

# **Executive Summary**

## **Analysis of MJC Staffing Prioritization Process Survey**

### **Spring 2011**

#### **Background**

The Modesto Junior College President requested that a survey be conducted regarding the assessment of the recent staffing prioritization process in spring 2011. The MJC Research Office and the Assessment/Institutional Effectiveness Committee designed and administered this survey to 950 MJC faculty, staff, and administrators, using the online version of Class Climate Survey. There were a total of 273 respondents for a response rate of 28.7 percent.

#### **Analysis**

- Of the respondent groups, identified by their highest level of involvement in the prioritization process, 47.3 percent of the respondents indicated themselves as “None/Don’t Know,” which provides a unique perspective of the college community concerning this process.
- The next largest group was the Division/Unit Program Review group, at 40.3 percent of total respondents. (Please see attached tables for other demographics.)
- Regarding Statement 2.2 (I need more training in the prioritizing process.), 48.0 percent of the respondents indicated “Strongly Agree/Agree.”
- Regarding Statement 2.8 (I felt a part of the Staffing Prioritization Process at MJC.), 49.8 percent indicated “Disagree/Strongly Disagree.”
- Regarding Statement 2.9 (The college’s overall planning process effectively incorporates input from the appropriate people or groups in the college and district.), 39.2 percent indicated “Disagree/Strongly Disagree.”
- Regarding Statement 2.1 (The criteria/rubrics used in the Staffing Prioritization Process were effective in helping set priorities.), 33.0 percent indicated “Strongly Agree/Agree.”
- The following groups (by percentage) thought the criteria/rubrics were effective (Statement 2.1): the Planning and Budget Committee group: 81.3 percent; the IAC group, 80.0; Division/Unit Program Review group, 46.8 percent; Student Services Council group, 28.6 percent, and None/Don’t Know group, 12.7 percent.
- The following groups (by percentage) indicated the need for training in the prioritization process (Statement 2.2): Student Services Council group, 71.4 percent; IAC group, 50.0 percent; None/Don’t Know group, 50.0 percent; Division/Unit Program Review group, 48.1 percent; and Planning and Budget Committee group, 31.3 percent.
- The following groups (by percentage) felt a part of the Staffing Prioritization Process (Statement 2.8): Planning and Budget Committee group, 81.3 percent; IAC group, 80.0 percent, Student Services Council group, 42.9 percent; Division/Unit Program Review group, 36.4 percent, and None/Don’t Know group, 10.4 percent.
- The following groups (by percentage) thought the college’s overall planning process effectively incorporated input from appropriate people/groups (Statement 2.9): Planning and Budget Committee group, 81.3 percent; IAC group, 80.0 percent, Student Services Council group, 71.4 percent; Division/Unit Program Review group, 40.9 percent, and None/Don’t Know group, 22.8 percent.

## **Conclusions/Recommendations**

The Division/Unit Program Review group and the None/Don't Know group, comprising the vast majority of respondents to this survey, indicated the lowest agreement regarding the effectiveness of, and connection with the Staffing Prioritization Process. Clearly, these groups identified the need for training in this process.

The Accreditation/Institutional Effectiveness Committee recommends the following changes to the process for next year's prioritization:

- Develop better methods of communication for the college community
  - Present a "Just the Facts"-like weekly announcement from the Instruction Office during the prioritization process
  - Deans/managers need to spend time at the division/unit level with faculty and staff articulating the process of program review
- Limit the number of faculty to be prioritized by IAC
- Instructional support staff to be prioritized at IAC
- Managers/deans need to be able to present at Administrators' Council
- Separate Student Services resource requests into two lists (staff requests from faculty)
- Scoring rubrics need to be more clearly defined
- Force ranking of resource requests
- Training on the process (vocabulary, usage of a scoring rubric) for all involved