requirements for the district’s management information systems. Management information includes the collection of applicable data and the conversion of the data into meaningful and relevant information to measure progress against a goal. Analysis of other management information may surface additional observations or findings unrelated to goals that might need to be acted on. The result of the analysis is the identification of a problem and its sources, and the subsequent development of alternatives to address the problem. Research is conducted, key stakeholders affected by the decision get involved, and a set of options is evaluated within the legal and regulatory framework. A decision is recommended, and made at a level of the organization that is consistent with district policy. Once made, a decision is implemented based on careful planning, communication with stakeholders affected by the decision, and effective project management.

The entire decision-making process is directly affected by two major support systems - communications systems and procedures and controls.

While the effectiveness of the Pasadena USD decision-making process varies based on the particular decision being made, there are several deficiencies in the process and underlying support systems that inhibit decision-making. These are referenced in Exhibit 2-12 and
listed below. The remainder of this section explains each of these deficiencies by functional area and provides recommendations to address them.

**Exhibit 2-12**
**Observations Regarding Pasadena USD’s Decision-Making Process**

1. Management Information Systems:
   a. Management information systems are more advanced for instructional information than non-instructional.
   b. For several reasons, the technology infrastructure is highly unstable and subject to frequent crashes.
   c. The lack of a network operating system is limiting the ability to allow users efficient access to data needed to support decisions.
   d. District-wide reporting tools are underutilized or unused because of lack of training and/or lack of access.
   e. Core software applications used by Pasadena USD are less integrated and less functional then they were five years ago.
   f. Insufficient data is collected and analyzed to support certain decisions.
   g. Some analysis is perceived to be incomplete or skewed to represent more favorable results.
2. Communications Systems:
   a. The district phone system is outdated and does not effectively support efficient communications.
   b. The district’s email communication system is not fully implemented and is not meeting the functional requirements of the district.

3. Stakeholder Input: Key stakeholders are omitted from either the decision-making process or the communications loop.

4. Implementation: Some decisions are not adequately planned or managed resulting in implementation missteps.

5. Procedures and Controls:
   a. Data integrity is at risk because of multiple data systems used to support the same transactions.
   b. Job descriptions and procedures are incomplete and outdated.
   c. Performance evaluations are not conducted frequently enough to support accountability.

Management Information Systems

Management information systems extend beyond the district technology function, although technology is perhaps the most significant component. Collection of the right data and data integrity are also key aspects of supporting the decision-making process.

An example of a good management information system in place at Pasadena USD is the benchmark testing system implemented in conjunction with the standards-based curriculum. This system serves as an early warning system for low scores on state standardized tests by providing interim tests on specific state learning objectives throughout the year. Currently, only principals and Central Office administrators have direct access to this system because of network capacity and other technology limitations discussed later in this section. This notwithstanding, the information is being used to make adjustments in teaching techniques. While teachers expressed some frustration in knowing what to do with the information, there was positive feedback regarding the value and usefulness of the data. To optimize this system, each teacher should be able to access information and reports online directly from their classroom computer.

Non-instructional management information systems and deficiencies with the network infrastructure itself are adversely affecting the decision-making process more than any other functional area in the decision-making process. Virtually all issues identified during this study have been identified and prioritized as needs by the Information Technology Services (ITS) Department. However, due to budget limitations, these needs have not been addressed.

The impact of these deficiencies on participants in the decision-making process was apparent in the survey responses. As shown in Exhibit 2-13, less than 18 percent of employees in any staff category, including teachers, believe that the district’s information systems effectively support decision-making. This suggests that the district has work left to do in the implementation of its benchmark testing system.
Recommendation 2-9: Create a technology steering committee.

The district does not have an effective method for involving district stakeholders in the technology decision-making process. Further, there are insufficient technology standards that affect Information Technology Services and its stakeholders.

Many school districts address these issues by establishing technology steering committees that have representatives from all stakeholders of the district. To be effective, the committee must not be too large, yet it must include representatives of the various constituencies of the district. The committee should have ten to 12 members and include teachers, principals, various administrative and instructional department staff, Board members, parents, and community members. ITS management and staff should also be part of the committee but should serve mostly in an advisory role. The committee should meet on a monthly basis in order to provide the necessary guidance and oversight.

To ensure continuity and an annual infusion of new ideas and perspectives, members should be appointed to staggered three-year terms (when established, one-third of the members should have one-year terms, one-third should have two-year terms, and the final third should have three-year terms).

Some of the main functions that this committee should perform include:

- Review and update the Technology Plan annually
- Establish recommended lists of instructional software
- Monitor the level of technology support available to schools and devise strategies for improving it as necessary
- Assist in the establishment of technology budgets
- Provide advice on and help set priorities for administrative technology projects
- Devise a policy governing the acceptance of donated equipment
- Develop hardware, software, and network standards
- Monitor the progress of all technology projects
- Monitor the equity of technology in schools
- Recommend revisions in policies and procedures that affect technology use

Most technology steering committees also address more specific areas through subcommittees. For example, Pasadena USD may develop a technology subcommittee to choose and recommend lists of instructional software. The subcommittee could then present its recommendations to the full committee for acceptance. Pasadena USD may also develop a separate subcommittee for developing technology standards. Benefits of having established technology standards include:

- Support and assistance can be provided much more effectively and economically
- Ability to use district’s own technology staff instead of costly outside consultants on various technology initiatives
- Assurance on compatibility with district’s existing technology
- Minimize training costs
- Possible savings based on economies of scale
- Increased integration and communication among district technologies

In order to achieve maximum benefits from having technology standards, the district should have technology standards beyond just workstation standards. Establishing software and, network standards will enhance the benefits of standardization for the district.

**Recommendation 2-10: Upgrade Technology Infrastructure.**

During Central Office and campus site visits, there were several instances of the network systems or subsystems crashing, affecting not only the decision-making process, but transaction processing and email communications as well. When the network was functional, some secondary schools experienced slower response times due to the limited capacity of the network’s bandwidth.

The network infrastructure can be divided into two main categories: pipes that carry the information, and the hardware, such as routers, switches and hubs that help deliver and manage the information delivery. Excessive downtime and slow network speed are indicators that the network infrastructure is at risk. Pasadena USD has identified needs relating to both components of its network, although the equipment needs are perceived to be a higher priority.

In addition to network infrastructure, the district’s servers also need attention. During the review team’s site visit, the Central Office server room was toured. A professional data center/computer room typically has racked-style servers, multiple air-conditioning units with multiple back-up power supplies, waterless fire suppressant systems, and sensitive heat and motion detectors. The Pasadena USD computer room has old equipment with insufficient
capacity, no racks, one air-conditioning unit, no waterless fire suppressant systems, and no heat or motion sensors.

In addition to running out of physical storage space on its servers, Pasadena USD does not have a storage area network residing on its servers. A storage area network would allow users to save files to a personal drive located on the server. The files could be backed up daily by the Central Office. Currently, users are responsible for backing up their own files on their local hard drives.

District server needs have been identified as a high priority by ITS, but funds have not been allocated to address them. The issues with district servers, like the network components, contribute to a highly vulnerable and unstable technology infrastructure. While the scope of this study did not include a review of the technology function, it became apparent based on our limited work that the district is well beyond acceptable levels of risk with respect to its technology infrastructure.

Pasadena USD should dedicate resources to address needs identified on the ITS list to upgrade the district’s network infrastructure and server environment, and phone system. Cost estimates for these initiatives have been developed by ITS for both short-term and longer term needs.

Separate from the technical issues, employees expressed concerns about the access to data needed to support decisions. As shown in Exhibit 2-14, approximately one out of four individuals responded that they could access data needed to make decisions. This was consistent among all employee groups. Interestingly, Pasadena USD’s Central Office employees showed the highest percentage dissatisfied with data and report access. School principals were slightly more satisfied than other groups. During campus site visits several principals and teachers provided positive feedback on the benchmark testing system reports.

Exhibit 2-14
Pasadena USD Employee Survey Response
Access to Data / Reports

I can personally access data for reports needed to make decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Employee</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campus Employee</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Assistant Principal</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another survey question asked about tools that were available to access reports. Pasadena USD has two reporting software tools, and employees also use other database and spreadsheet tools. **Exhibit 2-15** shows perceptions of reporting tools by employee group. The large majority of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that they have easy-to-use tools to generate reports.

### Exhibit 2-15
Pasadena USD Employee Survey Response
**Access to Data / Reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Employee</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campus Employee</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Assistant Principal</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 2-11: Implement a network operating system and role-based security structure.**

Pasadena USD does not have a network operating system or a role-based security structure, which today are basic components of information management. Most school systems with greater than 5,000 students have been using network operating systems for at least the past five years. This is a significant indicator of Pasadena USD being behind the times in information management. The lack of a network operating system is limiting the district’s return on investment in other technologies that depend on it.

In 2004, COGNOS reporting software was purchased by the district, and the district pays an annual maintenance fee of $32,000. One of the district’s goals with COGNOS was to provide teachers, administrators, and parents with the ability to access and analyze class and student performance. This system is significantly underutilized, primarily because of insufficient training and lack of access to the software. The lack of a network operating system inhibits the users’ ability to access COGNOS, as well as other applications and databases on the system. Users must rely on designated staff that has access to these applications to provide them with needed reports.
For those individuals that do have access to COGNOS, it was perceived to be a very sophisticated reporting tool, but difficult to use without proper training. For these reasons Pasadena USD has not achieved a return on its investment in COGNOS, and is not fully utilizing it to support data analysis and decision-making.

Because of the limitations of reporting through COGNOS (that had little or nothing to do with the software itself), the district purchased Crystal Reports software which was perceived to be less sophisticated but easier to use. The use of Crystal Reports is more common but because of the security issues described above, it is also underutilized.

In a “best practice” situation, users enter one password for computer/network access, and a single security system assigns rights based on predefined restrictions for that position. Network operating systems provide these benefits by supporting:

- **Authentication** – allows users to be assigned to groups that have rights to centrally stored systems, reports, and data. Without a network operating system, users have access only to what is stored on their computer, or sent to them by another user.

- **Authorization** – assigns specific rights and access based on the specifications for that group. This role-based security structure allows information to be stored and managed centrally and more efficiently.

**Recommendation 2-12: Refine long-term plan for application software and reporting.**

There are several other events that have contributed to the current data integrity and reporting deficiencies. The district purchased SchoolMax, a student information system (SIS) that is accessed through the internet. The advantage of this type of system was that the district would not have to maintain the hardware or database to host the system internally. The application resides in the vendor’s data center, and the district users access the application online. According to district technology staff, Pasadena USD is one of the largest districts to use this application as a hosted application. Because of this, Pasadena USD’s increasing reporting needs were slowing down system access for other customers and costing Pasadena USD additional money beyond the application hosting fees.

In addition, the current SIS cannot run some basic reporting functions provided by the previous SIS. Based on information provided by district and school staff, the district’s previous SIS could print student report cards, sorted by zip code at the district-level, allowing the district to bulk mail the report cards for all secondary schools. The current SIS also prints report cards sorted by zip code however, only at the school-level. As a result, ITS staff must manually sort the report cards after printing them.

The district became concerned about both the limitations of the new system and the additional reporting cost, and decided to purchase its own database to store the data and run reports. Each night, data is exported from SchoolMax – as well as other application systems – to the database. The district now runs direct queries and reports (through COGNOS or Crystal Reports in some cases) against this database to meet information needs for decision-making. This sometimes creates data integrity problems, because the in-house database data are one day old and users may run reports off the database and SchoolMax during the day.

The end result is that the district is paying SchoolMax to host the data, and is incurring duplicate costs to download the same data to an internal database for reporting. Other factors described above are further limiting the ability of employees to use these tools.
The district finance and human resources systems are also fragmented. Pasadena USD uses selected PeopleSoft (now a part of Oracle) modules of the Los Angeles County Office of Education’s (LACOE) business application. According to staff interviews, Pasadena USD is one of the largest districts that uses this hosted application from LACOE.

The Human Resources is a text-based (green screen) module, indicating that is an outdated version of the software and has not been upgraded by LACOE. The budget, accounting and payroll modules are Windows-based, indicating a more current version in use. Due to district budget limitations and the functional shortcomings of the LACOE applications, ITS has developed its own custom systems for time cards, sick leave and vacation tracking, and purchasing and warehouse. ITS, school staff, and other Central Office staff spend additional time ensuring that all of the modules interface with each other and that data and transactions are accurately recorded. An example relating to payroll changes is provided below:

- School administrative staff completes a manual form on a monthly basis entitled “Classified Monthly Payroll Time Report.”
- Data on this form is entered by school staff into a Unisys application (used by Human Resources) as opposed to the PeopleSoft system (used by the Payroll Department).
- The Pasadena USD Payroll Department does not have access to the Unisys system, and developed a separate spreadsheet template to collect the same information from schools for entry into the PeopleSoft system.
- The code options for the Unisys application are not the same codes as the PeopleSoft system. Accordingly, a considerable amount of time must be spent by the Payroll Department staff and the school staff to reconcile the data.

The impact is that the same data is entered four times for one transaction: (1) the original hand entry on the Classified Monthly Payroll Time Report form; (2) the computer entry of the form onto the Unisys system; (3) the entry onto the spreadsheet template; and (4) the entry of the spreadsheet template by the Payroll Department onto the PeopleSoft system. The district is facing serious risks in terms of data integrity, timely data access, and data redundancy because of this type of transaction processing. Data integrity is also discussed later in this section under Procedures and Controls.

All the technology issues described above adversely affect Pasadena USD’s decision-making process. Excessive downtime and slow response times of an unstable infrastructure, limited access to data and reporting tools, and an overly fragmented approach to application software impair the quality and timeliness of data, the completeness of the data analysis supporting decisions, and the ability to communicate effectively via email.

Communications

Technology is closely related to communications at Pasadena USD in that the district’s technology infrastructure supports email communications, and to a lesser degree its phone systems. This section addresses the various forms of communications used by Pasadena USD that support decision-making.
Recommendation 2-13: Require all teachers to use district email.

District employees were asked through the online survey their primary means of communication. Exhibit 2-16 presents the results by employee group. The vast majority of Central Office staff and school leaders (76 and 90 percent, respectively) use email as the primary means of communication. Only 51 percent of teachers, however, reported using email as the primary means of communication.

Exhibit 2-16
Pasadena USD Employee Survey Response
Primary Communication

There appear to be several reasons for the relatively low use of email by teachers, based on interviews with school and ITS staff and review of the technology needs lists:

- Some teachers do not have a functioning computer.
- Some teachers have a functioning computer but with an outdated operating system than cannot run the current email program.
- Some teachers choose not to use email, even though they have access to it.
- Some teachers use only personal email accounts.
- Some teachers have not received a user ID or password to access their email. In some instances the ID’s and passwords were not distributed by the school administrative staff.

ITS has a goal of having 75 percent of all teachers connected to the district’s email system during 2006-07. The goal for 2005-06 was 50 percent, and that target appears to have been achieved based on the survey results. The impact of inaccessibility to email is that many teachers do not receive communications that are relevant to district and school
decisions. On several occasions teachers expressed concerns about parents finding out about district news through the newspaper before teachers were informed.

Survey questions also addressed Central Office staff effectiveness in communicating with district employees and the community at large. **Exhibits 2-17 and 2-18** show the results by employee group.

**Exhibit 2-17**
Pasadena USD Employee Survey Response
Internal Communications

The central office is effective in communicating on a timely basis with staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Employee</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Campus Employee</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Assistant Principal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The central office is effective in communicating on a timely basis with community.

The responses regarding varied by employee groups on both internal and external communications, although there were more negative than positive responses in most instances. Teacher responses may be explained in part by the email issue described earlier in this section.

Most Pasadena USD employees agreed that the district website is an effective communication tool for the district staff. Exhibit 2-19 shows that employee responses were fairly consistent across employee groups. A separate question was asked about the effectiveness of the website as a communication tool for the “community” – employee responses were similar although slightly less favorable.
Recommendation 2-14: Upgrade the district’s phone system to Voice Over Internet Protocol.

Interviews with district and school staff indicated that the district is having various problems with its phone systems at school sites. Most school districts throughout the country have upgraded their aging telephone systems to Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP) technology. VOIP uses the district’s current network infrastructure (as opposed to telephone lines) to carry voice communications. This allows the district to consolidate and better manage its investments in communications and technology. Since VOIP is digital, the quality of communications is also better. Pasadena USD uses an outdated analog system that is limiting the effectiveness and efficiency of district communications. An upgrade to VOIP is mentioned in the technology priority project list for 2006-07.

Recommendation 2-15: Reconstitute all recurring staff meetings and establish standard for ad-hoc meetings.

Meetings represent another means of communicating information. However, in many instances meetings are conducted only to share information that could be transmitted via email or other means. Exhibit 2-20 presents employee responses to a survey question regarding time spent in meetings. More employees believe that too much time is spent on meetings.
During campus site visits, several principals expressed concerns about meeting time that pulls them off campus. In addition, many of these meetings are “on-demand” and do not allow time for sufficient planning.

**Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholder input is important to any decision-making process. Stakeholder representatives should be involved in evaluating viable options for decisions, and once decisions are made, stakeholders should either serve on the implementation team or be communicated with to ensure a smoother implementation.

Pasadena USD has included stakeholders in major decisions regarding facilities, standards-based curriculum, and other initiatives. However, for many lower level decisions at the Central Office and schools, stakeholders are frequently omitted from the decision-making process and the communication loop during implementation.

Examples of stakeholders not being included at the school-level are described below:
- **Changing lunch schedule.** A leadership team at one school decided to change the lunch schedule for the school. The decision resulted in several complications because neither the food service staff nor the custodial staff was consulted about the decision.

- **Planting trees.** A decision as simple as planting a tree can create difficulties for schools if not done right. At one school, a decision was made to plant a tree. The decision was made without consulting stakeholders that could be affected by the decision, including the maintenance and grounds staff and warehousing. As a result, the tree impeded the delivery of goods to the school by limiting the truck’s access to the delivery area, and the tree was planted too close to water and sewer lines.

**Recommendation 2-16: Identify and include decision stakeholders in the decision-making process and the communication loop upon implementation.**

This recommendation can be implemented as a procedural extension of the recommendation to adopt a single decision-making framework made earlier in this report. For each decision identified in the framework, internal and external stakeholder groups should be identified and listed for each decision in a documented procedure. This procedure can be used as a checklist to ensure that all stakeholder groups are appropriately included in the decision-making process and also in communications throughout implementation process. All levels in the organization should follow this procedure for decision-making processes.

**Implementation of Decisions**

Once decisions are made, the necessary communication, planning, and project management is applied to effectively implement the decision and monitor the results. The cycle repeats itself as subsequent data and measures are analyzed to determine if the decision is having the desired impact. The quality of implementation at Pasadena USD is more dependent on the person rather than a structured process. Some decisions made by the district were well-planned and well-managed and stakeholders were informed throughout the process. Other decisions - in some cases because of the short time between decisions and implementation – did not receive adequate planning or project management time to ensure a successful implementation.

Pasadena USD management provided evidence of several efforts to manage and monitor projects, as well as project management training. However, because of issues described in other sections of this report – namely accountability, technology, and communications – the effectiveness was not realized in many cases.

**Recommendation 2-17: Adopt formal project management techniques and train project managers.**

Project management training is available through sources outside public education. For certain types of decisions or initiatives, such as technology, there are certification programs for project management.

**Procedures and Controls**

Procedures and controls provide guidance to employees on how they conduct their work in a manner that ensures compliance with applicable laws and regulations and that safeguards district assets. An example of a control is the segregation of duties between employees that
have access to district assets, such as equipment, and employees that have access to the accounting records for tracking equipment.

Each year the district is subject to a financial audit by an accounting firm, and the audit includes a review of the district’s internal control environment. The purpose of this study is not to duplicate this work, but rather to look at procedures and controls that affect the decision-making process.

Pasadena USD employees are split in their perceptions of how consistently the district enforces its policies and administrative regulations. Exhibit 2-21 presents the results by employee group. Teachers and other campus employees showed the lowest positive responses at approximately 15 percent, less than one-half of the positive responses expressed by Central Office staff and school leaders. This may indicate procedural and training issues at the schools and Central Office.

Exhibit 2-21
Pasadena USD Employee Survey Response
Enforcement of Policies

| The district consistently enforces its policies and administrative regulations. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Neutral | No Opinion |
| Central Office Employee | 0% | 38% | 34% | 7% | 17% | 4% |
| Other Campus Employee | 0% | 15% | 38% | 3% | 27% | 17% |
| Principal/Assistant Principal | 2% | 41% | 20% | 2% | 29% | 6% |
| Teacher | 2% | 16% | 28% | 12% | 22% | 20% |

The district does not have a clearly defined quality control process to catch errors or make corrections in district information systems. Below are examples of data integrity concerns:

- **Position Control** – The budget department struggles with keeping accurate staffing numbers due to insufficient data systems. Deficiencies of these information systems are discussed earlier in this chapter.

- **Reports** – Also because of management information system issues, data may be different each time reports are run. Staff spends significant time verifying the data to ensure it is accurate.
• **Enrollment** – Enrollment numbers shown on the Student Information System do not reflect the actual number of students for each school. The Budget Department uses this system to project staffing for the budget. The district has identified two main reasons for the inaccurate data. The first relates to the system counting students twice when they are initially at a choice/alternate school and then return to their school of residence the following year. The system counts them at the choice/alternate school during the year end process and then the student is counted again at the school of residence when they return to this school the new school year. The second reason for inaccurate enrollment numbers occurs when dual enrollment students are entered twice in the system as ADA eligible. These students should be coded as ADA eligible only once for the school they attend full-time. They should be coded as a Non-ADA at the school where they are taking additional classes. Since there is not an immediate solution to fix the Student Information System, the district has implemented procedures to reduce or eliminate these errors.

• **Payroll** – Staff is not being paid timely for summer work and professional development. At the time of the management audit team site work of November 2006, staff stated that they have not been paid for this past summer work and professional development.

• **Payroll** – Staff stated that errors were made regarding longevity payments. It is also possible that there are inconsistencies in calculating longevity payments for part-time employees.

Most Pasadena USD employees stated that there were documented procedures for the operations at their location, as shown is Exhibit 2-22. Based on information obtained by the review team, many of the documented procedures are outdated or incomplete. Each department is responsible for maintaining its own documented procedures.
Job descriptions were found to be outdated and incomplete. Job descriptions for some senior management positions do not exist at all. Many other job descriptions at all levels of the organization are outdated and incomplete. For example, Pasadena USD has a job description for a PBX operator. This position description title and related functions are obsolete. For classified employees, the burden of getting a job description updated is sometimes left with the employee, who will do so to get the position appropriately upgraded and compensated. Some classified employees do not want to initiate the process because of the time and effort involved, and continue to perform duties that are not reflected in the job description except through “other duties as defined.” Classified hiring practices and the Personnel Commission are discussed in a separate chapter of this report.

The lack of current and complete job descriptions impairs the ability to hold individuals accountable for decision-making and performance.

Another weakness in procedures and controls involves performance evaluations. Performance evaluations are not conducted for all staff, and others are done very infrequently or late. For some positions, the employment contract requires evaluations every two or three years. Examples of deficiencies in performance evaluations are presented below:
• One principal indicated that the previous year’s principal had conducted only one evaluation of staff in the prior year.

• One director position at the Central Office stated that she has not been evaluated in six years.

• One teacher specialist stated that she was evaluated last in 1999-2000 at the campus and has not been evaluated since.

This frequency of performance evaluation is insufficient to hold individuals accountable for performance against annual goals and objectives. Individuals interviewed during this study – at schools and the Central Office - also perceived that poor performing or incapable employees are not terminated. This is also symptomatic of an inadequate performance evaluation process.

Other examples of procedure weaknesses or lapses in control include:

• Employees not following the chain of command, and in some cases going directly to Board members on matters that should be dealt with by their supervisor or the next position up on the organization chart.

• Employee concerns regarding missing computers and equipment at closed schools. There is concern that some of the equipment was stolen. The Closing School Procedures instructed the staff from the closing schools to back up their computers and leave them at the schools. The ITS Department was responsible for taking inventory of the computers and forwarding them to the other schools on an as needed basis. However, staff took the computers with them to their new location. ITS did not take the computers back since they were already installed and being used in the new classrooms or offices. Therefore, schools that had been promised computers did not receive any or received less than promised due to this circumstance.

• Some schools have not received student records of transferred students. If any of these students have special requirements documented in these files, particularly medical requirements, there is no assurance that the current school has the information it needs make decisions or provide services to the student. According to the Closing School Procedures provided by Central Office, the schools receiving the students from the closed schools were responsible for requesting these student’s records from Student Support Services. A memorandum was sent to the schools explaining the procedures on how to access the students’ files. Student Support Services staff also researched all of the student files that were not claimed to identify and forward records to the school that showed to have the student enrolled at their location.
The Fiscal & Crisis Management Assistance Team conducted a Business Services Review of Pasadena USD in late 2005 and made many recommendations that appear to still be relevant today. These include:

- Provide adequate and appropriate training
- Review and update all job descriptions
- Consider designation of an internal auditor
- Review position control system
- Hold department managers accountable
- Develop procedures manuals

**Recommendation 2-18: Update and document all operating procedures and job descriptions.**

Job descriptions should reflect the current duties and responsibilities assigned to the position, and should contain specific, measurable performance objectives to support an evaluation of performance. Procedures should be documented initially through process maps to better understand and communicate the processes that run across the organization. The development of job descriptions, process maps, and procedures should be done in concert with each other to ensure internal consistency. These documents can be used to support improved internal training, as well as to identify process deficiencies and opportunities for streamlining and automation. (Appendix D includes a job description template and examples of process maps and procedures to consider when developing or revising the district's documents.)

**Recommendation 2-19: Prepare performance evaluations annually for all personnel.**

Performance evaluations need to be conducted at the same frequency as district goals are established. Currently this is done annually. Performance evaluations should meet all minimum legal and contractual requirements, and also be used to support accountability for performance.
CHAPTER 3:
PERSONNEL COMMISSION AND CLASSIFIED STAFF RECRUITMENT

BACKGROUND

The Personnel Commission is a separate legal entity that provides services on behalf of the district in connection with the recruitment and hiring processes of classified employees. The objective of this review was to evaluate the processes applied by the district and the Personnel Commission employees and identify possible areas for improvement. An overview of findings and recommendations is provided below.

- The Pasadena USD Classified Human Resources (HR) Department and the Personnel Commission do not work together effectively. The Classified HR Department should take primary responsibility for improving the coordination and communication between the two entities in order to increase their collective effectiveness. Communication with current and prospective employees also needs to be improved and better coordinated.

- Pasadena USD management does not believe that the current process is yielding the highest quality candidates, and efforts are sometimes made to circumvent the process. The two most significant factors influencing quality are outdated job descriptions and a highly paper-intensive and lengthy recruitment process. Both Pasadena USD and the Personnel Commission share responsibility to streamline the process and improve its results.

- Pasadena USD and the Personnel Commission should adopt a governance philosophy that provides better coordination between the two entities and accountability to the Pasadena USD Board of Trustees.

The Pasadena Unified School District (Pasadena USD) is a merit system district under Article 6 of the California Education Code. The merit system was adopted at Pasadena USD in January 1979 by a 70.1 percent affirmative vote of the eligible non-certificated employees of the district. The designation as a merit system is the basis for the establishment of a Personnel Commission. This system is unique in the United States for public schools.

The Personnel Commission is an independent body within the school district and is responsible for the following functions for positions which are “classified” according to the Education Code:

- Administration – rules, employee assistance concerning rights, etc.
- Recruitment and selection
- Classification of positions
- Hearings and appeals

The district is responsible for all other functions, including employee training, establishment of pay rates based on position classification, and performance evaluations.
The California Education Code Section defines the employees and positions which are considered to be part of the classified service. Section 45103(a) states that all positions not requiring certification are included in the classified service. Section 45103(b) specifies the exceptions as:

- Substitute and short-term employees, employed and paid for less than 75 percent of a school year.
- Apprentices and professional experts employed on a temporary basis for a specific project, regardless of length of employment.
- Full-time students employed part-time, and part-time students employed part-time in any college work-study program, or in a work experience education program conducted by a community college district pursuant to Article 7 of Chapter 5 of Part 28 and that is financed by state or federal funds.
- Part-time playground positions.

The code further defines a “substitute employee” as someone employed to replace any classified employee who is temporarily absent from duty. A “short-term employee” is defined as one who is employed to perform a service for the district, upon completion of which, the service required or similar services will not be extended or needed on a continuing basis.

One further exception in Section 45103(c)(1) states that if the district is engaged in a procedure to hire a permanent employee to fill a vacancy in any classified position, the governing Board may fill the vacancy through employment (for not more than 60 days) of one or more substitute employees.

According to the California Education Code, Section 45319: A merit (civil service) system within a school district – and in essence the Personnel Commission - may be terminated by one of the following methods:

- If the governing Board of a school district, or a county Board of education, receives a written petition of qualified electors not less in number than 10 percent of the number voting in the last election for a member of the Board calling for the termination of the merit (civil service) system, the Board shall order the county superintendent of schools to place the question of termination of the system on the ballot at the next regular governing Board member election, or county Board of education member election, or the next primary or general election in a general election year, whichever is the earlier after receipt by the county superintendent of schools.

- If the governing Board of a school district, or the county Board of education, receives a written petition from 40 percent of the classified employees entitled to vote calling for the termination of the merit (civil service) system and the system has been in operation for not less than five years or has been imposed pursuant to the terms of Section 45119 or 45120. The governing Board shall conduct an election by secret ballot of its classified personnel to determine whether or not they desire to have the merit system terminated within the district.

Each candidate for a classified position goes through a process that involves both Pasadena USD Classified HR Department and Personnel Commission staff. Exhibit 3-1 presents an overview of a typical recruitment process for classified staff.
The Classified HR Department is notified by district managers of any positions to be filled. The Personnel Commission director is notified only if there is not an active eligibility list of applicants for the particular class of positions corresponding to the open position. Otherwise, the Classified HR Department provides the hiring manager with the names and contact information of the top three candidates with the highest scores from the eligibility list. The hiring manager is required to interview all provided candidates and make a selection.

If there is not an active list of applicants, the Personnel Commission director is notified and begins recruiting at that time. The position opening is posted, or flown, for 15 working days, and applications are accepted until the closing date. At that time, qualified applicants are scheduled for a written test, which requires an invitation to be mailed at least seven calendar days prior to the test date. After the written test is scored, successful applicants may be invited to a performance examination. Once that is scored, successful applicants may be invited to an oral interview with a panel of non-district employees. Once all applicants associated with the particular position have been through all tests and interviews, each one is scored and they are ranked from highest score to lowest to create the eligibility list of candidates with the top three scores.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Organization and Administration

Recommendation 3-1: District management should establish and give continuing support for cooperation between the Personnel Commission and Classified Human Resources Department staff.

The Classified HR Department and Personnel Commission currently function as two disconnected entities, instead of an integrated human resources function. During several of the classified staff focus groups, participants were unaware as to which unit the staff they encountered during hiring or employment processes were affiliated.

There is no regularly scheduled, meaningful communication between the Classified Department staff and the Personnel Commission staff, and therefore, there is no continuity with respect to decisions made in each area. According to focus groups, some employees perceive the differences in decision-making as discriminatory or arbitrary.

A contributor to the lack of communication between the Personnel Commission and the Classified HR Department is the physical proximity of the staff; they are located in separate offices, although they did recently move to the same floor. It is more difficult to coordinate activities and cultivate communication channels under these circumstances.

Exhibit 3-2 shows Pasadena USD employee survey results to a question about the consistent application of Personnel Commission policies and procedures. Although 31 percent of principals and assistant principals responding to the survey agree that Personnel Commission policies and procedures are consistently followed, 37 percent of other campus staff (excluding teachers) and 33 percent of Central Office staff disagree. Additionally, in the classified staff focus groups, it was found that there is a perception by classified employees that managers can circumvent both the Human Resources and Personnel Commission rules because many exceptions are made.
Since the survey included employees other than classified employees, many respondents were neutral or expressed no opinion.

Some specific suggestions to increase cooperation between the departments are:

- Combine the two departments into one larger office space.
- Train one employee and a backup to fulfill the receptionist duties for both the Personnel Commission staff and the Classified HR Department staff to present the district’s HR function as a coordinated effort to both employees and applicants.
- Re-engineer and integrate Classified HR Department and Personnel Commission operations to achieve needed efficiencies in the classified employee staffing processes.
- Develop procedures for all Classified HR Department processes – These should be prepared jointly by the Personnel Commission and the Classified HR Department.
- Conduct regular meetings between the Personnel Commission staff and the Classified HR Department staff to discuss issues that arise in the course of business.

In order for district employees and applicants to feel they are treated in an equitable manner, these two departments must work together to ensure that decisions made and actions taken are consistent with laws, rules, and departmental procedures and processes.
**Recommendation 3-2: Increase the frequency and value of communication regarding classified personnel policies and procedures.**

Some Pasadena USD employees do not feel sufficiently informed of Personnel Commission policies and procedures. **Exhibit 3-3** presents the employee survey results. Approximately 37 percent of those responding felt that appropriate district employees are not kept informed of Personnel Commission policies, and procedures, while only 24 percent felt they were.

**Exhibit 3-3**

Pasadena USD Employee Survey Response
Informed of Policies and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree/Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree/Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No Opinion</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable/No Answer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon hire, classified employees are provided a “Classified Handbook”, which is issued by the Office of the Personnel Commission. This document contains general information about the district, as well as district policy information. This booklet also contains sections describing the merit system, the Personnel Commission, the Classified Personnel Services Department and some high-level explanations of employment processes. Although Pasadena USD’s “Job Seeker” web page provides a link to some general information about the Personnel Commission, there is no avenue by which current employees receive information on Personnel Commission policies and procedures.

All human resources processes are affected by district policy, Personnel Commission rules or a related union contract. In classified focus groups, some district classified staff expressed that they are not aware of how employment actions are governed by the various regulations, policies, and procedures.

The Classified Personnel Handbook can be a good introduction for new hires However, district employees need supplementary targeted documentation to better understand any related regulations, policies, or procedures that affect them when applying for transfers, promotions, or reclassifications.

In order to provide clear and timely information to employees, the following should be accomplished:
• The Personnel Commission office should establish regular communications to employees regarding changes in policies and procedures. Some possible avenues are:
  ❖ New employee orientation sessions.
  ❖ District website – Post comprehensive, organized, easy to access information on the district’s website.
  ❖ Bulletin board – Post changes to policies and procedures on the Personnel Commission bulletin board.
  ❖ Periodic newsletter – Create a newsletter to be electronically distributed and mailed to classified personnel and their supervisors informing them of items of interest as well as changes to policies and procedures.

• The Personnel Commission staff and the Classified HR Department staff should cooperatively create quick references, or cheat sheets, which describe each human resources process and explain why the existing procedures are followed.

• Quick reference sheets should be provided to employees or applicants as they begin a human resources process.

The quick reference sheets mentioned in the last bullet will provide information to better inform employees and applicants of the source(s) for each policy and its related procedural steps. As employees are more informed, they will understand which entity they should contact to address concerns that arise in their employment.

Another issue that was voiced in several of the classified focus groups was the position reclassification process. The review team was informed that many employees did not understand the process required to have a position reclassified, and did not understand the basis for granting a position reclassification.

The Personnel Commission Rules, Section 3112, states that “a District employee shall have the right to submit a request for study of his/her position”. The rules also describe the procedures to be followed and the general basis for reclassification.

Because the classification of a position can directly affect an employee’s pay, reclassification information should be periodically communicated to all classified employees in a Personnel Commission newsletter.

This issue may be intensified because of the current state of job descriptions in the district. Reclassification requests will lessen as all district job descriptions are updated and reviewed for proper classification on a regular basis. In the interim, the district and Personnel Commission should communicate to all employees the process by which reclassifications can be requested, as well as the basis for granting reclassification.
**Recommendation 3-3: Create and execute a plan to conform to and maintain established administrative requirements related to classified job descriptions and their classifications.**

According to employees interviewed, many district job descriptions are out-of-date. The Personnel Commission director is responsible for maintaining and keeping job descriptions current. However, it is critical that the district provide new information to the Personnel Commission director as soon as it is received in order to keep job descriptions up-to-date.

The Personnel Commission director is updating the district’s job descriptions. The director should be mindful to align the job descriptions with the district’s organizational needs, including minimum experience and cross-training requirements. It is important that the Board and district management require supervisors and managers to cooperate and provide information to the Personnel Commission director in order to accurately and efficiently update the job descriptions.

Additionally, **Section 3130** of the Pasadena USD Personnel Commission rules requires the Personnel Commission director to periodically (no later than every two years) review the duties and responsibilities of all district positions in order to determine their proper classification. At present, this has not been done.

In order to meet these requirements, the Personnel Commission director should:

- Create a timetable to inform district leadership when each district job description will be reviewed for accuracy and alignment with organizational needs.
- Coordinate the review of job descriptions with managers and supervisors.
- Review all district positions for proper classification.
- Institute a plan to review all district positions for proper classification every two years.

Classified employee focus group members expressed frustration that position reclassification requests at Pasadena USD take a long time to complete. For example, a high school registrar indicated that the reclassification of the registrar position took one calendar year. Several classified focus group attendees expressed that the time it takes to complete the process discourages them from initiating it.

The district and the Personnel Commission should work together to establish reasonable time limits for decisions on reclassifications of positions. Two to four months is a reasonable time limit for the completion of the reclassification questionnaire and the review and approval processes.

**Recruiting and Staffing**

**Recommendation 3-4: Investigate ways to increase the quality and number of candidates for classified positions.**

The majority of Pasadena USD principals, assistant principals, and supervisors are dissatisfied with the Personnel Commission’s effectiveness in finding quality candidates. As shown in **Exhibit 3-4**, 62 percent of principals and assistant principals and 54 percent of directors, managers, supervisors and coordinators responding to our survey feel that the Personnel Commission is ineffective in filling open classified positions.
Some classified employees participating in focus groups felt that flyers for open positions do not consistently reach all employees who may wish to apply. It seems that the consistency primarily depends on where the classified employee works. Some employees, who do not have an office or “home base” to which they go to daily, may not see a flyer during the 15 days for which it is flown. Flyers are emailed to some departments and may or may not be printed and posted for those employees without computers.

One resolution to this problem is to reinforce the directive to the departments to print the emailed job flyers. Flyers should continue to be posted on the Personnel Commission bulletin board and the district website. The Classified HR Department and Personnel Commissions should develop a plan to work collectively to determine the best approach to reach the largest number of classified employees and candidates.

As shown in Exhibit 3-5, 55 percent of principals and assistant principals responding to the survey are dissatisfied with the quality of classified candidates supplied by the Personnel Commission. Only 19 percent of principals and assistant principals responding are satisfied. Forty-four percent of directors, managers, supervisors and coordinators in the Central Office and at the campuses are dissatisfied with the quality of classified candidates.
Exhibit 3-5
Pasadena USD Employee Survey Response
Quality of Candidates Supplied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals/Assistant Principals</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree/Agree</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree/Disagree</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/No Opinion</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable/No Answer</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some contributing factors to these findings:

- Screening evaluations (e.g. food service tests) are out of line with current position requirements. During the food service focus group, employees gave an example of a question on the test which required the applicant to know how to make a particular dish, which now comes pre-prepared.

- Overall, the recruitment and screening process is very lengthy, resulting in top candidates accepting other employment before Pasadena USD makes a job offer.

- While experience is used to determine whether the candidate meets the minimum qualifications to be admitted to the examinations, it is not used in ranking eligibility lists (Education Code 45272).

As a result of their dissatisfaction with the eligibility lists, managers hire “unclassified”, hourly positions to circumvent the Personnel Commission rules and obtain an employee of their choosing with the desired experience and qualifications. The hiring of employees into these positions has been approved by the Classified HR Department. The Personnel Commission director states that he is aware of 40 to 50 “unclassified” positions. Because these “unclassified” positions do not conform to the exceptions set forth in Section 45103 of the California Education Code (detailed in the background section of this chapter), these actions may place the district at risk of litigation by an applicant or employee who would have filled the position through the Personnel Commission process.

As noted previously, the screening examinations administered by the Personnel Commission are not aligned with the actual duties performed by the incumbents in the positions. Both classified staff and supervisors that attended the review team’s focus groups believe that potentially viable candidates are screened out because of this. According to Pasadena USD Personnel Commission Rules, Section 5121, supervisors of positions may evaluate the scope and content of screening examinations for their positions. The Personnel Commission director should communicate with managers and supervisors their responsibility to ensure
that screening tests to fill their open positions are aligned with the actual duties of the position being filled. The Personnel Commission should create and provide detailed documentation on how to complete this process in the Personnel Commission newsletter and on the Personnel Commission bulletin board. The Personnel Commission director should also facilitate the alignment of screening tests with the job descriptions.

As referenced above, managers and supervisors in the focus groups stated that many times, when applicants are offered a position within Pasadena USD, they have already accepted an offer from another employer. These managers and supervisors believe that the reason is the long recruitment and hiring process, but no information is currently collected from these applicants to support this notion. The district should begin asking applicants for the reasons that they did not accept employment with Pasadena USD. In addition to improving the recruiting and hiring processes, this information may provide useful information that could be used to increase the district’s appeal to prospective employees.

**Recommendation 3-5: The Personnel Commission should investigate methods to compress the time that it takes to complete the hiring process.**

The current Personnel Commission’s applicant tracking process is paper-intensive. Applicants are tracked by manual entry into Microsoft Excel by Personnel Commission staff. This can greatly affect the applicant processing time and thus the quality of new hires that Pasadena USD obtains.

Both the Bassett and Hacienda La Puente USDs implemented online applicant tracking systems in 2005-06, which they credit for enhancing the productivity of examination processing. Because Pasadena USD has an online applicant tracking system, which is used for teaching positions, the district and the Personnel Commission should jointly explore the feasibility of integrating the Personnel Commission applicant tracking functions into the Pasadena USD applicant tracking system, versus purchasing a separate system for the Personnel Commission.

Most classified campus and Central Office staff responding to the survey express that it is easy to apply for open classified positions. This is supported by many comments during classified staff focus groups. In these groups, it was stated that while it is not difficult to apply for an open classified position, the process after applying can be very difficult and drawn out.

The recruiting process is very lengthy, for several reasons cited in the *California Education Code Section 45278(a)*:

- a written notice concerning a vacancy must be posted, or “flown”, for a minimum of 15 working days;
- oral examination Boards should be solicited from outside of the district;
- seven day testing notification must be mailed to the candidate.

Based on interviews with district staff, it appears that the Personnel Commission does not proactively plan for peak period staffing. The Personnel Commission begins the process for creating a new eligibility list only if the prior staffing list expires.

The Personnel Commission staff should examine common recruitment patterns within the district and begin instituting proactive staffing activities during those times. Additionally, it
is essential that the recruiting process for frequently hired positions be initiated prior to the expiration of the related eligibility list.

Applicants are not invited to subsequent tests until they have passed the prior test(s), adding to the length of the sub-process.

The following are recommendations to consider are:

- For high-turnover positions that are “flown” frequently, authorize continuous examination procedures in order to compress the timeline.
- Consider using more district employees as raters for oral interviews.
- Compress the testing process by scheduling the applicant’s tests during the same week. Applicants should be informed that if one test was failed, they will not proceed to the remaining scheduled tests.
- Implement the use of automated testing and grading software in order to reduce the timeline for testing.

**Accountability of the Personnel Commission**

Although the Personnel Commission director has been included on the District Leadership Team for several years, the Pasadena USD Personnel Commission is not accountable to the School Board from a governance or customer standpoint, and does not collaborate with the district in this manner. Pasadena USD Board members expressed frustration with their statutory inability to hold the Personnel Commission accountable.

The logical start to establishing accountability to and collaboration with the district is to provide timely information to the Board in order to open a dialog.

**Recommendation 3-6: Increase the Personnel Commission’s accountability to the district and to the Board.**

Personnel Commissions are charged with “ensuring that the personnel policies and practices affecting the classified service are based upon merit, fitness and equal opportunity, and are in compliance with the provisions and procedures contained in the Education Code.” Furthermore, the Commission represents the district’s interest in hiring and retaining the best qualified employees. Because of this, it is important that the governing Board and administrators work in partnership with the Personnel Commission to improve the personnel functions of the district.

Currently, the Personnel Commission provides an annual report to the Board. In order to provide more timely information, increased frequency of reporting by the Personnel Commission should be initiated. The additional reports to the Board should occur monthly and could include information such as the following:

- Number of classified employees per Personnel Commission staff FTE
- Number of postings flown
- Number of applications received
- Number of applicants tested
- Number of applicants interviewed
- Number of eligibility lists created
- Number of new classified employees hired
- Average time-to-hire (from notification of vacancy to new employee start date)
- Number of classified promotions
- Number of classified transfers
- Number of positions examined for reclassification (employee initiated)
- Number of positions examined for proper classification (Personnel Commission initiated)
- Number of positions reclassified

The Personnel Commissioners, Personnel Commission director, and the Board should meet to determine appropriate information to include in this monthly report. In addition to providing the Board with needed information, this report may also be used by the Personnel Commission director and the Personnel Commission to proactively identify potential issues and make modifications to procedures and processes.

According to the 2004 Comparison of Merit System School Districts completed by the California School Personnel Commissioners Association (CSPCA), 55 percent, or 38 of 69, of merit system school districts in California place the Personnel Commission director as a member of the superintendent’s Cabinet. Pasadena Unified School District was not one of the 38 districts.

Including the Personnel Commission director on the superintendent’s Cabinet may foster better communication between the two offices, thus providing for more accountability to the district, the staff, and its stakeholders. The Personnel Commission director should serve as a liaison between the Personnel Commission and the cabinet, superintendent, and Board of Education, assuring that all are well informed of Personnel Commission issues and decisions.

If the district wishes the partnership with the Personnel Commission to succeed in improving the Personnel functions of the district, the Personnel Commission director should also be included in all exchanges of information that involve district administrators.
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2. Survey

1. I am a/an:

- Central Office Employee
- Principal/Assistant Principal
- Teacher
- Other Campus Employee

   Response Percent  Response Total
   11%   54
   8.6%   42
   59.7%   292
   20.7%   101

   Total Respondents 489
   (skipped this question) 0

2. My job title is:

   Total Respondents 488
   (skipped this question) 0

3. I have been with the district for:

   Response Percent  Response Total
   Less than 1 year 2.7%   13
   1 to 5 years 30.9%   151
   More than 5 years 66.5%   325

   Total Respondents 489
   (skipped this question) 0

4. The district's basis for decision-making is well documented.
5. The school board effectively makes decisions within boundaries established by state law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>489</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(skipped this question)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The school board works effectively with senior district leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>489</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(skipped this question)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The school board provides appropriate oversight on school district programs and decisions.

---

http://www.surveymonkey.com/DisplaySummary.asp?SID=2683371&Rnd=0.9872395
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8. Both the school leaders and district leaders have a consistent view of the decision-making process.

9. I think the decision-making is:

10. The district’s decision-making process is better than it was 5 years ago.
11. The district successfully applies site-based decision-making for schools that choose it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 487
(Skipped this question): 2

12. The district decision-making process supports efficient operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 488
(Skipped this question): 1

13. The district maintains a strategic plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. The district’s strategic plan is used to guide major decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 488
(skipped this question): 1

15. The district’s strategic plan contains specific performance measures for instructional achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 488
(skipped this question): 1

16. The district’s strategic plan contains specific performance measures for non-instructional areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 488
(skipped this question): 1
17. The district's information systems adequately support effective decision-making at my location.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No Opinion

Total Respondents: 487
(skipped this question) 2

18. I can personally access data for reports needed to make decisions.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No Opinion

Total Respondents: 488
(skipped this question) 1

19. I have easy-to-use tools to generate meaningful reports from the district's information system.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No Opinion

20. I am held accountable for performance through specific, documented measures of performance.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No Opinion

Total Respondents: 488
(skipped this question) 1

- Response Percent
- Response Total
13.3% 65
52.5% 256
11.7% 57
12.5% 61
4.1% 20
5.9% 29

Total Respondents: 488
(skipped this question) 1

21. I am not held accountable for anything that I do not have control over. In other words, my authority and responsibility are consistent with each other.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No Opinion

Total Respondents: 488
(skipped this question) 1

- Response Percent
- Response Total
5.1% 25
31.1% 152
15.6% 76
27.7% 135
13.7% 67
6.8% 33

22. My primary means of communication with district and or campus leadership is:

- Email
- Phone
- Fax
- Mail/Delivery
- In Person
- Other

Total Respondents: 488

- Response Percent
- Response Total
59.2% 289
10.5% 51
0.2% 1
2.5% 12
24.8% 121
2.9% 14
23. The central office is effective in communicating on a timely basis with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Members</td>
<td>1% (7)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32% (158)</td>
<td>22% (107)</td>
<td>6% (28)</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Members</td>
<td>1% (7)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18% (88)</td>
<td>9% (45)</td>
<td></td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>487</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. My school is effective in communicating with parents on a timely basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>488</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. The district maintains a web site that serves as an effective communication tool for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>10% (48)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3% (16)</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>7% (34)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19% (90)</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Community Members</td>
<td>9% (45)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14% (70)</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>487</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. I do not spend too much time in meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Appropriate district employees are kept informed of Personnel Commission policies and procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>488</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(skipped this question)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. The Personnel Commission policies and procedures are consistently followed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>488</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(skipped this question)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. I think the Personnel Commission is effective in filling open classified positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. I am satisfied with the quality of classified candidates supplied by the Personnel Commission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>22.1% 108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>18% 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>21.9% 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>7.8% 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(skipped this question)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. It is easy to apply for open classified positions.

| Strongly Agree | 1.8% 9 |
| Agree | 17.2% 84 |
| Neutral | 19.5% 95 |
| Disagree | 26.6% 130 |
| Strongly Disagree | 11.1% 54 |
| No Opinion | 16.2% 79 |
| Not Applicable | 7.6% 37 |
| **Total Respondents** | 488 |
| (skipped this question) | 1 |

32. Board policies are clearly written and understood.

| Strongly Agree | 1.5% 8 |

33. The district consistently enforces its policies and administrative regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1.6% 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19.3% 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>22.1% 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>29.7% 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8.8% 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>18.4% 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents 488
(sked this question) 1

34. There are documented procedures for most operations at my location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5.9% 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39.5% 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19.1% 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21.1% 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.3% 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>9% 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents 488
(sked this question) 1

35. Please provide any comments that you may have regarding your answers to the questions in this survey. Be sure to list the question number your comment is referencing.
36. If needed, additional space is provided below for comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>(skipped this question)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Area</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General School District Management | - Ratio of students (enrollment) to Full-Time-Equivalent (FTE) employees  
- Ratio of students to central administrator and school administrators combined  
- Central administration and school leadership expenditures per pupil  
- Comparison of projected budget surplus or deficit to actual surplus or deficit  
- General fund balance as a percent of general fund budgeted expenditures (TEA target fund balance formula in annual audit report)  
- Percentage of students economically disadvantaged, mapped against the percentage of total operating expenditures supported by federal funds |
| Program Management              | - Pupil-teacher ratio, by grade level  
- Pupil-aide ratio, by grade level  
- Average class size, by grade level  
- Number of schools on block scheduling  
- Number of teacher planning periods, by school  
- Number of secondary classes with < 10 students enrolled  
- Number of secondary classes with < 5 students enrolled  
- Special education student population as a percent of total enrollment  
- Special program FTE student per administrator  
- Special program unduplicated headcount per administrator |
| Human Resources                 | - Number of students per FTE human resources employee  
- Annual staff turnover, by function  
- Average teacher salary, by experience level and education level – compared to nearby competitors  
- Benefits cost as a percentage of salaries and wages  
- Number of vacant positions, including duration of vacancy  
- Overtime cost as a percentage of total pay |
| Facilities                      | - Maintenance Cost per Gross Square Foot (including portables)  
- Custodial Cost per Gross Square Foot (including portables)  
- Gross Square Feet per Full-Time-Equivalent Custodian  
- Ratio of FTE maintenance staff to Gross Square Feet  
- Utilities Cost per Square Foot  
- Facility capacity versus occupancy  
- Percentage of gross square feet in portables  
- Number of acres maintained per FTE groundskeeper  
- Average turnaround time – maintenance work orders |
| Finance                         | - Number of checks per accounts payable personnel  
- Number of employees per payroll personnel  
- Number of days after end of month that books are closed  
- Average turnaround time – purchase orders  
- Average interest earnings percentage  
- Average percentage of funds in non-interest bearing accounts |
| Technology                      | - Students (enrollment) per instructional computer (in classrooms and labs, plus laptops)  
- Administrator per administrative computer (in central and school offices, plus laptops)  
- Computer distribution % - instructional versus administrative  
- Computer distribution % - by hardware platform  
- Average age of computers  
- Number of computers per FTE technical support staff  
- Number of computers per FTE help desk staff |
| Technology Continued            | - Average number of FTE school-based technology liaisons per school  
- Ratio of total students to technology staff  
- Ratio of total employees to technology staff  
- Ratio of total computers to technology staff  
- Technology expenditures per student  
- Technology expenditures per computer |
Exhibit 16
Sample Efficiency Measures for School Districts, by Functional Area
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Area</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Service</strong></td>
<td>• Meals Per Labor Hour (MPLH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participation Rates (Breakfast and Lunch):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Free and Reduced Price Lunch participating versus eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Net Profit (Loss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Indirect costs allocated to food service (amount and type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dollar value of commodities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Food cost as a percent of total cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td>• Student riders per mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student riders per bus route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost per route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost per mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost per student rider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance cost per bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance cost per mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accidents every 100,000 miles of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Average percentage bus occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual turnover rate of bus drivers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public oversight of local government is the foundation of American democracy. Nowhere is this more evident than in our public schools, where local boards of education are entrusted by their diverse communities to uphold the Constitution, protect the public interest in schools and ensure that a high quality education is provided to each student. To maximize the public’s confidence in local government, our local boards must govern responsibly and effectively.

The California School Boards Association (CSBA), representing nearly 1,000 local school districts and county boards of education, recognizes there are certain fundamental principles involved in governing responsibly and effectively. These principles — or Professional Governance Standards — reflect consensus among hundreds of board members, superintendents and other educational leaders throughout the state.

These Professional Governance Standards describe the three components vital to effective school governance:

1) the attributes of an effective individual trustee,
2) the attributes of an effective governing board, and
3) the specific jobs the board performs in its governance role.

The intent of these standards is to enhance the public’s understanding about the critical responsibilities of local boards and to support boards in their efforts to govern effectively.

The Individual Trustee

In California’s public education system, a trustee is a person elected or appointed to serve on a school district or county board of education. Individual trustees bring unique skills, values and beliefs to their board. In order to govern effectively, individual trustees must work with each other and the superintendent to ensure that a high quality education is provided to each student.

To be effective, an individual trustee:

- Keeps learning and achievement for all students as the primary focus.
- Values, supports and advocates for public education.
- Recognizes and respects differences of perspective and style on the board and among staff, students, parents and the community.
- Acts with dignity, and understands the implications of demeanor and behavior.
- Keeps confidential matters confidential.
- Participates in professional development and commits the time and energy necessary to be an informed and effective leader.
- Understands the distinctions between board and staff roles, and refrains from performing management functions that are the responsibility of the superintendent and staff.
- Understands that authority rests with the board as a whole and not with individuals.

The Board

School districts and county offices of education are governed by boards, not by individual trustees. While understanding their separate roles, the board and superintendent work together as a “governance team.” This team assumes collective responsibility for building unity and creating a positive organizational culture in order to govern effectively.

To operate effectively, the board must have a unity of purpose and:

- Keep the district focused on learning and achievement for all students.
- Communicate a common vision.
- Operate openly, with trust and integrity.
- Govern in a dignified and professional manner, treating everyone with civility and respect.
- Govern within board-adopted policies and procedures.
- Take collective responsibility for the board’s performance.
- Periodically evaluate its own effectiveness.
- Ensure opportunities for the diverse range of views in the community to inform board deliberations.

The Board’s Jobs

The primary responsibilities of the board are to set a direction for the district, provide a structure by establishing policies, ensure accountability and provide community leadership on behalf of the district and public education. To fulfill these responsibilities, there are a number of specific jobs that effective boards must carry out.

Effective boards:

- Involve the community, parents, students and staff in developing a common vision for the district focused on learning and achievement and responsive to the needs of all students.
- Adopt, evaluate and update policies consistent with the law and the district’s vision and goals.
- Maintain accountability for student learning by adopting the district curriculum and monitoring student progress.
- Hire and support the superintendent so that the vision, goals and policies of the district can be implemented.
- Conduct regular and timely evaluations of the superintendent based on the vision, goals and performance of the district, and ensure that the superintendent holds district personnel accountable.
- Adopt a fiscally responsible budget based on the district’s vision and goals, and regularly monitor the fiscal health of the district.
- Ensure that a safe and appropriate educational environment is provided to all students.
- Establish a framework for the district’s collective bargaining process and adopt responsible agreements.
- Provide community leadership on educational issues and advocate on behalf of students and public education at the local, state and federal levels.
APPENDIX D
Position Description Template

Date completed __________________________ Work Location ___________________

Title ___________________________________ Department ______________________
Exempt Status ___Y ___N Position Status ___FT ___PT ___IC*

Company Conformance Statements

In the performance of their respective tasks and duties all employees are expected to conform to the following:

- Perform quality work within deadlines with or without direct supervision.
- Interact professionally with other employees, customers and suppliers.
- Work effectively as a team contributor on all assignments.
- Work independently while understanding the necessity for communicating and coordinating work efforts with other employees and organizations.

Position purpose

[General statements regarding the overall objective of the position]

Responsibilities/Duties/Functions/Tasks

[List of material responsibilities and essentials duties which must be completed in achieving the objectives of the position]

Qualifications

[Statements regarding minimum educational and experience qualifications, required proficiencies with specialized knowledge, computer proficiencies, military service, required certifications, etc.]

Special Position Requirements

[Optional section: any travel, security, risk, hazard or related special conditions which apply to the position]

Preferences

[Optional section: preferred attributes for the position which are not absolutely required in the minimum qualifications (i.e., multi-lingual, master’s degree)]
Work Requirements

[Optional section: work requirements for mental, physical, or other important issues which relate to the job]

Employee acknowledgement/date ________________________

*IC—Irregular or casual; nonregularly scheduled staff
Purpose:

The purpose of this procedure is to provide schools and departments a process for disposing of computer equipment.

General:

It is the policy of the Board that all its capital assets be properly and fully utilized. It is also the policy of the Board that when assets reach the end of their useful life, they be disposed of in the public interest and in the manner prescribed by law.

Criteria:

The first criterion for use of computers which a school or department may no longer need is to use those computers to fulfill other needs which may exist at other schools in the District.

Procedures:

1. A school or department determines that it has computers that it no longer requires for its programs.

2. The school or department, using its assigned Instructional Technology Specialist (ITS) and its assigned System Support Technician (SST), determines whether the available computers are functional or not. The ITS and SST remove any network cards, other installed hardware, and all software except that authorized to remain on the system.

3. The school or department notifies the department of Instructional Technology (IT) of the number and type of computers it has available and whether they are functional. Notification is made in writing (email is acceptable).

4. The IT department queries other schools and determines if there is a District need for any of the available computers.
If the IT department determines there is a District need for the available computers, it directs the transfer to the appropriate school(s) and the process ends.

If the IT department determines that there are computers that can be made available to the Computer for Kids program, the process continues as follows.

5. The IT department queries the “F” schools to determine if it has a need for computers to issue under the Program. If so, it determines the distribution (if there is more than one “F” school involved), and directs the transfer of computers to the “F” schools. The losing school prepares the property accountability documents, and the gaining schools issue the computers in accordance with the established priorities.

6. If there are still available computers, the IT department queries the “D” schools to determine if there is a need for computers under the Program. If so, it determines the distribution and directs the transfer. The losing school prepares the property accountability documents, and the gaining schools issue the computers in accordance with the established priorities.

7. If there are still available computers, the IT department repeats Step 6 for the Alternative Schools.

8. If, after satisfying the District needs and Program needs in “F”, “D”, and Alternative Schools, there are still computers available for the Program, the school will prepare the required property accountability documents and then may transfer the computers to the warehouse for final disposition.
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4. Professional Design Requirements
5. Network Topology
6. Design Document Standards
7. Electric Power Standards
8. Transient Voltage Suppression Standards
9. Materials Standards
10. Installation Standards
11. Network Configuration Standards (not finalized)
12. Network Performance and Analysis Standards
13. Wireless Networking Standards (not finalized)

V. Appendix

A. Scheduled Backups for Windows 2000
B. Server Installation Form
C. Server Change Control Form
D. Users and Groups Form
E. Deployment Assessment Form
F. Web Site Initiation Request Form
G. SDHC 10 Network IP Address Distribution
Sites request to move money from one account to another

Accountants catch an error and need to move money from one account to another

Other sources of journal entry

Source Documents

Secretary* scans source documents

ERP System

Scanned source documents

Accountant imports Excel spreadsheet data into system, if needed

ERP System

Comptroller reviews entry online

Approved?

YES

END

NO

Comptroller approves journal entry and posts to general ledger

Accountant researches problems with journal entry

Notes:
* Either the secretary or the accountant may be responsible for indexing the scanned documents and creating the journal entry, depending on the complexity of the journal entry.

Department: Accounting
Participants: Beth Callahan
Validated: Beth Callahan, 5/4/05
Fixed Assets - Additions

FAA generates listing of fixed asset account additions

FAA reviews each addition and supporting documents online

Is item a fixed asset?

- **YES**: FAA collects any other information beyond the PO and invoice and scans into system
- **NO**: FAA transfers applicable data from accounts payable module and enters supplemental data into fixed asset module

FAA posts fixed asset entry

Fixed Assets - Transfers/Deletions

Site administrator enters fixed asset transfer request into work order system and site administrator approves

Receiving site receives asset and site administrator acknowledges receipts online

FAA imports fixed asset information into ERP system

Item sold or retired?

- **NO**: FAA removes equipment from fixed asset inventory
- **YES**: FAA changes location code and posts transaction

FAA posts fixed asset entry

Note: Assumes the use of a work order system

Department: Accounting
Participants: Beth Callahan
Validated: Beth Callahan, 5/4/05
Fixed Assets - Depreciation (Annually)

Fixed Asset Accountant verifies that all information is complete before calculating depreciation

ERP System

Fixed Asset Accountant executes depreciation calculation

ERP System

Comptroller reviews and approves depreciation amount

ERP System

Comptroller runs depreciation report and sends electronic version of report to auditors*

ERP System

Depreciation Report

END

Notes:
* When the Comptroller runs the depreciation report on the system, she will have the option to export the report data to an excel spreadsheet. She will choose this option and attach the output to an email to the auditors.

Department: Accounting
Participants: Beth Callahan
Validated: Beth Callahan, 5/4/05
Sr. Accountant receives notice of wire transfer or goes online to bank’s website to retrieve information

Notes:
Other wire transfers (disbursements or transfers between district accounts) are addressed in the Investments process map.
Accountants run grant expenditure reports for the month/quarter.

Accountants go to state website and fill out DE147 (one amount for each grant).

Accountants notify Comptroller via email that the DE147 is ready to review online.

Comptroller goes online to approve and submit request.

To Journal Entries Process.
Financial Reporting to Board

Comptroller runs Board reports

ERP System

Board Report

END

Department: Accounting
Participants: Beth Callahan
Validated: Beth Callahan, 5/4/05
Sr. Coordinator of Accounting runs state reports

Sr. Coordinator of Accounting goes online to the state website and uploads data

Sr. Coordinator of Accounting cleans data until both reports are accepted by the state

Superintendent signs off on submission online

Sr. Coordinator of Accounting prints out approved reports if needed, or archives electronic versions on local server

END

ERP System

State Website

MS Access

State Website

DE0046A Data

DE0420A Data

DE0046A

DE0420A

DE0046A

DE0420A

DE0046A

DE0420A

Notes: Account code conversion will be handled by the ERP system.
Summer School Receipts

Sr. Coordinator of Accounting meets with the site administrators to coordinate the registration logistics*

Team of accountants collects money and credit card receipts on the day of registration**

Team of accountants reconcile money and credit card receipts to registration forms

Team of accountants prepare deposit slips and give money bags and credit card receipts to Senior Coordinator of Accounting

Sr. Coordinator of Accounting signs off on the reconciliation sheets

Sr. Coordinator of Accounting deposits cash in bank and receives a deposit receipt

Cash/Money Order/Credit Card Receipts

Registration Form

Reconciliation Sheet

Deposit Slip

Signed Reconciliation Sheet

Deposit Receipt

ERP System**

ERPs

Sr. Coordinator of Accounting takes deposit slips from bank to Accounts Payable

Accounts Payable enters cash receipt into ERP system

Sr. Coordinator of Accounting (2) posts credit card amounts once they come through the bank

Sr. Coordinator of Accounting reconciles the cash and credit card amounts in the GL to the amounts in her spreadsheet that is used on the day of registration

Sr. Coordinator of Accounting creates a reconciliation spreadsheet

MS Excel

END

Summer School Book Deposit Refunds

To Special Check Request Process

At the end of summer school, the Sr. Coordinator of Accounting will receive a list via email of students that returned books

Sr. Coordinator of Accounting issues a special check request to refund book deposits to the students who returned books

Notes:
* There might be an opportunity for online registration through SASIxp, whereby parents could register and pay any fees online.

** The only change from the "as is" maps is that AFIN is replaced with ERP system. This process only occurs 4 days out of the year, so streamlining opportunities are not justified.

*** Out-of-county students

Department: Accounting
Participants: Beth Callahan, Tara Daniel
Validated: Beth Callahan, 5/4/05
Cash Receipts

Option I: Cash receipts handled via Lockbox*

- Bookkeeper receives electronic listing of cash receipts and assigns proper codes
- Bookkeeper uploads data into system
- Secretary/Bookkeeper stamps endorsements on check
- Secretary/Bookkeeper scans front and back of checks
- Comptroller reviews and approves cash receipts entry
- System generates a bank deposit slip
- Cash Receipts Clerk takes deposit to bank and receives a deposit receipt
- Cash Receipts Clerk scans the deposit receipt and electronically files it in the check folder where the respective scanned checks are filed
- END

Option II: Cash receipts handled by Accounts Payable Department

- Secretary/Bookkeeper receives checks via mail or Pony
- Secretary/Bookkeeper stamps endorsements on check
- Secretary/Bookkeeper creates folder** on local server and electronically files scanned checks
- Secretary/Bookkeeper scans front and back of checks
- ERP System
- Cash Receipts Clerk enters and posts receipts into system
- ERP System
- System generates a bank deposit slip
- ERP System
- Deposit Slip
- Deposit Receipt
- ERP System
- Scanned Receipts
- END

Notes:
* The benefits of this process may not outweigh the costs considering that checks are received from multiple sources for multiple reasons. It is anticipated that checks will continue to come in to the central office regardless.

** Folder structure will be Year/Month/Day. The year (named “2005”) will be the main folder, the month will be the subfolder of the year folder (named “03/2005”), and the date of the deposit will be the subfolder of the month (named “03/15/2005”).
Transportation - Field Trip Billing

- Requestor completes a field trip request form online*
- Site Administrator approves and form is routed to Laidlaw
- Sites receive electronic invoice from Laidlaw and review for accuracy
- Sites forward electronic invoices to Accounts Payable department
- Accounts Payable department processes payment and check is generated

- Sites identify and resolve coding errors and emails Laidlaw and Site Administrator
- Correct? YES
- Correct? NO

Notes:
* Central approval of field trip request may not be practical prior to submission to Laidlaw because of time demands.

** Need to discuss options with Laidlaw for streamlining billing and field trip requests.

Department: Accounting
Participants: Beth Callahan
Validated: Beth Callahan, 5/4/05
Bank Reconciliations

Bank sends electronic bank transaction listings to the Sr. Coordinator of Accounting (and/or MIS)

Sr. Coordinator of Accounting (and/or MIS) uploads bank transaction data into ERP System

Sr. Coordinator of Accounting performs automated reconciliation

Comptroller reviews and approves results of reconciliation online

Journal entry required?

NO → END

YES → To Journal Entries Process

Bank Transaction Listing

ERP System

ERP System

ERP System
Internal Audit

Option I: Data needed by auditors is stored in ERP system. After fully implemented, the new ERP system would take the place of ACL.

Option II: Interface is built between ACL and new ERP system, making data extraction/upload easier and less prone to error.

Note: * ACL is a software tool for audit and financial professionals that provides for data extraction and analysis, fraud detection, and continuous monitoring.
Investments

**Notes:**
The “to be” process for investments is the same as “as is” with the exception of using email instead of fax to send out bid sheets and receive responses since there is such a low volume of transactions.

* Accountant also keeps a copy of the trade confirmation to file in her Investments notebook.

**Department:** Accounting  
**Participants:** Beth Callahan  
**Validated:** Beth Callahan, 5/4/05
Student Activity Funds - Central Office (Monthly)

**Principal approves monthly financial statement online**
- ERP System
- Email
- SAF Accountant
- SAF Accountant reviews financial statements online and fills out electronic SAF Checklist
- ERP System
- SAF Checklist
- Problem or Question? (NO)
- SAF Accountant finalizes online checklist
- SAF Accountant generates system report with initial principal approval dates
- ERP System
- Principal Approval Date Report
- SAF Accountant distributes copies of report to CFO, Superintendent, and Assistant Academic Service Officers via email
- END

**Problem or Question? (YES)**
- SAF Accountant calls the school or investigates further detail
- Adjustment Necessary? (NO)
- SAF Accountant notifies school via email that adjustments are necessary
- ERP System
- School principal reviews and approves adjustments
- Schools make adjustments
- ERP System
- SAF Accountant generates system report with year-end totals by school and sends to external auditors via email
- Year End Report
- ERP System
- END

**Student Activity Funds - Central Office (Annually)**

**Department:** Accounting
**Participants:** Barbara Brown, Beth Callahan
**Validated:** Beth Callahan, 5/4/05
Student Activity Funds - Campus

Check Request

Bookkeeper receives Student Activity Funds Check Request via email from requestor

Bookkeeper verifies and forwards to administrator for approval

Bookkeeper enters request into system

Bookkeeper prints check or prepares manual checks

Check recipient signs off for the check at the bottom of the request form

Check recipient signs off for the check at the bottom of the request form

Bookkeeper attaches a copy of the check and any supporting documentation to the check request form and places in file (by month)

END

Cash Receipt

Sponsor completes Report of Monies Collected

Sponsor makes copies of checks

Sponsor sends completed report and money to bookkeeper

Bookkeeper counts money

Bookkeeper enters receipt on system

Bookkeeper saves the entry and prints a receipt with balance

Bookkeeper gives copy of receipt to sponsor

END

Deposit

Bookkeeper runs tape of Report of Monies Collected forms

Bookkeeper prepares deposit slip

Custodian takes deposit to bank

Custodian brings bank deposit ticket to bookkeeper

Bookkeeper receives bank deposit ticket, attaches to support and files (by month)

END

Notes:
The "to be" process is the same as the "as is" except that the "to be" process assumes activity funds will be handled by the ERP system, replacing the current Manatee system.

Department: Accounting
Participants: Beth Callahan
Validated: Beth Callahan, 5/4/05
Food Service: Inventory Adjustments
USDA and Purchased Food Items

- **Department**: Accounting
- **Participants**: Warren Mitchell, Beth Callahan
- **Validated**: Beth Callahan, 5/4/05

**Notes**: SNAPS might be replaced with MCS school food service system.
Food Service: Monthly Meal Reimbursement

1. **SNAPS**
   - MS Access

2. **Food Service Accountant (FSA)** enters after-school snack counts into an Access database
   - After-School Snack Counts (DE0113)

3. **FSA uploads meal counts from SNAPS into an Access database (DE0118, DE0112)**
   - MS Access

4. **FSA uploads data (in text file) from system onto state website**
   - State Website
   - DE0106

5. **FSA calculates reimbursement receivable amounts by school and compares to state calculations**

6. **FSA uploads amounts into ERP system and creates journal entry to book the receivable**
   - ERP System
   - Comptroller approves journal entry and posts to general ledger

7. **FSA is notified by state via email that account was accepted and deposit will be made in ~10 days**
   - Email
   - ERP System

8. **FSA calculates reimbursement receivable amounts by school and compares to state calculations**

9. **FSA uploads amounts into ERP system and creates journal entry to book the receivable**

10. **Comptroller approves journal entry and posts to general ledger**
    - END

**Notes:**
This process requires an interface with SNAPS, as well as state reporting capability.

* SNAPS might be replaced with MCS school food service system.
Food Service: Financial Reporting (Monthly)

- **ERP System**
  - Food Service Accountant uploads data from SNAPS and ERP system into Access database
  - MS Access

- **SNAPS**
  - Food Service Accountant uploads data from Access onto state website
  - MS Access

- **State Website**
  - Food Service Accountant cleans data until accepted by state
  - State Website

- **MS Access**
  - Food Service Accountant prints out approved reports if needed (or archives electronic versions on local server)

- **State Website**
  - Electronic Reports
  - Hard Copy Reports

- **END**

**Department:** Accounting

**Participants:** Warren Mitchell, Beth Callahan

**Validated:** Beth Callahan, 5/4/05

**Notes:**
* SNAPS might be replaced with MCS school food service system.*
Food Service: Posting of Food Service Revenues and Deposits to GL

Food Service Accountant imports sales and deposit data from SNAPS into ERP system

Food Service Accountant reconciles sales and deposit data with bank deposits

To Journal Entries Process

SNAPS

ERP System

Bank Website

Department: Accounting
Participants: Warren Mitchell, Beth Callahan
Validated: Beth Callahan, 5/4/05

Notes:
* SNAPS might be replaced with MCS school food service system.
AP Clerk scans invoice, statement, credit memo, manual check, etc. into system

AP Clerk pulls up batch and reviews for legibility

Is the document legible?

YES

Is the document for SCCPS?

YES

Was purchasing (credit) card used?

NO

Is the P.O. # on the invoice?

YES

AP Clerk enters vendor name, invoice #, P.O. #, date scanned, type of document

NO

P.O.# needed or SCR?

SCR

NEED P.O. #

To Special Check Request Process

Email

END

To Payment Vouchers Process

AP Clerk stamps invoice, indicates that the P.O. number is needed, and returns the original to vendor

ERP System

Display batch

Email

Source Documents

NO

NO

NO

Invoice

Vendor obtains and provides P.O. number

ERP System

AP Clerk enters vendor name, invoice #, P.O. #, date scanned, type of document

ER System

Email

ERP System

NO

ERP System

To Special Check Request Process

Email

ERP System

To Payment Vouchers Process

Vendor obtains and provides P.O. number

ERP System

Display batch

Email

ERP System

NO

NO

ERP System

NO

Notes:
No substantive changes from "as is" process
From Indexing Process

AP Clerk gives indexed batch of paperwork to AP Clerk

ERP System

Paperwork

AP Clerk runs edit reports to find issues

ERP System

P.O. Aging

Invoice Aging

Tolerance Limits

Other Reports

Notes:
No substantive changes from "as is" process
Current SCCPS tolerance limit: $200 or 10%

Department: Accounts Payable
Participants: Mercedes Ferguson
Validated: Matthew Yoakum, 3/31/2005
Credit Memos

Vendor issues credit → AP Clerk scans credit memo into the system → AP Clerk assigns credit memo to appropriate AP Clerk → Is credit valid? → YES → Is the P.O. from this fiscal year? → YES → AP Clerk keys credit into system → Over tolerance limit? → NO → AP Clerk applies credit

NO → AP Clerk enters notes in system → ERP System

Is account number still valid? → YES → ERP System → END

NO → AP Clerk contacts originator to get valid account number

Was a valid account # provided? → NO → ERP System

Notes:
When a credit memo is received referencing an account that has been closed, the Accounting Department applies the credit in the current year if the amount is not material. If the credit is material and relates to a grant, the grant may need to be re-opened with the state and the credit applied in the appropriate year.
Special Check Requests

Department: Accounts Payable
Participants: Mercedes Ferguson
Validated: Matthew Yoakum, 3/31/2005

Notes:
System should only allow entry of specified categories for processing as a special check request. Refer to "as is" process map for current valid items.
*BOE = Board of Education.
Voiding Checks

Vendor calls to report lost check, employee changes travel plans, etc. → AP Clerk checks Wachovia system to see if check has cleared → Has check cleared? → YES → AP Clerk prints copy of cancelled check and sends to requestor → Copy of Cancelled Check → END

NO → Vendor must provide a written statement that check was not received → AP Clerk stops payment with bank → AP Clerk voids check in system → Does check need to be re-issued? → YES → Any changes to check? → NO → System automatically generates replacement check → END

YES → AP Clerk prints copy of cancelled check and sends to requestor → Copy of Cancelled Check → ERP System → AP Clerk files voided check → Voided Check → YES → AP Clerk modifies P.O. to make funds available or makes other corrections to meet conditions for payment → ERP System → To Payment Vouchers Process

AP Clerk stops payment with bank → ERP System → AP Clerk files voided check → Voided Check → ERP System → AP Clerk modifies P.O. to make funds available or makes other corrections to meet conditions for payment → ERP System → To Payment Vouchers Process

Department: Accounts Payable
Participants: Mercedes Ferguson
Validated: Matthew Yoakum, 3/31/2005

Notes: No substantive changes from "as is"
Travel Expense Processing

- **Is it local travel?**
  - **YES**: Employee completes form
  - **NO**: Fly or drive?
    - **FLY**: Employee faxes form to travel agent
    - **DRIVE**: Employee completes form

- **Does employee own vehicle?**
  - **YES**: Employee logs mileage on form
  - **NO**: Employee Local Travel Reimbursement Form (yellow)

- **Employee logs mileage on form**
  - **End**: AP Clerk makes correction on form or returns to originator for correction

- **Any problems identified?**
  - **YES**: Error or missing information?
    - **MISSING INFO**: AP Clerk contacts employee to obtain information or documentation
    - **ERROR**: AP Clerk completes Employee Travel Reimbursement Form
  - **NO**: Problems with the form?
    - **YES**: AP Clerk sends form back to employee
    - **NO**: Employee Travel Reimbursement Form

- **Employee Travel Reimbursement Form (blue)**
  - **End**: AP Clerk enters into system

- **AP Clerk forwards to appropriate AP Clerk for entry**
  - **End**: ERP System

- **AP Clerk enters into system**
  - **End**: ERP System

- **AP Clerk reviews forms and documents**
  - **End**: ERP System

- **AP Clerk reviews forms and documents**
  - **End**: ERP System

- **AP Clerk reviews for completeness and obtains needed information**
  - **End**: ERP System

- **Four Seasons sends paperwork to SCCPS**
  - **End**: ERP System

- **AP Clerk completes worksheet from forms to facilitate reconciliation**
  - **End**: ERP System

- **Recon worksheet**
  - **End**: ERP System

- **To Journal Entries Process**

- **Credit card statement**

- **Four Seasons charges airline tickets to Board credit card; Wachovia sends monthly statement**

- **Four Seasons sends paperwork to SCCPS**

- **Employee Travel Reimbursement Form**

- **AP Clerk reconciles Air/Rail Travel Form and credit card statement**

---

**Department:** Accounts Payable  
**Participants:** Alice Watson, Mercedes Ferguson  
**Validated:** Matthew Yoakum, 3/31/2005  

**Notes:**
No significant changes from "as is" process
Originator sends Special Check Request (along with supporting documentation) to AP

Advance to employee (meals) or pre-pay vendor (lodging, fees)?

AP Clerk reviews for documentation, account number, etc.

Any problems identified?

Pre-Pay

SCCPS pre-pays conference fees directly to vendor; pre-pays lodging directly to hotel

END

ADVANCE

To Special Check Request Process

Special Check Request Form

AP Clerk contacts originator to resolve

Notes:
No substantive changes from "as is"
The "to be" process map for cash receipts is included in the Accounting section
Schools make bank deposit
Athletics sends log sheet with dates of games and bank deposit slips
Event Log Sheet
Deposit Slips
AP Clerk keys deposits into system
AP Clerk files deposit slips
END

**Department:** Accounts Payable

**Participants:** Matthew Yoakum

**Validated:** Matthew Yoakum, 3/31/2005
Schools collect money from students
Schools make bank deposit
Schools send textbooks, deposit slip and Principal's Report to AP
Principal's Cash Report to Acct.
AP Clerk matches report with deposit slip
AP Clerk keys deposit information into system
Issuance of Receipt, Books
AP Clerk completes form
AP Clerk returns books and form back to schools
AP Clerk files deposit slips

Schools send textbooks, deposit slip and Principal's Report to AP
Deposit Slip
Damaged books

Principal's Cash Report to Acct.
Deposit Slip
Damaged books

AP Clerk sends books and deposit slip back to school
Deposit Slip
Damaged books

Does it balance?
YES
ERP System
Damaged books

NO
School corrects paperwork
Deposit Slip
Damaged books

AP Clerk files deposit slips

Department: Accounts Payable
Participants: Matthew Yoakum
Validated: Matthew Yoakum, 3/31/2005
Budget Analyst calculates enrollment projections based on cohort survival, birthrate data and other demographic data

Budget Analyst requests input from Program Manager (Special Ed, Pre-K, Choice)

Budget Analyst makes adjustments (program changes)

Budget Director reviews/validates projections

Budget Analyst sends adjusted projections to principals for validation

Budget Analyst enters principal proposed adjustments/notes in Access database

Budget Analyst enters principal proposed adjustments/notes in Access database

Budget Director and Budget Analyst review all input

Budget Director determines final adjustments to forecast

Budget Analyist enters final adjustments

Budget Director presents to steering team for final approval

Approved?

YES

To Staffing Allocations Process

NO

Budget Director determines final adjustments to forecast

Approved?

YES

To Staffing Allocations Process

Budget Director determines final adjustments to forecast

Approved?

YES

To Staffing Allocations Process

Notes:
No changes from "as is" process map; not impacted by ERP implementation.

Department: Budget
Participants: David Fields
Validated: N/A - no changes made
Enrollment Reporting / Formula Earnings Adjustments

**Notes:**
* Count days = 1, 5, 7, 10, 15 and 20

** May be able to download school enrollment data directly into budget system where calculations are applied (positions and non-salary allocations).

*** This happens on record day, which is usually the 20th day.
Revenue Projections

Department: Budget
Participants: David Fields
Validated: David Fields, 5/4/05
Staffing Allocations

MS Access: QBE Database

State FTE Information

Enrollment Projections

MS Access: Enrollment Database

Budget Analyst enters enrollment and position counts in staffing allocation database

Budget Analyst calculates formula-driven staffing in database

Formula override required?

NO

Budget Analyst finalizes the allocation and sends to schools via email

YES

To Salary Budget Process

Staffing Allocation Document (PDF)

Note:
Position control may be able to address some of the Access staffing formula and allocation functions. The Access tables are already linked; interface to system may be all that is needed.

Department: Budget
Participants: David Fields
Validated: David Fields, 5/4/05
Sr. Budget Analyst pulls various data* from the ERP system into Access to build a master table.

Position Control Coordinator reviews edit reports.

Sr. Budget Analyst updates Access database.

Sr. Budget Analyst generates reports and sends them out to the schools for review.

Principal review and markup reports and submit input to Position Control Coordinator.

Position Control Coordinator makes edits in Access and uploads data into ERP system.

**Notes:**
* Pay tables, staffing allocation, current employee salary information, fringe rates by object, vacant position information, non-position compensation.

Some of the database-related tasks may be eliminated depending on available budget module features. It is expected that some offline analysis will still need to be done.

**Department:** Budget
**Participants:** David Fields
**Validated:** David Fields, 5/4/05
Budget Development (non-salary accounts)

- Budget Analyst sends out budget instructions and worksheet (Excel) to schools, depts, and program managers*
- Schools, depts and program managers determine budget allocations and fill out the worksheet
- Budget Director reviews worksheets and uploads data into ERP system
- Budget Analyst generates the Recommended Budget Book
- Board reviews the Recommended Budget Book and makes adjustments as needed
- Board adopts budget
- Budget Analyst develops Adopted Budget book

**Notes:**
* Extensive training and transition support will be needed to make this work, whether entering directly into ERP system or on Excel templates.

** Budget system may have formula capability and sensitivity analysis capability to reduce or eliminate use of some spreadsheets or databases for non-salary accounts.

---

Department: Budget
Participants: David Fields
Validated: David Fields, 5/4/05
Budget Amendments

Department: Budget
Participants: David Fields
Validated: David Fields, 5/4/05

Notes:
An amendment is anything that changes a budgeted amount at the fund level

Will need query capability on historical transaction history in order to eliminate the need/desire for hard copy (by date, approver, account code, etc.).
Budget Transfers

Department Head or Principal enters Budget Transfer Request

- Requires Board approval?
  - NO
  - Budget Transfer Request is forwarded to appropriate approver
    - Request rejected by any approvers?
      - NO
      - Positions involved?
        - NO
        - End
        - YES
        - Budget Analyst posts budget transfer data into system
          - Positions involved?
            - NO
            - End
            - YES
            - Position Control Coordinator makes adjustments in system
              - Positions involved?
                - NO
                - End
                - YES
                - Budget Analyst notifies the appropriate people of approved request
                  - Positions involved?
                    - NO
                    - End
                    - YES
                    - Budget Director submits for review and approval by Executive Team
                      - Board approves?
                        - NO
                        - Budget Director notifies program manager via email that the transfer was not approved
                          - Email
                            - End
                        - YES
                        - Board approves?
                          - NO
                          - Budget Director prepares Board resolution
                            - Requires Board approval?
                              - YES
                              - Budget Director applies decision rules to determine if the request is appropriate and approves online
                                - ERP System
                                  - Board Resolution
                                    - ERP System
                                      - ERP System
                                        - ERP System
                                          - ERP System
                                            - ERP System
                                              - ERP System
                                                - ERP System
                                                  - ERP System
                                                    - ERP System
                                                      - ERP System
                                                        - ERP System
                                                          - ERP System
                                                            - ERP System
                                                              - ERP System
                                                                - ERP System
                                                                  - ERP System
                                                                    - ERP System
                                                                      - ERP System
                                                                        - ERP System
                                                                          - ERP System
                                                                            - ERP System
                                                                              - ERP System
                                                                                - ERP System
                                                                                  - ERP System
RIPT START

Department: Budget
Participants: David Fields
Validated: David Fields, 5/4/05

Note:
Will need query capability on historical transaction history in order to eliminate need/desire for hard copy (by date, approver, account code, etc.).
Position Verification

Department or School enters requisition* in system

- ERP System

Does valid vacant position exist?

- Yes: System flags the requisition as "pending" and routes it to the Director of Employment for approval

- No: System generates error message or on-screen notification informing the requestor that vacant position does not exist

Requestor contacts Position Control Coordinator who conducts research on position/incumbent

- ERP System

Does valid vacant position exist?

- Yes: Position Control Coordinator makes necessary changes in system

- No: Position Control Coordinator notifies requestor via email that the requisition is denied

- Email

END

To HR Applicants/New Hires/Transfers Process**

Note:
* After the requisition is entered, the system will automatically check to make sure the position is in fact vacant

** Under "to be" process, the Budget Office is responsible for the verification process and HR is responsible for the approving the requisition and filling the position.
Schools, departments and program managers will have access to the system and will run their own reports.

**Note:**

Schools, departments and program managers will have access to the system and will run their own reports.
State Reporting (DE0046B, 0420B) - October and April

**ERP System**

Sr. Budget Analyst runs state reports

**State Website**

Sr. Budget Analyst goes online to the State website and uploads data

Sr. Budget Analyst cleans data until both reports are accepted by the State

**State Website**

Budget Director and CFO review final input online

**State Website**

Superintendent signs off on submission online

Sr. Budget Analyst archives electronic versions on local server

**END**

**Note:**
Assumes system will generate reports that map to a separate state level chart of accounts

**Department:** Budget
**Participants:** David Fields
**Validated:** David Fields, 5/4/05
E-Rate Processing

**Notes:**

* Recurring projects do not require resubmission of Form 470.

** Vendors can begin contacting the district at this point. District must wait at least 28 days until contingent contract can be signed.

**Department:** Budget  
**Participants:** David Fields  
**Validated:** N/A - no changes made
Hiring manager screens and interviews applicants and enters interview notes into the system.

Hiring manager marks an applicant as pending hire choice and indicates the proposed position.

Workflow electronically notifies Employment Specialist.

Employment Specialist verifies the employee's qualifications for proposed position.

If employee qualified for the position, Employment Specialist marks the applicant record as qualified.

If this a transfer?

To Applicants, New Employees Process

ERP System

Notes:
* System automatically verifies that the position is vacant in Position Control before allowing the creation of a vacancy.
Applicants, New Employees

Applicants, Transfers

Notes:
* System automatically verifies (again) that the position is vacant in Position Control before allowing the entry of an employee into it.
Board approves?

YES

Employment Specialist notifies site

Email

END

NO

Employment Specialist notifies site and employee

Letter

Email

To Applicants/New Hires/Transfers Process

Department: Human Resources
Participants: Ramon Ray
Validated: Distributed 3/31/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Terminations/Resigns/Retirements/Deaths

**Department:** Human Resources  
**Participants:** Ramon Ray, Glenn Arnsdorff, Roger Bartlett  
**Validated:** Distributed 3/31/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Employee Self-Service Changes

Department: Human Resources
Participants: Ramon Ray, Glenn Arnsdorff, Roger Bartlett
Validated: Distributed 3/31/05, No response as of 5/16/05

Notes:
Changes such as:
- address changes
- emergency contact update
- dependent information update
- bank information update
- withholding changes
- leave requests
- application for open jobs
Employee Self-Service Inquiries

1. Employee logs into the ERP self-service screen
2. Employee navigates to the desired information
3. Employee prints or views as desired
4. Employee logs out of the ERP self-service screen
5. END

Notes:
Inquiries such as:
- pay stubs
- benefits enrolled in
- salary and job information
- salary verification statements

Department: Human Resources
Participants: Ramon Ray, Glenn Arnsdorff, Roger Bartlett
Validated: Distributed 3/31/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Substitutes

- Employment Specialist accepts applications online or via kiosk
- Applications
  - Are all required documents present?
    - NO
    - Employment Specialist requests document(s) from the applicant
  - YES
    - Employment Specialist runs a report to pull new and expiring subs to invite to orientation
      - Employment Specialist sends emails and letters inviting subs to orientation
      - Sub Report
      - ERP System
      - Letters
      - Emails
      - Sub Calling System
      - Employment Specialist inactivates the sub in the sub calling system
      - Employment Specialist notifies the sub
      - ERP System
      - HR Data Entry inactivates the sub in the ERP System

- Employment Specialist conducts orientation session and subs sign in
  - Sign in sheet

- Did the sub attend?
  - NO
  - Employment Specialist inactivates the applicant record
  - ERP System
  - END
  - YES
  - Letter

- Is it an expiring sub?
  - NO
  - ERP System
  - END
  - YES
  - ERP System

- Employment Specialist requests document(s) from the applicant
  - Employment Specialist marks the sub's record to indicate the subject(s) in which the sub is highly qualified
  - ERP System

- Is the sub highly qualified?
  - NO
  - ERP System

- Sub Report

Notes: 14 orientations per year - between 75 to 85 people.
Employment Specialist notifies subs that they must log into the sub calling system to select preferences via the web or telephone.

End

Notes:
*NCLB requires that parents are notified if a student has received instruction for four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified.
Teachers/employees log absences via the web or telephone. Sub calling system calls out to available subs. Did the sub accept the job in the system? If yes, the sub reports to the site for assignment. The sub's time worked and the teacher's absence feed from the sub calling system to the ERP system. Before payroll, the site manager electronically approves the transactions. The ERP system pays the sub.

ERP System

Electronic flat file

Before payroll, the site manager electronically approves the transactions. The ERP system charges the teacher for leave. The ERP system pays the sub.

ERP System

Timecard approval screen

From Substitutes Process, Page 2

Technology performs a nightly export to move approved subs with preferences submitted to the ERP system (based on criteria from HR)

At predetermined intervals, the Employment Specialist runs a report to determine if there are any long term subs who are not highly qualified in the subject they are teaching.*

Are there any non-highly qualified long term subs? YES NO

ERP System

Query Results

Electronic flat file

ERP System

Sub Calling System

Sub Calling System

Sub Calling System

Student System

Letter

Notes:
*NCLB requires that parents are notified if a student has received instruction for four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified.
Benefits Specialist provides a list of eligible employees to State Health (in early Sept)

State Health sends the PIN numbers to HR (sorted by location) and HR distributes them to the schools

Benefits Specialist runs edit reports to check deductions

Employees complete open enrollment online for all benefits (in October)

Technology imports the State Health benefits information into the system to set up deductions

At end of enrollment period, State Health provides an electronic file of deductions to HR

The ERP functionality converts the open enrollment records into deductions for the new year

Benefits Specialist runs edit reports to check deductions

ERP System

Sealed Letters

Employee access screen

Electronic flat file

To Benefits Open Enrollment Process, Page 2

Electronic flat file

Technology imports the State Health benefits information into the system to set up deductions

ERP System

ERP System

Edit reports

ERP System

ERP System

ERP System

ERP System
Benefits Open Enrollment, Page 2

From Benefits Open Enrollment Process:
- Benefits Specialist sends benefits confirmation letters to all employees
  - ERP System
  - Confirmation Letters
  - Emails
  - Emails

Employees return letters/emails with verification or corrections
- Confirmation Letters
- Emails

Benefits checks if benefits on statement are correct?
- NO
- YES

Benefits communicates with vendor to determine if issue can be fixed
- Can error be corrected?
  - YES
  - HR Data Entry corrects benefit deductions/choices
  - Benefits notifies employee
  - Letter
  - Email
  - Benefits Specialist generates a new benefits confirmation letter for the employee
  - ERP System
  - ERP System
  - Confirmation Letter
  - Email
  - END

  - END

  - END

  - END

Notes:
State Health sends the new insurance cards to SCCPS, who mails them out.

Department: Human Resources/Benefits
Participants: Glenn Arnsdorff, Roger Bartlett
Validated: Distributed 3/31/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Leave (Five Days or More)

Employee turns in leave request form to HR (with supporting documents)

HR Data Entry enters the leave info into the system

Does the employee have available leave?

YES

The site enters leave time for the employee

System deducts benefit premiums out of paycheck and sends to vendor, as normal

NO

System electronically notifies Benefits about the LWOP

ERP System

To LWOP Process

ERP System

Does employee need to remain on leave?

YES

ERP System

Employee turns in appropriate documents to HR

NO

ERP System

HR Data Entry takes the employee off of leave

Email

Department: Human Resources/Benefits
Participants: Glenn Arnsdorff, Roger Bartlett
Validated: Distributed 3/31/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Leave Without Pay (LWOP)

From Leaves (Five Days or More) Process

Is the leave for an FMLA-eligible reason?

YES → To FMLA Process

NO → Benefits Specialist runs a report each pay period and sends a letter to people on LWOP explaining how to pay insurance premiums

ERP System

Does employee have State Health?

YES → Employee sends premium checks directly to State Health (GA Dept of Community Health)*

NO → LWOP report

Does employee need to remain on leave?

YES → Employee turns in appropriate documents to HR

ERP System

Employee Data Entry takes the employee off of leave

END

NO → Leave Form

Notes:

*If employee does not have a paid workday or holiday in the month, then State Health does not allow SCCPS to take the deduction from reserve pay. Employee must pay State Health by check.

Department: Human Resources/Benefits
Participants: Glenn Arnsdorff, Roger Bartlett
Validated: Distributed 3/31/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Leave Without Pay (LWOP), Version 2
Insurance Premiums Taken From Reserve Pay (Escrow)

From Leaves (Five Days or More) Process

Is the leave for an FMLA-eligible reason?

YES

To FMLA Process

NO

Does the employee have reserve pay (escrow)?

YES

Does employee have State Health?

NO

ERP System

LWOP report

Letters

ERP System

Electronic flat file

Does employee need to remain on leave?

YES

Employee sends checks to State Health (GA Dept of Community Health)*

Check(s)

NO

HR Data Entry takes the employee off of leave

ERP System

Leave Form

Medical Release

Employee turns in appropriate documents to HR

NO

System automatically deducts insurance premiums from reserve pay and sends to the vendor, as usual

Does employee need to remain on leave?

YES

Check

NO

Benefits Specialist runs a report each pay period and sends a letter to people on LWOP explaining how to pay insurance premiums

ERP System

Notes:
*If employee does not have a paid workday or holiday in the month, then State Health does not allow SCCPS to take the deduction from reserve pay. Employee must pay State Health by check.

Department: Human Resources/Benefits
Participants: Glenn Arnsdorff, Roger Bartlett
Validated: Distributed 3/31/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Employee fills out FMLA form and turns it into Benefits

Approved for FMLA? NO

FMLA Request Form

To LWOP Process

Yes

Benefits Director signs off on FMLA form

FMLA Form

ERP System

FMLA Letter

HR sends FMLA letter to employee and marks the HR record to show FMLA

To LWOP Process

Department: Human Resources/Benefits
Participants: Glenn Arnsdorff, Roger Bartlett
Validated: Distributed 3/31/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Employee is injured and receives treatment

Risk Management sends First Report of Injury form to the supervisor

First Report of Injury

Supervisor begins his/her investigation of the injury

Supervisor sends "First Report of Injury" to Risk Management

First Report of Injury

Risk Management records incident details

ERP System

Risk Management begins their investigation

Incident report

Risk Management faxes information to Underwriter Safety and Claims (USC)

ERP System

Is the employee out of work?

YES

END

Is the leave FMLA qualified?

NO

NO

To Workers' Compensation Process, Page 2

YES

Risk Management sends FMLA* letter to employee and marks their HR record, if appropriate

ERP System

FMLA Letter

To Workers' Compensation Process, Page 2

* Family Medical Leave Act

Notes:

Department: Human Resources/Risk Management
Participants: Rob Gordon
Validated: Distributed 3/31/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Has employee been released from Workers' Compensation? NO

Risk Management enters the employee's choice and electronically notifies HR data entry and the site

ERP System

Has employee reached 21 consecutive days of lost time? NO

YES

ERP System

END

Has employee already been paid for first week of disability? NO

YES

After 21 consecutive days of lost time, Workers' Compensation pays employee for first week of disability (66 2/3% of average wage over the 13 weeks prior to accident)

ERP System

Notes:
Risk Management runs periodic reports such as:
- Incident Detail
- Incident Summary
- Location Incident Summary
- Employees in Incidents over Time Period
- Non-Employees in Incidents over Time Period
- Lost Work in Time Period

Department: Human Resources/Risk Management
Participants: Rob Gordon
Validated: Distributed 3/31/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Supplemental Payroll

BOE requests supplemental payroll
or
More than 20 errors are identified on regular payroll

Payroll Clerks enter pay adjustments in system

ERP System

Payroll Clerks run edit reports

ERP System

Extra checks, missing checks, errors?

Payroll Supervisor runs payroll process

ERP System

Payroll prints checks

ERP System

Payroll Clerks separate checks for distribution & send or mail to sites

ERP System

Paychecks

END

Payroll Clerk makes necessary corrections in system

Notes:

BOE = Board of Education

Department: Payroll
Participants: Matthew Yoakum, Sheryle Null
Validated: Matthew Yoakum, 3/14/05
Vendor Register Reconciliation

Vendor:
- Payroll Clerks reconcile reports
- Payroll Clerk checks child support, tax levies
- Payroll Clerk checks Chapter 13, state & federal taxes
- Payroll Clerk checks student loans, garnishments

Any problems identified?

Payroll Clerks make necessary adjustments in system

ERP System

Payroll Supervisor runs payroll process and generates checks

ERP System

END

Vendor Checks

Court Checks

Court ordered:

- Payroll Clerk checks child support, tax levies
- Payroll Clerk checks Chapter 13, state & federal taxes
- Payroll Clerk checks student loans, garnishments

Garnishments
- Payroll Register
- Cancelled Check Register
- Deduction Register
- Vendor Check Listing

ERP System

Payroll Clerks run edit reports

ERP System
Employee starts after first day of his or her contract year

HR enters new hire, (including benefits, taxes, etc.)

System automatically calculates adjusted annual pay based on business rules

Payroll Clerks run edit reports

Problems identified?

YES

HR or Payroll issue?

Payroll issue

Payroll Clerk makes corrections in system

System generates notification email or letter to employee (in HR)

NO

Payroll notifies HR to correct

Letter

Email

ERP System

ERP System

ERP System

ERP System

ERP Register

Exception Reports

Deduction Registers

Payroll Clerk makes corrections in system

Department: Payroll
Participants: Matthew Yoakum, Sheryle Null
Validated: Matthew Yoakum, 3/14/05
Manual Checks

Error occurs on original check or no pay is generated for an employee → Payroll Clerk voids check in system (system automatically reverses GL entries) → Payroll Clerk enters information for manual check (system generates GL entries) → Payroll Clerk prints check → Payroll Clerk obtains signatures and delivers or mails to employee → END

ERP System

ERP System

ERP System

Check
Supplemental Pay

Department: Payroll
Participants: Matthew Yoakum, Sheryle Null
Validated: Matthew Yoakum, 3/14/05
**Garnishments**

**Payroll**

**Participants:** Matthew Yoakum, Sheryle Null

**Validated:** Matthew Yoakum, 3/14/05

---

**Notes:**
- BOE = Board of Education
- If garnishment is missed, SCCPS must pay the Court.
Purchasing creates a bid event in the ERP system. The ERP System then posts the bid on the website and advertises it in the local newspaper for at least two weeks (two weeks plus one day).

Responses to the bid are time and date stamped by the Purchasing Department. Bids are opened in purchasing on the bid opening date and time.

Buyer prepares and presents the bid package to the director for review and signature, then mails bid to the list of vendors.

Buyer forwards the request for recommendation form, copy of the bid, proposals, bid tabulation sheet, and RFP register***

Users evaluate the responses, fill out the recommendation form, and explain the justification, if not the lowest priced vendor.

Notes: *Addendum must be issued within 72 hours of bid opening. **Purchasing posts unaudited tabulation sheet to the website. ***Users have two weeks to evaluate.

Department: Purchasing
Participants: Shera L, Bridgette K, Joan C., Vanessa M.
Validated: Distributed 4/21/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Department: Purchasing
Participants: Shera L, Bridgette K, Joan C., Vanessa M.
Validated: Distributed 4/21/05, No response as of 5/16/05

Notes: Vendors have one week to respond.
Is this vendor in the ERP system?

- **NO**
  - ERP system checks its vendor database for duplicate vendor information
  - **NO**
    - **YES**
      - ERP system puts the vendor creation request in the queue for the assigned approval person
      - Is the vendor creation request approved?
        - **YES**
          - ERP system assigns number and creates a record for the new vendor
          - ERP system notifies the user and provides them with new vendor number
          - END
        - **NO**
          - ERP system puts the vendor creation request in the queue for the assigned approval person
          - **YES**
            - ERP system notifies the user via email
            - ERP system notifies the user and provides them with new vendor number
            - Email
            - END
          - **NO**
            - ERP system notifies the user that vendor already exists
            - ERP system notifies the user via email
            - Email
            - END

- **YES**
  - ERP system checks its vendor database for duplicate vendor information
  - **YES**
    - ERP system notifies the user that vendor already exists
    - ERP system notifies the user via email
    - Email
    - END
  - **NO**
    - ERP system assigns number and creates a record for the new vendor
    - ERP system notifies the user and provides them with new vendor number
    - END

**Department:** Purchasing
**Participants:** Vanessa Miller-Kaigler
**Validated:** Distributed 4/21/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Vendor Evaluation

1. Purchasing Department creates Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for vendors
2. Users can enter vendor feedback to the system
3. ERP system generates vendor evaluation reports based on KPIs and user input
4. Positive report on the vendor? YES -> END
5. NO -> Buyer contacts the vendor to resolve any issues highlighted in the report

Department: Purchasing
Participants: Vanessa Miller-Kaigler
Validated: Distributed 4/21/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Vendor or vendor's courier delivers the items to the site → The person who generated the requisition inspects the items → Are they the items ordered? → Is the quantity correct? → User receives the items on the system → To Payment Vouchers Process

NO → User contacts the vendor to resolve the issues

YES → ERP System

ERP System → Purchasing Department modifies the purchase order to match the received order → Is issue resolved without modification to the purchase order? → Does user have rights to modify purchase order?

YES → User modifies the purchase order to match the received order → ERP System

NO → ERP System

Department: Purchasing
Participants: Michael Coon
Validated: Distributed 4/21/05, No response as of 5/16/05
Inventory Count

ERP System

Warehouse Supervisor generates the complete inventory count report from the ERP system

Complete Inventory Count Report

Is this a monthly cycle count?

NO

Complete Inventory Count Report

YES

ERP System

Warehouse Supervisor generates a random cycle count report from the ERP system

Random Cycle Count Report

Is there still a discrepancy?

YES

Warehouse Supervisor counts the unmatched items then marks adjustments in the ERP system, with explanations if possible

ERP System

NO

Complete Inventory Count Report

Warehouse staff counts the items on the inventory count report and records them on the report

Warehouse staff gives the counted and completed inventory count report sheets to the Warehouse Supervisor

Warehouse Supervisor compares the on-hand quantity in the ERP system with the actual counted quantity

Is there a discrepancy?

YES

Warehouse Supervisor asks for a recount of the items with discrepancies

END

NO

ERP System

Warehouse Supervisor reports the inventory count results to the Warehouse Director

Warehouse Director reviews the results and approves the adjustments, if any

ERP System

ERP system updates the inventory totals based on changes, if any

Notes:
*Both inventory count reports have the item description, item location, **Warehouse Supervisor can assign items or locations to specific warehouse staff or team. The printed count sheets have the assigned team or staff names
***Supervisor gives the recount task to a team or staff other than the one who counted the unmatched item(s).

Department: Facilities and Maintenance
Participants: Michael Coon
Validated: Distributed 4/21/05, No response as of 5/16/05
**Stock Item Order (by Warehouse)**

1. Warehouse Supervisor enters reorder levels in the ERP system for stock items.
2. ERP system notifies the Warehouse Supervisor that reorder level has been reached.
3. Email

**Stock Item Order (by Sites / Stock Item Fulfillment)**

1. From Requisition Process
2. Warehouse Supervisor prints picking tickets for warehouse orders placed by the users.
3. Picking tickets for the stock items*
4. Warehouse staff pulls the orders from inventory and delivers to the requested sites.
5. To Receiving Process

**Note:**
*Driver brings a signed copy of the picking ticket for filing back to the warehouse.

**Department:** Facilities and Maintenance

**Participants:** Michael Coon

**Validated:** Distributed 4/21/05, No response as of 5/16/05