

**MJC Staffing Prioritization Process Survey
Spring 2011**

Employee Group	Number	Percent
FT Faculty	98	35.9%
Adjunct Faculty	54	19.8%
FT Classified	88	32.2%
PT Classified	11	4.0%
Administrator	21	7.7%
Blank	1	0.4%
Total	273	100.0%

Years Employed at MJC	Number	Percent
1-2 years	15	5.5%
3-5 years	50	18.3%
6-10 years	72	26.4%
11-15 years	69	25.3%
16 or more years	66	24.2%
Blank	1	0.4%
Total	273	100.0%

Gender	Number	Percent
Female	177	64.8%
Male	93	34.1%
Blank	3	1.1%
Total	273	100.0%

Highest Level of Process Served On	Number	Percent
Planning and Budget Committee	16	5.9%
Instructional Administrators Council	10	3.7%
Student Services Council	7	2.6%
Administrative Council	0	0.0%
Division/Unit Program Review	110	40.3%
None/Don't Know	129	47.3%
Blank	1	0.4%
Total	273	100.0%

**MJC Staffing Prioritization Process Survey
Spring 2011**

Statements	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/ Strongly Disagree		Blank/NA	
2.1 The criteria/rubrics used in the Staffing Prioritization Process were effective in helping set priorities.	90	33.0%	81	29.7%	102	37.4%
2.2 I need more training in the prioritizing process.	131	48.0%	73	26.7%	69	25.3%
2.3 The Division/Unit Program Review level of the Staffing Prioritization Process worked effectively.	101	37.0%	75	27.5%	97	35.5%
2.4 The Administrative Council level of the Staffing Prioritization Process worked effectively.	40	14.7%	61	22.3%	172	63.0%
2.5 The Student Services Council level of the Staffing Prioritization Process worked effectively.	43	15.8%	42	15.4%	188	68.9%
2.6 The Planning and Budget Committee level of the Staffing Prioritization Process worked effectively.	51	18.7%	57	20.9%	165	60.4%
2.7 The Instructional Administrative Council level of the Staffing Prioritization Process worked effectively.	55	20.1%	48	17.6%	170	62.3%
2.8 I felt a part of the Staffing Prioritization Process at MJC.	77	28.2%	136	49.8%	60	22.0%
2.9 The college's overall planning process effectively incorporates input from the appropriate people or groups in the college and district.	99	36.3%	107	39.2%	67	24.5%

Appendix A - MJC Staffing Prioritization Process Survey Crosstabulations by Groups Spring 2011

2.1 The criteria/rubrics used in the Staffing Prioritization Process were effective in helping set priorities.

Employee Group	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
FT Faculty	39	39.8%	50	51.0%	19	19.4%
Adjunct Faculty	7	13.2%	8	15.1%	38	71.7%
FT Classified	22	25.9%	29	34.1%	34	40.0%
PT Classified	2	18.2%	3	27.3%	6	54.5%
Administrators	19	90.5%	1	4.8%	1	4.8%

Number of Years Employed at MJC	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1-2 years	4	26.7%	3	20.0%	8	53.3%
3-5 years	19	38.8%	8	16.3%	22	44.9%
6-10 years	17	23.6%	25	34.7%	30	41.7%
11-15 years	23	34.3%	24	35.8%	20	29.9%
16 or more	26	40.0%	21	32.3%	18	27.7%

Highest Level of Process Served On	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Planning and Budget Committee	13	81.3%	2	12.5%	1	6.3%
Instructional Administrators Council	8	80.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%
Student Services Council	2	28.6%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%
Administrative Council	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Division/Unit Program Review	51	46.8%	44	40.4%	14	12.8%
None/Don't Know	16	12.7%	29	23.0%	81	64.3%

Appendix A - MJC Staffing Prioritization Process Survey Crosstabulations by Groups Spring 2011

2.2 I need more training in the prioritizing process.

Employee Group	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
FT Faculty	47	48.5%	35	36.1%	15	15.5%
Adjunct Faculty	26	50.0%	5	9.6%	21	40.4%
FT Classified	46	53.5%	23	26.7%	17	19.8%
PT Classified	3	27.3%	2	18.2%	6	54.5%
Administrators	8	38.1%	8	38.1%	5	23.8%

Number of Years Employed at MJC	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1-2 years	11	73.3%	0	0.0%	4	26.7%
3-5 years	28	57.1%	8	16.3%	13	26.5%
6-10 years	28	40.0%	20	28.6%	22	31.4%
11-15 years	34	50.0%	21	30.9%	13	19.1%
16 or more	29	44.6%	24	36.9%	12	18.5%

Highest Level of Process Served On	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Planning and Budget Committee	5	31.3%	8	50.0%	3	18.8%
Instructional Administrators Council	5	50.0%	5	50.0%	0	0.0%
Student Services Council	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%
Administrative Council	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Division/Unit Program Review	52	48.1%	44	40.7%	12	11.1%
None/Don't Know	63	50.0%	14	11.1%	49	38.9%

Appendix A - MJC Staffing Prioritization Process Survey Crosstabulations by Groups Spring 2011

2.3 The Division/Unit Program Review level of the Staffing Prioritization Process worked effectively.

Employee Group	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
FT Faculty	45	45.9%	39	39.8%	14	14.3%
Adjunct Faculty	9	17.0%	6	11.3%	38	71.7%
FT Classified	30	36.1%	21	25.3%	32	38.6%
PT Classified	2	20.0%	4	40.0%	4	40.0%
Administrators	14	66.7%	5	23.8%	2	9.5%

Number of Years Employed at MJC	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1-2 years	2	13.3%	3	20.0%	10	66.7%
3-5 years	17	35.4%	9	18.8%	22	45.8%
6-10 years	25	35.2%	18	25.4%	28	39.4%
11-15 years	28	41.8%	24	35.8%	15	22.4%
16 or more	29	45.3%	21	32.8%	15	23.4%

Highest Level of Process Served On	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Planning and Budget Committee	10	62.5%	5	31.3%	1	6.3%
Instructional Administrators Council	5	50.0%	2	20.0%	3	30.0%
Student Services Council	3	42.9%	3	42.9%	1	14.3%
Administrative Council	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Division/Unit Program Review	66	60.0%	41	37.3%	3	2.7%
None/Don't Know	17	13.9%	24	19.7%	81	66.4%

Appendix A - MJC Staffing Prioritization Process Survey Crosstabulations by Groups Spring 2011

2.4 The Administrative Council level of the Staffing Prioritization Process worked effectively.

Highest Level of Process Served On	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Planning and Budget Committee	6	37.5%	7	43.8%	3	18.8%
Instructional Administrators Council	1	11.1%	3	33.3%	5	55.6%
Student Services Council	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	4	57.1%
Administrative Council	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Division/Unit Program Review	22	20.0%	30	27.3%	58	52.7%
None/Don't Know	10	8.3%	19	15.7%	92	76.0%

2.5 The Student Services Council level of the Staffing Prioritization Process worked effectively.

Highest Level of Process Served On	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Planning and Budget Committee	7	43.8%	4	25.0%	5	31.3%
Instructional Administrators Council	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	7	77.8%
Student Services Council	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	0	0.0%
Administrative Council	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Division/Unit Program Review	17	15.5%	20	18.2%	73	66.4%
None/Don't Know	14	11.3%	14	11.3%	96	77.4%

Appendix A - MJC Staffing Prioritization Process Survey Crosstabulations by Groups Spring 2011

2.6 The Planning and Budget Committee level of the Staffing Prioritization Process worked effectively.

Highest Level of Process Served On	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Planning and Budget Committee	13	81.3%	3	18.8%	0	0.0%
Instructional Administrators Council	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	4	44.4%
Student Services Council	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	3	42.9%
Administrative Council	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Division/Unit Program Review	22	20.0%	33	30.0%	55	50.0%
None/Don't Know	12	9.9%	16	13.2%	93	76.9%

2.7 The Instructional Administrative Council level of the Staffing Prioritization Process worked effectively.

Highest Level of Process Served On	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Planning and Budget Committee	11	68.8%	2	12.5%	3	18.8%
Instructional Administrators Council	8	80.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%
Student Services Council	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%
Administrative Council	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Division/Unit Program Review	25	22.9%	25	22.9%	59	54.1%
None/Don't Know	11	9.1%	17	14.0%	93	76.9%

Appendix A - MJC Staffing Prioritization Process Survey Crosstabulations by Groups Spring 2011

2.8 I felt a part of the Staffing Prioritization Process at MJC.

Employee Group	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
FT Faculty	35	36.1%	50	51.5%	12	12.4%
Adjunct Faculty	5	9.4%	29	54.7%	19	35.8%
FT Classified	20	23.3%	46	53.5%	20	23.3%
PT Classified	2	18.2%	4	36.4%	5	45.5%
Administrators	15	71.4%	6	28.6%	0	0.0%

Number of Years Employed at MJC	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1-2 years	2	13.3%	10	66.7%	3	20.0%
3-5 years	15	30.6%	23	46.9%	11	22.4%
6-10 years	17	23.9%	40	56.3%	14	19.7%
11-15 years	20	29.4%	33	48.5%	15	22.1%
16 or more	23	35.4%	29	44.6%	13	20.0%

Highest Level of Process Served On	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Planning and Budget Committee	13	81.3%	3	18.8%	0	0.0%
Instructional Administrators Council	8	80.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%
Student Services Council	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	0	0.0%
Administrative Council	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Division/Unit Program Review	40	36.4%	62	56.4%	8	7.3%
None/Don't Know	13	10.4%	65	52.0%	47	37.6%

Appendix A - MJC Staffing Prioritization Process Survey Crosstabulations by Groups Spring 2011

2.9 The college's overall planning process effectively incorporates input from the appropriate people or groups in the college and district.

Employee Group	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
FT Faculty	41	42.3%	46	47.4%	10	10.3%
Adjunct Faculty	12	23.1%	14	26.9%	26	50.0%
FT Classified	27	31.8%	37	43.5%	21	24.7%
PT Classified	3	27.3%	4	36.4%	4	36.4%
Administrators	16	76.2%	5	23.8%	0	0.0%

Number of Years Employed at MJC	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1-2 years	5	35.7%	3	21.4%	6	42.9%
3-5 years	21	42.9%	13	26.5%	15	30.6%
6-10 years	20	28.2%	33	46.5%	18	25.4%
11-15 years	27	40.3%	30	44.8%	10	14.9%
16 or more	26	40.0%	27	41.5%	12	18.5%

Highest Level of Process Served On	Strongly Agree/ Agree		Disagree/Strongly Disagree		Blank/ N/A	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Planning and Budget Committee	13	81.3%	3	18.8%	0	0.0%
Instructional Administrators Council	8	80.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%
Student Services Council	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%
Administrative Council	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Division/Unit Program Review	45	40.9%	61	55.5%	4	3.6%
None/Don't Know	28	22.8%	39	31.7%	56	45.5%

Appendix B - Staffing Prioritization Process Survey Spring 2011 Comments

Process

- We were unclear of the process and the importance of being at the final meeting to advocate for positions. In addition, the prioritizing process was confusing. We prioritized positions we knew had no possible chance of obtaining and included those positions on our program review to no avail. This seemed like an exercise in futility. In addition, we will conduct this entire process again next year knowing the budget conditions and the hope for obtaining any positions is grim. Knowles Learning Theory describes how the adult learner must see value in what they are learning or doing.... The value may be to satisfy accreditation but faculty are getting tired of the meaningless smokescreen. (X 6)
- The new steps/process in hiring prioritization seem like a step in the right direction. The ranking process is a great idea and seeing the finished product helps everyone understand where things fall in terms of the big picture (meaning the whole college). (X 3)
- Division prioritization was not done equitably across divisions, leaving some administrators with the power to make individual decisions. Additionally, because of the illness of a dean, IAC rankings demonstrated the absence of that dean. This demonstrated the "silo" mentality surfacing even in the IAC. Many positions are dependent upon each other, and PB or IAC did not take this into account when prioritizing. (X 2)
- I believe that the directions given to the Administrative Prioritization group was incomplete which led some rankings that did not reflect the needs of various departments. I think this process needs to be carefully reviewed.
- As stated in the open forum, all job openings should be placed on the prior list and not just opened because a vacancy occurs. If all jobs are not placed on the list, this gives an unfair disadvantage to jobs that got caught in the economic times of the hiring freeze.
- Since the role of the PB is to listen to and gather additional input from the college community, we may want to explore a strategy that will allow the IAC representative an opportunity to provide additional input prior to the PB making its final deliberations/decisions. In my view this is needed when there is no full-time faculty member teaching in a program/department. The open forum had an impact on the final decision making process.
- A Division Dean is supposed to have a grasp of the needs of the Division as well as a greater understanding for the needs of the entire campus. The Hiring prioritization process was a fair process when it was left up to the Deans to prioritize needed positions. Too many hands muddy the water. As an instructor in my Department, I really don't know the true needs of the entire campus. This process should revert back to the process used in the early to mid 90s. It was more fair and it worked. The Deans create the list, the president makes any changes, changes were discussed among the Deans and president, and the final list went to the Board. Simple and more accurate.

Criteria/Rubric

- The hiring prioritization process succeeded in putting large divisions high up on the list, while smaller groups were weighted heavily on the bottom (see Allied Health and Tech Ed). The rubric UNFAIRLY boosts the score of "transfer/academic" divisions by

emphasizing degree and transfer completion, availability, and rates. Many vocational classes train students in specific areas or for specific skills, where students DO NOT INTEND to transfer or obtain a degree or certificate. If this process continues, vocational areas will not be able to replace retiring (read: experienced) faculty as readily as the "academic" divisions do, even though the average age of faculty in vocational areas is generally much higher than in the "academic" divisions. The criteria rubric needs to be refined and specified clearly. There were too many categories for points in the IAC review. (X 5)

- The suggestions from advisory committees for our programs should be looked at and used in decision making.

Classified/Faculty Involvement and Program Review

- It appears as if the same classified people are the ones that are appointed for important committees [sic] such as Planning [sic] and Budget. Other people should be given a chance. Program Review at division level is barely a voice for many. When things don't align with what the manager wants voices are shut. It'll be interesting what a focus group of classified would say about this process- participants randomly selected, of course. (X 3)
- when [sic] it comes to prioritizing, the process is not transparent and generally faculty don't have enough information to effectively be part of the ultimate process and decision making. It's a select few only, which leaves most wondering why their recommendations seem to be ignored. (X 3)
- All programs need some 'quantification' to measure their viability for our students. Program review is a good start. However, it is too nebulous for those outside the program to make a valid and wise decision about which programs to limit or cut.
- Adjunct faculty tend to be overlooked by full time. Our input is not necessarily wanted or valued.

Need for Training in Prioritization Process

- I am unaware of the process the college uses to "staffing prioritization" - actually I was unaware that as a classified staff I could give input [sic] as I thought those decisions were made at the administrative level. Thank you for asking. (X 4)
- there [sic] were arguments made at the IAC level for positions ... those arguments were not transmitted in further communications. I'm pretty sure that others don't know what arguments made positions go up or down the list. (X 2)
- I think all departments should have same policy when prioritizing positions. Our department seems to make up their own rules.
- More effort should be made to inform and to ask for input from PT faculty with regard to the needs of their department. Thank you
- I believe that IAC and administrative council folks requested some additional training.
- Committee needs to contact each employee to discuss the issue.
- I think staff need additional training in prioritizing for positions and the importance of early planning for program review.

Miscellaneous

- Thank you for seeking our input; it will be nice to have the results of this survey and see them utilized to the employee's benefit. (X 2)
- We keep re-inventing the wheel regarding planning and budget and staffing. It is very frustrating. Then we disregard what we've done to our departments to start a new process. It isn't right. We need to have some institutional memory that has some impact on how some of these decisions are made. (X 2)
- We need reading [sic] instructors.
- Even if MJC need more staffing/faculty with the existing budget crises there should not be hiring of any kind. Existing administrative, employee, faculty, maintenance, and custodial should be able to carry the burden for another two more years. We are willing to do more and take more responsibly in order to save existing staff/faculty positions as many as we can.