

APPENDIX E

REPORT FEEDBACK



VENTURA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Market Assessment and Organizational Performance Review

SUMMARY

This Appendix E is a compilation of the 102 report feedback comments provided to KH by VCCCD employees. Following is a summary of the response figures:

- KH received comments from 22 individual VCCCD employees.
- 21 of those respondents provided 60 individual comments, of which:
 - 6 comments indicate agreement with or support for one or more of the KH recommendations
 - 21 comments indicate a negative response or disagreement with one or more of the KH recommendations
 - 33 general comments and additional suggestions were provided.
- One respondent provided 42 individual comments covering 23 pages. This respondent's comments have been kept together and presented separately at the end of Appendix E to give appropriate attention to the concerns of this one individual and also to avoid skewing the flavor of the feedback overall.
- Several changes have been made to the report in response to the comments.
- KH has responded to ALL of the comments presented in this appendix.

KH appreciates the time that VCCCD stakeholders took in providing feedback. KH has taken each comment seriously and has balanced the thoughts from the perspective of what is in the best interest of students, the community, and the Colleges overall.

FEEDBACK RESPONSES

COMMENTS PROVIDED BY 21 INDIVIDUALS

Leadership

- 1) We need to have greater leadership from administrators, deans in student services. How many deans have we gone through in how many years? We need the consistency of our dean of student services and the staff training.

KH Response: We agree.

Organization

- 2) The idea of regularly scheduled meetings with staff and management is good as long as the management present at the meeting does not include the immediate supervisor and/or dean. In addition, employees need to know that what they are saying in these meetings will not be repeated to their supervisor/dean (at least the individuals who speak up will not be identified and what they say will not be linked to them). In this district, top management always listens to supervisors and not to staff. Supervisors have a goal of not making waves and proving that their department can be the most cost efficient. This usually hurts the classified employees because we are left with fewer staff, more work, and ridiculous procedures to follow. Management needs to start listening to the people who actually do the work. We do know what procedures/policies cause the most problems and which ones make everyone's life easier.

KH Response: We understand the concerns in the current culture and the need for change. We are proposing a clear delegation of responsibility and accountability, effective 2-way communication processes and the building of a new organizational culture and values. We are also recommending that all processes be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that 'ridiculous ones' are revised or removed and workloads are balanced and reasonable.

- 3) Faculty need to be respected and allowed to do their jobs without feeling insecure or intimidated by their managers let alone their chancellor.

KH Response: We agree that mutual respect needs to become a cultural priority throughout VCCCD. In addition, everyone must accept responsibility for their own feelings and become more accountable for thoughtfully addressing and reconciling these issues.

- 4) I would like to see included is that District Office personnel be dispersed to the three campuses--if not permanently, then at least until the proposal to build a new district office in Camarillo is very carefully considered. (We're dealing now with the consequences and costs of the last hasty decision to move.) In this age of e-mail and FAX and teleconferencing, is it really necessary to have all DO employees at one site? And isn't there some space available at each campus to take in displaced DO personnel? I think that even the East Campus in Santa Paula could come up with offices for two staff people [with] some rearranging. If there are not enough existing offices on the campuses, then consider temporary modules? Leasing them would probably be much cheaper than leasing the former Kinko's headquarters on Ventura's Westside. Maybe the Chancellor would consider migrating to a different campus every year. It seems to me that giving district staff homes on our campuses would be the best possible way to dispel the feeling that many have that one college or another is the favorite and that people "at the district office" are out of touch.

KH Response: This is an interesting idea that should be considered as a transition strategy but we suspect it would be too confusing and disruptive for both the Colleges and the district office staff as a longer-term solution. One option that might be considered is having the District Office housed permanently at one campus.

- 5) The Board should consider whether to have Trustees elected at large to maximize a District-wide perspective and minimize partisan behavior in support of their electoral constituency.

[The preceding] paragraph [from KH’s recommendations] negates/ignores Title 5, section 53203 that sets up collegial consultation and makes it clear that even while an Academic Senate President is participating in collegial consultation, the senate retains the right to interact with the Board on academic and professional matters on behalf of the faculty:

(c) While in the process of consulting collegially, the academic senate shall retain the right to meet with or to appear before the governing board with respect to the views, recommendations, or proposals of the senate. In addition, after consultation with the administration of the college and/or district, the academic senate may present its views and recommendations to the governing board.

Obviously, KH is unfamiliar with this section of Title 5 or it wouldn’t have made the recommendation that it did.

KH Response: We do not agree that the recommendation impacts in any way on Title 5 or shared governance principles. The idea was proposed as a way to deal with the potential for (or perception of) parochial behavior when Board members have a narrow constituency vs. representing the whole County. Moreover, our recommendation is consistent with the steps outlined above – “after consultation with the administration of the college and/or district, the academic senate may present its views and recommendations to the governing board”. We believe this consultation process should occur prior to matters being taken to the Board. In this way, the VCCCD can address its internal issues (and avoid involving the Board in day-to-day matters) while allowing the recommendations to be reviewed by the Board and, if necessary, resolved by the Board in areas where there is lack of agreement.

- 6) I can't speak for the other colleges, but I came from environments w[h]ere teamwork was ingrained in the culture and it enabled results. That teamwork is often lacking here, as everyone seeks individual recognition, and we reinforce that with individual awards at Flex day and other events. There are exceptions of course, such as joint efforts to increase enrollment or pass accreditation. The bottom line is that we worry too much about who is going to get the credit.

KH Response: We agree with the sentiment expressed but have no first-hand knowledge of the extent of the behavior.

- 7) There is a comparability study of ten carefully selected "benchmark" districts, the main purpose of which seems to be to support the recommendation that more district managers be hired. I request in all seriousness that another comparability study be included in the report: the one that shows how all the districts in the state stack up with regard to the percentage of FTEF attributable to full-time faculty. With just 54.2% of VCCCD classes taught by full-time faculty, our district ranks an embarrassing 56th out of the 70 districts in California.

The statewide average is 61.9% of classes taught by full-time faculty. Shouldn't it be a goal of our district to at least meet the state average in this important regard? In order to come up to that level, we would need to hire 60 more full-time faculty members. Or, better yet, why don't we aim for the average of the benchmark districts cited in the KH report? To match that percentage (62.5%), we would need to add 65 new full-timers.

KH Response: The 10 benchmark CCDs were chosen based on their 'comparability' to VCCCD. The data are presented merely as a diagnostic indicator. Our actual staffing recommendations were based on many other factors. We support the idea of developing strategies to meet your requirements under the 75-25 rule.

- 8) Increasing demands are being placed on the Chancellor's Office and the rest of the organization to support the monthly Board meeting, study sessions, and the five subcommittee/ad hoc committees.

Resources should be reprioritized or added if the Board wishes to maintain the existing meeting schedule and structure. Alternatively the Board could consider modifying its current operating practices.

One such change would be to minimize its requests for reports. When a request for a report is before the Board, the Chair should ask the Chancellor to estimate the time and staff hours required to produce the report so that members can be more judicious in their decision to support the request.

I have a concern about the Board minimizing its requests for information. This limits the Boards access to information...information it needs to make informed decisions. [In addition, to build or lease suitable meeting room [a]t a time when campuses are cutting staff and faculty seems unreasonable and imprudent.

KH Response: There is no desire to limit the Board's access to information. We believe that they require and should have access on a regular basis to comprehensive and accurate information on all aspects of the performance of the system. What we are referring to here are special ad hoc reports that can add a heavy burden on the staff if the number requested is high. This is a standard problem we encounter in similar organizations and are suggesting a

method for the Board to consider to help them be more judicious in their use of limited resources.

- 9) I object to KH's decision to use simply governance as a term adequate to encompass shared governance. The omission implies a lessening of the term itself. Also, the phrase, down through the ranks implies a hierarchy typical of a military model as opposed to a collegial model typically used in institutions of higher education. You can't have it both ways.

KH Response: We tried to explain why we use the more general term. We support the principles of 'shared' and 'participatory' governance and have provided recommendations and suggestions for clarifying and strengthening these processes at VCCCD

- 10) The recommendation is that the Classified Senates be treated as an equal to the Academic Senates in giving feedback regarding issues that affect classified. This is a violation of law. There is a common misunderstanding that the classified senates have a legislated role in shared governance similar to that of the Academic Senates. This is not true. The classified senates are not recognized as representative organizations of classified staff and do not have a role in setting District policy and procedures. The only legally recognized classified representative organization is SEIU Local 535. This issue has been addressed in more than one court case, and each time the ruling is the same. Management is only allowed to deal with the Union (in the absence of a union they can go to the classified senate) in all areas that concern classified employees - including shared governance issues. By encouraging management to include classified senates as a representative organization you are encouraging management to break the law.

KH needs to be very clear that the classified senate is not a legally recognized organization and that the classified senates have not been legislated any authority or role in shared governance.

KH Response: We understand the position taken but are aware that there are opposite views on this issue. We agree the union is the sole representative on bargaining issues but believe the problem stems from a lack of clarity of what are or are not bargaining issues. As we read the rulings, there is no prohibition against having a classified senate that addresses and provides advice on all non-bargaining issues. Their involvement is part of being more inclusive in governance.

- 11) KH recommends that DCC be the logical entity to spearhead and monitor the implementation process, etc. However, DCC is not a shared governance committee and does not follow shared governance protocol, i.e., the regular taking of minutes, the

proper ratio of faculty to staff/administration, etc. Thus, the question is . . . is this really the logical entity to implement shared governance?

KH Response: We are providing a general framework. It will be up to the organization to decide if this is the right committee and to clarify its role and operating procedures as part of the review of the Governance process. If DCC is used, it should follow standard protocols of taking minutes, transparency, representation, etc.

- 12) Our organizational structure was designed 80 years ago and we've outgrown it. In those days you had some maintenance/grounds people, A&R staff, cafeteria workers, faculty, some managers and their clerical support -- basically some chiefs, some teachers and low level people. There is very little in the middle. As a result we have clerical people doing high-level tasks, Deans and higher trying to do everything without sufficient time to do everything right. Other than faculty to Dean, there is no career ladder. There is no cadre of professionals that a Dean can pass project management off to, for example. Your report suggests hiring more managers, but perhaps existing managers could do the job with higher-level help.

KH Response: We agree that many feel there is not enough support staff but that issue has to be addressed in the context of the review of systems and processes and the next stage of reorganizations we are proposing at each College. The management positions we are proposing are addressing leadership (and control issues) and are providing a management infrastructure to help you move forward on the various challenges you are facing.

- 13) The recommendation to create a flatter, less hierarchical organizational structure seems confusing in light of KH's previous recommendation stressing hierarchy (i.e., down through the ranks). Which is it? -- collegiality/team-building or hierarchy?

KH Response: We think you will always have some hierarchy. We are proposing fewer levels from top to bottom of the organization. We believe you can have collegiality, team style management, and decision-making within the hierarchy.

- 14) [It is] assume[d] that Executive Vice Chancellor, Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services and Vice Chancellor of Student Learning have already been created. Also, my second question is why the Vice Chancellor of Student Learning ranks third in this pecking order if delivery of educational services is our primary business? Also, last spring the Chancellor came to our campus and said there was no need to have a Deputy Chancellor position. Doesn't that also apply to the Executive Vice Chancellor position? In the face of our current budget crisis, creating at least 5 new higher management positions seems unconscionable. After all, there have been faculty layoffs, staff cutbacks, and class and program elimination. Each of these

positions represents 40 sections that can no longer be offered, especially if you are cutting back total personnel costs to 80% (when it is now at 88%).

KH Response: As we stated above, the management positions we are proposing are addressing leadership (and control issues) and are providing a management superstructure to help you move forward on the various challenges you are facing. Because “educational services is our primary business”, the Vice Chancellor of Student Learning position is needed.

The implicit assumption in this comment is that this is an either/or situation (or zero sum game). Our premise is that (in addition to streamlining programs and processes) the organization’s primary focus should be on growth, which if it is obtained will provide the resources for both program growth and program enrichment.

- 15) My question is why the colleges should suffer temporary rent-a-deans while the District hires new permanent managers? The colleges have been waiting years in some cases to hire appropriate management. Perhaps the District Office needs to stand in line and wait for better funding to arrive, especially in light of our current budget crisis.

KH Response: See our comments above.

- 16) Several years ago we had a district-wide planning committee. They resolved that as a district we should be focus on achieving results by being a "Results driven organization" (rather than blindly following processes that often stymie or slow results) rather than process driven. That never happened and we are still ruled by process. That change needs to come from the top, and soon.

KH Response: We agree.

- 17) Another new position (*management analyst to assist and monitor FACs*) in the face of above-described budget cuts! – a totally irresponsible recommendation.

KH Response: See our previous comments.

- 18) Another management position in the face of our current fiscal condition. Ridiculous! Also, the timing of such a hiring, i.e., March 2006, is questionable, as this will be exactly when others are being laid off!

KH Response: See our previous comments.

- 19) Please allow me to convey to you the general sentiment amongst the faculty, at least here at Oxnard College. We don't feel much support from our District administration. Actually, I'm understating the problem. In fact, we feel that we are continually "under attack" by the District office. It's tiring, demoralizing, frustrating and professionally unhealthy. Our energy is perpetually sapped by the efforts we have to make just to keep our heads above water. We are committed and dedicated beyond belief to the education of our students. But we feel as if we were "irritants" to the District--just a thorn in its side. It's an awful feeling.

...Never in my professional life have I ever felt so stigmatized and so targeted as I have lately in the VCCCD. If the District wants to have "good relations" with faculty, it's going to have to work very hard to counter the prevalent situation that has become quite toxic.

KH Response: We sympathize with the feeling but remind everyone that what is past is past and should be left behind. As we move forward, it will take a concerted effort by all parties to build a constructive relationship.

Human Resources

- 20) Why should only the Colleges have a recruitment plan? Why is the District Management being expanded without the presentation/discussion and likewise acceptance of a similar plan? Why isn't the District Office being held to the same standards in its hiring practices at present?

KH Response: It is!

- 21) **More Staff Development dollars should be given to faculty willing to do education R&D.** The current \$100/academic year stipend allotted for each full-time faculty member is woefully small, and Staff Development grants have been spotty over the last 5-8 years.

KH Response: We agree and have recommended this as a high priority. We believe the future of the District is closely tied to the caliber of its staff.

- 22) If indeed our counseling services are often below standard, I would highly recommend some customer service seminars and constant counseling training in the area of academic policy, degree, transfer and certificate requirements.

KH Response: Good suggestions to be considered as priorities are being developed.

Student Learning Experiences

- 23) Counselors need to take a more global view of their profession and their responsibilities.

VC counselors narrowly focus on academic requirements for transfer or degrees. They rarely refer students to job training programs, even when the programs are short-term and can accommodate students who enroll in mid-semester. They do little career guidance and know little about vocational assessments -- except to refer students to the former Career Center to use Eureka or take the SDS, both of which have been in use since 1998. Yet, new, computerized assessments and guidance information systems are flooding the Internet and could be valuable tools for counselors. And while counselors must, of course, remain within legal limits of the profession and not venture into therapy, they must also be aware of the wide variety of social services throughout the community and make referrals, when appropriate.

KH Response: Good suggestion.

- 24) KH has a good point. Students who may not be as well prepared to attend College logically require more intervention strategies and student services. I hope the people at the District hear this particular recommendation, as well as the people at Moorpark.

KH Response: Thank you.

- 25) The emphasis on SLOs seems to contradict the emphasis on 525 WSCH.

KH Response: We are not clear on the point being made. Student Learning Outcomes are very important. The "525 WSCH" is a variable that the state uses for program-based funding. We can only infer that the respondent would like more funding to do a better job of meeting students' learning needs. We would agree. In terms of maximizing program-based funding from the State (526 WSCH), faculty can help by ensuring their classrooms are enrolled at the targeted levels of capacity, the Colleges reach cap, programs are relevant to community and students' needs, etc.

- 26) I would have liked you to include and highlight some very successful programs we offer at Oxnard College that are unique to Oxnard College (i.e. Fire Technology). We also have outstanding programs in Engineering Technology, Hotel and Restaurant Management, Addictive Disorders Studies). I like the way you highlighted our Dental Hygiene.

KH Response: We have added these comments to the report.

27) Oxnard College is very proud of being a Hispanic serving institution. The ethnicity breakdown of Oxnard College is written in a way [in the report] that it doesn't state. I think it should state that as our first strength and it doesn't state that. Why did it just give you the breakdown and not what it means to the college and our community as a whole?

KH Response: We developed the strengths from the interviews and focus group discussions and then asked each of the presidents to review and finalize the list. Our goal was not to prioritize but to remind the reader that the District and Colleges have many positives to provide a broader and more balanced perspective than the typically negative impression you get reading studies like these that focus on problems.

28) **Computer science needs to be reactivated at all 3 Colleges.** Even though fulltime CS jobs are not a large, direct driver to the future economy of the county, having basic computer skills are essential throughout all jobs. Also, it has added value in that students know that they can enroll in computer education while taking core courses.

KH Response: A reasonable suggestion that should be considered in your program priority setting process.

29) Title III was mentioned as a campus support service that received high marks from all 4 reporting entities. None of the campuses have had a Title III grant in 10 years. Similarly none of us had the data before us that would have enabled us to make an informed decision on what programs should be cut or increased, so these must be viewed as opinion polls.

KH Response: We agree.

30) I would have like for our college not to give money back to the district this past summer. I don't know who made that decision, but it hurt our Oxnard College students, especially in the delivery of general counseling services. There was no counseling available for students and EOPS step up to the plate and was doing the counseling. You just don't take money out of student services and expect good delivery of services. It is not going to happen and our students hurt big time. Under Academic Programs and Student Services and Perceptions it hurts me to see this kind of negative perception of counseling. My reaction to that is that not all student services programs are well marketed. EOPS program at Oxnard College is a model program to the college and to the district. Our students are very satisfied of our services specially our counseling. Did you interview any Oxnard College EOPS students?

KH Response: We asked each College to select students for the focus groups. We asked that they encourage broad participation and to include particularly those who were the most vocal and apparent student leaders. They were not selected specifically as EOPS students nor were they asked to identify themselves as such.

We agree that student services is a priority that needs to be addressed.

- 31) I am proud to know that Oxnard College is a Hispanic Serving Institution. However, I am curious to know how you selected your students to fill out the surveys. Where the surveys written in Spanish for our Spanish speaking population? How many of your students who filled out the survey belong to the EOPS program??

KH Response: See our comments above. There was no survey of students. They participated in focus groups that were conducted in English. We would have accommodated any language concerns but none were raised.

- 32) As you know our problems stem from many years of trying to make Oxnard College look more like a college and be more inviting to students. However, did you get the chance to walk around our campus? I am pretty sure you were not impressed with certain areas of the campus. Beautification of our campus is so needed! It's the first thing a student notices when they step foot on campus. In addition, because we believe in student's first just like Moorpark College was noted as their first strength.

KH Response: Noted and see our previous responses regarding how the strengths were developed.

- 33) We are desperately in need of more extensive services for our students such as learning labs and support programs.

KH Response: Noted. This suggestion should be addressed as part of the priority setting processes.

Systems, Processes, and Technology

- 34) You reference having the District utilize common course numbering and course naming. This would require that two of the three schools redo all of their course outlines and redo transfer-level courses articulation agreements. Oxnard is currently redoing a substantial part of its curriculum and it involves both of these processes. As a result, I have seen first-hand and up close how many hours are involved in this process. Hundreds and hundreds of hours worth of technical reviewers time is involved, not to mention the hundreds of faculty hours involved in revamping all of a colleges curriculum. In addition, the Articulation Officer (which is only 50% time at Oxnard) is working overtime in the extreme even now. I don't think KH is aware of

what would be involved in adopting common course numbering and common course naming, or it wouldn't have made such a suggestion.

KH Response: This recommendation focuses on what is in the students and community's best interest in how they access the College offerings. We recognize the recommendation will require a substantial investment in time to develop. We believe the benefits to students and VCCCD outweigh the costs; and, the process can be accomplished over time. Moreover, the community leaders were articulate about the confusion they have about the different offerings, programs, and approaches at the Colleges. More students are taking courses online and want to shop for the best course, time, and location to meet their needs. Some students may live in one part and work in another part of the county. This recommendation is to make students' access to VCCCD courses easier.

Foundation

- 35) You hit the mark when you said we should direct more efforts toward increasing revenue including grants and fund-raising. But it often seemed that you lumped them together organizationally afterwards. At VC we are separate, but try hard to work closely together. The other colleges have disbanded their organized grant seeking efforts and seem to take a part-time approach to fundraising.

KH Response: Thank you and we agree the efforts should be coordinated. The organizational decision of whether to combine or separate grants from other fundraising activities should be made as part of the reorganizations we are recommending at the Colleges.

- 36) The colleges have never paid much attention to developing a strong alumni base. This is strategically shortsighted because it eliminates potential fund raising. One significant donation from successful CC alum can make a huge difference to a college. **A database of CC alumni and alumni newsletter should be developed at each college.**

KH Response: We agree but are not being prescriptive regarding what media you use to reach alumni.

Finance

- 37) Although alluded to in Recommendation 8: "VCCCD should define its desired organizational culture that it aspires to achieve", I am surprised that the recommendation provided no real strength of conviction acquired from all the data collection. It is quite obvious to even casual observers that the current fall in enrollment has resulted from the "heavy handed" approach by the chancellor in meeting budget goals. In most businesses that I have had an opportunity to study, the decision of "where to cut" is left to the administrators at the site (college presidents), not left to the CFO (as it was since our new chancellor took office).

It is my opinion that if our college had been given the opportunity to decide where budget cuts were made to meet shortfalls, we would have chosen exactly what you recommend in your recommendations - find the low enrollment, multiple section, non-mandatory sections and cut them first. Instead, we were forced to cut important programs that students take to earn a "living wage"- like the Water Science Program. Additionally, if it were not for the fact that I have obtained over \$4M in grants for biotechnology (in the last 10 yrs, for our college), then that small (but essential) program would have been cut too. Nothing drives away good faculty (like my early retirement) more than administrators with little business "common sense".

I hope that you will strengthen your recommendation, or at least, include this dissention.

KH Response: It is our understanding that the College presidents were responsible for identifying the cuts at their respective colleges and that a wider process was not followed because of the urgency to address the financial crisis. Hopefully, that will not be the case in the future when many of the new review processes are in place. (We also hope no future cuts will be necessary.)

- 38) Oxnard College needs to be treated equitably and that means more funding so we can offer more classes and grow in numbers.

KH Response: By using the phrasing: ‘to be treated more equitably’, a tension is created by implicitly impugning the motives of others. There is no doubt many feel this has been the case, but holding on to this feeling will hook defensive reactions and anger. This will get in the way of making optimal decisions as the whole district wrestles with the tough decisions around resource allocation within the new strategic priorities.

- 39) [The recommendation to consolidate maintenance and custodial services] sounds like a good idea, but it won't work. When there is a big job to do at each campus, which one gets priority and therefore gets the staff? I think the reason people feel this might be a good solution to M&O problems is that M&O is always the first place to get hit when the district makes budget cutting decisions. The fact is there are not enough staff people available to keep up with daily maintenance of facilities. People are starting to see the results of this lack of daily maintenance. In addition, because of the reduced staffing levels, the services M&O used to provide are either no longer being provided or have been dramatically reduced. As a result, the idea that consolidating M&O appeals to a large majority of people because they think this action might bring back the level of service that used to be provided. However, the only way to improve the look of our facilities and to bring up the level of service to where it was in the past is to increase the number of people working in M&O.

KH Response: The level of service is an important consideration because it affects the image of the district in many stakeholders' eyes. This proposal does

not assume a physical centralization only an organizational amalgamation. The aim is to ensure that all facilities come up to the highest standards the district decides to fund and that management and administration of this function is as efficient as possible.

- 40) As with any government entity, the use it or lose it mentality thwarts sound fiscal management. The reward for saving money is usually having your budget cut the following year. The reward for leaving a position left unfilled to save funding usually means the elimination of that position. We need to rethink this.

KH Response: We believe there is merit in addressing the issue of incentives to encourage cost savings and entrepreneurial behavior. We believe the first priority is to ensure that the budget process is transparent and that everyone sees it as fair even if they disagree with some of the final decisions.

- 41) KH highlights the historical imbalanced cooperation between the 3 colleges. I believe that this is a result of the fiscal allocation model adopted by VCCCD years ago where District funds were allocated to colleges based on growth in student enrollment. This fostered competitiveness over cooperation between the colleges. In light of the spirit and goal of college cooperativeness, the allocation model needs to be revisited.

KH Response: We have recommended that the allocation formula be revisited as part of the strategic priorities process.

- 42) I question the need to cut personnel costs to 80%. After all, the VCCCD has no manufacturing costs and its assets/stock is WITHIN its personnel. It's not like other businesses that incur manufacturing costs and have to store its stock (whatever it manufactures). We are marketing education, which is an intangible.

KH Response: Perhaps we have not been clear enough with this recommendation. We have a number of recommendations to grow revenue and the total amount to divide between these two categories of expense. Thus this recommendation does not imply salary reductions or staffing reductions. It does provide an overall goal to aim for as these additional resources are acquired. The 20% available then will allow for improved facilities, equipment, supplies, staff development, maintenance, etc., to allow for program improvements and enrichment all of which are important investments in improving VCCCD's programs, services and image. Many expressed their concern about the erosion of this part of the budget over the last few years.

- 43) Total Compensation Philosophy: Why should faculty trust this wording since the current contract has been blatantly misinterpreted to the disadvantage of faculty? Why didn't KH deal with the attempt by the District to eliminate a whole section of

the contract instead of just a sub point? You can't expect any buy-in on this recommendation with the atmosphere that currently exists.

KH Response: We agree the current atmosphere is unfortunate but that does not mean the idea is unimportant or won't provide useful benefits to the faculty (and other employees) and the organization.

44) I thought the Union presented Interest-Based Bargaining last February and that the concept was rejected by the District at that time.

KH Response: This is not our understanding but regardless, if both union and management now agree it is a good idea, this will facilitate its introduction.

45) I wish that District and administrative officials would listen to KH's suggestion re having an emphasis on growth instead of cutting.

KH Response: We share your hope.

46) In my years of experience and observation both in private industry as well as education, I've seen that when money flows all problems "disappear". The predominant direct problem for VCCCD is having robust student enrollment. Fix that, money flows, and problem areas disappear. As the KH report points out, organic K12 growth will not do it alone. We need to define the percentage gap between robust student enrollment from all potential sources both inside and outside the county, and the projected K12 growth so that we know how much ground we need to make up.

KH Response: We agree.

Vision/Strategy

47) Has [the Action Plan proposed by KH] ever been accepted by the Board? How can implementation begin in January-February when the Board hasn't even approved it? Or is this process just pro forma.

KH Response: The dates have been updated in the final report.

48) Since we can't expect much from county growth we need to move outside the county. One obvious way is to develop online education for out-of-county residents rather than just for in-county residents that has been developed in the past primarily for student flexibility in work/school scheduling. **Therefore, we need an online ed strategy to do this perhaps in the form of College strategy committees made up of qualified instructional and counselor staffs that already use online teaching.**

KH Response: We agree that on-line education is a key area of potential growth and should be addressed in your priority setting processes.

Community Interface

- 49) We need more “2+2” programs and collaboratives (2 yrs of CC + 2 yrs of university) to strengthen ties with K12, CSUCHI, and UCSB.

KH Response: We agree that these programs should be considered for strengthening as part of your priority-setting process.

- 50) The VC academic excellence image held by K12 counselors is abysmally weak, even though there are excellent instructors at the tri-colleges. Why? There has never been PR done on the excellence and academic achievements of college faculty. The college schedule of classes only speaks of comparative tuition costs between CC and UC/CSU schools, and nothing more. **An easy change would be to highlight faculty achievements (awards, grants, ed research) in each schedule of classes as well as the college catalogues. Another would be to host K12 counselors annually to interact with CC faculty, for example, for a casual barbeque at each of the campuses.** This would be dollars well spent by the colleges.

KH Response: These are good ideas to consider as part of your overall public relations program.

- 51) **The District needs to collaborate with other CC Districts on grants that build educational consortiums.** Experienced grant writers from the 3 colleges could provide expertise on crafting such collaborative efforts.

KH Response: As stated previously, we believe these should be coordinated and collaborative efforts.

Problem: VCCD does not have a coordinated approach to economic development. Each of the three colleges has an effort ranging from minimal to large. The colleges frequently compete against one another for grants and information about opportunities is not shared between colleges. There is no point person for economic development. The major economic development organization in the County, the Workforce Investment Board, does not have a representative from the District participating, although we are mandated partners.

Recommendation: Provide coordination for economic development at the District level through an EVP level position. This level is higher than existing dean positions will allow for clear authority. This level is also needed to be recognized in the business arena as a decision-making position on behalf of the District. This is required to be on the Workforce Investment Board since the individual is expected to vote.

The new position recommended in the study calls for a manager with responsibility for Student Learning, Student Services, and Economic Development. With a scope of responsibilities this wide, Economic Development will not get the attention it deserves and requires.

KH Response: The suggestion was one of the options we considered. We recognized there would be resistance to creating a lot of new senior positions. We decided on this design as way to get started. We are concerned about economic development, but still believe this is the right management structure for now, with a focus on improved student services and learning. It can always be adjusted later as experience is gained.

- 52) The Institute for Community and Professional Development is unique in our District - providing community education, contract education, grant development and management. Twenty employees work under this umbrella with an infrastructure that provides marketing, recruitment, curriculum development, payroll, and invoicing. The Institute is self-supporting, with a payroll of over \$1,000,000. In addition, the Institute contributes financially to the college. I believe the Institute should be recognized in the self-study for its unique and positive contributions to our college and community.

Our Community Education program is the only one in the District. It was awarded the Community Education Program of the Year award by the Association for Community Education. It offers a rich variety of personal and professional development opportunities. I believe it warrants a commendation. I believe a recommendation to expand this program to offer these life-long learning opportunities throughout the County is appropriate.

Our Contract Education program has offered training to more than 28,000 employees in business, industry and government. We are recognized as leaders in employee development and serve as a resource to employers to develop short-term and long-term training programs. In addition, we have developed performance evaluation systems and needs assessments. I believe this program warrants a commendation. I believe a recommendation to expand this program throughout the County is appropriate.

KH Response: We see the programs as strengths and have recommended the expansion of community and contract education.

- 53) In response to [the recommendation that says] VCCCD should expand contract, vocational and community education options, including partnerships with businesses and community organizations:

While this is an important recommendation, it fails to fully address the enormous potential for both financial gain and improved community relations through an enhanced, district-wide program of Community Education.

Community Ed. classes bring not only revenue to campus but also the individuals from throughout the community who may have never considered the community college as a serious educational option. The Community Education classes at Ventura College typically attract an older demographic with discretionary income to spend on lifelong learning. But it is shortsighted to believe that the reach of this program ends with each workshop or seminar, as the Community Ed. students also have family and friends with children who might consider the community college an option with the positive recommendation of respected friends and family members.

It is important to remember that the general public neither distinguishes nor cares about the difference between a fee-based class and a college credit course. If an individual has a positive experience, he/she has had a "positive experience at Ventura College." If an individual has a negative experience in any area, the entire program is besmirched. As the response to Community Ed. programs is typically very positive, we should consider drawing upon our satisfied customers for additional enrollments in other areas.

Ventura College is currently positioned to operate a Community Education program throughout the county. With last year's implementation of the Lumens Online Registration System, it is possible to develop a program of fee-based classes throughout the county -- with ease. I would recommend that the program be initially expanded to Moorpark College rather than Oxnard, as the current program already draws from the Oxnard Plain; but the Moorpark College/Simi Valley area is completely without Community Ed. services (except for a Financial Management class offered by VC Community Ed. at the Simi Valley Sr. Center). Program expansion to the East County could be accomplished by hiring a part-time person at MC to coordinate the logistics of room assignments. The VC Community Ed. program could initially pick up 10 hours a week of an existing staff person to be the Community Ed. liaison.

Finally, the District needs to bring Community Ed. to the table, recognizing its potential rather than discarding it as an appendage to the college credit program. The District needs to form a committee whose charge would be to develop a plan to strategically position community education throughout the county to integrate lifelong learning into the fabric of the community, improve public relations and expand enrollments across the board.

KH Response: You have made the case more eloquently than us. We fully support community education. The final organizational structure should be resolved as part of the college reorganizations we are recommending.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- 54) Let me begin by stating how uncomfortable I am with this method of confidentiality, that I must email you rather than fill out some other type of anonymous format. I think this is symbolic of the entire research process for this report. Undoubtedly, you have all worked very hard, but it is also evident from the findings presented that this report was written for the benefit of management NOT the employees of the VCCCD.

KH Response: We saw our primary client as the Board and our goal was to produce a set of recommendations that would benefit all current and potential stakeholders, including students and the communities served, and not just the current employees and management.

The decision to use this form of feedback was based on economic and timing considerations. Our firm address has also been made available throughout the project and you could always write us by U.S. mail, which a few have done during the study. We assure you that our reputation as an ethical firm is important to us and there is no way we will allow your identity to be divulged to the Board members, management, staff or any one else.

55) Overall I found the report to be very insightful and I agreed with most of the conclusions. The last few pages were particularly interesting.

KH Response: Thank you.

56) I hope you get others to respond to give you valuable input. Thank you for all your hard work. I appreciate it, because it tells us what we are and not doing or areas of improvement. That is the way I see it.

KH Response: Thank you.

57) Based on what I read I did not find anything new from what I already know is going on at Oxnard College and at the district level.

KH Response: That's not necessarily a bad thing. It probably means we have zeroed in on key issues that at least you are aware of. Hopefully this will encourage people like you to engage in and contribute to a positive change program at VCCCD.

58) Do you honestly think the recommendations will get implemented?

KH Response: We surely hope they will all be considered and that the VCCCD will begin a process of organizational renewal.

59) It is my hope that something good and a positive action come out of this. I truly love my job and most of all working with wonderful students.

KH Response: We do too and we hope you are prepared to invest your time and energy into the change program to make the students' experiences even richer.

- 60) A lot of familiar items from management's wish list turned up: about five new positions for the district office (including three vice chancellors, a PR person, and an auditor), a new District Office, a compressed calendar, new evaluation procedures, and a "total compensation philosophy."

KH Response: While some of the management team did raise some of these ideas, we and other stakeholders also raised them.

- 61) In the report, there is a discussion of the Ventura College East Campus. The East Campus is a building (actually three buildings) that houses day and evening Ventura College satellite classes. In addition to the East Campus, Ventura College offers satellite classes at local high schools. The KH study is using some numbers that reflect just the East Campus and other numbers that reflect the East Campus **AND** the local high school classes. The result is confusing and gives an incorrect perception of the East Campus offerings.

The [report also] states that 734 students were enrolled at the East Campus during Fall 2005, [and] that there are 40 to 50 part-time faculty. The 40 to 50 part-time faculty are for the East Campus **AND** the VC classes at the high schools. In Fall 2005 there were approximately 25 part-time faculty members at the East Campus alone. [It also] states that there were 72 "Sections." Again the 72 sections are for the East Campus **AND** the VC classes at the high schools. At the East Campus alone there were 44 "Sections."

I recommend that you be consistent with your numbers. Otherwise, it appears that there are too many sections and faculty for the number of students enrolled. The following are the census numbers I have for Fall 2005.

- East Campus alone - Enrollment - 734, part-time faculty - 25, sections - 44.
- East Campus **AND** high schools - Enrollment - 1207, part-time faculty - 43, sections - 72

There is a chart of East Campus classes and enrollments. Those numbers are for the East Campus **ONLY** (although they are not consistent with numbers I received from the district office). The paragraph that follows states "...loss of space in the local high schools..." as a reason for the reduction in class sections at the East Campus. However, since the numbers in the chart are for the East Campus only, the loss of classroom space at the high schools would have no effect on the number of classes at the East Campus. The reason for the reduction of class offerings at the East Campus was a reduction in **ALL** class offerings at Ventura College and district wide as well as the other reasons you stated.

KH Response: We have reviewed the statistics and history again and made the appropriate changes.

COMMENTS PROVIDED BY 1 INDIVIDUAL

Leadership

62) [Re:] Recommendation 6: VCCCD should define the leadership roles throughout the organization with a greater emphasis on delegation and accountability.

6.1 3) The Board should take the primary responsibility for engaging with all parts of the community with the goals of ensuring stronger two-way communication and community relationships. This is good; I agree, however, on p. VI-14 under paragraph 6), “During the previous Chancellor’s term, to improve communications, Trustees began to meet officially with the District’s Senate Presidents... This can undermine the Board’s policy role and makes establishment of official communication structures more difficult to develop within the District.”

Two Comments:

1. Factual; Senate Presidents meeting with Trustees predates AB 1725, not Westin. I met with Trustees in early 1990s.
2. If the “Board . . . [is to engage] all parts of the community ... [for] stronger two-way communication” then why are Senate President/Trustee meetings questionable?

My answer to comment 2: The Chancellor’s Communications Plan will be a hierarchical bureaucratic (at worst autocratic) policy that will deny any district group access to Board members, who they have elected, and when measured in terms of service to the district, have less tenure. This recommendation, if implemented, will deny a voice to faculty, most voters in the county. Certainly Board members are intelligent enough to know when they are being “gamed” except, perhaps, by their sole employee, their chancellor!

KH Response: No group is being denied access to the Board. The intent is to ensure that roles and responsibilities are more clearly defined. The meetings between the Senates and the Board ‘are questionable’ if decisions are taken and they undermine the governance process and the defined management authorities.

63) [Re:] 6.3 “The Chancellor should build an environment of collaboration and accountability to achieve meaningful and lasting change across VCCCD.” Good idea, but so far little from chancellor has shown any inclination for collaboration.

KH Response: On the basis of our recommendations, a primary role of the chancellor is to build a clearer and more collaborative process.

Organization

- 64) With all this in mind, it was frightening to read the KH Recommendations. KH has things upside down. In their document the overwhelming theme is that more control from the “top” is necessary to bring this district into shape—managers are directors, not contract administrators. Cynically responding, what should be expected from a consulting firm hired by the chancellor?

KH Response: We are disappointed that the respondent is so cynical. As an independent firm we bring objectivity to our work that is not possible by insiders. We are not suggesting more control, but we are recommending more accountability. Our actual recommendations are to delegate more decisions.

- 65) [Re] 6.2 “Many coming before the Board do not feel they are listened to or that their issues are addressed with consideration.” Absolutely true.

Continual board member and chancellor cross talk during meetings has contributed to one of the themes that runs through the recommendations—the need for civility. Most addressing the board would react in a civil manner, were they certain that their comments would be taken seriously by board members who at least make the effort to appear that they are listening. Paragraph 1) notes this lack of civility and respect. Moreover, it is a civility and respect from the board’s employees, the district management, for those that generate the district’s revenues (the faculty) that is lacking as well. To be told continually by district managers making 50% more per year than those who generate the funds that faculty are overpaid, when looks at other district’s salary schedules reveal the opposite; it is highly disrespectful and patently ungrateful.

KH Response: No comment required.

- 66) [Re:] P. VI-16 7) “Build or lease a suitable meeting room” At a time of harped-upon fiscal crisis, such a recommendation is outrageous. District administrators validate benefits cuts/denied COLA increases to “put more supplies in the classroom” while consultants recommend a \$10 Million building to be used monthly!

KH Response: We are not recommending a \$10 million building, only a meeting room that would contribute to a sense of stability and decorum appropriate to this Board and VCCCD stakeholders.

- 67) [Re:] 1) “The Chancellor should develop a clear and specific governance process” Is this not spelled out in ED Code, 53200 and thereabouts? Is reinventing the wheel necessary? Cynics would say this is empowerment for the chancellor to ignore Ed Code and to rule as he sees fit.

KH Response: Based on the extensive feedback of the participants in the study (through interviews, surveys, and focus groups), we concluded that many parts of the governance process were unclear or not operational. This issue was discussed among the various College Advisory Teams and all concurred that there was a lack of clarity. We also met with a work group of 14 stakeholders (from the Colleges and District Administrative Services) regarding the governance process to discuss the discrepancies, differences in philosophy, and barriers. The outcome was agreement that greater clarity of how the governance process should work was needed. We have provided a methodology to help VCCCD clarify, reactivate, and hopefully create a meaningful and robust governance process.

- 68) [Re:] P. VI-17 “That said, KH uses the term ‘governance’ to encompass the process starting with the Board of Trustees’ responsibilities and on down through the ranks. What is critical is to understand the roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities at each step of the process.”

Here KH reveals its bureaucratic bias; what does down through the ranks mean? Does it mean that the faculty is subordinate to the management? Given collective bargaining and AB 1725 legislation, which empower the faculty to negotiate directly with the board, and that it is the board that employs the chancellor and his managers, who are subordinate to that employee, but do not negotiate or “consult collegially” with the board, then what does down through the ranks mean? Is it empowering legislation to attempt to treat faculty like K-12 teachers are treated by their principals and superintendents? If so, the recommendation turns back the clock.

KH Response: All we are recommending is that the roles and responsibilities be defined, and that incumbents be held accountable for achieving their responsibilities and goals.

- 69) [Re:] Recommendation 8: “VCCCD should define its desired organizational culture that it aspires to achieve.” To sound facetious, well Duhhh! For this we’re paying \$200K!

KH Response: Many participants to the study complained about negative aspects of the culture at VCCCD. We witnessed many examples directly. In fact this respondent’s rhetoric is a prime example of one of them – the lack of respect exhibited to each other and in this case an outsider. We have given a number of suggestions on how to address various aspects of the culture.. The cultural problems pose some of the major barriers for overall effectiveness.

- 70) Good points on p. VI-21: “*emphasizing mutual respect.*” Very important, but it takes two to respect. If one group continually tells another that it’s overpaid, and that it’s

responsible for the district's problems, and does not listen to the experts in the field, relying instead on others (like KH), how much "mutual" can there be, if one side does not respect the other. And why should faculty respect managers who are not accountable for poor state reporting resulting in fines and who continually disrespect them, but get upgraded in title and salary?

"civility to each other." A basic of civility is to listen, not to discount before even a mouth has been opened. This Board has even alienated the retired managers who implemented prior boards' policies for 40 years; this chancellor is seen as a hatchet man who will use this district as a stepping-stone to another position. He has insulted faculty in their own venue, the Academic Senate sessions; no wonder faculty come to board meetings and act uncivil, not to mention the lack of respect and even the common courtesy of listening to public comments by some board members. Civility is mutual; to insist upon it, one needs to grant it.

Good KH questions: *"Are successes celebrated? Are people positively stroked...? Are incentives and rewards in place...?"*

From the perspective of one who has a national reputation in his field, my comment on these questions is: HA! Constant are the pleas in district email for some travel funds for faculty members to go to conferences to be awarded. Faculty continually get acknowledged by outside agencies; from this district, we are told we're too expensive, that we'll have to tighten our belt, that there is no money for travel. There are no incentives or rewards in the VCCCD for exceptional service.

KH Response: The respondent's comments are a powerful example of the anger in the system (culture) that needs to be addressed but he raises a key point: "Very important, but it takes two to respect." And we add, it also takes some patience and willingness to stick with it when the first 'bump in the road' occurs.

- 71) [Re:] P. VI-22: Another layer of bureaucracy; the Deputy Chancellor. The Chancellor told the Oxnard College Academic Senate that he did not need a Deputy Chancellor. Why now is one needed, especially considering the district's alleged budget crisis?

KH Response: We have been clear that this is not another layer. This position is on the same organizational line as the Presidents and the other Vice Chancellors.

- 72) [Re:] P. VI-24: "...establish a Vice chancellor ...of Student Learning..."

Is this wise? At a cost of 70 sections, which could generate \$275,000, why should a position be added that will cost the district, considering office and support staff costs, in excess of \$200,000 a year? That's a total cost to the district of nearly half a million dollars! And, if this position is "common in many multi-

college community college districts” where is the analysis from the other districts of said position’s efficacy? If it’s common in many, this means it’s not in all. How are those not included in the many doing the job? “Many” is weasel worded—it lacks substance. How many? What is the percentage? Are there less expensive and less bureaucratic alternatives?

KH Response: We can only refer the Board to our arguments in the body of the report. Community colleges’ primary role is education. A Vice Chancellor of Student Learning can focus the needed efforts to continually improve student success, student learning outcomes, enrollment strategies, and programmatic efforts across the Colleges. We also, believe this position is important to many of the other recommendations we have made to help create a strong sense of a unified district that has student success and access as key priorities. There’s nothing like a positive reputation in this area to attract enrollment growth.

In this and future points, the respondent makes an argument based on dividing a fixed size pie. We have been clear throughout the report that the goal should be to grow the size of the pie so it isn’t an either/or decision. This position should help programs and services across VCCCD to become continually more effective. Many of our recommendations are based on that strategy. Operating within VCCCD’s current financial capacity will likely require the phasing in of some of these recommendations.

- 73) [Re:] P. VI-27: “Recommendation 10:2: VCCCD should consider a new location for its District Administration Center (DAC).”

While not a bad idea, per se, nevertheless, if the district is in fiscal crisis, as is the constant drum beat from district administrators, what is the wisdom of finding a new site? At the cost of how many sections to be cut will be the price of a DAC?

KH Response: See our comment above regarding a fixed size pie.

- 74) [Re:] P. VI-28: The call for district “organizational and . . . decision-making processes . . . [to be] transparent” would be a marked change to this district which conducts much of its business in the dark. Aside from a wholesale slaughter in the DAC, how does KH expect such a cultural change to occur? Divide and conquer have been the district’s strategy for years, pitting each college against the other and all against the DO. Human nature seems to militate against this recommendation, no matter how well intentioned.

KH Response: In our lifetime we have seen the Berlin Wall fall and the ‘troubles’ in Ireland finally addressed. So human nature can and does change. Call us optimistic, but we believe the discord at VCCCD is not as difficult or as deep-seated as those conflicts.

During the review, many faculty and staff came to us and said they were tired of the ‘old think and behaviors’. Nurturing this group and this sentiment,

clarifying your internal values, and the culture you wish to achieve and then modeling that new behavior will in our view get the ball rolling and make the difference.

- 75) P. VI-48: KH's bullets are correct. Recent surveys show that faculty has that feeling of achievement as far as students are concerned—first bullet.

Needed is KH's second bullet: *“environment which welcomes their ideas and input and encourages employee involvement.”* Recent actions scheduling task forces at times when people teach, or not allowing Senate Presidents to designate representatives, and limiting district task forces to one faculty member is not the way to “welcome ideas and input,” and scheduling meetings during the peak WSCH generating times (mornings) certainly does not encourage involvement, and neither does 3:30 Friday afternoon meetings—the chancellor's favorite gambit!

P. VI-49: Also sorely needed is KH's fourth bullet: *“climate that emphasizes that employees belong, are valued”* The protracted 18-month negotiations, the March 15 notices, and the current attempt to print contract language neither agreed to nor approved says lots about valuing. Telling faculty they are too expensive and blaming district fiscal problems on an alleged over-paid faculty does not indicate any valuing either.

The rest of P. VI-49, starting with Recommendation 23.1 is more boilerplate. It's generic, and could be applied to any dysfunctional organization.

KH Response: The respondent is agreeing with our recommendations. One of the ‘value added’ aspects in hiring our firm is that we bring our experience and our knowledge of what works in other organizations. However, we always tailor our reports and recommendations to the situation we find at our current client.

- 76) Generally speaking, the chancellor got what he wanted; a document justifying his taking full control of the district, having a compliant board—board members “need to be trained, he said one day in Coordination Council—that delegates all authority to him. The previous board made this mistake with a previous chancellor. I'll say no more on that.

Second, the call for a top-down, bureaucratic organization is counter tradition in Education, and it's counterproductive. Faculty members do not produce widgets; they are professionals who have two contracts with the board; one for salary and working conditions, and the other for the 10 + 1 Academic and Professional matters. They are, in the organization's flow chart, at the same level of the board; they have been contracted to provide the services the board thinks necessary.

The board hires the chancellor, and he hires his managers to administer the contracts faculty have obligated themselves to follow. When the chancellor, or

his staff attempt to compromise the professionals' delivery of services through meddling with the dynamics of the classroom, or the particular vagaries of any given discipline for which they have no qualifications, they are overstepping their bounds. Consequently, KH recommendations for HR are either ignorant of this, or they are focused on what they found to be needs in the HR department, and I'll not meddle by telling HR what to do. HR is not a major concern in the faculty ranks.

District management is not a policy-making entity; policymaking is the purview of the board and the professionals it contracts with. Policy facilitates education and the education is provided by the professionals under contract, not by those charged with managing the contracts or with making sure the classrooms are open and the facilities are clean, and that the faculty show up on time to meet their obligations. Consulting collegially, or relying primarily on the experts, the board establishes policy and contract with the faculty to provide expert professional services to fulfill that policy. KH does not recognize this matrix of policy and professionalism, seeking to force the educational enterprise into the hierarchical mode of a profit-based enterprise.

The VCCCD's only profit is the educational success of its students. Any policies that compromise the delivery of educational services will insure that the district will not fulfill its mission.

KH Response: We are making recommendations that stress empowerment and delegated authority with clearly defined roles and responsibilities -- not bureaucratization.

Many of our recommendations are focused directly or indirectly on student success. The Board hires its executive team – the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Presidents, and Vice Presidents – to be leaders of an educational enterprise, not just contract administrators. We disagree with most of the organizational assumptions made by the respondent.

Human Resources

- 77) P.VI-39 Human resources: A very telling phrase on p. 39: “Colleges need to create an organizational climate that promotes mutual respect.” Note above online offerings, RE: wildfire. Maybe now that KH recommends what Fire Science faculty have been calling for, it'll be implemented. This inaction is typical of the lack of respect for the district's most central resource, its faculty.

Second: is renegeing on contract between the time it's approved by the board and printed by the district facilitative of mutual respect?

Third: citing “Why we Hate HR” is a red herring. No one hates HR! The discontent is between the district and its faculty, not with the poor souls in HR. Moreover, to place HR into a problem solving, and therefore a programmatic role, will to exacerbate the situation KH says is bad. HR should have no role in programming; Minimum Qualifications for hire are part of the 10+1 called for by 53200 of the Ed Code.

Fourth: mention of leadership role of department heads. Further evidence of KH's lack of knowledge of the operations of the VCCCD in which department heads are elected by their departments and are generally seen as not being a problem area. As for "leadership" role for middle management, how can a contract manager be a leader? Leadership in the field of Higher Education is driven by the professionals in the disciplines, not by the managers whose primary task is to make sure the classrooms are available, that there are markers for the board, and that the faculty gets paid for its services.

Overall the Human Resources paragraphs reproduce nothing more than a bunch of boilerplate that does not address the environment of Higher Education, more evidence of KH's lack of research.

KH Response: The reference to the article was to point out the challenges of any Human Resources function in meeting the needs of its users. Because VCCCD's Human Resources functions have focused primarily on personnel transactions, the College community has not experienced what a comprehensive human resources operation can provide.

The role of VCCCD's executive and management team is clearly broader than contract administrator, as outlined in the above comment for comment #76.

- 78) Recommendation 19: streamlining part-time hiring. This issue has all the indications that it is a set-up. At their earliest meetings with us, KH people noted the district's part-time hiring morass—as if they had been clued into someone's problem with it. And, guess what, nearly a year later they have found problems with the process. Did they find problems, or did they look for practices that could be construed as problematic? As a former chair of one of the disciplines that uses part-timers most, this need for streamlining does not resonate among the departments much. It's largely a complaint from deans who don't want to do the work to determine who is best qualified to teach our students. They wish, like on-going district policy, to do things on the cheap. They complain about poor part-time faculty, yet fight more stringent hiring policies as being too complicated. They want a free hand to hire whomever they want, regardless of the candidate's qualifications, thinking that they know more about the needs in the disciplines than those teaching. A case in point when I was department chair working with a dean whose degrees were in Physical Education and Education. He presumed to know who was most qualified to teach English classes, yet he had a hard time writing a complete sentence. My current dean is a former vocational dean; what does he know about the needs of English or ESL, or Sign Language, or the Social Sciences and their needs?

The use of the "hundreds of cities" boilerplate is merely filler, hardly reflective of research, or of applicability to the specific needs of hiring part-time faculty in a community almost too far from a major metropolitan area to be able to rely on that area's part-time labor pool. Likewise, a community college faculty is not a municipal bureaucracy. Moreover, doing it "on the cheap" as has been this district's tradition has delivered more of the part-time hiring problems that would

have occurred had this district committed to the implementation of the 75:25 rule mandated by AB 1725 and by any concern for complete academic quality.

Granted, it takes 11-20 weeks to hire a part-time faculty member. There is a simple solution; hire more full-timers. 44% of the district's instruction is by full-timers. If VCCCD had fully implemented the 75:25 goal of AB 1725, the so-called part-time hiring problem would have been more than halved.

Granted, there could be some streamlining, but there are candidates who apply for a job at Moorpark who don't want to be considered at OC, and vice versa. Yet they are in the pool and get the call for the interview, but reject many calls. Mention of a need for "a common application for part-time faculty hiring across the Colleges"

P. VI-41: further indication that KH either did not do its research or it is misguided in its assumptions for all applicants fill out the common district application form! Moreover, the district already practices the KH suggestion: "applicants could indicate at which of the colleges they are interested in working."

KH Response: KH met with a work group of approximately 13 VCCCD employees to flow-chart the recruitment function, focusing on part-time faculty. The group represented a cross-section of Human Resources staff (housed at the District Administrative Services and the campuses) and users (i.e., individuals involved in the recruitment process), including users from the three Colleges. Documentation of the outlined processes from this work group discussion is contained in the KH report. What was clear from the flow-charting was that there were differences in how the process was implemented at each campus, disagreement on how to interpret procedures, major time lags in the recruitment process at each campus, and deep concerns to make it work better. The desire to make it better was because of a sincere desire to hire needed faculty expeditiously to meet student-learning needs while not compromising academic quality and standards.

- 79) P. VI-43: Recommendation 19.4 calls for collaborative and positive labor-management environment. It "takes two to tango" and VCCCD declared impasse and Fact-Finding.

Noted in this recommendation is an "Internal-Based bargaining (IBB)"(sic) approach. Does not KH know that the AFT's request for IBB on Feb 17, 2005, was rejected summarily by the VCCCD? Likewise, at the final Fact Finding session, the faculty thought it has reached consensus, accepting the district's final offer. That offer was submitted to the faculty, and passed; it was submitted to the Board, and approved. Now district management is attempting to print a version different from that signed off by the respective negotiations teams. Is this consensus as called for VI-43?

KH Response: We understand there are two perspectives on what was agreed to by the negotiating teams. The formal processes will help resolve these

differences. The issue regarding IBB is now moot since management is prepared to adopt this approach.

- 80) P. VI-44: Recommendation 20: multi year HR plans. Point 2), first bullet: On what basis does KH think that College managers are most familiar with “their” needs. Should not the professionals in the field be consulted? This management-only emphasis belies the KH call for a bureaucratic governance model.

KH Response: The recommendation assumes a consultative process, involving appropriate stakeholders. In addition to faculty, other stakeholders – students, classified staff, and community representatives – should provide input on matters relevant to them.

- 81) p. VI-45: Recommendation 21: on HR plans. Largely this recommendation has nothing to do with the functioning of an educational institution, unless it reflects the needs of the classified staff. The bullets on p. VI-45 are other boilerplate examples, not indicative of VCCCD practice relative to faculty hiring.

KH Response: The recommendation addresses both part-time faculty and classified staff. The bullet points represent generally accepted good hiring practices and as such should be applied to both faculty and staff.

- 82) P. VI-46: Performance Appraisals presumes that there are professionals qualified to appraise professional performance; deans do not want to do this job. Deans, in many instances, are not professionally qualified to do this job. Under 53200 the job of evaluation is faculty driven, yet the district has fought faculty-driven professional assessments to the point that the author of the current district evaluation and tenure policies was told by one college president that he didn’t know what he was talking about when he questioned her guidelines for the implementation of the policies he had written 10 years earlier, following consultation with former State Chancellor Tom Nussbaum. The evaluation and tenure policies in the current contract are designed precisely to address what KH says the district needs: to identify “strengths, accomplishments, and areas for further development.” KH needs to read the evaluation and tenure articles of the AFT 1828/VCCCD contract and cut its boilerplate.

Recommendation 22: calls for performance review to be meaningful, outcome based, and constructive. Obviously, as said above, KH has not read the contract. Tenure and faculty evaluate were premised on review that was meaningful, facilitative to developing good faculty into better, excellent into great, and to do all in the most constructive manner possible.

Further down the page KH again belies its lack of research, at least on the faculty level, when the report says “not using training as an employee development tool”, because the evaluation/tenure process is viewed as primarily one of

developing the faculty member into a fully participating member of the professional team.

Most of the recommendations are relevant to classified staff. The recommendations again read like boilerplate from other clients' reports.

KH Response: During the study we found that the current performance review processes were not being followed. The recommendation and sub recommendations we have put forward are a set of principles and processes that we believe have a greater chance of success than traditional performance review systems. They are applicable to faculty, management, and staff. They are key to holding people accountable and aligning everyone's efforts to achieve the strategic priorities of the organization. Review of the faculty tenure process was outside of KH's work scope.

- 83) P. VI-48: Recommendation 22.7 calls for bargaining with AFT to implement "these" principles. "These" principles do not apply to faculty members. Faculty members are not "subordinate" to deans, or to other management; they are independent contractors working under contracts negotiated with the board of trustees and as long as they fulfill the obligations of the contract, there need be no remediation by management. Long ago the district reneged on commitment to faculty development when it ceased funding development activities, save for the negotiated \$100 per year professional travel allowance and sabbaticals available to 3% of the faculty, when 15% would be a number in keeping with the every 7th year (i.e. sabbatical) process.

KH's recommended enhanced career opportunities are not a consideration for faculty, unless its part-timers wanting a full-time slot, or faculty wanting to make more money by becoming management. Most faculty are in a calling; teaching is their career, and mobility is not a consideration. The AFT has negotiated principles for performance evaluation into the contract; faculty abide by these principles. Management complains that the evaluation and tenure strictures are too stringent.

KH Response: The respondent seems to have an unorthodox perspective of the working relationships of deans, chairs, and faculty. This perspective may be one of the causes of why the working relationships are not as collegial as desired. Even given the respondent's perspective of the organizational relationship of faculty to the administration, the performance review principles are sound. If they need to be negotiated, then it would be our recommendation that the Board negotiate them. The respondent also seems to be overlooking the need for professional growth of all VCCCD employees, not just faculty.

- 84) Recommendation 23: Organizational Development and Training- At least KH recognizes what the district does not, as signaled by its actions: "The District's most important assets" are its employees, and that the "VCCCD should strive to become a desired place for employment." With lay-offs of "at will" employees and the continued disrespectful attitudes by the board and district management perceived by

faculty members, a similar reputation will affect faculty recruitment that has affected management recruitment. The VCCCD reputation as a, in chancellor Meznick's words, "squirrely district" will soon affect faculty recruitment as significantly as it has management candidates' desire to work for the VCCCD.

KH Response: The respondent supports our recommendation.

- 85) P. VI-50 reads like more boilerplate from "ideal HR" functions. Needed is specific application to the VCCCD situation. The Human Resources section of the KH report covers 9 pages of recommendations; most are generic, and only tangentially applicable to the district's core function, the delivery of instruction to students by faculty members, most of whom have limited involvement with HR, save for getting checks on time and making sure that their benefits are there. Once hired, evaluation and promotion are taken over by peer functions, as per 53200 and the contract. There is no professional migration for faculty act in the professional role they have chosen with no need to "move up" the ladder; once tenured, they are at the top, so 9 pages of boilerplate hardly apply. This section, were it submitted as a research paper for an English 101 class would be rejected as inappropriate for its audience and indicative of a lack of research.

KH Response: The section was included to give VCCCD a blueprint for developing a progressive human resources and organizational development function for the whole organization, including faculty, classified staff, and administrators. Tenured-track faculty members have a separate career path from other employee groups.

Student Learning Experiences

- 86) Recommendation 24: the Rodney King "Can't We All Get Along" recommendation. The recommendations for working together is fine; so what else is new? Treat us well and we might play better together. Treat us poorly and we, like jackals, will fight one other for the limited resources. As always, a lack of planning is identified. However, it's not a lack of planning—there are many plans collecting dust on the shelves of the district. It's lack of implementation of the plans that is the problem. Analysis of the cost/benefit spread sheets notes that there are not many programs whose costs exceed the \$3800 WSCH state allocation: Nursing, Dental Hygiene, and a few others. True, there are some small programs that, as anomalies, show up as expensive, but most programs, aside from the ones with categorical or contractual restrictions on enrollments, come in considerably under the \$3800 figure the state pays us for a FTES.

KH Response: One of the underlying themes raised throughout the study was that there was unhealthy competition among the Colleges. It became clear to us that VCCCD was not taking advantage of the potential economies and synergies of being a three-college district. This recommendation is meant to stress the advantages of and the ways of achieving these benefits. The Colleges would benefit from a better understanding of program-based funding,

enrollment management strategies, and revenue diversification initiatives. The above statement reinforces the need for gaining a deeper understanding of WSCH. Such an understanding will help the Colleges to maximize funding levels, reach class capacity, and appreciate the need for high enrollment classes that can help offset the costs for vocational education programs, development education needs, etc. – a need greatly recognized by the respondent for Oxnard College in particular. Such an initiative can only work if the Academic Senates and faculty members are part of the solution. And this philosophy is consistent with most community college governance philosophies that recognize that responsibility should be delegated to the individuals who can most directly affect desired outcomes.

- 87) This page, with Recommendation 24.2 is an embarrassment. While it footnotes Terry O'Banion, it plagiarizes his recommendations. To maximize student learning outcomes while striving to enhance the 525:1 funding proviso is a contradiction in terms. When “*learning and the learner are the central focus of the educational enterprise,*” especially given the poor school outputs in Oxnard, striving for the 525:1 creates the college as an educational MASH unit. Students from API rated 2 and 3 high schools are offered the access of a class, but there is not support for them. So, given the morphine dosage of easy access, they blame themselves, or their teacher’s “unreasonable expectations” for their failure. To create “*substantive change*” (Principle 1) for such students, extensive student support mechanisms need to be created, like learning laboratories, tutorial services, additional opportunities for distributed practice, and smaller classes—all at odds with the 525:1 goal.

When learners are full partners, Principle II, assuming primary responsibility for their learning, they need much one on one-hand holding. To blame them for their own failure to swim, when they haven’t been taught to swim, is despicable. Principle IV calls for collaborative learning activities. Having taught collaboratively for years, my own strategies had to be modified and collaboration had to be curtailed because of the large class sizes in the VCCCD. 27 non-native English speakers from marginal high schools in an English Composition class has twice as many students as a similar section at UCSD. It’s 7 students in excess of the maximum class size recommended by the Conference on College Composition and Communication which established class cap recommendations at a time when most students in College Composition classes were white, middle class, and college-prep (Wyoming Declaration, NCTE 1989). UC Berkeley’s “Turbo 1-A” class for its subject A lower third limits the class to 14 students and meets 5 hours a week for 6 units on their academic load. These are the tested methodologies that enable college teachers to function as “learning facilitators” (Principle V), not as the sage on the stage called for by 525:1.

Will the VCCCD board take the KH recommendation from the bottom of VI-52 and give the VCCCD faculty the opportunity to “*explore innovations proven successful elsewhere*”?

KH Response: We have summarized the key concepts and did give credit to O'Banion as the author. While the respondent describes this recommendation

as “an embarrassment” it appears that he supports it and is challenging the Board to accept it. Other community colleges with diverse learning needs have adapted these concepts, despite the funding limitations (referred to as 525:1 by the respondent)

- 88) P. VI-52: Looking at the success chart, one can note that 2/3 of VCCCD students succeed; 1/3 do not. Is this failure, as well as the noted 50% non-completion in Mathematics, due to the poor preparation of students, the poor performance of the teacher, or, as principle II on p. VI-50 notes, students taking primary responsibility for their own choices, and one of those choices is not to finish the class? A 2/3 success rate in poker, or in batting, or in other facets of life is not a shabby success rate. However, to a dedicated teacher like myself, that 1/3 non-completion is viewed as a lack of success on my part. However, I know that many of my non-succeeding students have moved on to other aspects of their lives: motherhood, a new job, some time in jail, the choice to take a different and easier teacher next semester, and so on. Still, like most of my colleagues, I wish more would complete the classes, but as a professional I will not lower my standards to increase the retention.

I am pleased to quote the KH Report here, for they are absolutely correct: “*The other educational tragedy is when community college students fail English, they often drop out of college and never return; for those who complete English but fail mathematics, there is a similar revolving door.*”

What I draw from this, and speaking as one of the leaders of English instruction if not in the nation, at the least in California, is that we need to continue to address this problem. And one way certain not to address it is to implement Lydia Ledesma-Reese’s budget cut strategy to increase courses capped at 27 (English Composition) to 30. That would increase the load of the teacher by 10%, without any extra pay, and given the percentages of failures, it would increase the measure of unsuccess felt by that teacher. Rather, we should seek to mimic best practices of other colleges and universities and to follow recommendations of professional organizations. Moorpark College already limits its developmental English classes to 25; OC and VC do not. Why do the less needy, as judged by the “quality” of the High Schools they come from, get better treatment at MC? The solution to this issue, following up on the KH recommendation is to implement the Conference on College Composition and Communication’s Wyoming Statement: limit developmental and ESL classes to 15 students, with a full-time faculty equivalent load of no more than 45 students. And for the transfer-level Composition course, cap the ubiquitous English 1A/101 at 20 (currently 27) with no more than 60 composition students per full-time faculty equivalent. Implementing these changes would afford research opportunities; would the retention rate increase? If so, would not these students stay around to take other classes? The same could be said for the various levels of Mathematics. Perhaps we could implement some of the principles of Uri Triesman, but I’ll leave the recommendations to my colleagues on Mathematics.

KH Response: We agree that standards are important. Lowering standards will likely be detrimental to student success in future careers or further education.

The issue is how to meet or exceed standards with a heterogeneous mix of students whose preparation, learning skills and motivation vary.

The respondent seems to believe that the student/teacher ratio is THE answer. We agree it is an important variable but what are needed are new methods and paradigms that recognize that having one-third of our students give up on education is not an optimal strategy for VCCCD or our society's future.

Regardless of whether we live in good times or periods of restraint, educators will always have to make tough choices regarding the optimal allocation of scarce resources. All we are suggesting is to examine VCCCD's student learning philosophy, teaching-learning strategies, and examine new options to continually improve and meet more students' needs.

We hope the respondent can abandon a pessimistic perspective about students' futures. Education must be a lifetime commitment and individuals may make detours (parenting, job changes, and regrettably even incarceration) but the community colleges can be the one presence in their lives where they can return, retool, and begin again.

Given the limited State funding, rather than battling with the District Administrative Services, it would be far more beneficial to collaborate to determine how best to advocate for better State funding levels.

- 89) Recommendation 24.3; common course catalog. This was addressed earlier. Articulation agreements. 700-800 courses needing to be revamped and articulated. Likewise, the recommendation on the bottom of VI-52 with one college offering first-year, and upper levels offered elsewhere is counter-intuitive, given student dynamics. Most of my British Literature students have come from my English 101 and 102 classes. Few from VC or MC take it, except those whose schedule is better accommodated by my course's time. Students choose classes for reasons other than what KH thinks reasonable. Moreover, interactive classrooms with "lecture" on one campus and screens on another seems to contradict principles of Student Learning Outcomes touted earlier.

KH Response: This recommendation focuses on what is in the students and community's best interest in how they access the College offerings. We recognize the recommendation will require a substantial investment in time to develop. We believe the benefits to students and VCCCD outweigh the costs; and, the process can be accomplished over time. Moreover, the community leaders were articulate about the confusion they have about the different offerings, programs, and approaches at the Colleges. More students are taking courses online and want to shop for the best course, time, and location to meet their needs. Some students may live in one part and work in another part of the county. This recommendation will help students access courses at VCCCD more easily.

- 90) P. VI-55: Recommendation 24.6: access/student outcomes. Developing stronger programs to support underprepared students sounds good to an OC faculty member. See recommendations above.

Second bullet calling for revisiting credit hour requirements for AA degrees; 60 hours is what is needed. Are not all degrees limited to reasonable requirements? If the requirements are unreasonable, the program fails, unless it's like Nursing and Dental Hygiene, which with their prerequisites, are 2-year programs that take 4 years to complete.

The rest of the bullets are more boilerplate, drawn from some KH macro, and hardly unique to VCCCD.

KH Response: The list of 9 bullets represents a disciplined approach to increasing student success and 'customer' service while also eliminating waste.

Systems, Processes, and Technology

- 91) [Re:] P. VI-24: "Implementing a common VCCCD catalog of courses"

Perhaps a good idea, but wholly ignorant of the logistics. Assuming the district offers 1000 classes, with 400 at MC and 400 at VC and 300 at OC, which college's course numbering (and course outline, therefore) will stay the same, and how will the other two have to change? And if so, why will one group not have to do the work that the other one will be required to do.

Has the impact upon student transfer been considered? To change the catalogs of 2 colleges, and therefore 700-800 courses, will necessitate the revamping of 700-800 course outlines—each having to go through the institution's curriculum committee for at least two votes, with a trip to the DCSL for its input, and then to the district board for its approval. And then, each revised course will have to be articulated with the 25 CSU and 10 UC and 40+ private colleges in the state, on a course-by-course basis! This process could take up to 5 years and what would be the impact upon the students caught in the middle.

Mention of Student Learning Outcomes is at odds with WSCH:FTE of 525:1 goal stated elsewhere in document. 525:1 presupposes the "sage on the stage" model of a lecturer addressing 5 3-unit sections or 35 students each for a WSCH of 525, or better, a lecturer addressing 5 3-unit sections with 150 students each for a WSCH of 2250! SLOs advocate for the "guide on the side" type of instruction with students participating with faculty members; such a model is highly inefficient in the current 525:1 model because it's impossible to be a "guide on the side" to that many students.

KH Response: See our comment to point #34 above. The 525 'goal' is a state funding average. The state recognizes that some offerings may and should have a higher and some a lower WSCH/FTEF. As part of the funding formula, however, it is currently a fact of life. So, in the absence of new sources of revenue (which we are advocating VCCCD develop), the issue is to ensure that there are enough programs operating effectively above the 525 line. Such program enable VCCCD to provide high-cost programs, such as nursing,

dental hygiene, or basic skills development, which are also consistent with the strategic priorities for the County.

Such an initiative may take 5 years to implement but, in the long run, VCCCD will be better positioned to meet students' learning needs.

- 92) [Re:] P. VI-31: Recommendation 13 calls for customer service focus. Good idea, but looking at the 3rd and 4th bulleted points reveals some shortsightedness. The recommendation to “build [a] uniform system” across the district but to not reinvent the wheel contradicts with the recommendation for a single district catalog called for on p. VI-24. To force two colleges to reconfigure their course outlines, go through all the processes attendant with getting the reconfigured courses approved, and then to submit them to the Byzantine structures of the UC and CSU systems would, truly, be more than reinventing the wheel; it would be substituting a tracked vehicle for a wheeled one! The course approval process is uniform; however, the colleges have evolved with different philosophies, serving different communities in the county, and have, therefore, developed different curricula reflecting their communities. To make the VCCCD curriculum uniform would be a monumental reinvention of the wheel task.

A second recommend calls to “improve all systems so they are ‘customer’ friendly and easy to use” calls to mind a number of policies implemented by District Computer Services. First, mail-in registration was terminated as being too expensive. In Oxnard, we have a large population that uses the mails extensively to send postal money orders, etc., to Mexico and elsewhere. They trust the mail and mail-in registration afforded them the opportunity to register without having to leave home, and they could pay with postal money-orders; two of the other available options, phone registration and on-line registration were less than desirable resources. In a community with people of questionable documentation, or those with documents are skeptical of revealing anything to authority figures, many do not have credit cards necessary to pay fees through phone registration (recently terminated as well!) or through on-line. Moreover, the percentage of Oxnard area potential students without on-line opportunities is certainly less than that in the Moorpark or Ventura areas. Hence, the only option available for many potential Oxnard students is to come on campus to register, but what if they are working? On-line registration is friendly to the largely middle-class populations of the Moorpark and Ventura catchments, but less available in Oxnard. Improving systems to return them to what is friendly to the customer in the neighborhood may necessitate restoring mail-in and phone registration. WebStar, moreover, is hardly customer friendly even to the most experienced users; my daughter, a Web Content manager, and former intranet head of the US Customs website, gave up in disgust while trying to register for classes. My son-in-law, at my request, tried to register; his attempts were stymied, and he’s a former techie with Intel! If they can’t access the system, what about the non-native English-speaker amateur in the county? The system may be friendly to a customer like Vic Belinski, but is he the type of customer we want?

KH Response: See our previous comments on courses. The remainder of the comments supports our recommendation with examples of the need to be more customer-friendly. We recognize that some limiting of choices need to be made in the interest of cost-effectiveness. That said, we agree that sensitivity to all customer 'segments' is appropriate.

- 93) Recommendation 13-2 (P. VI-31) calls for reengineering systems. The second to the last bullet on p. VI-31 has to do with purchasing and contracting. Trustee Huber's eagle eye on purchase orders is responsible for extra procedures in the selection of print vendors. While his questions were appropriate, the CYA behavior of the district with additional levels of signatures required has slowed down, and even increased costs of publications.

KH Response: There will always be a tension between empowerment and control in the expenditure of public funds. We are advocating for more empowerment and delegation with appropriate accountability. We have recommended the addition of an internal auditor position to ensure that the needed controls in the processes are in place and that processes are effective and efficient.

- 94) Recommendation 13.4. Facetiously put, a well, duhhh! What organization should not adopt a customer service strategy? Perhaps it needs to be said, but basic human relations considerations would cover this recommendation. Maybe this makes the \$200,000 worthwhile, but I'm skeptical that anyone will change her/his behavior.

KH Response: We hope the respondent's skepticism is unfounded.

- 95) P.VI-38—Information Technology: Recommendation 18 deals with IT. The KH group jumps on the IT bandwagon, seeing technology as a panacea. Has IT improved efficiency? IT processes, like Banner, have complicated and outsourced tasks. For instance, now faculty members at \$60 per hour plus pay-rates spend their time logging on, going to WebStar sites to print out their course rosters, and then have to repeat the whole login at course's end to enter the grades. In the past, these clerical tasks were done by much lower paid clerical staff. Is this good use of professionals' time? Likewise, faculty is now expected to type and duplicate their course materials, clerical staff being reserved for administrators. Good use of time? Management is recognized as needing clerical assistance; faculty have become their own clerks! Is that good use of highly paid professionals' time?

Bullet items: Many of these sound like they come from some KH macro/boilerplate; nothing new, nothing VCCCD specific.

--Labs and incubators—is there money for these ephemeral and quickly --changing technologies? Purchasing bottlenecks end up leaving us with out-of-

date technology being purchased and installed, only to be last generation, once operational.

--District wide scanner-is this technology not available in each Registrar's office already?

--Smart classrooms: trendy; is there any demonstrable gain, or have we been victimized by smarter marketing? Moreover, this counters the call for SLOs with guide on side faculty member; smart classrooms in many ways just jazz up the sage-on-stage traditional lecture—all with PowerPoint and other snazzy stuff, but does the research support the need for speed into technology?

--enhancing learning experiences? For whom? What about ESL students? Students whose last educational experience was in a village school in central Mexico? What's better? Cold LCD screens, or warm faculty bodies?

--Offering selected AA degrees online would seem to be duplicating what other districts are doing. Would VCCCD, again, be late, and behind the curve. Perhaps money should go elsewhere? Still, there is much interest for wildfire technology online in Fire Science, but no institutional support. Faculty have been calling for it for years; deaf ears in the district.

--Online office hours—already done with online and hybrid courses, and many faculty carry on correspondences with students on line.

--Implement searchable class schedules—has KH not gone to the district's website and searched the VCCCD schedule?

To sum up the bullets on pp. VI-38-39: What are we getting for our \$200,000?

KH Response: There are many applications of technology that can improve customer service, educational experiences, efficiency, and effectiveness, but it is not a panacea. Moreover, not all circumstances can be foreseen when new systems are introduced.

Recommendation 18.3, which introduces a new discipline in the evaluation of investments in technology, should minimize the stumbles during implementation. Faculty should be matching the best teaching-learning strategies to optimize student-learning outcomes. Some students (e.g., possibly adult learners desiring mid-career transitions) might benefit more from online courses than other students (e.g., basic skills students who require more one-on-one instruction). Other students might prefer taking courses via a smart-classroom to avoid a long commute. Faculty in other institutions have successfully adapted this technology, particularly for some low enrollment, second-year courses (e.g., in the sciences) that would otherwise not be possible to offer every year. We encourage faculty to explore the benefits of new technologies to enhance their teaching, while maintaining their commitment to meeting the individual learning needs of students.

Finance

- 96) [Concerning the] December 2005 Instructional Cost/Benefit Analysis spreadsheets, some questions need to be asked.

- A. Are the numbers correct? I have it on good authority that the FT FTEF columns have numbers that are incorrect. If so, how many. And if so, then many of the assumptions drawn are incorrect. The numbers should be impeccable. KH's \$200,000 stipend would pay for 70 sections; if each generated the average district WSCH, the district would have generated \$276,000 in revenues, so the cost for the study is at closer to \$500,000 assuming expenditures for KH + lost revenues, hardly wise fiscal practice in a time of crisis.
- B. To follow on # 1. Have the costs for hourly and Full-time been fully sorted out? That is, have the funds paid to full-time faculty to teach overload courses on the hourly schedule been assigned to the hourly schedule, or are they included in the column assigned to full-time faculty compensation—more than a W-2 salary data dump is needed. If payments for overload assignments have been assigned to the full-time column, then the full-time expenditures are inflated; hourly instruction is hourly instruction whether or not it's done by a full-timer or a part-timer.
- C. Why are categorically-funded programs included: for instance, Assistive Computer Technology, Disability Studies, Educational Assistance Center, Learning Skills. Are these programs limited in how they offer instruction and the Faculty/Student ratios are mandated by outside agencies? Does not including them skew the data to make the cost of instruction seem more expensive? There is no choice; a Dental Hygiene class is limited to 18. Gross comparisons attempt to match oranges with pomegranates. Surely we have better data analysts than an English teacher poking holes!
- D. Likewise, while the snapshot was for Fall 2004, why were cancelled programs: Journalism and Theater Arts at OC, for instance, left in? Cynics might say to skew the data.

If the district is in such dire financial shape, then why do these spreadsheets not show such an impending disaster? The district's average cost per FTES is \$2110; the state allocates \$3836 per FTES; that means that the district is spending \$1726 less on instruction per FTES than it is generating: thus direct instruction costs are 55% of allocation. Sue Johnson, as part of her remarks during Fact-Finding noted that faculty salary and benefits costs are 57% of the district's budget, not a bad estimate. But, if faculty salary and benefits and FTES average costs run in the 55-57% range, then why is there the litany of 89% salaries and benefits cost?

Another interesting, and pathetic conclusion can be drawn from the same district total: the ratio between FT FTEF and Total FTEF. The district's FT FTEF is 323.5; that's less than 44% of the district's 740.4 FTEF total. In sum, is the district not trying to do things on the cheap? Moreover, if my assumption in # 2 above is true, and hourly amounts are included in the FT FTF expense columns, then the district is overstating the FT FTEF amounts and the district's costs for its FTO are even less than stated. I know it sounds cynical, but cynicism is this district's foundational survival skill.

KH Response: The Strategic Cost Management model was included to provide a relatively straightforward methodology to review VCCCD's program costs.

The data was illustrative to help explain the concepts. The information was drawn from internal VCCCD data sources but we were clear that it was not comprehensive. The ability of the Colleges to reach their enrollment cap and academic programs to reach capacity would generate important revenues to VCCCD.

- 97) Recommendation 15.1. Revisit resource allocation. This is a constant call in VCCCD; we're always revisiting resource allocation; seldom do we resolve the problem. Moreover, the recommendation to consider ZBB and RCM, with the footnote listing five major universities as support, is sloppy; USC, Penn and Harvard are private institutions with large endowments while Michigan and IU are large state universities with huge endowments as well. The VCCCD situation is hardly parallel to theirs and what might work for them, perhaps, might work for VCCCD, but stronger evidence for ZBB and RCM needs to come for parallel institutions—CA CCs, especially low revenue ones with declining enrollment. A glaring lack of research by KH is demonstrated here.

However, a positive note emerges in Recommendation 15.3: “*Students who may not be as well prepared to attend College logically require more intervention strategies and student services, including basic skills and developmental education to succeed.*”

Precisely the point OC has been making all along! With feeder high schools ranked 2-4 in the API index as contrasted with the 7-8 rankings for Ventura's feeders and the 9-10 ranks for Moorpark's feeder high schools, Oxnard's students come in with lower skills levels. As Juan Esparza Loera's FresnoBee article <http://www.fresnobee.com/7_day_archive/extended/index.html >notes, the parents of many Latino students do not have the same understanding of the needs of post-secondary education, and are 5-10 times less likely to have post-secondary education than the assumed typical parent of a VC or MC student. Hence, to treat all students as equals will insure that some will not succeed.

KH Response: We are not recommending ZBB or RCM methodologies. We are recommending a tailor-made model that fits VCCCD's situation.

As we discussed above, we envision VCCCD developing its own unique strategy for addressing student learning needs. Once the strategy is defined, we suspect it will become one of your highest strategic priorities and as such will be funded.

- 98) Recommendation 17: Total compensation philosophy. AFT will never negotiate this. Moreover, the figure to get the total compensation cost down to 80% of the budget is at variance with most other cc districts. How many are that low? Most are in the 85-90% range. To apply an 80% figure, a pseudo-business goal reveals the ignorance of those making the recommendation. The only product the VCCCD has to sell and the only inventory it carries is what is in the brains of its faculty. Faculty expertise, faculty

professional achievements is the VCCCD's sole stock and trade and unless the district acknowledges this, it will be futile to try to solve the district's problems.

The second bullet on P.VI-38 calls for a national strategy and alludes to SLOs. SLOs are notoriously person-sensitive. They are at odds with the 525:1 paradigm. Moreover, to implement a compensation policy that will pit one employee group against another, and within those groups the old against the young, the married against the single, and the part-time against the full-time, and all against the retired, will not develop the type of institution that will attract the best quality faculty.

The third bullet on P.VI-38 is naïve at best. While it may apply to classified staff, to put classified staff in charge of staff development for faculty, who are continually developing, will not work. Better to recognize and facilitate further faculty development through PR gambits noting awards, funding faculty travel to conferences, and paying for additional degrees.

A historical note from someone who has been around long enough to remember: in the late 80s, this district allocated \$20,000+ for a district wide colloquium each year. I was facilitator for it one year, and on the committee for three. When AB 1725 staff development funds became available at \$7.00 per FTES, the district pulled back from its commitment to staff development, so when the state stopped allocating money for staff development, the district had no commitment. Moreover, the \$100 a year travel funds for faculty is a joke! While the district can say it allocates \$42,000 for that, no one's professional development is facilitated by the miniscule amount!

KH Response: The respondent again assumes a fixed size pie. We imagine a future where revenue diversification and growth creates a much bigger pie to divide. A bigger pie will allow for more staff, higher wages, and an 80:20 ratio. With 20% of its budget for improvements to facilities and non-staff related educational resources, VCCCD will have one more tool to enhance student success.

We believe that a total compensation philosophy, perhaps including a cafeteria approach to benefits, will increase employee choices. There is nothing in our recommendation that would pit one employee group against another (including retirees). We recognize that this is subject to negotiation and would hope that all union representatives would approach this concept with an open mind and look for a win/win solution.

The respondent appears to agree with our recommendation to invest more substantially in staff development.

- 99) P. VI-60 athletic programs: Here I'm in accord. I see no reason whatever why the taxpayers of California should subsidize intercollegiate athletics. I'm an advocate of the Stanford model. If VC boosters want their aquatics program, or their football team, and the same goes for MC, and for OC, then the boosters should raise the funds.

KH Response: No comment is required.

- 100) I'm frightened by many of the recommendations; 80% for personnel costs seems like a pipe dream since human resources (the professionals, not the department), as KH says, is the key resource of the district. Students do not come because Jim Meznek is chancellor; they come because David Magallanes will teach them math. The board needs to recognize this. When its policies and the chancellor's behavior cause even the Magallaneses of the district to feel attacked, demoralized, stigmatized and targeted, so as to consider leaving the profession for which they are so aptly suited, then no amount of consultant moneys will stop the spiral this district is in. Something needs to be done and I don't think KH has provided the solution. So much for \$200,000!

KH Response: One of our concerns is the organization does not know its market well enough. KH has developed a number of recommendations for VCCCD to consider. The goal should be to increase revenues, continually improve on student access and learning, and diversify funding sources so VCCCD is less reliant on State funding and can provide better for students and its employees (e.g., training, conferences, etc.).

The market data indicate that reliance on the number of 18-year-olds who graduate from high school and enroll in community colleges -- a single market strategy -- is not viable for VCCCD. Academic programs might design new approaches that tap into other market segments (e.g., the working adult) and partner with local governments to help generate economic development (e.g., attract new businesses such as biotechnology to the county) and develop a workforce skilled to meet these new employers' needs.

- 101) Recommendation 11 calls for better public relations. Good advice, but in the district's culture, one of lack of respect, the implementation of a recommendation like the second bullet: "*Build on the public relations talent that resides in the Colleges*" is naïve--An example from 2004-05, complicated by personnel decision in 2005: In 2004 OC implemented, as part of its management enrollment plan, a marketing committee. Much work was done by the committee members, and one member used her Marketing class to develop a marketing strategy for the college. This strategy was developed by the very people towards whom any marketing campaign should be directed: the students. They came up with the (and here I paraphrase) slogan "The New OC: Check us out!" This slogan and the work of the committee was summarily dismissed by the OC administration's desire to shove "Pathways to Excellence" into everything. A simple google search of that phrase generates 1.6 million hits, hardly a catch- phrase designed to brand the college or to arouse attention. And, given the public relations of this district, who would look at one of its colleges as a pathway to anything but despair! The other slogan generated less than 10,000 hits. Now the teacher of that class, who the district tried to lay off last year, is resigning. She's a national leader in convergent journalism with many years of PR experience. As typical, the quality of the VCCCD faculty is recognized and respected only by those

outside the district; VCCCD management are either unwilling or incapable of recognizing quality, and so top people like Toni Allen go elsewhere because the district is unwilling to recognize and properly use her talents.

The final bullet recommends “*establish relationship building as everyone’s job*” From his first day on the job the chancellor has been hacking and slashing—that’s his style. Management is terrified for their jobs. Faculty wants less to do with the chancellor’s vision, whatever that is. Unless there is some commitment from the chancellor level to build relationships, and not the my way or the highway cliché of the chancellor’s strategy, there will be no further positive relationship building. Chancellors and presidents and vice-presidents and most deans come and go; the faculty and classified (if not laid off) stay for the duration; they put roots down in the community and do not see the VCCCD as one stop in the quest for a bigger salary and larger staff of underlings.

KH Response: The respondent appears to support our recommendations on marketing.

The concern about the Chancellor and the administration is noted but is contrary to our experience of these individuals. Relationship building is key to VCCCD’s future.

General Comments

- 102) KH has a very limited view of the district’s history, its qualities, resources and strengths. Their recommendations belie a lack of adequate research.

KH Response: The goal of the study was to make recommendations for improvements, not to undertake an in depth review of the history of the district and the various views on it.

We presented the strengths as a counterbalance to our recommendations. We find that studies of this type, which concentrate on areas of improvement, sometimes overwhelm and depress members of the organization. We feel it is important to remind the organization of its strengths and accomplishments, which are building blocks for making continual improvements. We find this helps build the motivation to make the tough choices and changes that have to be made.

- 103) My comments on Recommendation 7: So What Else is New? Most of pages VI-17 through VI-20 are boilerplate. It would be interesting to look at other KH reports to see how much of this language came from a word-processing macro, simply pasted into the VCCCD report. The only items that might be particular to VCCCD are the names of the committees, but given the sales pitch on VI-19—“A template for . . . that KH has developed for other clients...”—it would not be out of order to ask how much continuing revenue KH expects to generate over the years from VCCCD using these templates?

[Re:] P. VI-28-29: A series of window dressing suggestions—mostly boilerplate. How many other KH reports have exactly the same suggestions? Have they, if implemented, worked elsewhere? If so, what is the evidence?

p. VI-56 Strategic Cost Management. One question: Does KH have a matrix or a program they want to sell? Other suggestions on VI-56 are boilerplate....

Did the district get its money's worth? The lack of research I've documented, and the large amount of boilerplate pages raises questions.

KH Response: As we stated above, we bring many years of experience, 'best practices', and ideas from other sectors to all of our studies, but our recommendations are tailor-made for our current clients.

Although it was beyond our work scope, VCCCD requested that we meet with College representatives to review their WSCH/FTE data, by academic program, and outline how the Colleges could think more strategically about their offerings. KH has used this approach successfully with other community college districts in California. In the past, faculty in particular have found it a useful tool for understanding how program-based funding worked, how their programs fit into the overall state funding "equation", and how other College support services, such as student services and administrative overhead, are funded. What we offered is just a starting point – a framework – to begin considering such possibilities.