Final Report & Recommendations on the Organizational Structure Review of the Ventura County Community College District

MARCH 27, 2019

COLLABORATIVE

CBT

BRAIN TRUST

**COMMUNITY COLLEGE
CONSULTING**

**1130 K Street, Suite 150
Sacramento, CA 95814
916.446.5058**

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In November of 2018, the Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT) was employed by the Ventura County Community College District to review and make recommendations on the organizational structure of the District and its colleges. This is the final report containing the recommendations for organizational structure.

The work of CBT was done in three phases including Phase I – the initial discovery, planning and interviews; Phase II – a review of documents, additional interviews and a survey of employees; and Phase III – the preparation of the final report including recommendations of the consulting team.

The consultants from CBT utilized multiple measures to assess the organizational structure of the colleges, the district office (DAC) and the district as a whole. Those measures included; individual conversations with members of the Board of Trustees; multiple conversations with the Chancellor; meetings with the vast majority of student, classified, faculty and management leaders throughout the district; review and analysis of numerous current and historical college and district documents; a comparative analysis of three colleges of similar size from multi-college districts with each college in the VCCCD; a comparative analysis of four similar-sized multi-college districts to the VCCCD, and a survey of 445 college and district employees.

The analysis, findings and recommendations were organized into several specific areas including an overall recommendation. Although the order of the specific areas is purposeful, it is not necessarily ordered by level of importance. Those areas and the corresponding recommendations include:

Overall Recommendation:
1. An overarching recommendation of this report is that there be an increased, concerted, and deliberate effort to promote a more positive and collaborative district-wide culture that is truly student-centered and where departments, functions, and sites are coordinated and working together. Most of the recommendations that follow are components of that umbrella philosophy. This recommendation stems from the multitude of review interviewees and survey respondents who expressed, on the one hand, a focus on student access and success and, on the other hand, skepticism about the extent of harmony and partnership across the departments, colleges, and District.

Recommendation on Decentralization vs. Centralization:
2. The District should review the current level of centralization and decentralization by service area and work function to bring more consistency throughout the organization by centralizing or centrally coordinating appropriate areas. This improved balance will better serve students, be more efficient, and be more cost effective. As part of the review, a function map of the organization, required by accreditation, should be reviewed and revised.

Recommendations on Resource Allocation:
3. Colleges and the District office should consider added management to more effectively oversee the operations of the district and colleges.

4. The District and Colleges should revisit the budget allocation model and include greater specificity in where the funds are allocated to achieve greater consistency at the colleges.

Recommendations on Human Resources:
5. An in-depth review of the processes currently utilized by Human Resources should be conducted. This review should include virtually all constituents and functions to develop streamlined processes to expedite hiring, enhance the evaluation process, better utilize integrated technologies, and training on these technologies, and better facilitate the evaluation, discipline, improvement plan, and separation processes.

6. The position of Vice Chancellor of Human Resources should be transitioned to Associate Vice Chancellor of Human Resources reporting to the new Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness.

Recommendation on DAC Program Review:
7. The DAC and each districtwide service should conduct a recurring Program Review within their unit/department to assess effectiveness and efficiency, and to improve services to the colleges.

Recommendations on Comparative Position Analysis:
8. There are discrepancies within the District regarding staffing that may not be entirely desirable or intentional. Therefore, the District should review the current, and ultimately revised, organizational structure with these comparisons in mind.

9. The District should make efforts to educate its constituents and correct the misperception that it has too many overall managers and is "top heavy".

Recommendation on Position Control:
10. The District should implement a comprehensive and integrated Position Control system, in compliance with State recommendations, administered by the District Business Office, in coordination with Human Resources.

Recommendations on District-level Administrative Operations:
11. The current position of Vice Chancellor-Business should be transitioned to Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) with oversight responsibility for most non-academic functions. The EVC should act as the Chief Operating Officer in the place of the Chancellor during any extended absence.

12. The district should review and document all district office functions so that everyone understands the purpose and role of the district. As part of this review, the district should revisit and revise, as needed, their map of responsibilities between the colleges and the district required by the community college accrediting body (ACCJC).

Recommendations on Institutional Effectiveness:
13. A Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness (replacing the current position of Vice Chancellor of Instruction) position should be created to provide overall district-wide coordination and leadership of institutional effectiveness, academic affairs, student services, workforce development, grants, distance education, planning, human resources and district-level advancement.

14. Data analysis, research and planning should be included as part of the Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness unit for better coordination with planning and districtwide data support and a Director of Research and Planning position should be added at the District Office.

Recommendation on Benefits Coordination:
15. The Benefits Coordinator position should be realigned with Business and report to the Director of Fiscal Services.

Recommendation on Communications, Marketing, Board and Governmental Relations
16. The current position of Administrative Officer to the Chancellor and Board should be revised to Director of Communications, Marketing and Government Relations. The position should function as the public interface for the Board and Chancellor. The role should coordinate branding and marketing for the District as a whole, coordinate governmental relations and work directly with the colleges in support of communications and enrollment management.

17. The communications and marketing function (reporting to the college presidents) should be reestablished at each college in order to support the branding and messaging to the public which is critical to enrollment management and public communication. The added college communications/marketing staff should work with the District marketing and communications staff to brand and market each college and the District as a whole.

Recommendations on Facilities/Maintenance/Operations:
18. Custodial and grounds services should remain reporting to the college vice presidents of administration.

19. The Maintenance Departments should migrate to report through a new Associate Vice Chancellor-Facilities (AVC-F) position at the District Office, reporting to the Executive

Vice Chancellor (EVC) position. While remaining on the campus, each maintenance department should report to the new AVC-F position and develop common standards and work order systems with appropriate tracking.

20. The AVC-F should coordinate the building program with the campus and EVC, and should work closely with the college Vice Presidents of Administration to ensure the campus needs are being met.

21. Standard and common building systems should be adopted and a migration to these systems should evolve over time.

Recommendation on Risk Management:
22. Though no organizational recommendations are necessary, it must be understood that General Services, reporting to the EVC, needs to be the recognized leader in this function. All units (colleges, District Office, etc.) must defer to necessary directives regarding these matters.

Recommendation on Grants and Special Projects:
23. To facilitate increased coordination and oversight of grants, a Director of Grants and Special Projects, reporting to the Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness, should be established. Working with the colleges, this individual will assist in identifying new grant opportunities, assist the colleges in obtaining grants, and work with the Internal Auditor to ensure compliance issues are met.

Recommendation on Internal Auditor
24. The position of Internal Auditor should be added and filled and given adequate authority to establish appropriate internal controls and enforce these controls. The position should report to the Executive Vice Chancellor position.

Recommendation on Police/Safety:
25. The organization of the Police unit should remain centralized and report to the EVC. The Chief of Police should be primarily responsible for developing a comprehensive Emergency Preparedness Plan and oversight of recommendation implementation.

Recommendations on Legal Services:
26. Attention should be paid soon to the Title IX and ADA compliance issues. Although many in the organization believe an in-house counsel is warranted, based on a review of legal costs, there does not appear to be an organizational change warranted and out-sourcing seems to make sense.
27. Specific guidelines and protocols for accessing legal services should be developed and shared with key leadership positions.

<u>Recommendations on Information Technology:</u>

28. Technology should be used to simplify business practices by coordinating software throughout the District and reducing redundancy and time-consuming activities like getting signatures and forms from one campus to another.

29. Common IT systems should be adopted district-wide for instruction, support services and business services functions.

<u>Recommendation on College and District Advancement:</u>

30. A foundation should be created at the district level in support of the college foundations and to identify and cultivate potential districtwide donors. This unit should also ultimately assume the information technology support of the college foundations (back office activities) to better coordinate donor solicitation, recognition and cultivation throughout the District.

<u>Recommendation on Workforce Development:</u>

31. The workforce development district administrative lead function needs to be re-framed to include the coordination of the implementation and funding of workforce development programs across the colleges, with a focus on new funding streams and programs. This area should report to the Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness.

INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT OVERVIEW

In November of 2018, the Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT) was employed by the Ventura County Community College District to review and make recommendations on the organizational structure of the District and its colleges. This is the final report containing the recommendations for organizational structure.

Phase I: Facilitate Initial Discovery and Planning Meeting and Interviews

The CBT Team Lead will meet with the Ventura County Community College District (VCCCD) Chancellor and district/college leaders, staff, and stakeholders as designated by the Chancellor to:

- Review procedures, timelines, and protocols, including communication regarding the project;
- Identify the information and documents required by the Team, such as position descriptions for selected employees, District budgets, staffing levels and ratios, departmental organizational charts, and any prior evaluations or assessments of departments and services;
- Identify up to four similar-sized multi-campus districts, three similar-sized colleges for each of the three VCCCD colleges, that consultants will use for benchmarking purposes as comparative organizations;
- Identify the Point(s) of Contact at VCCCD who will be able to deliver reports, data, and insights to the CBT Team;
- Identify college staff and email addresses to be included as participants in an online survey;
- Review existing organizational decision-making structures and roles related to this project;
- Identify district, college and center stakeholders to be interviewed; and
- Clarify and finalize expected deliverables, and how progress will be tracked throughout the project.

The CBT Team will conduct district-wide interviews with administrative, faculty and classified leaders and other stakeholders in preparation of Phase II.

Phase II: Review Documents and Conduct District, College and Community Interviews and Surveys

The CBT Team will:

- Review all relevant documents, including budgets, staffing levels, job descriptions, collective bargaining agreements, and any program review reports of the identified departments and services;

- Draft online survey to gather feedback and input from stakeholders. Share with appropriate District staff.
- Conduct on-site individual and small-group interviews with identified campus leaders, faculty and staff.

In its review of data and documents and during employee interviews, the team will also consider and analyze such issues as:

- How best to align organizational structure to meet strategic goals?
- How best to align District Administrative Center's (DAC) management structure to meet strategic goals?
- Are key administrative and management positions proportional to the size of the organization, with appropriate placement within departments?
- How does the number of administrators compare with similar sized multi-college districts?
- How best can the organizational structure align with the institution's goals and mission? (e.g. accountability, access, financial stability, and student outcomes)
- Is the role of an Institutional Research and Data Team positioned to drive decisions and if not, what changes should be made to strengthen its impact?

Phase III: Prepare Draft and Final Report

The CBT Team will:

- Prepare a draft report of the organizational assessment and recommendations;
- Share draft report with Chancellor and/or his designated representative(s);
- After receiving comments from the Chancellor and/or his designated representative(s), prepare final report, and
- Present to the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees and/or appropriate committees as directed by the Chancellor.

METHODOLOGY FOR ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT

The CBT team of consultants utilized multiple measures to assess the organizational structure of the colleges, the District office and the District as a whole. Those measures included:

- Individual conversations with members of the Board of Trustees (see Appendix B),

- Multiple conversations with the Chancellor,

- Meetings with the vast majority of student, classified, faculty and management leaders throughout the District (see Appendix A & B),

- Review and analysis of numerous current and historical college and district documents (see Appendix E),

- A comparative analysis of three colleges of similar size from multi-college districts with each college in the VCCCD (see Appendix C)

- A comparative analysis of four similar-sized multi-college districts to the VCCCD (see Appendix C), and

- A survey of 445 college and district employees (see Appendix D).

The above sources were then synthesized into the following analysis, findings and recommendations.

ANALYSIS, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the extensive review of available documents, reports, interviews, benchmark comparisons and a survey of employees, a number of key areas of opportunity were identified by the CBT team. What follows are the analysis, findings and recommendations in each of those areas. Although the order of the specific areas is purposeful, it is not necessarily ordered by level of importance. The recommendations in this report, if implemented, encompass significant change to the organization and will take time and financial resources. It is anticipated that a reorganization of this magnitude would be done over several years. Although the costs associated with the added positions recommended are difficult for CBT to estimate accurately, they will include the cost of some added positions and some savings from reorganization of existing positions. The timing of these changes is good in that the District does have some discretionary resources made available by the new state funding formula.

Overall Recommendation: An overarching recommendation of this report is that there be an increased, concerted, and deliberate effort to promote a more positive and collaborative district-wide culture that is truly student-centered and where departments, functions, and sites are coordinated and working together. Most of the recommendations that follow are components of that umbrella philosophy. This recommendation stems from the multitude of review interviewees and survey respondents who expressed, on the one hand, a focus on student access and success and, on the other hand, skepticism about the extent of harmony and partnership across the departments, colleges, and District.

Decentralization vs. Centralization

Analysis

The dilemma of how much to centralize or decentralize an organization is not unique to California Community Colleges, or education in general. It is a never-ending issue that has been debated since the evolution of complex entities, both public and private.

Generally, "centralization" refers to the concentration of authority and decision making in the upper echelons of an organization. Among the many commonly recognized benefits to the centralized approach is that it affords: the ability to quickly implement decisions, a more efficient and cost-effective method of decision implementation, the ability to deal with crisis situations, and the ability to have greater consistencies in operational functions. Centralization, however, does not come without possible drawbacks including: poor management development, delays in dealing with a fast-changing environment, and poor morale when it is perceived that all decisions are made utilizing a top down approach with little vesting of non-decision makers. It can also be argued that the quality of decisions can be adversely affected when actual implementers are not involved in the decision making.

Conversely, "decentralization" generally refers to the freedom and independence in the decision-making process. Common perceived benefits in this approach include: the ability to make quick decisions, improved morale, better decisions when actual implementers are involved, and a better

utilization of management positions.   Drawbacks of an overly decentralized organization may include higher cost of implementation due to duplication of efforts, inconsistencies in policies, programs and procedures, a lack of quality managerial and decision-making capacity, a "handcuffing" of the process of emergency management, and potential legal exposure resulting from differing practices at each unit.

As one can see, neither the centralized or decentralized approach individually provide the optimal method of dealing with the complexities facing today's community colleges' challenges. In fact, in California's community colleges system there are many requirements and regulations influencing this matter. For example; many educational and classroom decisions are covered in AB 1725 which outlines faculties decentralized decision making in the commonly referred to "10 + 1" rights of faculty. Another example is in the single audit requirements facing all community college districts requiring the District Administration to adhere to very prescriptive, and consistent practices in how they account for District funds. All this is to say that there is an inherent need to utilize the components of both a centralized and decentralized system in managing California's community colleges, especially in a multi-college district.

In order to help understand the "optimal" level of centralization and decentralization of California community college districts it is helpful to look back at some of the founding principles and requirements of the system. In the 1920's, California was embarking on several endeavors to develop a comprehensive system to provide education to its populace. As a result, a Special Legislative Committee on Education was created which set several parameters and requirements for the recognition and support of Junior Colleges (the pre-curser to community colleges). Among the requirements was a minimum level of Assessed Valuation of the ultimate College District and a minimum number of students (average daily attendance). This, in and of itself, precluded a college "on every street corner" and reflected the State's concern regarding the financial cost and support of community colleges.

As a result of evolving legislation, Junior Colleges and Community Colleges began emerging over the decades. Some districts, depending on size and/or community make-up followed the high school district boundaries, some county boundaries and others multiple, but contiguous high school district boundaries in one or more contiguous counties. Eventually, and to this day, the California Community College Chancellor's Office establishes more prescriptive requirements on the creation of new districts, colleges, and officially recognized centers. These requirements were established to help deliver educational services to a very large and diverse state, as well as attempting to effectively manage a system with limited State financial resources.

Multi-college districts afforded the system, and local constituents, with a model to meet minimum requirements, deliver services to students, and to efficiently use limited financial resources. As the populations grew in a District's boundaries the system allowed for growth to meet student needs by the inclusion of added colleges or centers (providing minimum requirements were met). As a result, the California Community College system has now evolved into 115 Colleges in 72 Districts serving over 2.1 million students annually.

Largely delegated by the State to oversee the system make-up, the Community College system Chancellor's Office has established various specific responsibilities for the Colleges and for the

District Office in multi-college districts. For these reasons, it is virtually impossible for any multi-college district to be entirely "centralized" or entirely "decentralized".

A review of multi-college districts across California does reveal some common practices regarding centralization and decentralization. Most often more decentralization can be found in the delivery of instruction and student services with coordination at the district level. Conversely, areas like finance, information technology, facilities, and human resources tend to be more often managed at the district level. However, every district is different and this is why the accrediting body for California community colleges (ACCJC) requires a "map" of district and college functions as part of the self-study process.

Findings
The Ventura County Community College District was created under the provisions of the county boundaries and has evolved into a 3-college district (including the Ventura College East campus in Santa Paula which does not meet the "Official" Center requirements and therefore is not recognized by the State as a College Center, but rather as an outreach center).
Based on interviews, and materials reviewed, inconsistent practices across the District are quite prevalent, inconsistent procedures are not uncommon, and the use of unofficial (non-Board approved) policies are fairly typical at the colleges of VCCCD. Therefore, CBT concludes that the District is significantly more decentralized than centralized. Additionally, the District has a significantly lower number of management personnel than peer California multi-college districts of similar size (see Appendix C). Most interviewees and survey respondents recognize the need for greater consistency, but many are leery of "losing control" and over-centralization. Ironically, students seem less concerned about who makes the decisions than the various employee groups.

Further, a survey of employees revealed that a significant percentage of respondents do not have adequate knowledge of the balance between centralization and decentralization within the District to even respond to a question related to that balance. A large percentage of those who do have adequate knowledge are mixed in their opinion on the issue as are those who responded to a similar question regarding the division of responsibilities and procedures between the District and the colleges (see Appendix D). That same survey revealed that most employees understand the organizational structure of their individual department or unit, but do not necessarily understand the organizational structure at the District or between the District and colleges.

There is considerable disparity of staffing levels (classified, certificated and administrative), and other spending categories, at the three colleges. This disparity can cause potential equity issues for students of the District. Students residing in one part or another of the District should simply not be potentially advantaged or disadvantaged by where they live. And, while students in theory may have access to all three colleges, various socio-economic issues may preclude this, in many cases limiting them to the programs and offerings of the nearest college. This is not to say all three colleges need to have identical programs, but measurable differences in basic services including those for academic and student services, and environmental factors (facilities, equipment, etc.) can be regarded as inequitable.

Lastly, and in part as an outgrowth of a highly decentralized system, programs and decisions seem to be made in a "silo" system. A "silo" system is one in which operations and decisions are not integrated and are often made in isolation with little consideration of any impact for other departments, activities, etc. In order to break down these silos, better communication and coordination is needed.

Recommendation
- The District should review the current level of centralization and decentralization by service area and work function to bring more consistency throughout the organization by centralizing or centrally coordinating appropriate areas. This improved balance will better serve students, be more efficient, and be more cost effective. As part of the review a function map of the organization, required by accreditation, should be reviewed and revised.

Resource Allocation

Analysis
Currently the District utilizes a fairly equitable overall resource allocation model. The model allocates a specific number of full-time faculty and dollars largely based upon the number of Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES). Other than full-time faculty, what the colleges ultimately do with the allocated funds is largely up to them. This results in considerably different numbers of part-time faculty, classified personnel, manager positions, and non-personnel discretionary spending.

As a result of inconsistent levels of part-time faculty and monitoring of the overall number of section /class offerings, the resulting class size levels between colleges can be quite different. So, while full time faculty staffing is allocated on a respectable and recognized basis (525 Weekly Student Contact Hours-WSCH per Full time equivalent faculty-FTEF) no accountability of what is actually generated (including part-time faculty) is utilized. As a result, average class sizes in the District between colleges can be quite different. In the past three years "productivity" has been as low as 452 at one college and as high as 530 at another. This represents a differential of over 17% which indicates stronger monitoring for greater equity is needed.

Findings
Currently the District Administrative Center (DAC) is allocated 6.98% of the unrestricted General Fund to provide its services. While most interviewees do not seem to want this to increase, most of those same individuals and most of the survey respondents do not believe the DAC is providing adequate services to the colleges. Several areas were identified for additional support such as academic program coordination, emergency preparedness, planning and institutional research, marketing and communications, information technology and other areas including Human Resources for improved support. While it is recognized that improved processes or efficiencies may allow for some added or improved support within the current allocation model, it is inconsistent to want more college assistance from the District without some recognition of the need for added financial resources. The District and College peer group

analysis (see Appendix C) show virtually all Ventura CCCD units, including the District as a whole, well below their peer groups in the number of administrators. This is a strong indicator that the DAC is understaffed, and therefore underfunded. It should be noted that in CBT's view, the 6.98% allocation limit in many ways is counterproductive to providing improved services and other than perhaps an historic benchmark is relatively useless. Comparisons with other multi-college districts of District Office costs is virtually impossible since some include centralized Maintenance and Operations, some have decentralized IT, etc. The bottom line is that to some degree you get what you pay for and in CBT's view, the District limitation of 6.98% largely limits the DAC's ability to provide quality services to the colleges. A much better approach may to be to determine where the District Office can best assist the colleges and establish a "prudent" level of funding to do so; ultimately holding the unit (DAC) accountable for providing the expected level of service.

While the overall District financial resource allocation model has merits, the colleges have near full control of how they use the funds. This has resulted in some significant disparities that cannot be entirely attributed to their individual "uniqueness". One example is the different "policies" of how much an employee will be reimbursed for approved college travel. This is simply not fair to employees of differing institutions within the same district. Another example is one college paying for Police tactical vests while another does not, resulting in placing employees at potential risk. In addition to similar educational and support services, the cleanliness of a college should not entirely rest at the discretion of each college as minimum standards must be met for all students. Though the colleges' appearance is currently quite good and exceeds most standards, minimum standards would ensure this to always be the case and not subject to a single college leadership's priority. In the survey of employees (appendix D) respondents are concerned that the budget process is not transparent and that there is a lack of funds for student-centered programs and initiatives.

As mentioned previously, administrative and support staffing at the District is low compared to the level of service expectation at the colleges (see Appendix C). Further, respondents to the employee survey (see Appendix D) express concerns at all levels regarding adequacy of staffing and adequate management.

New funding is becoming available to the District through the new Student-Centered Funding formula.

The survey of employees (see Appendix D) also revealed:
- Some respondents are concerned the budget process is not transparent.
- Others are concerned that there is a lack of funds for student-centered programs and initiatives.

Recommendations
- The Colleges and the District office should consider added management to more effectively oversee the operations of the District and colleges.

- The District and Colleges should revisit the budget allocation model and include greater specificity in where the funds are allocated to achieve greater consistency at the colleges.

Human Resources

Analysis
VCCCD currently utilizes a centralized approach to the recruitment, hiring, evaluation, and separation of employees. While this is quite common in multi-college community colleges, VCCCD is one of a small group of California Community College Districts utilizing the Merit System for classified employees.

There is a common perception among all constituent groups that the Human Resource (HR) functions are inadequate in meeting the needs of the colleges and District. Many believe the processes currently in use are burdensome, archaic, inefficient and untimely.

Because the requirements of California's community colleges human resource functions are quite prescriptive, there are many opportunities to use best practices which are in place in other multi-college districts. The "uniqueness" aspect for any district certainly exists, but meeting State and legal requirements is more of a compliance function.

Findings
The Human Resource functions of the District are perceived by virtually all constituents as inadequate. There is considerable frustration regarding all aspects of the functions, most notably the HR processes in use.

There is a considerable lack of understanding of the Merit System and what the implications are for administering the human resources functions for classified employees.

The survey of employees (see Appendix D) also found that:
- There is a lack of efficiency of the hiring process.
- Many noted that they are not valued or compensated fairly compared to other districts, as well as attracting, hiring, and retaining qualified personnel.
- Some respondents noted concern for the lack of diversity in hiring panels and in the applicant pools.
- Professional development and career advancement opportunities should be available to all staff.
- Others would like more human resources presence on campuses.
- Many stated there are too many managers. However, they also identified gaps, such as leadership for institutional effectiveness and coordination of the work under the many new statewide initiatives.
- Some feel that leadership needs skills to innovatively lead the district/colleges and be able to think outside the box for solutions.
- Many observed the need for additional faculty and student services staff to guide and support the work.
- Departmental reviews of existing staffing and resources are needed to ensure that the distribution of duties is appropriately assigned and that each unit is set up to successfully serve students.

The Human Resources unit of the District has attempted to respond to college concerns by placing staff at each college a day or two each week. However, the colleges report various levels of success with this process and express concerns that the level of authority of the individuals sent to the colleges is not adequate to truly impact HR decision making. College staff further complain that the human resources leadership is rigid and unwilling to work with the colleges to support their HR needs. HR in turn expresses concerns that the colleges are unwilling to "follow the rules" and do not understand the compliance-based nature of personnel law in California.

The position of Vice Chancellor of Human Resources currently reports to the Chancellor. In the current organizational structure of the District, the Chancellor has an extremely high number of direct reports and is too often cast in the role of arbiter of personnel issues. Considering the work that needs to be done to improve the practices and image of human resources in the District, the Chancellor will need additional management assistance to complete the task.

Recommendations
- An in-depth review of the processes currently utilized by Human Resources should be conducted. This review should include virtually all constituents and functions to develop streamlined processes to expedite hiring, enhance the evaluation process, better utilize integrated technologies, and training on these technologies, and better facilitate the evaluation, discipline, improvement plan, and separation processes.

- The position of Vice Chancellor of Human Resources should be transitioned to Associate Vice Chancellor of Human Resources reporting to the new Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness.

DAC Program Review

Analysis
Currently the colleges undergo a reoccurring program review of their programs and services to meet Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) accreditation requirements. More importantly, program review is used to identify areas and methods to provide continuous improvement in the unit's mission. Program review has proven to be an invaluable tool in this improvement process.

Although it is recognized that it is the college that is being accredited and not the District, in recent years program review has been utilized by many multi-college district offices to help identify strengths, deficiencies, staffing needs, and areas requiring improvement to assist the colleges in meeting their mission of serving the colleges and their students.

Findings
Currently there is no Program Review being undertaken by the District Office or the various services it provides to the colleges. Interviewees remarked multiple times that DAC does not engage in program review. Of the 33 DAC survey respondents who offered a response to the question, 88% indicated that they do not engage in program review in their department on a regular basis. Notably, on the other hand, the same approximate percentages—84% to 92%--of

college respondents *agreed* that they *do* engage in program review in their department. This lack of self-assessment results in not only a lack of accountability for valuable District office functions, but the perception at the colleges that they must be held accountable but that the District office does not need the same level of accountability.

Recommendation
- The District Office and each districtwide service should conduct a recurring Program Review within their unit/department to assess effectiveness and efficiency, and to improve services to the colleges.

Comparative Position Analysis

Analysis
As part of the Organizational Structure Review CBT conducted a comparative analysis of peer organizations agreed to by the District (see Appendix C). Three similar colleges were identified for comparison with each of the VCCCD colleges and four multi-college districts were identified.

For Moorpark the following colleges were selected for the peer group:
- Cypress College
- Foothill College
- Grossmont College

For Oxnard College the comparative colleges included:
- Clovis College
- Cuyamaca College
- Mission College

For Ventura College the agreed upon peer group included:
- Golden West College
- Irvine Valley College
- San Diego Miramar College

For the entire VCCCD four California multi-college districts were compared:
- Contra Costa CCD
- Foothill/DeAnza CCD
- Kern CCD
- South Orange County CCD

CBT utilized the California Community College's Office Data Mart report of staffing and the Annual 320 FTES reports for consistent and unbiased data. Appendix A outlines the results of the analysis which breaks apart staffing based on certificated, classified and administrative personnel. The analysis further breaks down the staffing on a Full Time Equivalent Student basis (per 1,000 students) to equalize the staffing comparison on a per student basis. CBT

conducted the review to include the past five years of data to minimize the effect of any "outlier" years.

Findings
The number of faculty per 1,000 FTES was generally lower than each peer group average. This reflects that, although not achieving the budget goal of 525WSCH/FTES, the average class size and "productivity" in the class room was better than their peer college average.

While not necessarily the lowest in each peer group comparison in each individual year, the number of classified employees utilized in VCCCD is generally less per 1,000 FTES than the peer group average.

One of the several questions guiding this review process included assessing how, "the number of administrators compared with similar sized multi-college districts". In nearly all comparison groups and comparison years, VCCCD had the lowest number of Managers/Administrators per 1,000 students.

VCCCD is fairly efficient in staffing compared to sister colleges and districts.

It should be noted that the comparison spreadsheets show disparities for colleges within the District which helps to underscore the need for greater staffing controls to achieve more equity for students.

Recommendation
- There are discrepancies within the District regarding staffing that may not be entirely desirable or intentional. Therefore, the District should review the current, and ultimately revised, organizational structure with these comparisons in mind.

- The District should make efforts to educate its constituents and correct the misperception that it has too many overall managers and is "top heavy".

Position Control

Analysis
Position Control is recognized as a best practice in complex organizations, including California's community colleges, to provide financial accountability in the hiring process.   With approximately 86% of VCCCD's costs associated with personnel and therefore budget flexibility, it is essential that all positions hired be appropriately planned, approved and budgeted. Failure to provide adequate hiring controls can quickly result in over expenditures, unplanned contractual obligations and financial degradation. The Chancellor's Office has underscored the importance of this management tool by including it in its Sound Fiscal Management Checklist required report (see Appendix F).

Position Control is a system that limits the hiring of personnel to Board authorized positions and integrates the personnel allocations budget with the financial system (primarily budget and

payroll). In summary, a comprehensive position control system tracks authorized positions and assists in monitoring personnel levels and staffing budgets in the organization.

Findings
Currently, VCCCD does not utilize a position control system. While it allocates full-time faculty positions on a formula (WSCH/FTES of 525), it does not control part-time faculty hires or classified hires on a similar basis. As a result, each college can hire the number of positions it wants largely upon their own discretion. While HR helps monitor the load for part-timers, the lack of controls in this area can result in cost over-runs, lower class size than desired and potentially contractual rights for these part-timers. In fact, the District has seen a reduction in the past 3 years of its 75/25 ratio (the statewide goal of achieving faculty staffing of 75% full-time faculty to 25% part-time faculty) from 59.8% full-timers to 58.3%. Since the District exceeds its Full-time Faculty Obligation Number (FON), this is another indicator that "productivity" is down and that part-time faculty hires need to be better monitored and included in a position control system. The lack of an overall comprehensive system can also result in potentially significant disparities (see Appendix C) between staffing (faculty and classified) at the different colleges, which is a simple case of equity for students attending the various colleges.

A true Position Control system monitors the status of all positions which are typically allocated based upon selected criteria (FTES, sq. ft., etc.).   Such a system also assists in monitoring salary savings achieved through any "vacancy factor" (the time it takes to fill a position, vacated or newly established, once it is approved and budgeted).

Some may view Position Control as a loss of overall control or flexibility. In fact, it is not. The choice of what classes, courses, positions, etc. still remains with the experts (faculty chairs, deans, vice presidents, presidents, etc.), but the ability to overspend is controlled as is any other expenditure. The same can be said for non-faculty positions. The allocation of the overall approved positions remains a college decision determined by its own unique prioritization process.

The monitoring of Position Control should be housed in the fiscal side of the "house". These are the individuals in the District who are designated and trained in the accounting function of determining the status of the allocation (in this case positions) spending.

Recommendation
- The District should implement a comprehensive and integrated Position Control system, in compliance with State recommendations, administered by the District Business Office, in coordination with Human Resources.

District-level Administrative Operations

Analysis

Multi-college districts in California require significant oversight to ensure effective service to students and the community. They are typically complex organizations serving significant numbers of students with a large number of employees and a significant budget of public funds. These public organizations are overseen by an elected Board of Trustees who employs a Chancellor as the CEO of the organization. Multi-college districts in California vary from two colleges to as many as nine, but most multi-college districts in the state have three or four colleges generally serving a significant geographical region. The role of Chancellor of these systems is a complex and varied one. Typically, the Chancellor's duties include the oversight of the entire organization at the direction of the elected trustees. But the job increasingly also includes working with multiple constituent groups, the community, other locally elected and appointed officials, the California Community College Chancellor's Office and the State Legislature. Additionally, chancellors are tasked to relate to the federal policy makers, raise private funds, and generally present the public face of the district. Increasingly, large multi-college districts are led by chancellors who must spend a significant portion of their time outside the district and must therefore depend on their vice chancellors and college presidents to manage the day-to-day operations of the district and delivery of instruction and support to students.

Findings

The VCCCD organizational structure currently includes two Vice Chancellors (VC-Human Resources and VC-Business) to assist the Chancellor in administering the District. In addition to these two positions, the Chancellor currently has 11 other individuals reporting directly to him. As a result, the Chancellor is not only serving as the Chief Executive Officer, but apparently as the Chief Operating Officer. Therefore, a considerable amount of valuable time for the Chancellor is spent administering the day-to-day activities and coordination functions in the District. This structure of 13 direct reports violates any realistic quality span of control standards for a position of this importance.

In order to better utilize the Chancellor in his role as Chief Executive Officer (CEO), many of the routine duties in administering the organization are better delegated to a position of Executive Vice Chancellor of Administration. This position would oversee most non-academic activities and serve in the temporary capacity of the CEO in his absence.

By freeing up the Chancellor from these day-to-day, more routine, duties he will have time to truly be the leader of the District. As such, more time interfacing with the Board, community, local and State officials will be available, and he will be able to look beyond the daily challenges of the District to work with the Board to chart a course for the future.

Further, the employee interviews and the results of the employee survey (see Appendixes B & D) clearly show a lack of understanding related to the division of labor and responsibilities between the colleges and the District office. This lack of understanding has led to frustrations and distrust at the colleges with the District office and at the District office with the colleges. This culture of distrust has also increased the bifurcation within the District leading to far too many silos and far too little working together. Although feedback indicates the Chancellor is well-received

throughout the District, the culture suggests a we/they attitude between the colleges and the District.

One purpose of this review was to not only determine how the number of administrators compared to similar-sized multi-college districts, but also to assess appropriate placement of administrators and managers across the organization, within departments. Consequently, some of the review's analyses and recommendations relate to this topic.

Recommendation
- The current position of Vice Chancellor-Business should be transitioned to Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) with oversight responsibility for most non-academic functions. The EVC should act as the Chief Operating Officer in the place of the Chancellor during any extended absence.

- The District should review and document all District office functions so that everyone understands the purpose and role of the District. As part of this review the District should revisit and revise, as needed, their map of responsibilities between the colleges and the District required by the community college accrediting body (ACCJC).

Institutional Effectiveness

Analysis
Although teaching and learning delivery functions are traditionally controlled, as they should be in a multi-college district, at the individual colleges under the direction of the college presidents, there is an increasing need for the coordination of both academic and student services at the District level. District operations are overseen by an elected Board of Trustees who have a significant role in the ultimate approval of curriculum and delivery of instruction and student services. Although, the community college accrediting commission (ACCJC) accredits colleges and not districts, they do review districts and the operation of the District and the performance of a board can impact the individual college accreditation.

Findings
The current structure of the VCCCD does not provide for adequate district-level coordination and/or leadership in a number of critical areas. These areas include instruction and curriculum, student services, planning research, workforce development, grants, enrollment management, distance education and district-level advancement. Further, the current position of Vice Chancellor of Human Resources puts the Chancellor in the position of being the only level of review before personnel disputes reach the elected board.

Many survey respondents were very insightful in their responses and comments regarding the implementation of new directions, new state-wide initiatives and requirements such as AB 705 and Guided Pathways, and addressing rapidly changing higher education demands. In that regard, there were multiple suggestions for district-wide coordination and leadership, as well as for opportunities for sharing and partnership with other colleges in the District. A district leader

for such changes and new directions is critical to efficiently and effectively manage change and maintain high quality.

From employee interviews and the employee survey (see Appendixes B & D) it is clear that the organizational structure of the DAC is confusing to many in the organization. In addition to expressions of concern and a lack of understanding on the part of the colleges related to the District office, people within the District office express concerns over the structure as well. The previous position of Vice Chancellor of Instruction was not well understood and therefore somewhat ineffective but the functions of that administrative position, nonetheless, are currently without leadership. Further, District and college faculty and staff expressed concern in interviews that there is no overall coordination of planning efforts as well as for institutional research and related data issues—a major area of review for this report. The District and colleges are embarking on updating their strategic goals and educational master plans and critically need coordination for these processes at this time.

Recommendation

- A Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness (replacing the current position of Vice Chancellor of Instruction) position should be created to provide overall district-wide coordination and leadership of institutional effectiveness, academic affairs, student services, workforce development, grants, distance education, planning, human resources and district-level advancement.

- Data analysis, research and planning should be included as part of the Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness unit for better coordination with planning and districtwide data support and a Director of Research and Planning position should be added at the District Office.

Benefits Coordination

Analysis
Currently the Benefits Analyst position, largely responsible for implementing established employee benefits and including workers' compensation benefits, reports through the Human Resources hierarchy. The position does not determine levels of benefit, but rather facilitates the implementation of these negotiated benefits to eligible employees.

Findings
CBT believes the implementation and administration of benefits is largely a business function. Employee benefits represent the second largest cost to the District, second only to salary costs. Much like payroll, the function is responsible to make sure the right benefit is provided to the eligible employee and any cost sharing is appropriately established. By aligning with Business, the position will also provide input into any appropriate cost efficiency/reduction measures.

While Human Resources should continue to work with the employee groups in determining negotiated benefit levels, the acquisition, accountability and distribution of those benefits is

primarily a business function. Business personnel are best trained on efficient purchasing techniques and business contracts, and should be responsible for this aspect as well.

Workers' Compensation benefits are determined primarily by law and should be included in this realignment. The position should also be responsible annually for summarizing Workers' Compensation losses, by both the number of incidents as well as the cost. A comprehensive and effective Workers' Compensation program monitoring injuries, lost work time and minimal cost is only effective if it is closely observed and tracked.

Recommendation
- The Benefits Coordinator position should be realigned with Business and report to the Director of Fiscal Services.

Communications, Marketing, Board and Governmental Relations

Analysis
Over a number of years, the current position of Administrative Officer to the Chancellor and Board has evolved significantly to now include support of the Board and Chancellor as well as communications and marketing for the District. The colleges do not currently have public information officers and the District does little in the area of governmental relations. In interviews with the Board, Chancellor and other District leaders it was clear that all these functions are important and need support. Assuming the hiring of a new Vice Chancellor for Institutional Effectiveness and the elevation of the current Finance Vice Chancellor to an Executive Vice Chancellor (Chief Operating Officer) the Chancellor will have more time to work with the Board and in the local and state community. This should allow for more focus on communications, marketing and government relations which are increasingly critical to multi-college districts during a period of softening enrollments and increasingly complex state funding.

In a previous budget cut, the colleges discontinued the public information offices. Community colleges have a responsibility to communicate their offerings to the public and to make the public aware of their services.

Findings
In the employee interviews (see Appendix C), several people expressed their belief that marketing and communications had improved recently. There were also opinions expressed related to concerns over enrollment. The employee survey (see Appendix D) also included feedback in this area and in the following areas:
- Creating opportunities for enrollment growth and linkages to the community, businesses and educational partners is important.
- Personnel need to be informed when changes are made to human resources and business practices, policies and procedures.
- There are implications that the lack of communication leads to lack of transparencies that feeds into a disrespectful and distrustful environment.

- Some expressed not getting a response to their inquiries in a timely manner.
- Respondents also find communication locally at the colleges and their department lacking and, sometimes, disrespectful of each other.
- Decisions are perceived to be made some times without input from the colleges and/or individuals with expertise or from those who work in the area of concern.
- Issues about budget allocation, hiring processes, and other business services need to be regularly communicated to all constituents, for transparency and to acknowledge the roles of everyone as part of the District.

The colleges have all experienced challenges related to enrollment and enrollment management. Public awareness of college offerings and activities is critical to successful enrollment management, and without college-level communication and public relations leadership this is difficult. One college does have leadership support for marketing, but this is an area of emphasis that should be restored at all colleges. Much more robust districtwide and college-level internal communications, public relations and marketing strategies should be prioritized and undertaken.

Recommendations
- The current position of Administrative Officer to the Chancellor and Board should be revised to Director of Communications, Marketing and Government Relations. The position should function as the public interface for the Board and Chancellor. The role should coordinate branding and marketing for the District as a whole, coordinate governmental relations and work directly with the colleges in support of communications and enrollment management.

- The communications and marketing function (reporting to the college presidents) should be reestablished at each college in order to support the branding and messaging to the public which is critical to enrollment management and public communication. The added college communications/marketing staff should work with the District marketing and communications staff to brand and market each college and the District as a whole.

Facilities/Maintenance/Operations

Analysis
Facilities maintenance and operation are increasingly important in a period of enrollment volatility and limited resources. The quality, amount and appropriateness of student learning facilities and support services is a critical part of the student experience and impacts student success. Colleges like those in the VCCCD have massive physical plants that require careful planning, construction and maintenance. The creation and management of those facilities is made more difficult by increasingly complex state regulations including the capacity and load factors that underpin new construction. Colleges must be increasingly sophisticated in the way they justify, classify and utilize facilities, and in multi-college districts that process is even more difficult.

Findings
Currently the District utilizes a much-decentralized approach to the development, maintenance and operation of its facilities. This results in near full autonomy for each campus in how it oversees its facility operations. As a result, there are inconsistencies in design, programmatic uses, costs, staffing and the overall appearance and maintenance of its largest material assets-its capital program.

Some of these inconsistencies are of lesser concern and others of greater concern. For instance, the overall appearance including buildings and grounds appearance of the three campuses is quite good and should be commended. Other differences, however, are cause for considerable concern, including the size, design and development of capital projects.

The size, type, capacity and overall condition of District facilities have become closely monitored by the State Chancellor's Office as funding for State Capital Outlay funds and Scheduled Maintenance and Repair funds have become limited and, in many cases, competitive. As a result, it is imperative districts pay special attention to their Cap/Load ratios. Cap/Load ratios are a determination of a college/district's student capacity for the amount of square footage dedicated to differing programmatic areas including lecture space, laboratory space, library space, office space, and AV/TV space. These are measured based upon established state utilization standards. Ultimately a Cap/Load ratio of 100% indicates the campus has the optimal facility space dedicated to the specific programmatic area and the number of students it serves. A ratio of 80% would indicate that there is only 80% of the space needed to educate the number of students attending the campus, and conversely a ratio of 200% would indicate that the campus has twice the amount of space needed to educate its students. In essence, a ratio higher than 100% indicates the campus is overbuilt in that particular area.

It has been determined by CBT that there is a considerable lack of understanding of Cap/Load ratios by many individuals/positions largely responsible for determination of the space design as well as utilization of the space. As a result, according to records obtained from the District, all campuses have a lecture space Cap/Load of well over 100%, and some other program areas such as lab space fall below 100%. Further, program administrators admit a lack of understanding of the inter-relationship of scheduling on the Cap/Load ratio. For example, offering few afternoon or night programs can significantly harm a college's ratio since the state expects the facilities to be used all day, not just at limited times or days. VCCCD's reduced afternoon, night and Friday schedules are adversely impacting its ratios. In discussing this matter with senior administrators, it was noted that a third-party firm has been engaged to look at this issue.

In addition to the seeming lack of full understanding by many of those responsible for the number, size, design and scheduling of the facilities other concerns exist with the level of decentralization of the facilities functions. Currently, there is no coordination among colleges of utilizing like building systems such as Energy Management Systems, Fire Suppression Systems, telecom, lighting, heating/ventilation/air-conditioning, etc. This virtually prohibits any purchasing leverage, comprehensive training and expertise sharing, and is undoubtedly an inefficient cost approach. The lack of any design standards also largely prohibits any quantity purchasing discounts and can become unwieldly and potentially dangerous. For example, a well-

coordinated door locking system can not only reduce acquisition and maintenance costs but can help expedite an emergency response.

Recommendations

- Custodial and grounds services should remain reporting to the college vice presidents of administration.

- The Maintenance Departments should migrate to report through a new Associate Vice Chancellor-Facilities (AVC-F) position at the District Office, reporting to the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) position. While remaining on the campus, each maintenance department should report to the new AVC-F position and develop common standards and work order systems with appropriate tracking.

- The AVC-F should coordinate the building program with the campus and EVC, and should work closely with the college Vice Presidents of Administration to ensure the campus needs are being met.

- Standard and common building systems should be adopted and a migration to these systems should evolve over time.

Risk Management

Analysis
Currently the purchasing and oversight of risk management functions (absent Workers' Compensation) reports through General Services. This structure is appropriate, given the size of the District, however the authority and attention to this function should be elevated. Issues concerning potential liability, property, or casualty can be quite expensive and disruptive. Therefore, a more centralized approach is necessary.

Findings
Currently there appears to be little coordination of the risk management functions of the District. While the colleges and District do participate in an annual review by the third-party insurance Joint Powers Authority (JPA), a more institutionalized approach is needed. Ongoing reviews, inspections and reports will help identify potential issues before they occur and make for a safer environment with less loss exposure and, therefore, lower costs.

Recommendation
- Though no organizational recommendations are necessary, it must be understood that General Services, reporting to the EVC, needs to be the recognized leader in this function. All units (colleges, District Office, etc.) must defer to necessary directives regarding these matters.

Grants and Special Projects

<u>Analysis</u>
California community colleges are increasingly dependent on a series of state-level grants tied to the new state funding formula. The acquisition and operations of not only these grants but other non-State grant money has caused grant making and oversight in California community colleges to be more important than ever. Increased oversight and coordination are critical for colleges to capture all available dollars in the new funding formula and in multi-college districts coordination is critical.

<u>Findings</u>
Currently the District's grants programs are mostly administered at the colleges. The aggregated total of all restricted funds is nearly $50 million, though the majority of these grants are non-competitive, received through the State Chancellor's Office. Better coordination will avoid competing internally and maximize the District's return on investment of applying for these grants. There are also no District standards as far as indirect cost rate recovery, meaning the grants are subsidized by the college/district if no indirect cost rate is included in the grant application. It is estimated by the Business Office that approximately $10 million is obtained annually for competitive grants, and some of those grants may allow for an indirect cost recovery.

Although the District Office helps administer the grants through basic business functions of Human Resources, Payroll, Purchasing, Auditing, and other services, there is no indirect cost recovery by DAC even if an indirect rate is included in the grant application and funding. It is commonly recognized that there are costs in administering grant programs and activities which is why some grants allow for an indirect cost rate.

One of the most significant issues with grants relates to compliance and meeting all of the required specifications and limitations of the grant. If these often-stringent requirements are not met, the college/district runs the risk of not only losing the grant, but not being reimbursed for any costs incurred. Currently, without an Internal Auditor, or any formal grants compliance oversight by the DAC, Business Services is attempting to provide some oversight. This lack of a coordinated program for acquiring and monitoring grants likely puts the colleges/district at risk for non-compliance, and indirectly takes from non-grant programs of the college/district by not recovering all the incurred costs of administering the grants.

The survey of employees (see Appendix D) reveals that respondents believe that the grants area needs to be reviewed to ensure the procurement, administration of funds and compliance are adequately done. The current organizational structure does not lend itself to adequate oversight and coordination.

<u>Recommendation</u>

- To facilitate increased coordination and oversight of grants, a Director of Grants and Special Projects, reporting to the Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness, should be established. Working with the colleges, this individual will assist in identifying new

grant opportunities, assist the colleges in obtaining grants, and work with the Internal Auditor to ensure compliance issues are met.

Internal Auditor

Analysis
Currently, the Internal Auditor position has been included in various iterations of Organizational Charts but has never actually been implemented. The Internal Audit function of a District is one of the most important, but often overlooked, functions.

Internal controls, according to FCMAT (Fiscal Crisis and Management Team - a State supported advisory and oversight unit for K-14 education), are "a set of rules, policies, procedures that an organization implements to provide reasonable assurance that its financial reports are reliable, its operations are effective and efficient, and its activities comply with applicable laws and regulations." FCMAT further has identified several common internal control issues which may be deficient including: segregation of duties (when this is lacking there is an increased risk of malfeasance and other mismanagement), access to assets (it is imperative that safeguards exist for physical objects , restricted/confidential information, and critical forms), knowledge of policies (administrators, managers, and employees must stay abreast of District policies and understand their responsibilities), fiscal conduct (minimizing opportunities for theft, fraud, embezzlement, fiscal misconduct and what to do if/when identified), and control overrides (how to facilitate necessary exceptions to established policies and procedures).

Findings
Because of the much-decentralized approach currently utilized by VCCCD and lack of consistent practices and procedures, CBT believes much greater attention needs to be given to the issue of internal controls.

Recommendation
- The position of Internal Auditor should be added and filled and given adequate authority to establish appropriate internal controls and enforce these controls. The position should report to the Executive Vice Chancellor position.

Police/Safety

Analysis
VCCCD currently has a Police department consisting of approximately 16 sworn officers and a Chief of Police operating and certified under the Police Officers Standard and Training (POST) program. Additionally, the department utilizes cadets to assist the department manage parking services and other activities on the campuses.

In addition, in order to assist in maintaining a safe environment the departments use a number of added tools including a fairly extensive (if not a bit antiquated in some places) camera system.

In fact, this camera system is quite impressive in its ability to cover the significant number of buildings and acreage making up the campuses.

There is a widespread perception that there are an inadequate number of officers for the size of the college campuses, the open hours of operation and special events. This perception is shared by most employees interviewed, respondents to the survey, and most importantly to student group leaders.

It should be noted that the use of cameras, and other tools (vehicles, cadets, etc.) can help augment safety coverage but cannot adequately meet the responsibilities of sworn officers. It is commonly recognized in law enforcement that the single biggest deterrent to safety offenses and crime is the visibility and presence of Police or Safety officers. It should also be noted that a comprehensive safety program does not just mean the presence of sworn officers. As an example: VCCCD custodians and maintenance workers do not currently wear any uniform or identifying apparel. Therefore, students or employees seeking assistance are somewhat at a loss unless they know an employee or see a uniformed officer or cadet. The use of official uniforms by custodians, grounds workers and maintenance personnel can act as another source of safety for those in need of assistance.

Findings
While the District has recognized campus safety as an important issue for several years, there appears to be a lack of optimal coordination of this critical issue. For example, there are differing systems for employee identification on the campuses (Oxnard uses a lanyard/card system while the other campuses have none), there is not a common door locking or keying system in place throughout the District, CBT found uneven availability of emergency procedures in classrooms and offices, some campuses supply tactical vests for officers while others do not, and key District personnel are unaware if General Orders exist which identify operational procedures for officers.

Recommendation*
- The organization of the Police unit should remain centralized and report to the EVC. The Chief of Police should be primarily responsible for developing a comprehensive Emergency Preparedness Plan and oversight of recommendation implementation.

*It should be noted that CBT is not a recognized expert in Emergency Preparedness and the above recommendation is general in nature and not all encompassing for a comprehensive Emergency Plan. VCCCD may want to seek a third-party expert in Emergency Preparedness to review Police procedures and assist in the development of a comprehensive plan.

Legal Services

Analysis
The need to access quality legal services and advice is essential to managing the myriad of issues facing the management of today's community colleges. While some districts choose to employ a General Counsel to provide "general" legal services and then manage the retention of specialized

outside legal service, VCCCD has elected to out-source all legal services. In determining which approach to use, consideration of the quality and cost of services should be at the forefront.

Findings

It is not for CBT to determine the quality of services it has been receiving, but it should be noted that some interviewed desired greater access to legal services be provided. One issue relating to the access of legal service should be recognized; regardless of the determination of out-sourcing or providing in-house counsel it is essential that protocols be established of who can access these services and for what purposes. Without these guidelines and protocols anyone within the organization may believe they can access these services on any issue.

Lastly, in addition to desiring greater access to legal services, one other concern consistently surfaced. Campus personnel expressed great concern regarding compliance with Title IX and ADA issues. Regardless of legal approach, this issue requires attention.

The average legal costs incurred by the District for the past three years is approximately $233,000/year. This seems to be a reasonable amount for a district of this size.

Recommendations

- Attention should be paid soon to the Title IX and ADA compliance issues. Although many in the organization believe an in-house counsel is warranted, based on a review of legal costs, there does not appear to be an organizational change warranted and out-sourcing seems to make sense.
- Specific guidelines and protocols for accessing legal services should be developed and shared with key leadership positions.

Information Technology

Analysis

Modern Information Technology (IT) hardware and software for both instruction and administration in a multi-college district provides a tremendous opportunity for improved services to students and the administration of the organization. Furthermore, districts that use different software for similar activities within a multi-college district risk differing level of support and services for students within the same organization.

Students attending colleges today expect a level of technology sophistication that they experience in the rest of their daily lives. Everything from paying for parking with an ATM card to automated transcripts are expectations that most higher education institutions are able to fill and have become the norm in most colleges.

Findings

The current IT structure seems to be working well, and in many ways can serve as a model of centralization vs decentralization for other District services. However, the management of the centralized networking and system security needs additional support. The current practice of

implementing and maintaining multiple systems and software for single purpose/initiative across the colleges will exhaust staffing and financing resources.

While the information technology functions of the District received many favorable comments and overwhelming support during this review process, there is a general feeling that the function is understaffed. It was also determined that IT is required to support several different programs designed to accomplish the same outcome. Determination of the best software and program to use for a given task, and utilization of a common system district-wide, may allow for greater efficiency in IT support personnel and therefore lessen the need for additional IT personnel.

Recommendations
- Technology should be used to simplify business practices by coordinating software throughout the District and reducing redundancy and time-consuming activities like getting signatures and forms from one campus to another.

- Common IT systems should be adopted district-wide for instruction, support services and business services functions.

College and District Advancement

Analysis
Community colleges are increasingly involved in institutional advancement including fund raising. These activities are relatively new to American community colleges. The colleges in the Ventura District each have foundations set up to support the college and the students. These foundations have varying levels of success but all are fully and effectively functioning.

Findings
In discussions with the college foundation leaders and the Chancellor it is clear that there are additional opportunities for support of the District as a whole that could be realized with the addition of a VCCCD Foundation. Further, a district-level advancement unit could provide tremendous support to the college foundations in assuming back office support of information technology related to donor recognition, management and cultivation. This addition should in no way minimize the importance and identity of the college foundations. Most donors and supporters identify with a college and not with the District. However, there are opportunities in a region such as the VCCCD to cultivate corporations and individuals who wish to support all of the colleges rather than just one.

Recommendation
- A foundation should be created at the District level in support of the college foundations and to identify and cultivate potential districtwide donors. This unit should also ultimately assume the information technology support of the college foundations (back office activities) to better coordinate donor solicitation, recognition and cultivation throughout the District.

Workforce Development

<u>Analysis</u>
Workforce development in California community colleges is an area of increasing importance and is benefiting from increased state funding. Multi-college districts that coordinate those offerings more effectively serve student and employer needs. Over-centralization as well as a lack of districtwide coordination can result in ineffective programs and accreditation challenges.

<u>Findings</u>
Although an attempt has recently been made to better coordinate the workforce development activities of the District and colleges it has been, thus-far, unsuccessful. The colleges have a high level of frustration and mistrust in this area and question some programs and courses being "offered" from the District office. The current arrangement for district-level coordination seems to lack clarity, at least from the colleges' perspectives, and there is a lack of commitment to work together in support of students.

<u>Recommendation</u>
- The workforce development District administrative lead function needs to be re-framed to include the coordination of the implementation and funding of workforce development programs across the colleges, with a focus on new funding streams and programs. This area should report to the Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness.

Appendix A

Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT)
Meeting Schedule
Ventura County Community College District and Colleges
Monday and Tuesday, November 19 – 20, 2018

DATE/TIME	CONSULTANT Brice Harris	CONSULTANT Nga Pham	CONSULTANT James Walton	NOTES
District Administrative Center **761 East Daily Drive, Suite 200** **Camarillo, CA** **(805) 652-5500**				
Monday 11/19	Consultants Meet in Santa Rosa Room			
9:00 – 9:45 am	Chancellor Greg Gillespie Chancellor's Office			
10:00 – 10:45 am	Vice Chancellor David El Fattal Santa Rosa Room			
11:00 – 11:45 am	Academic Senate Presidents Lydia Morales, Nenagh Brown, Diane Eberhardy Santa Rosa	Classified Senate Presidents Amparo Medina Gilbert Downs Sebastian Szczebiot Anacapa Room	AFT President Doug Thiel San Clemente	
11:45 am – 12:30 pm	Lunch – Santa Rosa Room			
12:30 – 1:15 pm	Trustee Dianne McKay Chancellor Gillespie Santa Rosa Room	Assoc. Vice Chan. IT Dan Watkins Anacapa Room	Director EWD Alexandria Wright San Clemente	
1:30 – 2:15 pm	Trustee Bernardo Perez Chancellor Gillespie Santa Rosa Room	Director General Svcs Terry Cobos Anacapa Room	Dir Employee Relations Laura Barroso San Clemente	
2:30 – 3:15 pm	OPEN Chancellor Gillespie Santa Rosa Room	Director Fiscal Svcs Emily Day Anacapa Room	Admin Offcr Chan/Brd Patti Blair San Clemente	
3:30 – 4:15 pm	Trustee Arturo Hernandez Chancellor Gillespie Santa Rosa Room	Police Chief Joel Justice Anacapa Room	SEIU Chief Steward Maria Urenda San Clemente	
4:30 – 5:15 pm	Trustee Stephen Blum Chancellor Gillespie Santa Rosa Room	Budget Director Jennifer Clark Anacapa Room	Director Empl. Svcs Michael Arnoldus San Clemente	

Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT)
Meeting Schedule
Ventura County Community College District and Colleges
Monday and Tuesday, November 19 – 20, 2018

DATE/TIME	CONSULTANT James Walton	CONSULTANT Nga Pham	CONSULTANT Brice Harris	NOTES
Tuesday 11/20	**MOORPARK COLLEGE** **7075 Campus Road Moorpark, CA** **Administration Building President's Conference Room**	**OXNARD COLLEGE** **4000 S. Rose Avenue Oxnard, CA** **Administration Building OC Business Services Conference Room**	**VENTURA COLLEGE** **4667 Telegraph Road Ventura, CA** **Administration Building President's Conference Room**	
8:30 – 9:15 am	President Luis P. Sanchez	President Cynthia Azari	VP Student Affairs Damien Peña	
9:30 – 10:15 am	VP Business Services Silvia Barajas	VP Academic Affairs Rojelio Vasquez	VP Academic Affairs Kim Hoffmans	
10:30 – 11:15 am	Director Int Effectiveness Oleg Bespalov	VP Student Developmt Oscar Cobian	Dean Int Effectiveness Phil Briggs	
11:15 am – 12:00 pm	Lunch			
12:00 – 12:45 pm	VP Academic Affairs Julius Sokenu	Dean Int Effectiveness Cynthia Herrera	Director Foundation Anne King	
1:00 – 1:45 pm	Director Inst Adv, Comm Relations & Marketing James Schuelke	Dean Stdt Success Leah Alarcon OC	Spvr Business Services Sue Royer	
2:00 – 2:45 pm	VP Student Support Amanuel Gebru	Director IT Michael Alexander	Trustee Larry Kennedy Chancellor Gillespie	
2:45 pm	Consultants depart campuses			

Collaborative Brain Trust Visit*
Mr. Brice Harris
Wednesday, December 5, 2018

Time	*Meet With*
9:00- 9:45 a.m.	Chancellor Gillespie
9:45- 10:30 a.m.	Joel Justice – Chief of Police
10:30- 11:30 a.m.	Patti Blair – Administrative Officer
11:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Michael Shanahan – VC Human Resources
12:30 – 1:00 p.m.	Lunch
1:00 – 2:00 p.m.	Alexandria Wright – Director Economic Workforce Development, John Cooney – Data Analyst
2:00- 3:00 p.m.	Damon Bell – President Ventura College
3:00- 4:00 p.m.	New Trustees Josh Chancer and Gabriela Torres
4:00- 4:45 p.m.	Mike Bush – Vice President Oxnard College
4:45- 5:00 p.m.	Wrap Up with Chancellor Gillespie

*All meetings will take place in the Santa Rosa conference room at the District (209)

Ventura County Community College District
Collaborative Brain Trust Visit Agenda
January 15-16, 2019

January 15, 2019			
Time	**Meeting**	**Participants**	**Location**
8:00 – 9:00	Chancellor Gillespie	All Consultants	Chancellor's Office
9:00 – 10:00	Terry Cobos, Director of General Services	Jon Sharpe	Santa Rosa Room 209
9:00 – 10:00	Alexandria Wright, Director of EWD	Julie Slark & Nga Pham	San Clemente Room 266
10:00 – 11:00	Directors of Facilities from the Colleges: John Sinutko – MC Bob Sube – OC Jay Moore - MC	Jon Sharpe	Santa Rosa Rom 209
10:00 – 11:30	Asst. Vice Chancellor IT Dan Watkins	Julie Slark & Nga Pham	San Clemente Room 266
11:30-12:30	David El Fattal Vice Chancellor, Business Services	Jon Sharpe, Brice Harris	San Clemente Room 266
12:30 – 1:00	Lunch	CBT members	Santa Rosa Room 209
1:00 – 2:00	College Vice Presidents of Business	Jon Sharpe & Brice Harris	Santa Rosa Room 209
2:00 – 3:00	Admin. Officer to Chancellor/Board – Patti Blair	Julie Slark & Nga Pham	Santa Rosa Room 209
2:00 – 3:00	Director of Fiscal Services – Emily Day	Jon Sharpe	San Clemente Room 266
3:00 – 4:00	Vice Chancellor, Human Resources – Michael Shanahan	Jon Sharpe	Santa Rosa Room
3:00-4:00	District Planning Leadership – Consultation Council Oleg Bespalov, MC Cynthia Hererra, OC Phillip Briggs, VC	Julie Slark & Nga Pham	Board Room
4:00 - 5:00	AFT President, Doug Thiel	Jon Sharpe, Julie Slark & Nga Pham	Santa Rosa Room

Meeting Schedule
at
Moorpark College
(7075 Campus Road, Moorpark CA 93021)

Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT)

Wednesday, January 16, 2019

TIME	Meeting	Participants	Location
9:00 – 10:30 am	VP of Student Support and Deans of Instruction and Student Services	Jon Sharpe	President's Conference Room
10:30 – 11:30	Luis Sanchez President	Jon Sharpe Brice Harris	A-103Conference Room
11:30 – 12:30	Lunch	CBT Team	TBD
12:30 – 1:30	Classified Senate	Jon Sharpe	President's Conference Room
12:30 pm 1:30 pm	Associated Student Board	Jon Sharpe	President's Conference Room
2:30 pm		Consultants depart campus	

Contact: Linda Resendiz, Executive Assistant to the President (805) 378-1407 located in Administration Building.

Meeting Schedule
at
Oxnard College
(4000 South Rose Avenue, Oxnard CA 93033)

Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT)

Wednesday, January 16, 2019

TIME	Meeting	Participants	Location
8:30 – 9:30 am	Student Leaders	Julie Slark	ASG Conference Room
10:00 – 11:00 am	Cynthia Azari President	Julie Slark	OC-Business Services Conference Room
11:00 am – 12:30 pm	Rojelio Vasquez (Roy), VP Academic Affairs and Student Learning Deans	Julie Slark	OC-President's Conference Room
12:30 pm 1:00 pm	Lunch	Julie Slark	President's Conference Room
1:00 – 2:30 pm	Oscar Cobian, Vice President Student Development and Student Services Deans	Julie Slark	OC-President's Conference Room
2:30 pm		Consultants depart campus	

Contact: Karla Banks, Executive Assistant to the President (805) 678-5808 located in Administration Building.

Meeting Schedule
at
Ventura College
(4667 Telegraph Road, Ventura CA 93003)

Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT)

Wednesday, January 16, 2019

TIME	Meeting	Participants	Location
9:30 – 11:00	Academic Deans	Nga Pham	Campus Center Conference Room
11:15 – 12:15	President Damon Bell	Nga Pham	President's Conference Room
12:15 – 1:00	Lunch	CBT Consultant	TBD
1:00 – 2:30	Student Services Leaders	Nga Pham	President's Conference Room
2:30 – 3:30	College Students	Nga Pham	President's Conference Room

Contact: Andrea Rambo, Executive Assistant to the President (805) 289-6102 located in Administration Building.

Ventura County Community College District
Analysis of Interviews Conducted

February 2019

An essential process of an organizational structure review for the Ventura County Community College District (VCCCD) included CBT Consulting hosting a series of one-on-one and group interviews of key individuals at the District and its colleges to elicit their perspectives and opinions about how the existing structure currently works.   A total of 93 people from across the District, comprised of members of the Board of Trustees, the administration (academic, student services and business administration), faculty leadership, classified leadership and students, participated in the interviews. The five days of interviews were conducted on November 15-16, 2018, December 5, 2018 and January 15-16, 2019 at all major locations of the District: Moorpark College, Oxnard College, Ventura College, and the District Administrative Center (DAC).

Notes collected during the five days were plentiful and provided unique perspectives about how the district currently works, as well as how it should be structured. This document highlights the collective trends/themes of opinions and concerns expressed by the interviewees as a whole. CBT consultants were pleased with the honest conversations shared with the team as they demonstrate the level of care and concern employees have for the district and colleges.

The Effectiveness of the Organizational Structure of the Units
(Colleges/DAC/VCCCD)

- College-level constituents noted that their unit organization is effective. However, many mentioned multiple concerns that the colleges are not getting enough support from the DAC.
  - Areas believed to need more support include: IT (more staffing at DAC), better Human Resources (most consistent opinion, almost unanimous).
  - Academics and student services need District Office coordination.

- District Administration Center is business-heavy and not enough academic and student services focused. Much districtwide work in these areas relies on college personnel.

- Human Resources area is not very receptive to the needs of the colleges.
  - Hiring processes take too long and are redundant, especially to hire adjunct faculty.
  - Having human resource staffing at colleges is not effective, especially in terms of lack of information provided or their authority to respond.
  - Changes in procedures are not communicated to colleges.

- Purchasing is centralized but not working well. Things take too long to purchase; there is not enough local flexibility; and the limits for local spending are too low.

- There are many buildings that need to be updated, but no processes to get the work done.

- Police was a problem identified throughout the interviews at all sites.
  - Colleges report that they do not have input into scheduling, and adequate special event and emergency coverage has been a consistent problem.
  - Additional staffing needed as multiple comments revealed concern for safety.
  - Emergency preparedness is a concern for staff and students.

- Both college-level and DAC expressed that the District needs uniform practices and procedures. Each site wants autonomy, including for setting their policies for travel reimbursements, bidding, selection of technology, etc.

- At the college-level, there was a need expressed to evaluate Counseling departments vis a vis new programs such as Guided Pathways which require extensive, broad, and different types of advisement services that currently and traditionally in place. Old models and limited staffing are apparent to students. Also, passing Math courses is a hurdle for many students, and alternative delivery approaches were suggested by students interviewed.

- The college-level interviewees conveyed that DAC staff do not know what is going on at the colleges and that they need to get out on the campuses to see for themselves. Meetings and activities are scheduled without regard for college calendars.

- The District is currently offering some not-for-credit courses, and there is concern that they have no accreditation authority to offer any courses.

- District Administrative Center is perceived by the colleges to be an impediment or a block to getting things done at the colleges.

- Communications to the colleges are inadequate and not effective, particularly in terms of changes in procedures or policies.

- There is a strong feeling among some members of the Board that DAC is under-supported and lacks adequate staff and resources.

- There are many who feel that the Chancellor is spending too much of his time in the operations of the District rather than as the district leader. He needs more support, needs to be able to delegate, and should not have so many people reporting to him.

- IT function (programming and networking at DAC and helpdesk/lab support at colleges) is very responsive and proactive to everyone's needs, and should be the standard of good practice for all units within the District.

- College-level staff do not believe there is transparency at DAC, specifically in regard to changes in policies, procedures or even forms to fill out.

- There is no shared understanding of the DAC's role in supporting the colleges, nor a shared understanding of how to properly gauge the effectiveness of any single unit.

Effectiveness of the Organizational Structure of the District as a Whole

- Ventura County CCD is a highly decentralized district with the colleges expressing that they would prefer to be even more decentralized in areas like human resources and public safety. The District Administrative Center staff and the Board expressed concerns over the level of decentralization in areas like facilities, instruction, student services and workforce development.

- Generally, interviewees reported that the District is organized effectively, but that there are some significant gaps in function leadership at the district level, specifically workforce development, academic affairs/student support services/institutional effectiveness, and marketing and communications.

- Because there is not a **district** leadership position focused on **academic affairs and student services**, it seems to some interviewees that the District's perspective is consequently dominated by fiscal and administrative issues. One example of the lack of academic affairs coordination identified by students is the lack of common course numbering across the District, sometimes creating a problem for them when taking courses at other district colleges.

- Reportedly, there is a lack of coordination and staffing throughout the District for **marketing and communication** functions, and this has resulted in lost opportunities for the colleges and District. That being said, there is a need to ensure unique branding and the significant differences of the colleges and their communities.
  - The colleges often do not know what is going on and the District Office feel left out of the loop occasionally.
  - The Chancellor's forum is appreciated and effective; however, college-level staff want to hear from the vice-chancellors and how they support campus needs.

- Human Resources was identified at the start of each interview as a major stumbling block for effectiveness, and as "dysfunctional" and "broken".
  - Specifically, new positions that have been approved through the college/district processes are often stalled in H.R., making efficiency in operations difficult at the colleges due to vacant positions and functions.
  - Good to have HR presence on campuses, but staff do not have authority to make decisions and information is not consistent between HR staff. Much of the personnel responsibility falls on the campuses.
  - Need competitive salary to recruit and maintain faculty and staff.
  - A lack of diversity among staff and faculty ranks, especially at DAC.
  - Professional development and career advancement opportunities were also mentioned as few and far between. Staff do not feel supported by immediate supervisors to attend the workshops offered.
  - HR staff's lack of concern for the academic calendar when scheduling meetings regarding human resources issues.

- **Workforce development programs and funding streams** also need coordination at the district level. College interviewees expressed a need for consistency and coordination of new program implementation and processes, and for maximizing the use of new funding.
- The District is embarking on renewing its Educational Master Plan, to be in step with the colleges' planning timelines, and there is a need for coordinated **institutional effectiveness** efforts, schedules, and continuous planning and improvement processes.
  - The District lacks an assigned leadership function for these activities.
  - District research and data analysis is needed to support planning efforts.
  - There is no program review at the District Office.

- Students would like some departments and staff to be more student-focused, that is, to arrange scheduling of services and courses on a student-need basis and to be more customer-service oriented in student services delivery.

- Some, including some classified representatives, expressed concern and lack of understanding of Merit system.
  - Need to review the costs of maintaining existing benefits and retirement for faculty. Many believe this area is taking a toll on the budget of the entire District.

- Students and staff expressed that the District lacks handling of emergency preparedness, especially in preparing how to deal with active shooters.

- College feedback on marketing was that the organization of the District as a whole was not aligned with the best interests of current constituents and prospective students. Since marketing for colleges is done at the district-level, more intimate and customized marketing from colleges could be achieved with a more integrated approach (district and college representatives).

- Most feedback was targeting single units as areas of concern, versus thinking through if the overall District is set up for success. In those terms, feedback seemed to infer that if the problem areas were corrected, then the District overall would be successful.

- College representatives look at the DAC as a support center, but often feel that the DAC does not see itself there to serve the needs of the three colleges.

Balance Between Centralization and De-centralization of the Functions of the District and Colleges

- There is a drastic difference of opinion about what should and should not be centralized or de-centralized. The colleges clearly want more de-centralization and the district office believes there is a need for more centralized coordination.

- Most say balance is appropriate, but then express concern about lack of DAC coordination, direction and consistency in selected areas. There are also those who expressed that DAC is not needed, but then express lack of DAC support.

- Many leaders are very focused on the percentage of the budget dedicated to the operation of the district office. Some complain that the district office does not deliver effective support to the colleges while simultaneously complaining about how much money is spent in support of the unit.

- Campuses overwhelming believe they need to protect their uniqueness and own identity.

- Many expressed lack of understanding of what DAC does and that the colleges know their own problems and how to solve them. College interviewees know what they need to do their jobs, but have not thought through alternative models in terms of what should be centralized and what should not in order to better do their jobs.

- College-level staff are concerned about amount of money spent at DAC and that the District is "top heavy."

- There are currently foundations at each of the colleges and no district foundation. There is some support for adding a district-level foundation to assist the colleges in back-office operations as well as to seek larger – districtwide – funding opportunities.

- Most people feel IT is currently working well and that it is appropriately split between the colleges and the district office.

- The most common type of feedback was that some areas are working well and others are not. There was a clear expectation that what works well in one area, should work just as well in other areas.

- College concerns are that the number of deans and directors has not grown in the last decade, yet the level of responsibility has increased. Also, there are too many faculty coordinating student support programs, while they should be teaching instead.

- Some areas, like marketing, had a desire to "own" more of the work versus the District running it. The issue did not refer to specific practices or people, but just to deliver a better experience.

Organizational Changes Recommended to Make Colleges/VCCCD Stronger/More Effective

- There is general agreement that a vice chancellor overseeing areas including instruction, student services, research and planning, workforce development and perhaps human resources is needed.

- Both college and district staff believe Emergency Preparedness needs coordination, direction and improvement. Also, there is a common perception that increased Policing is needed.

- Human Resources and other business processes need to be streamlined and improved.

- Campuses believed more grants coordination is needed to secure additional funding, to support large grants that they have, and to better support students.

- Many believe department program review is needed at District Administrative Center to ensure resources are used appropriately.

- College/district leadership needs better understanding of CAP/Loads and scheduling issues.

- The District needs to improve coordination for Title IX and ADA issues.

- The District has centralized coordinating of marketing, but there is still a need for more college-specific marketing and advertising.

- The executive leadership team does not function as a team. The colleges and district office staff do meet regularly to direct and oversee the operation of the District, but they lack the cohesion that results in effective decision-making.

- Facilities is currently highly decentralized and many believe that increased district office coordination of facility planning and construction would be beneficial.
  - College-level facilities need processes and procedures to address aging facilities.

- There needs to be a stronger research presence at the district office to support the research/data analysis districtwide on the numerous issues the California community college system is currently facing.

- The District contracts out all of its legal services and several leaders in the district question this approach and wonder if in-house council would be more appropriate and accessible.

- Diversity was a common topic among interviewees. Many believe the colleges have a good representation of the diversity of the student bodies, but that DAC does not.

- Release time for classified leadership and faculty leadership are not equal or enough to maintain the presence needed on the many committees/works of the district/colleges.

Concerns for the Future of the District

- Most interviewees seem to understand that long-term financial viability is a concern, especially in light of the new funding formula.
  - o Some expressed a lack of resources to secure additional funding, such as grants and private donations, to scale good programs and services to support additional students.

- Low salaries as compared to nearby districts was as a concern as it limits the District's ability to attract and retain quality faculty and staff.

- Many expressed safety concerns, as well as worry about being prepared for emergencies as this isn't currently a topic of urgent concern.

- Inadequate staffing in the academic dean and student services levels at the campuses, and that of safety, IT, research and facilities at the district level.

- Campus managers expressed concern about too much DAC centralization; however, classified and students did not list this among their concerns.

- Cabinet leadership are not supportive of each other, which impacts the ability to work with each other, communication and progress toward serving students.

- Course scheduling and ability to complete degree in timely manner needs to be addressed.

- The leadership turnover in the District is very high and many people expressed concern about the stability of the District and its ability to take advantage of new funding opportunities if leadership continues to change.

- The District does not have adequate capacity for planning in many areas. They are currently embarking on the development of a new educational master plan.
  - o There is not a common understanding and opinion of how the District's planning cycle operates.
  - o There needs to be a champion for the coordination of the District and colleges' plans, as well as someone to implement these plans.

- There is a concern that completion rates and enrollments are not consistent across the three colleges, and that if that trend continues then in a few years there may be big problems – primarily in pulling resources from performing areas to help the underperforming areas.

- College-level staff believe there is a lack of transparency at the district level, for example, the District speaking on behalf of the colleges at board meetings (unknowingly to the colleges), and providing inaccurate information.

- The District has a personnel commission (merit district) and many express concerns over the difficulty this puts on the entire hiring process.
  - o No cap on health and benefits for faculty, and lifetime coverage needs to be addressed as it has a huge implication for budgeting.

Other Issues and Concerns Shared by Interviewees

- Most interviewees spoke very highly of their college and/or the District, and had a sense of pride in working there. However, some expressed concerns over the culture throughout the District and suggest it is "broken" or "dysfunctional."
  - The "culture" throughout the District and colleges is reportedly very entrenched and needs to be refreshed, renewed, and re-invigorated.
  - There is "competition" among the colleges, including that one college was feeling it was the "ugly step-child," and by others that their college was "carrying" the District.

- Some believe District Administrative Center should serve more in an advisory role and, not as a regulator.

- Several interviewees noted that there is a lack of communication from Fiscal Services and Human Resources about processes and reasons for requirements. Several noted that the lack of any handbooks causes confusion.

- Lack of consistent documentation, practices and processes across the District and at the colleges.
  - Staff, in particular classified, see processes and practices change without notification.
  - Students do not always know where to go for assistance and/or when they asked, they get different responses.

- Several believed many college concerns were not being addressed due to lack of money.
  - There is a good deal of new money in the District which is currently being held until decisions on organization are completed.

- Students expressed a need for more student-focused/centered scheduling, attitudes, and basic skills delivery, and concerns about safety.

- College management indicated that grant and categorical indirect funding is not routinely sought and utilized.

- The new state funding formula and the new funding priorities are going to drastically impact the colleges and the District. These will require more staff, more paperwork and more compliance and make it harder for the colleges to be flexible and responsive.

- Colleges did not feel that they were represented well because they are arms-length away from the current contracted counsel. Regardless if the District hired in-house or not, they felt that a better solution was needed and that Counsel needs to be more accessible to managers making decisions at the college level.

- There is concern that the District and colleges need to better address student safety and safety practices for students with disabilities, especially relative to district/colleges of similar size.

Appendix C
Comparisons of Benchmark Districts and Colleges

Ventura County Community College District
FTE Employee Analysis of Comparative Districts by FTES
2013-14 through 2017-18

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Districts, 2017-2018

District	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Contra Costa CCD	60.20	56.00	116.20	460.60	443.80	904.40	434.10	1,454.70	31,828.31	1.89	1.76	3.65	14.47	13.94	28.41	13.64	45.70
Foothill CCD	82.70	16.80	99.50	554.70	527.50	1,082.20	568.90	1,750.60	28,924.92	2.86	0.58	3.44	19.18	18.24	37.41	19.67	60.52
Ventura County CCD	34.60	24.60	59.20	502.00	354.90	856.90	495.70	1,411.80	27,056.77	1.28	0.91	2.19	18.55	13.12	31.67	18.32	52.18
South Orange County CCD	42.40	94.90	137.30	462.80	468.80	931.60	522.00	1,590.90	28,637.87	1.48	3.31	4.79	16.16	16.37	32.53	18.23	55.55
Kern CCD	44.50	100.40	144.90	455.30	192.50	647.80	530.70	1,323.40	22,819.20	1.95	4.40	6.35	19.95	8.44	28.39	23.26	58.00

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Districts, 2016-2017

District	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Contra Costa CCD	57.50	61.90	119.40	497.60	452.70	950.30	432.10	1,501.80	26,516.22	2.17	2.33	4.50	18.77	17.07	35.84	16.30	56.64
Foothill-De Anza CCD	81.70	21.50	103.20	557.20	494.40	1,051.60	538.00	1,692.80	30,581.27	2.67	0.70	3.37	18.22	16.17	34.39	17.59	55.35
Ventura County CCD	35.00	15.20	50.20	454.10	333.10	787.20	484.60	1,322.00	25,777.22	1.36	0.59	1.95	17.62	12.92	30.54	18.80	51.29
South Orange County CCD	38.20	76.20	114.40	497.50	474.40	971.90	512.30	1,598.60	29,117.27	1.31	2.62	3.93	17.09	16.29	33.38	17.59	54.90
Kern CCD	42.00	89.40	131.40	493.70	189.10	682.80	508.70	1,322.90	21,976.33	1.91	4.07	5.98	22.47	8.60	31.07	23.15	60.20

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Districts, 2015-2016

District	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Contra Costa CCD	52.00	58.20	110.20	463.40	486.80	950.20	420.20	1,480.60	32,387.44	1.61	1.80	3.40	14.31	15.03	29.34	12.97	45.72
Foothill-De Anza CCD	79.90	20.80	100.70	551.70	493.40	1,045.10	515.50	1,661.30	31,945.62	2.50	0.65	3.15	17.27	15.44	32.71	16.14	52.00
Ventura County CCD	31.00	9.00	40.00	459.10	347.50	806.60	442.20	1,288.80	26,851.75	1.15	0.34	1.49	17.10	12.94	30.04	16.47	48.00
South Orange County CCD	38.50	75.20	113.70	470.30	439.30	909.60	494.50	1,517.80	25,162.24	1.53	2.99	4.52	18.69	17.46	36.15	19.65	60.32
Kern CCD	36.00	72.50	108.50	458.30	178.90	637.20	437.50	1,183.20	21,000.69	1.71	3.45	5.17	21.82	8.52	30.34	20.83	56.34

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Districts, 2014-2015

District	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Contra Costa CCD	50.10	50.20	100.30	427.80	500.00	927.80	416.70	1,444.80	26,849.93	1.87	1.87	3.74	15.93	18.62	34.56	15.52	53.81
Foothill-De Anza CCD	62.50	20.80	83.30	546.90	463.60	1,010.50	510.30	1,604.10	32,157.68	1.94	0.65	2.59	17.01	14.42	31.42	15.87	49.88
Ventura County CCD	25.00	9.00	34.00	445.60	328.30	773.90	436.80	1,244.70	26,389.67	0.95	0.34	1.29	16.89	12.44	29.33	16.55	47.17
South Orange County CCD	38.70	57.60	96.30	463.30	401.50	864.80	514.00	1,475.10	29,570.94	1.31	1.95	3.26	15.67	13.58	29.24	17.38	49.88
Kern CCD	30.50	62.90	93.40	430.80	185.70	616.50	377.50	1,087.40	20,030.93	1.52	3.14	4.66	21.51	9.27	30.78	18.85	54.29

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Districts, 2013-2014

District	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Contra Costa CCD	48.50	47.40	95.90	446.20	425.10	871.30	390.70	1,357.90	32,807.34	1.48	1.44	2.92	13.60	12.96	26.56	11.91	41.39
Foothill-De Anza CCD	55.70	23.80	79.50	562.70	477.60	1,040.30	510.80	1,630.60	32,032.06	1.74	0.74	2.48	17.57	14.91	32.48	15.95	50.91
Ventura County CCD	24.00	8.00	32.00	426.40	324.30	750.70	445.80	1,228.50	25,649.91	0.94	0.31	1.25	16.62	12.64	29.27	17.38	47.89
South Orange County CCD	38.50	53.00	91.50	425.10	390.50	815.60	498.60	1,405.70	26,398.27	1.46	2.01	3.47	16.10	14.79	30.90	18.89	53.25
Kern CCD	27.30	56.50	83.80	429.50	158.10	587.60	386.70	1,058.10	19,315.75	1.41	2.93	4.34	22.24	8.19	30.42	20.02	54.78

Sources: Fall FTE from California Community College Chancellor's Office Data Mart and Annual FTES (includes residents and nonresidents) from 320 Reports. Data does not include summer school shift.
* Classified Support includes those labeled as Classified Professionals.

Ventura County Community College District
FTE Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges by FTES for Moorpark College
2013-14 through 2017-18

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2017-2018

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Cypress College	12.00	15.00	27.00	276.50	190.20	466.70	188.90	682.60	11,064.34	1.08	1.36	2.44	24.99	17.19	42.18	17.07	61.69
Foothill College	30.30	3.00	33.30	236.30	239.30	475.60	126.80	635.70	11,833.33	2.56	0.25	2.81	19.97	20.22	40.19	10.72	53.72
Moorpark College	11.60	4.40	16.00	201.20	158.60	359.80	152.30	528.10	11,577.04	1.00	0.38	1.38	17.38	13.70	31.08	13.16	45.62
Grossmont College	23.50	1.00	24.50	254.70	272.40	527.10	209.40	761.00	12,480.20	1.88	0.08	1.96	20.41	21.83	42.23	16.78	60.98

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2016-2017

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Cypress College	15.20	16.20	31.40	270.10	195.50	465.60	189.80	686.80	12,567.69	1.21	1.29	2.50	21.49	15.56	37.05	15.10	54.65
Foothill College	32.40	3.00	35.40	226.80	226.30	453.10	123.60	612.10	12,383.97	2.62	0.24	2.86	18.31	18.27	36.59	9.98	49.43
Moorpark College	11.00	2.00	13.00	202.30	137.10	339.40	150.90	503.30	11,150.31	0.99	0.18	1.17	18.14	12.30	30.44	13.53	45.14
Grossmont College	16.30	8.30	24.60	232.40	239.00	471.40	195.20	691.20	13,524.35	1.21	0.61	1.82	17.18	17.67	34.86	14.43	51.11

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2015-2016

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Cypress College	17.20	12.20	29.40	253.90	199.80	453.70	192.20	675.30	11,920.74	1.44	1.02	2.47	21.30	16.76	38.06	16.12	56.65
Foothill College	33.30	3.00	36.30	233.60	206.10	439.70	114.70	590.70	12,809.87	2.60	0.23	2.83	18.24	16.09	34.33	8.95	46.11
Moorpark College	9.00	1.00	10.00	193.50	146.40	339.90	136.60	486.50	11,507.45	0.78	0.09	0.87	16.82	12.72	29.54	11.87	42.28
Grossmont College	17.40	5.00	22.40	207.00	236.70	443.70	192.00	658.10	13,792.32	1.26	0.36	1.62	15.01	17.16	32.17	13.92	47.71

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2014-2015

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Cypress College	16.20	14.00	30.20	241.70	187.10	428.80	182.80	641.80	11,380.40	1.42	1.23	2.65	21.24	16.44	37.68	16.06	56.40
Foothill College	25.40	3.00	28.40	223.40	189.50	412.90	108.50	549.80	12,665.04	2.01	0.24	2.24	17.64	14.96	32.60	8.57	43.41
Moorpark College	8.00	1.00	9.00	182.90	138.00	320.90	134.80	464.70	11,332.86	0.71	0.09	0.79	16.14	12.18	28.32	11.89	41.00
Grossmont College	19.60	3.00	22.60	211.50	215.50	427.00	185.00	634.60	13,326.11	1.47	0.23	1.70	15.87	16.17	32.04	13.88	47.62

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2013-2014

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Cypress College	14.00	13.00	27.00	241.30	169.60	410.90	182.80	620.70	11,228.46	1.25	1.16	2.40	21.49	15.10	36.59	16.28	55.28
Foothill College	25.70	3.00	28.70	226.50	193.30	419.80	114.30	562.80	12,533.27	2.05	0.24	2.29	18.07	15.42	33.49	9.12	44.90
Moorpark College	8.00	1.00	9.00	171.10	144.00	315.10	132.70	456.80	10,926.32	0.73	0.09	0.82	15.66	13.18	28.84	12.14	41.81
Grossmont College	13.10	2.00	15.10	209.00	206.60	415.60	181.00	611.70	13,178.46	0.99	0.15	1.15	15.86	15.68	31.54	13.73	46.42

Sources: Fall FTE from California Community College Chancellor's Office Data Mart and Annual FTES (includes residents and nonresidents) from 320 Reports. Data does not include summer school shift.
* Classified Support includes those labeled as Classified Professionals.

C.2

Ventura County Community College District
FTE Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges by FTES for Oxnard College
2013-14 through 2017-18

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2017-2018

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Mission College	0.20	8.20	8.40	126.10	74.40	200.50	94.30	303.20	6,421.73	0.03	1.28	1.31	19.64	11.59	31.22	14.68	47.21
Oxnard College	10.00	7.20	17.20	111.80	61.70	173.50	111.00	301.70	5,291.60	1.89	1.36	3.25	21.13	11.66	32.79	20.98	57.01
Cuyamaca College	19.80	-	19.80	101.40	137.50	238.90	128.50	387.20	5,570.41	3.55	-	3.55	18.20	24.68	42.89	23.07	69.51
Clovis Community College	8.00	7.00	15.00	81.50	89.80	171.30	60.20	246.50	5,189.13	1.54	1.35	2.89	15.71	17.31	33.01	11.60	47.50

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2016-2017

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Mission College	14.00	9.00	23.00	148.00	67.80	215.80	92.00	330.80	6,530.95	2.14	1.38	3.52	22.66	10.38	33.04	14.09	50.65
Oxnard College	10.00	3.20	13.20	99.90	59.60	159.50	108.20	280.90	4,986.47	2.01	0.64	2.65	20.03	11.95	31.99	21.70	56.33
Cuyamaca College	9.70	3.70	13.40	91.30	129.50	220.80	123.40	357.60	6,424.05	1.51	0.58	2.09	14.21	20.16	34.37	19.21	55.67
Clovis Community College	8.00	7.00	15.00	75.30	82.80	158.10	68.00	241.10	4,428.80	1.81	1.58	3.39	17.00	18.70	35.70	15.35	54.44

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2015-2016

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Mission College	11.00	5.00	16.00	146.00	65.80	211.80	98.60	326.40	6,658.21	1.65	0.75	2.40	21.93	9.88	31.81	14.81	49.02
Oxnard College	7.00	2.00	9.00	95.70	58.30	154.00	92.40	255.40	5,246.84	1.33	0.38	1.72	18.24	11.11	29.35	17.61	48.68
Cuyamaca College	11.30	5.00	16.30	85.80	122.00	207.80	123.60	347.70	5,811.75	1.94	0.86	2.80	14.76	20.99	35.76	21.27	59.83
Clovis Community College	6.00	4.00	10.00	59.40	86.40	145.80	59.00	214.80	4,442.66	1.35	0.90	2.25	13.37	19.45	32.82	13.28	48.35

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2014-2015

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Mission College	11.00	2.20	13.20	142.40	74.30	216.70	99.00	328.90	6,606.97	1.66	0.33	2.00	21.55	11.25	32.80	14.98	49.78
Oxnard College	7.00	2.00	9.00	95.80	57.30	153.10	92.30	254.40	5,239.63	1.34	0.38	1.72	18.28	10.94	29.22	17.62	48.55
Cuyamaca College	11.30	2.00	13.30	89.10	115.40	204.50	120.80	338.60	5,650.73	2.00	0.35	2.35	15.77	20.42	36.19	21.38	59.92
Clovis Community College	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2013-2014

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Mission College	11.00	2.20	13.20	151.90	72.40	224.30	100.90	338.40	6,983.90	1.58	0.32	1.89	21.75	10.37	32.12	14.45	48.45
Oxnard College	7.00	2.00	9.00	95.30	45.50	140.80	89.30	239.10	4,919.17	1.42	0.41	1.83	19.37	9.25	28.62	18.15	48.61
Cuyamaca College	7.40	2.00	9.40	83.50	119.90	203.40	117.70	330.50	5,709.47	1.30	0.35	1.65	14.62	21.00	35.63	20.61	57.89
Clovis Community College	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Sources: Fall FTE from California Community College Chancellor's Office Data Mart and Annual FTES (includes residents and nonresidents) from 320 Reports. Data does not include summer school shift.
* Classified Support includes those labeled as Classified Professionals.

Ventura County Community College District
FTE Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges by FTES for Ventura College
2013-14 through 2017-18

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2017-2018

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Golden West College	22.20	21.70	43.90	162.80	134.10	296.90	180.30	521.10	10,054.62	2.21	2.16	4.37	16.19	13.34	29.53	17.93	51.83
Irvine Valley College	14.00	22.00	36.00	171.40	181.50	352.90	172.90	561.80	11,197.51	1.25	1.96	3.22	15.31	16.21	31.52	15.44	50.17
Ventura College	10.00	4.00	14.00	189.00	134.60	323.60	159.80	497.40	10,188.13	0.98	0.39	1.37	18.55	13.21	31.76	15.68	48.82
San Diego Miramar College	8.00	1.00	9.00	124.60	113.80	238.40	108.80	356.20	10,899.68	0.73	0.09	0.83	11.43	10.44	21.87	9.98	32.68

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2016-2017

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Golden West College	18.20	19.70	37.90	169.60	138.20	307.80	169.70	515.40	9,037.01	2.01	2.18	4.19	18.77	15.29	34.06	18.78	57.03
Irvine Valley College	14.60	19.00	33.60	187.50	205.10	392.60	175.00	601.20	11,715.94	1.25	1.62	2.87	16.00	17.51	33.51	14.94	51.31
Ventura College	11.00	3.00	14.00	151.90	136.40	288.30	151.60	453.90	9,640.44	1.14	0.31	1.45	15.76	14.15	29.91	15.73	47.08
San Diego Miramar College	9.00	2.00	11.00	141.00	132.50	273.50	98.70	383.20	10,211.88	0.88	0.20	1.08	13.81	12.98	26.78	9.67	37.52

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2015-2016

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Golden West College	17.80	17.70	35.50	153.10	140.90	294.00	170.20	499.70	9,925.05	1.79	1.78	3.58	15.43	14.20	29.62	17.15	50.35
Irvine Valley College	14.00	17.00	31.00	169.30	167.00	336.30	173.90	541.20	9,527.77	1.47	1.78	3.25	17.77	17.53	35.30	18.25	56.80
Ventura College	12.00	2.00	14.00	169.90	142.80	312.70	139.30	466.00	10,097.46	1.19	0.20	1.39	16.83	14.14	30.97	13.80	46.15
San Diego Miramar College	11.00	1.40	12.40	133.60	108.60	242.20	99.50	354.10	9,665.43	1.14	0.14	1.28	13.82	11.24	25.06	10.29	36.64

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2014-2015

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Golden West College	16.80	15.50	32.30	146.60	131.10	277.70	177.10	487.10	9,695.96	1.73	1.60	3.33	15.12	13.52	28.64	18.27	50.24
Irvine Valley College	13.00	13.00	26.00	169.00	155.50	324.50	170.00	520.50	10,627.30	1.22	1.22	2.45	15.90	14.63	30.53	16.00	48.98
Ventura College	8.00	2.00	10.00	166.80	133.00	299.80	135.60	445.40	9,817.18	0.81	0.20	1.02	16.99	13.55	30.54	13.81	45.37
San Diego Miramar College	12.00	-	12.00	128.60	90.70	219.30	102.00	333.30	8,871.10	1.35	-	1.35	14.50	10.22	24.72	11.50	37.57

Full-Time Equivalent Employee Analysis of Comparative Colleges, 2013-2014

College	Fall Semester FTE By Classification								Annual FTES	FTE Per 1,000 FTES							
	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified* Support	Total FTE	Total FTES	Educational Administrator	Classified Management	Total Management	Tenured/Track Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Total Faculty	Classified Support	Total FTE Per FTES
Golden West College	16.00	15.00	31.00	146.30	119.60	265.90	166.60	463.50	10,316.00	1.55	1.45	3.01	14.18	11.59	25.78	16.15	44.93
Irvine Valley College	12.00	14.20	26.20	148.70	148.40	297.10	167.70	491.00	10,355.48	1.16	1.37	2.53	14.36	14.33	28.69	16.19	47.41
Ventura College	8.00	2.00	10.00	160.00	134.80	294.80	138.50	443.30	9,804.42	0.82	0.20	1.02	16.32	13.75	30.07	14.13	45.21
San Diego Miramar College	10.00	-	10.00	112.00	88.40	200.40	94.30	304.70	8,390.35	1.19	-	1.19	13.35	10.54	23.88	11.24	36.32

Sources: Fall FTE from California Community College Chancellor's Office Data Mart and Annual FTES (includes residents and nonresidents) from 320 Reports. Data does not include summer school shift.
* Classified Support includes those labeled as Classified Professionals.

C.4

Ventura County Community College District Results of Employee Survey on Organizational Structure

Spring 2019

INTRODUCTION

One of the strategies used to gather opinions about the effectiveness of the organizational structure of VCCCD was to survey all full-time faculty and staff*. Evaluators sought feedback about what works well and what could be improved at each of the three colleges and at the District Administrative Center (DAC). The survey response link was emailed to all full-time faculty and staff from the CBT Consultant Team Project Leader in early February 2019, and notices and reminders were sent from the Chancellor and college presidents. Responses were returned automatically to the consulting firm, CBT, and all individual responses will remain confidential and not related to respondent identities.

During a two-week period, a substantial number of employees, 445, responded to the survey. Respondents included a diverse pool of participants from employees of different employment classifications, from all work locations, and from employees with a wide range of longevity of employment within the colleges and District:

- Nearly half of the respondents (45%) were faculty; 39% were classified/confidential staff; and 16% were management/supervisory.
- There was proportionate representation among the respondents from the different college locations: 31% from Moorpark College, 23% from Oxnard College, 36% from Ventura College, and 10% from the District Administrative Center.
- One-third (34%) have been employed within the District for less than five years, 18% from 5 to 10 years, 30% 11 to 19 years, and 19% for more than 20 years.

Percent response distributions and average rating scores for each survey question are provided on the following pages. Each is provided for all respondents, as well as by self-identified work location (specific college or DAC), employee classification, and employment longevity within the District. Note that most "questions" were statements about ideal organizational structure characteristics and were rated on a four-point scale, from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Average ratings were calculated for most questions using "4" as "strongly agree" and "1" as "strongly disagree". Thus, the closer the average rating to "4", the more positive the response and closer to "strongly agree" with the statement. An average rating of over "3", then, can typically be considered very positive. Those average ratings, as well as the percent response distributions, do not include those who responded that they didn't know an answer to that the question or that the question was not applicable to them.

At one short point during the survey administration when reminder emails were being sent, the survey link was inadvertently emailed to part-time faculty and staff. The situation was promptly corrected, but in the mean time a few survey responses from part-timers may have been submitted. No responses were deleted, to ensure inclusion of all intended survey recipients. While the evaluators appreciate feedback from part-time faculty and staff, this group was not originally included in the distribution in order to maintain a manageable number of respondents.

Also, because responses are confidential and not attached to individual names, department/units of respondents are not known. Work location (specific college or DAC) and other categories used for survey analysis are self-identified in the survey by the respondent. Respondents were helpful to the review process by generously sharing time to complete the survey and provide their candid open-ended comments, compliments and concerns. The many comments, which were summarized by the evaluator, provide useful feedback along with the questions' percent response distributions and average ratings. A list of all comments can be found starting on page C.32.

Overall, respondents' responses about the District's, the colleges', and their department's organizational structures were quite mixed. There seemed to be slightly more understanding and satisfaction with respondents' departments and less with district-wide issues. For several statements which respondents were asked to rate about district-wide issues, a significant percentage selected the, "do not know" category.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Organizational Structure and Evaluation and Improvement Processes at Department Level (q4):

Readers with knowledge of their work locations and department/units should carefully assess the survey results to this set of questions within the context of other familiar factors that they might be aware of, as there are subtle differences in responses to specific questions by different groups of respondents.

- One of the most positively-rated statements overall for the entire survey was, **"Meeting student needs is the main focus of the department/unit where I work"**. This was the case for all groups studied, with average ratings between 3.29 and 3.52 (except for DAC respondents—2.91). (4a)

- On the other hand, when asked about **adequacy of staffing of their departments/units**, relatively low average ratings were provided, from 1.81 to 2.34, reflecting that more respondents disagreed that, **"My department/unit is adequately staffed . . . "** than agreed. (4b) The majority of respondents did, however, agree that, "**There is an adequate number of managers in my department/unit"**. The lowest average rating for this statement, 2.85, was by respondents in the District Administrative Center. (4d)

- The majority of respondents in all categories agreed that, "**I clearly understand the organizational structure of my department/unit"** (87% of the total "strongly agree" and "agree")(4c) and that, **"Responsibilities are clearly defined for those who work in my department/unit"** (70% "strongly agree and "agree"); managers and those who had been employed within the District for over 20 years agreed with this statement more frequently. (4e)

- Fewer agreed that, **"Responsibilities are evenly distributed among staff within my department/unit"**, with a relatively lower, 2.57, total average score. Lower average ratings are attributed to those at Moorpark College (2.39) and to faculty (2.44). (4f)

- Most (83%) respondents agreed that their department/unit regularly **engages in program review** (4h), and only slightly fewer agreed that they **regularly participate in the use of data and assessment** (75%). (4g) Faculty were more engaged in program review with an average rating of 3.45, and District Administrative Center respondents seemed to practice program review less, at a 2.76 average rating. Further, respondents were asked whether "**managers in my department/unit encourage employees to take initiative to improve department practices**"; responses were mixed, with up to 37% of respondent groups disagreeing with the statement, and up to 87% agreeing, depending. (4i)

- Lastly, respondents were asked **the extent to which their department/unit is cooperative with DAC procedures**, and most all respondents responded affirmatively (90%). (4j)

Decision-Making, Evaluation and Improvement, and Communication Processes at Colleges/Work Location (q5):

- Average ratings of agreement that, "**my work location has established governance structure and processes . . . "** were all below 3.00 for each group studied, although those from Moorpark College and those in a management employee classification agreed with the statement more often than other groups. (5a)

- In terms of **college-level and/or DAC-level evaluation and improvement processes,** respondents were asked three questions: 1) about their work location having a structured cycle of continuous improvement; 2) the use of data to evaluate and improve student achievement; and 3) having a program review process that is utilized for planning and decision-making. The average ratings for total respondents and for most categories of respondents were below 3.00 for the three questions, with the exception of the average ratings from Moorpark College respondents, which were 3.00 or slightly above.   DAC respondents expressed lower average scores than those from the three college locations for practicing and using program review, as well as for the other two questions of this topic; 38% of DAC respondents chose, "don't know". (5b, c, & d)

- For the statement about having **"processes to ensure effective communication for its staff"** at their work locations**,** average ratings for all groups studied were also below 3.00, and Oxnard and Ventura Colleges were lowest at 2.38 and 2.39, respectively. While average ratings seem low, the percent distributions of agreement-to-disagreement responses were spread somewhat evenly across the four levels of agreement, showing varying opinions and inconsistency among respondents. (5f)

- With the exception of management employee classification respondents, average ratings for, " . . . **having opportunities to contribute input to planning"** were also under 3.00. (5e)

Organizational Structure at Colleges/Work Location: (q6)

- The majority of respondents in all categories replied that they disagreed that, **"My work location is adequately staffed . . ."** This response was most pronounced at Moorpark College, where 75% of respondents disagreed with this statement; 72% responded negatively at the District Administrative Center. (6a) Respondents more frequently agreed that, **"There is an adequate number of managers at my work location"**, with 76% of total respondents agreeing. Managers disagreed with this statement more frequently, with 41% disagreeing. (6d) Some of the open-ended comments also reflected a need for improved internal communication at the colleges and DAC.

- In terms of college and DAC organizational structures, there were uneven response distributions for all related statements. For examples, just slightly more of the respondents disagreed to the statement, 53%, but 48% agreed to the statement: **"The organizational structure of my work location works efficiently"** (6b) Responses were mixed across all groups, as well.

- Other organizational structure questions about department responsibilities included: **"There is minimal duplication of services among departments"**, with 59% of the total agreeing and 41% disagreeing (6c); and, **"Responsibilities are evenly distributed across departments at my work location"**, with 44% agreeing and 56% disagreeing and no marked differences among respondent groups. (6f) The majority of respondents (60%) agreed that, **"Responsibilities are clearly defined for departments across my work location".** However, there were significant numbers who disagreed (40%), and differences were apparent among work locations. (6g)

- When asked whether vacated positions are evaluated **" . . . to determine whether or not each should be . . . refilled"**, many respondents, depending upon respondent group, (19% of the total) stated that they don't know. Of those who did respond, responses were mixed. (6e)

- A majority of respondents agreed that, **"My work location is . . . cooperative with DAC procedures",** but there were differences among the colleges and among employee classification of respondent. (6h)

Allocation of Resources Processes at Colleges/Work Location: (q7)

- For several questions about resource allocation *processes*, many respondents "did not know", particularly classified staff respondents, in which case 27% of respondents did not know whether **"processes promote the effective allocation of resources".** Also, 36% of DAC respondents did not know to be able to agree or disagree with the statement. Otherwise, the response distributions were mixed, with more respondents, 60%, disagreeing with the statement but 40% agreeing. (7b)

- Distributions of responses from strongly agree-to-strongly disagree were wide for, "**Resource allocation processes are clearly linked to planning . . . "**, with 51% of the

total agreeing but 49% disagreeing, and another 19% not knowing.   Moorpark College respondents were more positive, with 68% agreeing. (7a)

- While only 38% of all respondents agreed that they, **" . . . have appropriate opportunities to contribute input to budgeting"**, managers more often agreed, with 63% agreeing to the statement. (7c)

- It's important to know faculty's ratings of, **"My work location maintains and upgrades technology infrastructure to meet *student learning needs*":** Again, those results were mixed, with 58% of all faculty respondents agreeing with the statement and 42% disagreeing, providing an average rating of 2.42. All three colleges had similar response distributions to this question. (7d) In terms of **technology infrastructure to meet *staff needs***, average ratings for groups varied from 2.48 to 2.75; classified staff and managers had higher average ratings of 2.75 and 2.72, respectively. (7e)

- Asked about adequacy of **facilities maintenance and upgrades**, average ratings of responses from college respondents were relatively low, from 2.36 to 2.50. Fifty-six percent of Ventura College respondents disagreed that facilities were maintained and upgraded to meet student learning needs. (7f)

- Finally for this section and importantly, respondents rated the statement, **"My work location ensures a safe physical environment for students and staff.** 70% of all respondents agreed with the statement; the average rating for all respondents was 2.77. Faculty respondents and Ventura College respondents provided slightly lower average ratings, 2.55 and 2.60, respectively, than other groups, as well as greater percentages of disagreement with the statement. (7g)

Organizational Structure at District Administrative Center in Relation to Colleges and District Communication Effectiveness: (q8)

- Eighty-one percent of DAC respondents and 75% of management respondents disagreed that, "**DAC is adequately staffed to fulfill its responsibilities in an efficient manner."** There were varying ranges of response distributions and average ratings, depending upon the reporting group, although 30% of all respondents and 43% of faculty respondents chose not to rate the question due to "don't know/not applicable". (8a)

- Many chose also to not rate the question about the, **"balance of centralization and decentralization of functions between the DAC and the college . . . "** because they did not know: 25% of all respondents and 35% of faculty respondents. (8b) For those who did respond, few (only 1% to 10%) strongly agreed that the balance works well. Otherwise, responses were spread across the scale of agree to strongly disagree. The 32 DAC respondents, the classified staff, and the manager respondents rated this question the most positively, but not highly, with 2.58, 2.46, and 2.43 average ratings, respectively. The same response pattern of "don't know", a small percentage of those who strongly agreed, and mixed responses was the case for rating the statement, **"The

division of responsibilities and procedures between the DAC and colleges is clear". (8c)

- Similar to the questions asking whether "my department/unit" and "my work location" is cooperative with and responsive to DAC procedures, respondents were asked whether the **"DAC is responsive to and cooperative with the colleges' procedures."** (8d) Of all respondents, 24% responded that they "don't know". Otherwise, ratings were varied across the rating scale, and the 99 faculty respondents had the lowest average rating of 1.93.

  A comparison of those average ratings related to working together by colleges and DAC follows:
  - Department/unit cooperation with DAC procedures - 3.25 average rating for all (4j)
  - Work location [college] cooperation with DAC procedures (6h) –2.99 average rating for all (6h)
  - DAC cooperation with college procedures (8d) – 2.32 average rating for all (Keep in mind that only 36 DAC employees responded to the survey, so many more non-DAC employees answered this set of questions.) (8d)

- The survey includes three questions about the effectiveness of district communications, a topic important to the organizational structure review and to those interviewed for this project.
  - When asked whether, **"DAC effectively communicates for the colleges to the community",** 25% of the total and 28% of faculty responded, "don't know". Of the remaining respondents, their reactions were mixed, with 45% agreeing and 55% disagreeing. More faculty respondents, 71%, disagreed. (8e)
  - Asked whether, **"DAC effectively advocates for the colleges to the State"** 44% of the total and 50% of the faculty responded, "don't know". 72% of manager respondents agreed with the statement. (8f)
  - Finally, when asked whether, **"I am adequately informed of the changes, news, and activities throughout the District"**, all but 11% of the respondents responded, and agreement to the statement was mixed, with 47% agreeing and 53% disagreeing. Of the three employees groups of respondents, faculty more often expressed that they were not adequately informed disagreed with 58% disagreeing with the statement; however, response distributions were mixed, and 42% of faculty agreed that they were adequately informed. (8g)

Professional Development, Career Advancement, and Reasons for Leaving VCCCD (q9, 10, 14):

- Response distributions were varied regarding, **"There are sufficient professional development opportunities provided . . . ".** A higher percentage agreed that there are such opportunities, 58% of the total, than 42% who disagreed with the statement. Responses varied from the three colleges and DAC. (9)

- Fewer agreed that there are, **" . . . opportunities for career advancement throughout the VCCC District",** although for all respondents, 48% agreed and 52% disagreed, a very mixed response distribution. There were only slight differences among respondent groups. (10)

- When asked the reasons that former colleagues may have terminated their employment with VCCCD, 32% of the reasons provided were "a job elsewhere for better pay" and "a job elsewhere for promotion". Of the 1,195 reasons provided (a respondents could indicate multiple responses), about 20% were due to reasons beyond the control of VCCCD including retirement and moving out of the area. Eighty percent of the reasons, such as for better pay, promotion, lack of job satisfaction, are reasons for finding employment alternatives to VCCCD. (14)

Functions that Need to be Evaluated Further to Ensure and Enhance the Effectiveness of the Organizational Structures of Colleges and/or District Administrative Center (q11):

216 respondents gave a total of 352 suggestions of functions that need further review for an efficient VCCCD organizational structure. Those 352 suggestions are listed in the table in the survey data section of this report. For that table, the evaluator combined like functions and noted the number and percent of respondents. A summary of the suggestions follows below.

- Communications and marketing efforts for the district and colleges need more focus, in particularly:
  - Creating opportunities for enrollment growth and linkages to the community, businesses and educational partners.
  - Informed personnel when changes are made to human resources and business practices, policies and procedures.
  - There are implications that the lack of communication leads to lack of transparencies that feeds into a disrespectful and distrustful environment.
  - Some expressed not getting a response to their inquiries in a timely manner.

- A review of departments and positions at the district and at the colleges to ensure there are no gaps of services to the community and students, as well as distribution of resources.
  - Many conveyed that there are too many management positions and not enough classified staff to support those in place.

- o Also, respondents would like more collaboration among their peers at the other campuses to share best practices, as well as instituting standardized procedures to assist students who attend multiple campuses.

- A review of the budget allocation model to ensure the district captures all available funds and distributes it appropriately among the cost centers.
  - o Some respondents are concerned the process is not transparent.
  - o Others are concerned that there is lack of funds for student-centered programs and initiatives.
  - o Review of grants area to ensure the procurement, administration of funds and keeping in compliance.

- A review of the Human Resources function and processes, specifically:
  - o The lack of efficiency of the hiring process.
  - o Many noted that they are not valued or compensated fairly compared to other districts, as well as to hire and maintain qualified personnel.
  - o Some respondents noted concern for the lack of diversity in hiring panels and the hiring pool.
  - o Professional development and career advancement opportunities to all staff.
  - o Others would like more human resources presence on campuses.

- There is a need for the delineation of roles and responsibilities of shared functions at the District and that at the colleges.

- Respondents would like to see District policies and procedures to be standardized, documented, communicated and training offered to employees.

- District safety and emergency preparedness to ensure a safe environment for students and staff.

- There is need for support for districtwide oversight and support of institutional effectiveness units to oversee planning, academic, student services, etc.

Respondent's Suggestions About How the District and Colleges May Organize Themselves to Better Support Changing Student Needs, New State Requirements and Funding Models, and New Programs, Such as Guided Pathways, Delivery of Basic Skills and IEPI (q12):

Below are some summarized observations from reviewing the detailed comments submitted by survey respondents. A complete list of comments can be found on pages C.32 to C.49.

- Respondents noted a need for communication and information about new State initiatives, such as by an information forum by district/college leadership about how these initiatives impact their work and the students they serve, as well as regular emails to keep staff apprised of progress.

- o Often times, the college communities do not feel connected and do not understand the need for these initiatives/committees/meetings.

- Focus on student needs, and the ability to be creative about how to serve students' unique needs.
  - o Students need to be part of the solution, and so they should be at the table when discussions and plans are being formed.

- Review class size to ensure faculty have time to address the complete curriculum of each course.

- Respondents believe a review of human resources is critical as the District moves forward working on many of these many initiatives.
  - o Many stated there are too many managers. However, they also identified gaps, such as leadership for institutional effectiveness and coordination of the work under these initiatives.
  - o The leadership needs skills to innovatively lead the district/colleges and be able to think outside the box for solutions.
  - o Many observed the need for additional faculty and student services staff to guide and support the work.
  - o Departmental reviews of existing staffing and resources are needed to ensure that the distribution of duties is appropriately assigned and that each unit is set up to successfully serve students.

- Holding administrators, faculty and staff accountable in order to ensure a working environment of trust and collaboration was a concern expressed by many.

- The work needs to include all employees' input and support of those directly serving students, mainly faculty and support services staff.

- DAC needs to provide resources and support to the colleges as they address the new initiatives.
  - o The grants area needs to be reviewed to ensure that adequate staffing to administer the grants and funding are in place, and that compliance is maintained.
  - o Some suggested the use of technology to simplify business practices to be more efficient and effective while being environmentally friendly.

- Respondents suggested district-wide collaboration among all three colleges to understand the work ahead. Specifically, DAC could coordinate meetings of all three colleges to share best practices and learn how each college approaches the variety of initiatives.

- Hiring and business practices needs to be documented and communicated to all staff.
  - o Staff need training about new initiatives and guidelines.

- Delineation of roles and functions need to be clear and documented so that the district community understands who is responsible to address the specifications of each function, particularly where there is overlap of function and where coordination is critical.

Delivery of Educational and Support Services in Relation to District Financial Health (q13):

- The majority of respondents agreed that, **"The colleges deliver instruction in a way that considers the financial health of the District"**, even though 22% of respondents "don't know". Of those who rated the statement, 72% agreed, and 77% of faculty agreed. (13a)

- Faculty expressed a variety of opinions about whether of not they were, **"well informed about the relationship of class size, level of support services and educational quality with the District's financial health".** While 67% of managers indicated that they were well informed about these issues, about half, 49%, of faculty respondents agreed to the statement, and 51% indicated they were not well informed. (13b) More specifically, respondents were asked whether they were, **"well informed about the relationship between average class size and the ability of the District to provide competitive salary and benefits".** Again, there was an uneven distribution of responses, and the lowest average rating was for faculty respondents, at 2.29. (13c)

- Finally in regard to district financial health, respondents were asked about the statement, **"Decisions related to educational quality, class size and support staffing are made at the appropriate levels and with appropriate collaboration".** A majority of respondents of all categories disagreed with the statement. Managers had the highest percentage of agreement of any group (48%), but 77% of faculty disagreed with the statement. 45% of faculty "strongly disagreed". Overall, 22%, however, indicated "don't know", but only 14% of faculty responded "don't know." (13d)

Additional Comments/Concerns About the District's and Colleges' Organizational Structure(s) (q15):

Below are some summarized observations from reviewing the detailed comments submitted by survey respondents. A complete list of comments can be found on pages C.50 to C.65.

- Communication between the District and its colleges is limited, and respondents do not always feel well-informed.
  - Respondents also find communication locally at the colleges and their department lacking and, some times, disrespectful of each other.
  - Decisions are perceived to be made some times without input from the colleges and/or individuals with expertise or those who work in the area of concern.
  - Issues about budget allocation, hiring processes, and other business services need to be regularly communicated to all constituents, for transparency and to acknowledge the roles of everyone as part of the District.

- Many expressed a negative change in the college environments, citing lack communication and distrust between management and staff that has lead to lack of respect and low morale.

- Respondents conveyed frustration when dealing with human resources issues, in particular:
    - The hiring process is cumbersome and needs improved of technology support.
    - There is a need to recruit and hire more diverse faculty and staff that reflect the student body.
    - There are too many interims without the appropriate skillsets needed for the positions, and
    - Changes to processes and practices need to be communicated to the district-wide community.

- Respondents expressed their need to be recognized for their worth and asked for comparable compensation, with higher pay to live comfortably in the Ventura County area, and career advancement and professional development opportunities.

- Respondents noted a need for effective and innovative leadership at all levels of the District, colleges and department; specifically:
    - Managers are not held accountable; therefore, classified staff has to work and/or additional hires are made to compensate for the slack.
    - There is distrust about decisions made and not shared, in particular as they relate to hiring or budgeting.
    - Lack of collaboration with faculty and staff has lead to decisions being made that are not in the best interest of the students.
    - Hiring practices have in some cases represented questionable intentions.

- Professional development is needed for staff and faculty to further enhance quality services to students, as well as for management to lead the District and its colleges during this time of unprecedented demand for accountability and multiple challenges.

- Safety and compliance were among issues about which respondents would like more oversight and support from the District.

SURVEY DATA

4. Respondents' level of agreement about the organizational structure within the department/unit where they work most of the time:								
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
a. Meeting student needs is the main focus of the department/unit where I work.								
Moorpark College	50%	36%	9%	6%	126	3.30	3%	130
Oxnard College	65%	27%	4%	4%	93	3.52	1%	94
Ventura College	53%	36%	9%	1%	150	3.41	1%	152
District Administrative Center	26%	49%	17%	9%	35	2.91	9%	39
Classified	49%	36%	11%	4%	154	3.31	4%	162
Faculty	56%	31%	8%	5%	191	3.39	1%	192
Management	53%	40%	5%	2%	57	3.44	3%	59
Less than 5 years	49%	36%	10%	4%	134	3.30	2%	137
5 to 10 years	51%	33%	9%	7%	70	3.29	4%	73
11 to 19 years	59%	31%	7%	3%	117	3.45	3%	121
20+ years	51%	39%	9%	1%	79	3.39	1%	80
Total	52%	35%	9%	4%	407	3.36	3%	418
b. My department/unit is adequately staffed to implement its mission.								
Moorpark College	7%	20%	37%	36%	129	1.98	0%	129
Oxnard College	10%	21%	38%	32%	92	2.09	1%	93
Ventura College	12%	34%	30%	24%	149	2.34	2%	152
District Administrative Center	0%	14%	53%	33%	36	1.81	9%	40
Classified	10%	26%	32%	32%	156	2.14	1%	158
Faculty	10%	23%	40%	28%	189	2.14	2%	192
Management	3%	26%	40%	31%	58	2.02	4%	61
Less than 5 years	10%	26%	31%	33%	132	2.12	4%	138
5 to 10 years	12%	29%	33%	26%	73	2.27	1%	74
11 to 19 years	8%	22%	41%	29%	119	2.10	1%	120
20+ years	5%	23%	43%	29%	79	2.04	0%	79
Total	9%	25%	36%	30%	409	2.13	2%	417
c. I clearly understand the organizational structure of my department/unit.								
Moorpark College	45%	44%	8%	3%	129	3.31	0%	129
Oxnard College	45%	40%	9%	6%	93	3.24	7%	100
Ventura College	39%	46%	8%	7%	145	3.17	3%	150
District Administrative Center	30%	58%	10%	3%	40	3.15	11%	45
Classified	36%	50%	8%	6%	156	3.16	1%	158
Faculty	43%	43%	9%	6%	188	3.22	2%	191
Management	53%	40%	5%	2%	60	3.45	0%	60
Less than 5 years	36%	44%	14%	7%	131	3.08	3%	135
5 to 10 years	49%	43%	4%	4%	75	3.37	0%	75
11 to 19 years	42%	47%	6%	6%	120	3.24	0%	120
20+ years	41%	49%	8%	3%	79	3.28	1%	80
Total	42%	45%	8%	5%	410	3.22	1%	415

*Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
d. There is an adequate number of managers in my department/unit.								
Moorpark College	42%	40%	14%	5%	129	3.19	0%	129
Oxnard College	55%	37%	6%	2%	87	3.45	6%	93
Ventura College	30%	47%	16%	7%	141	3.01	6%	151
District Administrative Center	23%	50%	18%	10%	40	2.85	0%	40
Classified	40%	41%	14%	5%	154	3.16	3%	159
Faculty	41%	42%	11%	7%	180	3.16	6%	191
Management	30%	47%	20%	3%	60	3.03	0%	60
Less than 5 years	32%	46%	17%	5%	130	3.04	3%	135
5 to 10 years	47%	40%	10%	3%	72	3.32	4%	75
11 to 19 years	43%	36%	13%	9%	115	3.12	5%	121
20+ years	38%	48%	10%	4%	77	3.19	2%	79
Total	39%	43%	13%	6%	400	3.14	4%	416
e. Responsibilities are clearly defined for those who work in my department/unit.								
Moorpark College	24%	51%	14%	11%	126	2.87	1%	128
Oxnard College	28%	47%	19%	5%	93	2.98	0%	93
Ventura College	22%	43%	25%	9%	148	2.78	3%	152
District Administrative Center	15%	48%	33%	5%	40	2.73	0%	40
Classified	20%	43%	27%	11%	158	2.72	1%	159
Faculty	23%	49%	19%	9%	186	2.85	3%	191
Management	33%	50%	15%	2%	60	3.15	0%	60
Less than 5 years	15%	48%	28%	8%	132	2.70	2%	135
5 to 10 years	27%	42%	23%	7%	73	2.90	3%	75
11 to 19 years	25%	45%	17%	12%	121	2.83	0%	121
20+ years	28%	51%	15%	5%	78	3.03	1%	79
Total	23%	47%	21%	9%	410	2.85	1%	416
f. Responsibilities are evenly distributed among staff within my department/unit.								
Moorpark College	12%	32%	37%	18%	121	2.39	4%	126
Oxnard College	20%	47%	22%	11%	88	2.76	5%	93
Ventura College	15%	43%	30%	12%	135	2.61	11%	152
District Administrative Center	13%	50%	26%	11%	38	2.66	4%	40
Classified	17%	41%	27%	15%	150	2.59	5%	159
Faculty	12%	37%	35%	16%	171	2.44	10%	190
Management	21%	53%	22%	3%	58	2.91	2%	59
Less than 5 years	13%	42%	33%	11%	123	2.57	8%	135
5 to 10 years	16%	48%	22%	14%	69	2.65	5%	73
11 to 19 years	17%	38%	28%	17%	112	2.55	6%	120
20+ years	12%	39%	37%	12%	75	2.51	6%	80
Total	15%	41%	30%	14%	385	2.57	7%	414

Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
g. I regularly participate in the use of data and assessment to enhance the effectiveness of my department/unit.								
Moorpark College	26%	51%	13%	9%	117	2.95	9%	129
Oxnard College	35%	43%	12%	10%	86	3.02	6%	92
Ventura College	26%	48%	19%	7%	129	2.94	14%	151
District Administrative Center	21%	39%	33%	6%	33	2.76	16%	40
Classified	22%	43%	23%	12%	129	2.74	18%	160
Faculty	30%	49%	13%	9%	176	3.01	7%	190
Management	34%	51%	15%	0%	59	3.19	2%	60
Less than 5 years	25%	42%	22%	11%	115	2.81	13%	134
5 to 10 years	37%	44%	11%	7%	70	3.11	5%	74
11 to 19 years	26%	51%	16%	7%	105	2.96	12%	121
20+ years	23%	53%	15%	8%	73	2.92	8%	80
Total	28%	47%	17%	8%	368	2.95	11%	415
h. My department/unit engages in program review on a regular basis.								
Moorpark College	45%	43%	7%	6%	119	3.26	7%	129
Oxnard College	44%	40%	9%	7%	88	3.22	4%	92
Ventura College	48%	44%	7%	1%	137	3.39	9%	151
District Administrative Center	0%	18%	55%	27%	33	1.91	16%	40
Classified	27%	46%	15%	12%	137	2.88	14%	160
Faculty	55%	37%	6%	2%	185	3.45	3%	191
Management	33%	37%	22%	7%	54	2.96	9%	60
Less than 5 years	36%	42%	16%	6%	116	3.09	12%	134
5 to 10 years	44%	40%	9%	7%	68	3.21	8%	74
11 to 19 years	41%	40%	11%	8%	117	3.15	3%	121
20+ years	47%	41%	9%	3%	74	3.32	7%	80
Total	42%	41%	12%	6%	380	3.18	8%	415
i. Managers in my department/unit encourage employees to take initiative to improve department practices.								
Moorpark College	37%	39%	15%	10%	126	3.02	2%	129
Oxnard College	41%	37%	9%	13%	91	3.05	1%	92
Ventura College	24%	48%	17%	12%	139	2.84	8%	151
District Administrative Center	26%	61%	8%	5%	38	3.08	4%	40
Classified	28%	47%	14%	11%	154	2.92	4%	160
Faculty	33%	37%	16%	14%	178	2.89	6%	190
Management	37%	57%	7%	0%	60	3.30	0%	60
Less than 5 years	26%	53%	14%	7%	125	2.97	6%	134
5 to 10 years	42%	43%	6%	10%	72	3.17	3%	76
11 to 19 years	35%	39%	11%	15%	117	2.95	3%	121
20+ years	26%	38%	25%	12%	77	2.78	4%	80
Total	32%	44%	14%	11%	397	2.97	4%	415

Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
j. My department/unit is responsive to and cooperative with District Administrative Center procedures.								
Moorpark College	38%	53%	4%	6%	108	3.23	15%	129
Oxnard College	45%	40%	9%	6%	82	3.24	9%	91
Ventura College	32%	62%	5%	2%	117	3.23	21%	151
District Administrative Center	44%	53%	0%	3%	36	3.39	9%	40
Classified	37%	54%	3%	6%	143	3.22	10%	160
Faculty	35%	54%	6%	4%	140	3.20	25%	190
Management	48%	45%	7%	0%	58	3.41	2%	59
Less than 5 years	36%	60%	3%	2%	109	3.29	16%	133
5 to 10 years	52%	35%	5%	8%	63	3.32	13%	73
11 to 19 years	38%	53%	5%	5%	104	3.23	13%	121
20+ years	24%	62%	11%	3%	63	3.06	21%	80
Total	38%	52%	5%	4%	346	3.25	15%	414

*Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

5. Respondents' level of agreement about the decision-making process at the work location where they work most of the time (MC,OC, VC, DAC):							
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count

a. My work location has an established governance structure and processes to promote effective collaboration among its constituencies.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
Moorpark College	21%	54%	17%	8%	105	2.89	5%	112
Oxnard College	10%	45%	25%	20%	80	2.45	4%	84
Ventura College	14%	41%	34%	11%	114	2.59	13%	135
District Administrative Center	17%	47%	27%	10%	30	2.70	16%	37
Classified	16%	46%	25%	13%	116	2.66	14%	140
Faculty	11%	48%	28%	14%	160	2.55	7%	174
Management	25%	50%	21%	4%	52	2.96	2%	53
Less than 5 years	13%	54%	23%	10%	100	2.70	10%	115
5 to 10 years	25%	42%	18%	15%	65	2.75	5%	69
11 to 19 years	14%	48%	27%	10%	97	2.67	8%	107
20+ years	8%	41%	39%	13%	64	2.44	12%	74
Total	15%	47%	26%	12%	332	2.66	9%	371

b. My work location engages in a structured cycle of continuous improvement, identifying goals, evaluating progress and making improvements.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
Moorpark College	27%	53%	12%	7%	107	3.00	4%	112
Oxnard College	15%	46%	24%	14%	78	2.63	6%	84
Ventura College	14%	43%	32%	12%	120	2.59	9%	135
District Administrative Center	10%	34%	41%	14%	29	2.41	18%	37
Classified	14%	42%	28%	15%	118	2.56	13%	140
Faculty	19%	47%	23%	11%	163	2.74	6%	174
Management	25%	52%	19%	4%	52	2.98	2%	53
Less than 5 years	14%	50%	26%	10%	103	2.68	8%	115
5 to 10 years	22%	41%	22%	14%	63	2.71	8%	69
11 to 19 years	22%	46%	21%	10%	98	2.81	7%	107
20+ years	15%	43%	30%	12%	67	2.61	8%	74
Total	18%	46%	24%	11%	337	2.71	7%	371

c. My work location uses data to evaluate and improve student progress and achievement.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
Moorpark College	26%	61%	10%	3%	99	3.10	9%	112
Oxnard College	18%	67%	11%	4%	73	2.99	11%	84
Ventura College	16%	59%	16%	10%	115	2.81	13%	135
District Administrative Center	14%	48%	24%	14%	21	2.62	36%	37
Classified	17%	67%	9%	7%	99	2.94	24%	140
Faculty	17%	60%	15%	8%	163	2.87	6%	173
Management	29%	51%	18%	2%	45	3.07	12%	53
Less than 5 years	15%	68%	11%	6%	94	2.91	14%	115
5 to 10 years	28%	51%	16%	5%	57	3.02	15%	69
11 to 19 years	22%	63%	9%	6%	96	3.00	9%	107
20+ years	10%	59%	22%	9%	58	2.71	19%	74
Total	19%	61%	13%	7%	311	2.93	14%	371

*Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
d. My work location has processes that utilize program review results for decisions and planning.								
Moorpark College	28%	55%	14%	3%	96	3.08	12%	112
Oxnard College	16%	51%	20%	13%	79	2.71	5%	84
Ventura College	17%	57%	21%	5%	115	2.86	13%	135
District Administrative Center	0%	20%	45%	35%	20	1.85	38%	37
Classified	17%	57%	18%	8%	103	2.83	22%	140
Faculty	17%	53%	21%	9%	160	2.78	7%	174
Management	30%	37%	22%	11%	46	2.87	10%	53
Less than 5 years	19%	56%	18%	8%	90	2.86	17%	115
5 to 10 years	25%	51%	19%	5%	57	2.95	15%	69
11 to 19 years	20%	51%	19%	11%	97	2.78	8%	107
20+ years	13%	53%	27%	8%	64	2.70	12%	74
Total	19%	52%	20%	9%	313	2.82	13%	371
e. I have appropriate opportunities to contribute input to planning at my work location.								
Moorpark College	24%	50%	15%	11%	110	2.86	1%	112
Oxnard College	17%	42%	22%	19%	81	2.58	3%	84
Ventura College	18%	44%	25%	13%	130	2.68	3%	134
District Administrative Center	21%	32%	38%	9%	34	2.65	4%	36
Classified	15%	45%	26%	15%	130	2.59	5%	139
Faculty	19%	42%	24%	16%	172	2.63	1%	174
Management	40%	46%	10%	4%	52	3.23	0%	52
Less than 5 years	19%	44%	24%	12%	108	2.71	4%	114
5 to 10 years	29%	41%	21%	9%	68	2.91	1%	69
11 to 19 years	18%	47%	19%	16%	103	2.68	3%	107
20+ years	14%	41%	27%	18%	73	2.51	0%	73
Total	20%	44%	23%	14%	358	2.71	3%	369
f. My work location has processes to ensure effective communication for its staff.								
Moorpark College	16%	52%	20%	12%	107	2.72	4%	112
Oxnard College	12%	36%	30%	22%	81	2.38	3%	84
Ventura College	14%	35%	28%	23%	130	2.39	3%	134
District Administrative Center	17%	43%	29%	11%	35	2.66	4%	37
Classified	12%	43%	25%	20%	132	2.48	5%	140
Faculty	14%	37%	28%	22%	167	2.43	3%	173
Management	23%	49%	23%	6%	53	2.89	0%	53
Less than 5 years	12%	44%	27%	18%	108	2.50	5%	115
5 to 10 years	27%	38%	23%	12%	66	2.80	3%	68
11 to 19 years	12%	46%	21%	21%	103	2.48	3%	107
20+ years	10%	33%	36%	22%	73	2.30	1%	74
Total	14%	41%	26%	18%	356	2.51	3%	370

*Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

6. Respondents' level of agreement about the organizational structure of the work location where they work most of the time (MC,OC,VC or DAC):								
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
a. My work location is adequately staffed to implement its mission.								
Moorpark College	7%	16%	42%	35%	108	1.95	3%	112
Oxnard College	7%	29%	39%	25%	83	2.18	1%	84
Ventura College	6%	34%	41%	19%	126	2.26	5%	134
District Administrative Center	0%	29%	46%	26%	35	2.03	7%	38
Classified	8%	26%	40%	26%	133	2.15	4%	140
Faculty	7%	27%	41%	25%	167	2.15	3%	173
Management	2%	27%	45%	25%	51	2.06	4%	54
Less than 5 years	6%	27%	36%	31%	108	2.09	5%	115
5 to 10 years	6%	25%	46%	24%	68	2.13	1%	69
11 to 19 years	6%	25%	47%	22%	103	2.15	4%	108
20+ years	7%	31%	39%	23%	70	2.23	4%	73
Total	6%	27%	41%	26%	355	2.13	4%	371
b. The organizational structure of my work location works efficiently.								
Moorpark College	14%	38%	33%	15%	108	2.51	3%	112
Oxnard College	7%	40%	38%	15%	82	2.40	2%	84
Ventura College	4%	37%	39%	20%	125	2.25	5%	133
District Administrative Center	3%	53%	39%	5%	38	2.53	0%	38
Classified	6%	47%	30%	18%	137	2.41	2%	140
Faculty	7%	34%	41%	19%	162	2.29	5%	172
Management	15%	40%	42%	4%	53	2.66	2%	54
Less than 5 years	6%	41%	37%	16%	109	2.39	4%	115
5 to 10 years	9%	43%	33%	15%	67	2.46	3%	69
11 to 19 years	12%	40%	33%	15%	104	2.48	3%	108
20+ years	1%	34%	47%	17%	70	2.20	2%	72
Total	8%	40%	37%	16%	356	2.39	3%	370
c. There is minimal duplication of services among departments.								
Moorpark College	18%	47%	24%	11%	92	2.73	14%	111
Oxnard College	17%	54%	15%	14%	71	2.73	12%	83
Ventura College	8%	37%	35%	20%	109	2.33	15%	133
District Administrative Center	11%	56%	28%	6%	36	2.72	2%	37
Classified	12%	48%	27%	13%	121	2.58	11%	139
Faculty	13%	42%	27%	18%	136	2.49	18%	171
Management	18%	50%	26%	6%	50	2.80	4%	53
Less than 5 years	13%	49%	22%	15%	97	2.61	12%	114
5 to 10 years	19%	41%	27%	14%	59	2.64	12%	68
11 to 19 years	14%	46%	26%	13%	91	2.62	12%	106
20+ years	3%	47%	36%	14%	58	2.40	18%	73
Total	13%	46%	27%	14%	311	2.58	13%	367

*Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
d. There is an adequate number of managers in my work location.								
Moorpark College	28%	47%	18%	7%	106	2.97	4%	112
Oxnard College	42%	49%	6%	2%	81	3.31	3%	84
Ventura College	17%	51%	26%	6%	124	2.78	6%	134
District Administrative Center	8%	68%	16%	8%	37	2.76	2%	38
Classified	30%	50%	16%	5%	133	3.05	4%	140
Faculty	28%	51%	14%	8%	160	2.99	7%	173
Management	9%	50%	37%	4%	54	2.65	0%	54
Less than 5 years	23%	51%	20%	7%	106	2.90	6%	115
5 to 10 years	32%	44%	18%	6%	66	3.02	4%	69
11 to 19 years	28%	48%	20%	4%	102	3.01	5%	108
20+ years	21%	61%	13%	6%	71	2.97	2%	73
Total	26%	50%	18%	6%	351	2.97	5%	371
e. My work location evaluates vacated positions to determine whether or not each should be restructured, updated, and/or refilled.								
Moorpark College	24%	43%	20%	13%	88	2.78	17%	112
Oxnard College	16%	32%	29%	23%	69	2.41	15%	84
Ventura College	8%	32%	41%	18%	99	2.30	22%	134
District Administrative Center	14%	43%	25%	18%	28	2.54	22%	38
Classified	16%	33%	26%	25%	105	2.41	21%	140
Faculty	12%	36%	36%	17%	132	2.43	21%	173
Management	26%	41%	28%	4%	46	2.89	12%	54
Less than 5 years	18%	33%	24%	25%	76	2.45	27%	115
5 to 10 years	22%	44%	24%	10%	59	2.78	13%	69
11 to 19 years	16%	34%	36%	13%	91	2.54	13%	108
20+ years	4%	36%	38%	22%	55	2.22	22%	73
Total	16%	36%	31%	18%	287	2.51	19%	371
f. Responsibilities are evenly distributed across departments at my work location.								
Moorpark College	7%	35%	35%	22%	96	2.28	11%	111
Oxnard College	9%	38%	27%	26%	74	2.31	8%	82
Ventura College	8%	38%	41%	14%	106	2.39	18%	134
District Administrative Center	3%	39%	48%	10%	31	2.35	13%	37
Classified	9%	38%	33%	20%	117	2.37	13%	139
Faculty	7%	35%	35%	23%	142	2.26	14%	170
Management	4%	45%	45%	6%	47	2.47	10%	54
Less than 5 years	8%	38%	32%	22%	91	2.32	16%	115
5 to 10 years	12%	37%	31%	20%	59	2.41	12%	68
11 to 19 years	5%	40%	37%	17%	94	2.34	10%	107
20+ years	5%	32%	47%	17%	60	2.25	13%	71
Total	7%	37%	37%	19%	310	2.33	13%	367

*Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
g. Responsibilities are clearly defined for departments across my work location.								
Moorpark College	11%	53%	25%	11%	100	2.64	7%	110
Oxnard College	9%	47%	27%	17%	78	2.49	6%	84
Ventura College	6%	45%	35%	14%	113	2.43	13%	134
District Administrative Center	9%	65%	24%	3%	34	2.79	9%	38
Classified	7%	50%	29%	13%	123	2.52	10%	140
Faculty	9%	47%	29%	15%	151	2.49	11%	172
Management	12%	63%	22%	4%	51	2.82	4%	54
Less than 5 years	8%	51%	29%	12%	101	2.55	10%	115
5 to 10 years	15%	50%	26%	10%	62	2.69	9%	69
11 to 19 years	7%	53%	24%	15%	98	2.52	7%	107
20+ years	5%	47%	37%	11%	62	2.45	13%	73
Total	9%	51%	28%	13%	328	2.55	9%	369
h. My work location is responsive to and cooperative with District Administrative Center procedures.								
Moorpark College	30%	61%	5%	5%	88	3.16	17%	111
Oxnard College	22%	47%	18%	13%	68	2.78	15%	83
Ventura College	15%	69%	10%	7%	102	2.91	20%	134
District Administrative Center	29%	68%	0%	3%	31	3.23	13%	37
Classified	23%	63%	6%	8%	109	3.01	18%	139
Faculty	18%	61%	12%	9%	130	2.87	22%	173
Management	35%	55%	10%	0%	49	3.24	4%	52
Less than 5 years	27%	62%	6%	5%	84	3.12	20%	114
5 to 10 years	26%	52%	7%	15%	61	2.90	9%	68
11 to 19 years	24%	60%	10%	6%	87	3.02	16%	108
20+ years	7%	70%	17%	6%	54	2.80	22%	72
Total	23%	61%	9%	7%	292	2.99	17%	368

*Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

7. Respondents' level of agreement regarding allocation of resources at the work location where they work most of the time (MC, OC, VC or DAC):

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
a. Resource allocation processes are clearly linked to the planning processes.								
Moorpark College	15%	53%	23%	10%	93	2.73	13%	111
Oxnard College	4%	43%	35%	18%	68	2.34	14%	82
Ventura College	5%	37%	41%	17%	100	2.30	21%	133
District Administrative Center	5%	35%	45%	15%	20	2.30	40%	38
Classified	10%	44%	33%	13%	96	2.52	25%	138
Faculty	6%	38%	35%	21%	139	2.30	17%	172
Management	9%	56%	33%	2%	45	2.71	12%	53
Less than 5 years	10%	42%	34%	14%	83	2.47	22%	115
5 to 10 years	8%	43%	35%	14%	51	2.45	23%	69
11 to 19 years	9%	49%	27%	15%	86	2.52	15%	106
20+ years	3%	36%	45%	16%	58	2.28	16%	71
Total	8%	43%	34%	15%	28	2.45	19%	367
b. The budget allocation processes promote the effective allocation of resources.								
Moorpark College	10%	45%	28%	17%	89	2.48	15%	109
Oxnard College	3%	25%	37%	34%	67	1.97	15%	82
Ventura College	4%	29%	43%	24%	100	2.13	21%	133
District Administrative Center	9%	41%	36%	14%	22	2.45	36%	38
Classified	9%	38%	33%	21%	92	2.35	27%	138
Faculty	4%	27%	37%	32%	139	2.03	17%	172
Management	8%	46%	40%	6%	48	2.56	7%	53
Less than 5 years	9%	29%	39%	23%	79	2.24	25%	115
5 to 10 years	7%	40%	33%	20%	55	2.35	18%	69
11 to 19 years	5%	40%	36%	19%	88	2.30	14%	106
20+ years	2%	27%	36%	35%	55	1.96	19%	71
Total	6%	34%	36%	24%	281	2.23	19%	365
c. I have appropriate opportunities to contribute input to budgeting.								
Moorpark College	15%	39%	31%	16%	96	2.52	9%	108
Oxnard College	3%	24%	53%	20%	75	2.09	7%	82
Ventura College	6%	28%	38%	28%	116	2.13	11%	134
District Administrative Center	14%	21%	41%	24%	29	2.24	20%	38
Classified	7%	27%	45%	21%	114	2.20	14%	138
Faculty	5%	27%	40%	27%	153	2.10	8%	169
Management	23%	40%	29%	8%	48	2.77	7%	53
Less than 5 years	7%	24%	42%	26%	99	2.12	11%	115
5 to 10 years	15%	27%	39%	19%	59	2.39	12%	68
11 to 19 years	10%	36%	33%	22%	92	2.34	9%	104
20+ years	2%	30%	48%	21%	63	2.13	10%	71
Total	9%	29%	40%	22%	319	2.25	10%	368

Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	10%	Total count
d. My work location maintains and upgrades its technology infrastructure (hardware and software) to meet student learning needs.								
Moorpark College	15%	46%	19%	20%	97	2.58	10%	111
Oxnard College	4%	62%	20%	14%	76	2.55	6%	82
Ventura College	13%	56%	19%	12%	124	2.69	5%	132
District Administrative Center	18%	65%	12%	6%	17	2.94	47%	38
Classified	16%	56%	23%	5%	108	2.83	18%	138
Faculty	8%	50%	18%	24%	165	2.42	3%	171
Management	18%	68%	10%	5%	40	2.98	19%	53
Less than 5 years	16%	47%	20%	16%	97	2.64	12%	114
5 to 10 years	17%	47%	17%	19%	59	2.63	13%	69
11 to 19 years	5%	67%	15%	12%	91	2.66	12%	106
20+ years	9%	55%	23%	12%	65	2.62	7%	71
Total	12%	55%	19%	15%	317	2.64	11%	366
e. My work location maintains and upgrades its technology infrastructure (hardware and software) to meet staff needs.								
Moorpark College	13%	44%	22%	21%	103	2.48	6%	111
Oxnard College	3%	58%	29%	11%	80	2.51	2%	82
Ventura College	12%	58%	18%	12%	125	2.70	5%	133
District Administrative Center	11%	54%	23%	11%	35	2.66	7%	38
Classified	11%	60%	22%	7%	127	2.75	6%	138
Faculty	7%	48%	24%	21%	165	2.41	4%	172
Management	14%	56%	18%	12%	50	2.72	4%	53
Less than 5 years	15%	50%	19%	16%	106	2.64	6%	115
5 to 10 years	13%	54%	15%	18%	68	2.63	1%	69
11 to 19 years	4%	59%	26%	11%	97	2.56	7%	106
20+ years	4%	54%	30%	12%	69	2.51	2%	71
Total	9%	54%	22%	15%	346	2.59	5%	367
f. My work location maintains and upgrades its facilities to meet student learning needs.								
Moorpark College	11%	44%	29%	16%	102	2.50	6%	110
Oxnard College	8%	44%	29%	19%	77	2.40	5%	82
Ventura College	11%	34%	36%	20%	121	2.36	8%	133
District Administrative Center	17%	83%	0%	0%	12	3.17	56%	38
Classified	16%	46%	30%	8%	104	2.71	19%	137
Faculty	5%	37%	31%	27%	167	2.21	3%	172
Management	10%	55%	30%	5%	40	2.70	18%	52
Less than 5 years	17%	36%	32%	15%	98	2.55	12%	115
5 to 10 years	11%	49%	19%	21%	57	2.49	13%	67
11 to 19 years	4%	50%	29%	17%	90	2.42	12%	106
20+ years	5%	35%	42%	18%	65	2.26	7%	71
Total	10%	42%	30%	18%	315	2.45	11%	365

*Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
g. My work location ensures a safe physical environment for both students and staff.								
Moorpark College	22%	50%	15%	14%	110	2.80	1%	111
Oxnard College	15%	59%	20%	7%	82	2.80	1%	83
Ventura College	14%	47%	23%	16%	127	2.60	4%	133
District Administrative Center	27%	68%	3%	3%	37	3.19	2%	38
Classified	19%	57%	16%	7%	134	2.88	3%	139
Faculty	14%	46%	21%	19%	168	2.55	2%	172
Management	23%	68%	9%	0%	53	3.13	0%	53
Less than 5 years	21%	54%	18%	7%	113	2.89	1%	115
5 to 10 years	22%	52%	14%	12%	69	2.84	0%	78
11 to 19 years	15%	53%	19%	14%	102	2.69	3%	106
20+ years	10%	55%	19%	16%	69	2.59	4%	72
Total	17%	53%	17%	12%	359	2.77	2%	368

Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

8. Respondents' level of agreement about the organizational structure of District Administrative Center):								
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
a. District Administrative Center is adequately staffed to fulfill its responsibilities in an efficient manner.								
Moorpark College	13%	30%	43%	14%	63	2.41	32%	107
Oxnard College	24%	46%	17%	13%	46	2.80	32%	78
Ventura College	28%	32%	26%	13%	68	2.75	35%	123
District Administrative Center	0%	19%	50%	31%	32	1.88	7%	35
Classified	13%	40%	36%	11%	83	2.55	26%	128
Faculty	30%	34%	18%	17%	76	2.78	43%	162
Management	10%	14%	51%	24%	49	2.10	4%	52
Less than 5 years	9%	36%	36%	19%	67	2.34	27%	107
5 to 10 years	23%	23%	40%	15%	40	2.53	33%	66
11 to 19 years	16%	35%	34%	15%	62	2.53	32%	103
20+ years	38%	30%	22%	11%	37	2.95	33%	64
Total	19%	32%	33%	16%	212	2.54	30%	346
b. The balance of centralization and decentralization of functions between the District Administrative Center and the colleges works well.								
Moorpark College	3%	33%	45%	19%	69	2.20	25%	104
Oxnard College	4%	42%	36%	18%	50	2.32	28%	78
Ventura College	3%	18%	49%	31%	80	1.91	27%	123
District Administrative Center	10%	39%	52%	0%	31	2.58	9%	35
Classified	4%	42%	48%	6%	90	2.46	22%	128
Faculty	1%	22%	35%	42%	93	1.82	35%	162
Management	8%	25%	58%	8%	48	2.33	4%	51
Less than 5 years	4%	31%	41%	24%	68	2.16	27%	107
5 to 10 years	5%	33%	51%	12%	43	2.30	28%	65
11 to 19 years	3%	35%	47%	16%	77	2.25	20%	103
20+ years	2%	20%	44%	34%	41	1.90	28%	64
Total	4%	30%	45%	21%	233	2.17	25%	343
c. The division of responsibilities and procedures between DAC and the colleges is clear.								
Moorpark College	4%	36%	49%	11%	74	2.34	23%	105
Oxnard College	6%	38%	40%	15%	52	2.35	26%	78
Ventura College	2%	23%	40%	35%	81	1.94	26%	123
District Administrative Center	9%	41%	47%	3%	32	2.56	7%	35
Classified	4%	42%	47%	7%	96	2.43	19%	128
Faculty	2%	23%	36%	38%	94	1.89	34%	172
Management	10%	34%	50%	6%	50	2.48	3%	52
Less than 5 years	5%	38%	41%	15%	78	2.33	20%	107
5 to 10 years	7%	33%	37%	24%	46	2.22	26%	66
11 to 19 years	3%	36%	45%	16%	74	2.26	22%	103
20+ years	3%	18%	55%	25%	40	1.98	29%	64
Total	5%	33%	43%	19%	242	2.22	23%	344

*Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
d. District Administrative Center is responsive to and cooperative with the colleges' procedures.								
Moorpark College	7%	44%	29%	20%	70	2.39	24%	104
Oxnard College	4%	42%	33%	21%	52	2.29	25%	77
Ventura College	2%	28%	41%	28%	81	2.05	26%	123
District Administrative Center	17%	69%	14%	0%	29	3.03	13%	35
Classified	6%	59%	27%	8%	86	2.63	25%	128
Faculty	1%	26%	37%	35%	99	1.93	31%	171
Management	17%	42%	27%	15%	48	2.60	4%	51
Less than 5 years	7%	44%	36%	13%	72	2.46	24%	107
5 to 10 years	7%	49%	20%	24%	41	2.39	30%	64
11 to 19 years	5%	42%	33%	20%	76	2.33	21%	103
20+ years	2%	26%	36%	36%	42	1.95	27%	64
Total	6%	42%	31%	21%	235	2.32	24%	342
e. District Administrative Center effectively communicates for the colleges to the community.								
Moorpark College	7%	38%	30%	25%	69	2.28	28%	107
Oxnard College	7%	36%	35%	22%	55	2.29	22%	77
Ventura College	2%	33%	33%	33%	83	2.05	25%	123
District Administrative Center	13%	71%	17%	0%	24	2.96	24%	35
Classified	8%	49%	32%	11%	85	2.55	25%	128
Faculty	2%	28%	30%	41%	105	1.90	28%	161
Management	12%	48%	31%	10%	42	2.62	15%	52
Less than 5 years	10%	34%	34%	22%	68	2.32	27%	107
5 to 10 years	2%	54%	29%	15%	41	2.44	31%	65
11 to 19 years	5%	39%	29%	26%	76	2.24	21%	103
20+ years	4%	33%	29%	33%	45	2.09	23%	64
Total	6%	39%	31%	24%	234	2.27	25%	345
f. District Administrative Center effectively advocates for the colleges to the State.								
Moorpark College	10%	51%	13%	26%	39	2.46	49%	107
Oxnard College	9%	51%	20%	20%	35	2.49	42%	77
Ventura College	8%	40%	27%	25%	48	2.31	47%	122
District Administrative Center	21%	75%	4%	0%	24	3.17	24%	35
Classified	15%	72%	9%	4%	53	2.98	43%	127
Faculty	2%	35%	26%	37%	62	2.02	50%	161
Management	22%	50%	16%	13%	32	2.81	29%	52
Less than 5 years	18%	47%	18%	16%	38	2.68	46%	106
5 to 10 years	16%	55%	13%	16%	38	2.71	35%	65
11 to 19 years	4%	54%	17%	24%	46	2.39	44%	103
20+ years	4%	50%	25%	21%	24	2.38	48%	64
Total	11%	52%	17%	20%	149	2.53	44%	344

Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
g. I am adequately informed of the changes, news, and activities throughout the District.								
Moorpark College	4%	46%	32%	17%	93	2.38	10%	107
Oxnard College	6%	42%	34%	18%	65	2.35	12%	77
Ventura College	5%	32%	42%	21%	102	2.22	13%	123
District Administrative Center	13%	56%	19%	13%	32	2.69	7%	35
Classified	7%	45%	37%	11%	105	2.47	14%	128
Faculty	3%	39%	34%	24%	136	2.21	13%	151
Management	12%	40%	30%	18%	50	2.46	3%	52
Less than 5 years	12%	33%	37%	18%	94	2.38	9%	107
5 to 10 years	6%	46%	25%	23%	52	2.35	17%	65
11 to 19 years	3%	43%	40%	13%	90	2.37	10%	103
20+ years	0%	44%	31%	24%	54	2.20	12%	64
Total	6%	41%	34%	19%	295	2.34	11%	345

*Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
9. There are sufficient professional development opportunities provided throughout the VCCC District.								
Moorpark College	15%	58%	22%	6%	102	2.81	4%	108
Oxnard College	5%	45%	32%	18%	74	2.38	5%	79
Ventura College	6%	48%	37%	9%	114	2.51	6%	124
District Administrative Center	0%	41%	47%	12%	34	2.29	2%	35
Classified	10%	43%	36%	11%	119	2.52	6%	129
Faculty	8%	54%	28%	10%	152	2.60	6%	164
Management	4%	56%	31%	10%	52	2.54	0%	52
Less than 5 years	5%	42%	40%	14%	96	2.39	8%	107
5 to 10 years	11%	51%	28%	11%	65	2.61	1%	66
11 to 19 years	10%	52%	31%	7%	100	2.65	3%	104
20+ years	7%	60%	23%	10%	60	2.63	7%	66
Total	8%	50%	32%	10%	327	2.56	5%	349
10. There are opportunities for career advancement throughout the VCCC District.								
Moorpark College	8%	56%	23%	13%	90	2.58	12%	107
Oxnard College	1%	47%	24%	28%	68	2.22	11%	79
Ventura College	1%	36%	37%	26%	106	2.11	11%	124
District Administrative Center	0%	39%	33%	27%	33	2.12	4%	35
Classified	3%	38%	32%	28%	117	2.15	6%	129
Faculty	4%	51%	26%	19%	130	2.39	17%	164
Management	2%	44%	32%	22%	50	2.26	3%	52
Less than 5 years	2%	44%	32%	22%	95	2.26	8%	107
5 to 10 years	3%	42%	32%	22%	59	2.27	9%	66
11 to 19 years	5%	44%	25%	26%	87	2.26	13%	104
20+ years	2%	50%	28%	20%	54	2.33	15%	66
Total	3%	45%	29%	23%	300	2.88	11%	348

*Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

11. Functions that Need to be Evaluated Further to Ensure and Enhance the Effectiveness of the Organizational Structures of Colleges and/or District Administrative Center:		
Review of budget allocation to fund new programs, student services programs, equiable staffing	28	8%
Review of hiring processes	27	8%
Review of participatory governance process to be inclusive and decisions are based on data	21	6%
Human resources function for adequate staffing and services to colleges	19	5%
Employee and management relations, working environment	17	5%
Department review for equitable distribution of work and effective use of resources	16	5%
Academic/student services/planning and insittutional effectiveness oversight and support	14	4%
Marketing/Outreach efforts to the community, business and educational partners	14	4%
Review compensation for faculty and staff in order to hire and retain qualified personnel	13	4%
Professional development opportunities	12	3%
Diversity in hiring panel and hiring pool	12	3%
Career advancement opportunities for facullty and classified staff	11	3%
Delineation of roles and responsibilities for shared functions	11	3%
Internal communications between district and colleges	11	3%
Communication for information and transparency purposes	10	3%
More collaboration among same units at the three colleges	9	3%
Documentation and training of business services policies and procedures	9	3%
Campus safety and emergency preparedness	8	2%
Standardized processes and procedures across the campuses	7	2%
Use of technology for business practices	7	2%
Review grant area to procure additional funding, adminstration of funds and keep in compliance	7	2%
Review planning processes to integrate with that of colleges	8	2%
Others	61	17%
Total	**352**	**100%**

13. Respondents' level of agreement about the delivery of education and support services to students in relation to the financial health of the District and its colleges:								
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
a. The colleges deliver instruction in a way that also considers the financial health of the District.								
Moorpark College	24%	56%	15%	4%	78	3.01	20%	105
Oxnard College	15%	64%	14%	7%	59	2.88	17%	76
Ventura College	11%	49%	32%	7%	81	2.64	26%	122
District Administrative Center	0%	75%	25%	0%	20	2.75	31%	34
Classified	14%	68%	15%	4%	74	2.91	29%	124
Faculty	17%	50%	26%	7%	121	2.75	20%	160
Management	14%	62%	21%	2%	42	2.88	15%	52
Less than 5 years	19%	58%	17%	7%	59	2.88	29%	102
5 to 10 years	19%	63%	19%	0%	48	3.00	22%	65
11 to 19 years	14%	61%	18%	8%	80	2.81	17%	102
20+ years	10%	50%	35%	4%	48	2.67	21%	65
Total	15%	57%	22%	5%	241	2.83	22%	340
b. I am well informed about the relationship of class size, level of support services, and educational quality with the District's financial health.								
Moorpark College	17%	42%	29%	12%	83	2.63	16%	105
Oxnard College	9%	36%	35%	20%	69	2.33	7%	76
Ventura College	14%	33%	40%	14%	101	2.47	13%	121
District Administrative Center	0%	48%	38%	14%	21	2.33	29%	34
Classified	9%	33%	44%	15%	82	2.37	25%	124
Faculty	14%	35%	32%	19%	148	2.45	6%	159
Management	14%	53%	30%	2%	43	2.79	13%	52
Less than 5 years	11%	34%	37%	18%	76	2.37	18%	102
5 to 10 years	13%	42%	36%	9%	53	2.59	14%	64
11 to 19 years	15%	40%	31%	14%	87	2.56	12%	102
20+ years	11%	35%	36%	18%	55	2.38	12%	65
Total	12%	38%	35%	15%	277	2.47	16%	339
c. I am well informed about the relationship between average class size and the ability of the District to provide competitive salary and benefits.								
Moorpark College	14%	30%	37%	19%	84	2.39	15%	105
Oxnard College	7%	37%	39%	17%	70	2.34	6%	76
Ventura College	11%	32%	34%	24%	101	2.30	13%	122
District Administrative Center	0%	23%	59%	18%	22	2.05	27%	34
Classified	7%	28%	49%	16%	86	2.26	22%	124
Faculty	12%	32%	30%	27%	147	2.29	7%	160
Management	12%	42%	40%	7%	43	2.58	13%	52
Less than 5 years	10%	29%	42%	19%	79	2.30	16%	102
5 to 10 years	9%	37%	35%	19%	54	2.37	14%	65
11 to 19 years	13%	31%	38%	19%	88	2.36	11%	102
20+ years	8%	36%	34%	23%	53	2.28	15%	65
Total	10%	32%	38%	20%	280	2.32	14%	340

*Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Subtotal	Mean*	Don't know	Total count
d. Decisions related to educational quality, class size, and support staffing are made at the appropriate levels and with appropriate collaboration.								
Moorpark College	7%	29%	30%	34%	76	2.08	21%	105
Oxnard College	8%	32%	35%	25%	60	2.23	16%	76
Ventura College	3%	19%	41%	37%	86	1.88	21%	120
District Administrative Center	0%	40%	60%	0%	15	2.40	42%	34
Classified	7%	34%	42%	17%	71	2.31	30%	123
Faculty	3%	20%	32%	45%	132	1.80	14%	159
Management	11%	37%	49%	3%	35	2.57	25%	52
Less than 5 years	9%	26%	37%	28%	57	2.16	29%	100
5 to 10 years	6%	33%	42%	19%	48	2.27	22%	65
11 to 19 years	5%	28%	37%	30%	83	2.07	15%	102
20+ years	2%	18%	35%	45%	49	1.78	19%	65
Total	5%	26%	38%	30%	338	2.07	22%	338

Average of responses from 1 to 4, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 4 being "strongly agree". "Don't know/N/A" responses were excluded from the calculation of the mean.

14. Within the last year, former colleagues who I know have left VCCCD for the following reason(s):		
A job elsewhere for better pay (lateral move)	212	18%
A job elsewhere for promotion (higher level)	167	14%
Retirement	178	15%
Lack of job satisfaction	156	13%
A job elsewhere for different management/managers	148	12%
Lack of advancement	125	10%
A job elsewhere to be closer to home	71	6%
A job elsewhere for better benefits	58	5%
Moved out of the area	59	5%
Job elsewhere with better workload	8	1%
Others (hostile work environment, grant ended/medical)	13	1%
Total	**1195**	**100%**

COMMENTS

Respondent's Suggestions About How the District and Colleges May Organize Themselves to Better Support Changing Student Needs, New State Requirements and Funding Models, and New Programs, Such as Guided Pathways, Delivery of Basic Skills and IEPI

Note: While the CBT evaluator attempted to group the open-ended comments by topic, many individual comments address multiple concerns/issues. The evaluator chose not to separate any given comment in order to ensure respondents' thoughts are kept in its entirety. Additionally, any time one individual position or name is, or can be, identifiable and referenced negatively, a blank line, "_____" appears.

Classroom

- Stop trying to jam more students into fewer classes.
- It is inappropriate to demand that certain courses be capped at 30 when they should be capped at 24 (e.g., Public Speaking) because there simply isn't enough time during the semester to meet the course requirements with the larger number of students in the course (required number of speeches and time requirements for those speeches multiplied by the number of students, balanced with the time necessary to adequately teach the concepts). We need more faculty to teach more sections with fewer students in them.
- Re-evaluate the class size caps for online courses. 55 students should be considered an over-sized class. The level of connection and support many students need to be successful is high and these class sizes do not acknowledge this. Also, it should be acknowledged that some students will not be well-served by online coursework. Students need on-ground course offerings at varied times of the day and week. Cancelling low enrolled classes undermines these students.
- While I appreciate the fact that online classes are offered on such a large scale now, I think it is crucial for us to maintain truly divers and keep on ground classes offered and untouched for students who prefer learning in the traditional classroom. The larger numbers of students in online courses should compensate smaller class sizes on ground. I think it might be a good idea if similar programs within the district created a closer network to benefit from each other's successes and failures.
- Labor market information within each college is a necessity to program development. Having a dedicated person who can provide information quickly, understands the labor market data and faculty needs for LMI is an essential activity on each campus. Have more online classes offered on each campus to increase enrollment.
- Departments with three or more instructors/staff should have a department lead with release time.
- The three colleges need to be fluid and connected. As online learning becomes institutionalized, we need student hang-outs online, more use of (free) pre-existing resources (like google docs) in the classroom. It shouldn't be so hard to seamlessly use a word processor or excel (type) program across platforms. Students need us to set an example, which is to say: demonstrate that we are rational, that we understand science and reason.
- You need to focus on education, and the people who are in the classroom providing education to our students. VCCCD is the worst place I worked for. Nothing ever improves. The comments are useless, as nobody ever does anything to improve student services.
- Reduce class sizes; Guarantee classes with enrollments of at least 15. Allow division managers to have more autonomy in deciding about class cancellation.

- I AM BEING EXPLOITED. Somehow it is now the rule that we cannot increase class size beyond 60, so that we cannot be paid more (when the class size reaches 61 and beyond, for every 25 additional students we get more money). I am tired of being exploited and taken advantage of. Every semester I have two to three sections closed at 60, which could easily reach 85 or more. In essence I am teaching 1 to 3 classes for free. I have successfully taught up to 100 or more students in ONE class. (waste of money too - we have a 200 seat classroom which is never filled to capacity - I don't understand why it was built in the first place!) The rationale is that we cannot effectively teach large classes, because we lose contact with students. This is a weak and convenient argument. In Online classes, instructors have none to minimal face to face interaction with students, yet we offer hundreds of online classes. WE DESERVE A RAISE!!!! The District has a large reserve. Their unwillingness to negotiate in good faith is unethical and disrespectful. The morale is at an all time low. I keep teaching because I love my students and colleagues, otherwise I would be looking for another job.
- Moving towards a work groups based model where teams are formed based on the student population being addressed. For example, a Veteran's team would include a financial aid representative, and admissions representative, a counselor, etc. All the resources that student's need to succeed in one spot. This would also require better lines of communication between all the representatives to stay abreast of current information. This would minimize students being sent to all sorts of different places across campus and receiving conflicting information. EOPS works on a model that is similar to this and their retention and graduation rates are better than other student groups. Bakersfield College utilizes a similar work model.

Communication
- The Academic Senate and faculty need to be consulted and their input given much more influence regarding the implementation of all of these programs and issues.
- Downward communication needs to happen on an ongoing basis. There are management meetings everywhere but no information is relayed to the constituents that make it happen. In addition to that, our department keeps operating in positions that are the same and have not evolved. Position studies are not done to move them to the 21st century. Instead our organization is molded on some other college's model that does not fit our organization. Our organization has our jobs as too basic when all of our jobs have become more complex as time change. Its like the old, if it works, why change it. To further extrapolate on that employees are unwilling to change. Change is what makes us efficient. Instead we are being reactive to those that choose not to change and stagger the organization. We settle for adjusting our new processes for the ones that chose not to develop themselves and in doing so, we are not using technology the way that we should. We are also too political in terms of titles and seniority. This further staggers the organization in driving change to a culture that is on a continuous improvement path. We ignore newcomers with great ideas because we play it safe by following every opinion of those that have been here more than 5 years. The issue is that they fail to let go of history to reinvent it and establish new guidelines or procedures. Its so bad at times that individuals that are hired into a higher role are not given the respect that they need and are treated as if they should know what they are talking about, they mere thought that they should have the experience in education and that their value to the district because of their longevity is staggering the organization. I love my job, I hate the structure under which we operate and the fact that we resist change and are not open to ideas from others. So my idea is that we need training on Change. Perhaps who moved my cheese and give them the pickle and the 5 S system and PDCA.
- There is no discussion about "how" to help students choose their pathway. Lack of basic knowledge about student behavior is missing. The college is being forced to implement "Guided Pathways" which do not help transfer students. Transfer students may be mislead into selecting a vague pathway which will inhibit transfer. More emphasis should be placed on helping students select their pathway.

- Inclusion of all campus constituents should be taken into consideration before making decisions often times the district simply makes decisions and then we find out about the later.
- Provide information on these programs to all staff, so we understand what they are. Periodic emails or newsletter information, so we know what is going on and what requirements will affect us.
- Better communication among College staff involved in these programs that can and should lead to cross-collaboration. The District should improve or change their practices/policies to best help the Colleges deliver these programs to students in a speedy and efficient manner
- The district has grown tremendously in the past decade with staff and managers, they have a brand new building, they have the nicest, most expensive furniture, and get treated as if we have endless amounts of money. Yet, the colleges are treated as if we have no money. We often have broken chairs in our classroom (students often fall off them and have hurt themselves). We have rats and rat traps all around our building. Our roofs leak. We don't have enough custodians and trash is often not taken out for over a week. The campus looks disguising. This is one of many examples of how the district puts themselves before us. Now the district is teaching classes through the district as well, and there are many examples of them taking our students away from our classes and getting them into their classes. These not-for-credit courses are run poorly, hidden from faculty dispute many requests to share what is happening at the district and our small classes that often barely make enrollment are losing more students to the district classes because they are recruiting our students. It is as if our district office is our biggest competitor - instead of being the entity that helps us run smoothly. While we have to go through curriculum, have to have minimum qualifications for our discipline faculty, have to incorporate guided pathways and other state mandates and have to figure out how to split our allocated FTES to only teach classes that give us good productivity numbers and have high enrollments, the district is now teaching classes and not following any of these rules. And they are misguiding students. This is a very big discussion point on our campus and dispute all our attempt to get someone from the district to come talk to us - it seems each time we have a meeting they suddenly can't make it and have to cancel - because they don't want to communicate with us.
- Information seems to be delivered effectively at campus level via campus-wide email and workshops, with opportunity for input. The campus retreats are a great way to pull all staff out of their offices to learn about and participate in these initiatives. Not sure about "delivery of basic and IEPI".
- Greater cross-college collaboration on initiatives that each of the colleges implement. I'm serving on the VC Guided Pathways team and have zero idea what MC and OC are doing.
- The District Office is out of touch with student needs. "Present," competent, responsible, accountable, energetic and honest administrators are required to deliver on all of the above.
- The one thing that I think needs to be done at Ventura College is to go back to having the meetings for these programs on Fridays. We went to the block scheduling in an effort to have more people involved with the meeting process, and now people within our department can't actively attend or participate because meetings are held during our class time throughout the week. Department chairs should have more responsibility and the process becomes more efficient.
- Maintaining and strengthening enrollment through effective marketing will ensure the greatest course offerings and programs for students and a thriving campus for faculty and staff.
- All campuses should work together to implement programs, navigate state requirements, etc. Right now on our campus, Guided Pathways feels like it is only for this campus. Should we not have work groups with all three campuses to streamline everything? Nothing here feels "district-wide". We are all our own island. This is not how school districts normally operate.
- Improved communication and timely follow up with students. Individual explanation of how they fit in all the funding and programs.
- I feel the district is doing pretty well communicating, but the executive staff here is very frustrating, isolating, and demoralizing.

- The district's application of the new funding model must be clearly explained, transparent to the district and proportional to what the individual colleges' allocations would have been if existing as individual colleges and not as part of a district. Any exceptions to this should be supported by evidence and available to staff for review. Guided pathways and basic skills are essential. Please continue to support the colleges' efforts to implement these programs. I don't yet know enough about IEPI to have an opinion on it.
- Disseminate the new information to EVERYONE on campus and not through emails or flyers. Get students and all classified professional opinion or at least a voice. Those who oversees others need to be force (at times) in allowing there staff to attend informational sessions, PD or events on or off campus that will benefit them and or their area. Those certain overseers will attest in front of management and others they have no problem allowing the employees to attend events but in reality they are telling false tales. Listen to employees. Have a point person a go to person
- Promote more intercampus communication. Less top-down management. Include more input from people who actually teach and have daily contact with students rather than having admin make important budgetary (and other) decisions. Increased collaboration between faculty/staff and administration. I've yet to have an administrator from the district come to my class or discuss what I do with students.
- Learn from private colleges who are measured by completion rates and success already.
- Not offering classes through the District. Enforce District employees to know their job/do their job and for it not to take 6-8 months to hire someone. Less bureaucratic red tape at the district. Leadership starts at the top and we here at VC have not had good solid leadership for many years. No leader = no followers. Currently we have an interim president and two VP's who want to be the next president so no one will make any hard decisions that are needing to be made and addressed. Commitment from administration not to allow discrimination to students who receive priority registration to continue. (hiding classes that "popular" instructors teach until after registration begins) Saying that they "intend on this not happening again" is not acceptable.
- Paid position to wrangle all the communication between the three campuses. Many opportunities are missed from slow or no communication. Each campus is so different in make up and student needs, a function of the management should be to help facilitate student learning, but cancelling classes with students in need of those classes stops the pathway out of our schools, stopping progress. The guided pathways are in need of linkage to established Secondary school pathways and time needs to be allocated for staff to meet with the High School Counselors and College counselors to help marry the pathways.
- Use data to make decisions. For example, our district implemented enrollment for summer and fall to happen at the same time because it would increase FTES but no data was used to make that decision or to evaluate if the concurrent enrollment met the needs of the students or increase FTES.
- Need community involvement and advocacy for the arts at the state to remain and grow as a part of the community college mission. We need to respond to the needs of an aging population that needs and wants physical education and dance to improve their health and quality of life.
- We must keep great lines of communication open, lack of being informed does cause huge problems.
- Instead of having few individuals with no understanding nor knowledge of students' needs dictating what colleges and District must accomplish, maybe gain feedback from faculty and staff who are actually dealing with student issues. Understand students in different demographic locations having different needs, one size does not fit all.
- Oftentimes, changes are presented as a democratic option (ex. Guided Pathways), when in reality decisions regarding the change have already been made at a high level. I would encourage that "false options" are not presented as being a choice as it influences morale.
- The district and colleges should work together more effectively to coordinate a unified Guided Pathways idea.

- As a classified staff, I don't receive enough information about these initiatives and can't provide information or support as a result. I would like to see classified staff gain an increased knowledge of these initiatives and what each means for their college and district as a whole. Classified don't always have an opportunity to attend the meetings and gain this important knowledge and as a result they don't have an understanding of "the big picture". It would be helpful if the district and individual colleges could make a greater effort to include classified staff so they can gain the necessary knowledge to be able to provide supportive services in a way that they understand fully what they are doing and why it matters, not only to our students, but to the district as a whole.
- The academic senate and the classified senate are not taken seriously by the administration or the DAC. This must change in order to provide environments that enhance student outcomes by providing safe and fair working environments for staff. This also extends to the IEPI process. Key figures were not able to provide their appropriate input, and the input given was diminished in the reporting. Pay rates for faculty and classified employees need to be on par with other colleges in the region for employees to continue to be able to live in this area and work. Faculty and staff can't do the jobs they need to if finances are preoccupying their mind. When job offers from other colleges would increase their income by 15%-20%, why would faculty stay (especially in high need areas where they would make double in private industry). The DAC must not dictate what colleges do specifically, but support what colleges do. DAC must listen to students who repeatedly say that shorter classes makes more sense for them (the introduction recently of late start and half term classes is a beginning); low enrollment numbers could be linked to the length of the term since most other colleges in the region are on a 16 week semester. Guided Pathways is common sense...departments just need to put in writing what they've been telling students for years. Class sizes are TOO large! If you want actual learning to take place, classes must be capped at 30 (online too)! No one can effectively create relationships with one class of students of 55-100. Research (and Professional Development here at the college) tells us that relationships with students is one of the key factors in student success. Another is a teacher who actually has time to do their job well, which cannot happen if there are too many students in a class to properly attend to.
- Listen and really HEAR the requests of those "boots on the ground" staff, not just management

Faculty
- So many students are taught by adjuncts yet adjuncts make little money, have low job security, and no benefits. While this increased in the most recent contract, adjuncts only are paid for a limited number of office hours and time in department and division meetings. Office hours and attending meetings are key for adjuncts to be able to meet student needs. Late start and 15 week classes or a 15 week semester would meet the needs of students and adjuncts better than the current system.
- More focus on instruction and student services at the district office, as primary focus is now on HR and fiscal services.
- Hire more full-time faculty
- Having assigned offices and weekly hours for all staff so we are available to students, not just full-time faculty. Smaller class sizes would also help faculty better serve student needs.
- With the eradication of basic skills at VC (no required sequence for struggling students now directly placed in transfer courses as a result of AB 705), the district needs to set aside funds for co-requisite development, faculty training, cross-program collaboration, etc. Guided Pathways has received necessary funding; however, math and English departments are relying on faculty innovation at a time when classroom curriculum is shifting and enlisting specializations for which faculty have not been trained or educated. Cross campus work also needs to be funded heavily to ensure uniform standards and expectations. As a result of lack of foresight about these changes, administration at VC has also overlooked the need for more transfer-level English classes to be offered, with VC offering significantly fewer than MC (obviously resulting in higher success rates at MC...fewer students dropping as a result of having less options for their requirements to be met), for example.

- Work with faculty more. Get more faculty input. Support those that work directly with students.
- Find ways to pull in Adjunct Faculty into Professional "Learning Circles" for increased investment and ownership of the community's goals.
- We have over 60% Hispanic student population. Yet our American Ethnic Study courses have been ignored. We are in desperate need of new full-time faculty hires to contribute to creating a well established department. It is embarrassing that our college is completely ignoring this service and demand. These are gate way courses to student success. Stop pushing for courses to be cancelled. Several courses with 15 or mores students were cancelled. This is truly ridiculous and a disservice for our students.
- Listen to the faculty. We are on the front lines.
- There is a lack of faculty especially counselors to provide adequate service to students. Guided pathways needs more faculty to be involved. The campus is not designed structurely as a safe place. There should be more exits, better emergency alerts systems (intercom), and a more organized system in place. Canceling classes continues to hurt the success of the students and their completion at our colleges. We also do NOT offer adequate salaries in comparison with other community colleges to recruit and sustain faculty. We have lost many tenured faculty over the r years I have been with the district.
- Support faculty in their teaching. For example, provide more classrooms with active furniture for faculty using active learning pedagogy. Decrease class size so that faculty can focus on deeper education, more writing assignments, etc. Provide more opportunities for faculty to go to conferences. The current process is somewhat of a joke. Foster more collaboration between faculty and counselors. Provide more training for faculty to learn new teaching/learning pedagogies
- The academic departments are the pillars of our institutions. They should be the place of greatest focus of interest. The colleges were created to teach, not to administer. The accreditation process is sadly incapable of evaluating the quality of teaching, a thing that is mostly unquantifiable. Teaching is more akin to parenting than it is to production. When is a parent successful? What makes a successful life? Such questions will never have a satisfactory answer, but the answers are assumed when administrators talk to faculty about "productivity". Initiatives such as Guided Pathways are mostly attempts at addressing administrative shortcomings; clear degree paths should always have been apparent. In order to be truly successful in the mission of the colleges, we urgently need to respect and promote the best teaching practices established in the disciplines. This can only be done in academic departments, since our "mangers" are hired to direct (and evaluate) us lacking any knowledge of our fields. Our departments require department chairs who are up to date on the most current standards and teaching practices in their disciplines and can instruct their colleagues in these matters. This becomes especially critical in our colleges, where around half of the faculty do not have full-time employment. It is not uncommon that I hear international students express their surprise that college instructors in the US just teach the textbook. We offer teaching. Support services are also important for our students, but they are not what they come to college for. We need to refocus everything we do.
- Faculty should have an opportunity to be informed regarding the funding and usage of the specific laboratory rooms.
- Scheduling for faculty to participate in district meetings needs attention. We teach as our job so meetings during scheduled class time means we cannot participate. There needs to be a stronger effort to make it possible for faculty to participate in District programs.
- Trust faculty to make the right decisions. Most of the time it feels like the opinions of faculty are simply disregarded and administrators do whatever they want. While I understand that administration ultimately has the final say, explaining why decisions are made would be helpful.
- Faculty need greater say in how supply and equipment budgets are administered and spent. In recent years, our ability to independently spend our department supply budgets in particular has been curtailed by micromanaging deans.

- The same faculty always seem to participate in various college activities, programs, initiatives, etc. although serving the college is a part of every faculty member's job description, some faculty members do a lot and some hardly anything at all. So for these overworked faculty members, there needs to be some compensation for all the extra hours spent supporting the students and the college. So the District and the colleges need to revisit their organization and provide pathways for faculty members who are interested to become leaders in certain areas (other than department chairs) instead of hiring more managers (Deans) who either are or become disconnected from the "ground troops - faculty and students". The extra time and effort spent on these leadership roles should be compensated. But faculty cannot get release time and not teach ... this would be in addition to their teaching load but will get paid for it. I think leadership roles from within the faculty ranks will be more organic and have greater positive consequences for the college and the compensation will be a good incentive for faculty to take on greater leadership roles.
- We need more full time professors and fewer managers and vice presidents. We don't have funding for full time professors, yet we have THREE VPs! This clearly shows where the college and the districts priorities are.

Funding
- Oxnard College needs more financial support, as it serves a more disadvantaged population.
- Increased funding at each college. Less dependence of the District level
- DAC needs more funding so that it can be adequately staffed to support the colleges.
- Allocate funds more equally among the 3 colleges. All three schools should have the same course numbering of classes for consistency.
- District commitment to pathways. Include VC east campus part of funding model allocation.
- If a campus applies for a grant, they need to look into what is required to adequately use those funds as written in the grant. That means looking into the reporting, sticking to a budget and not spending funds just so we "not return the allocation."
- The contracts and grants unit at the DAC is in charge of reviewing accounting and budget for all federal and state grants/contracts/special funding for the three colleges. This includes reviewing all quarterly and year end reports. The contracts and grants unit at the DAC is understaffed for the amount of federal and state grants/contracts/special funding it handles. The colleges continue to obtain grants at an accelerated rate (see below). Staffing for this has never increased in the almost 7 years that I have been at the district. Here is a statistic that proves the statement I have just made: # of Contracts & Grants Handled as of FY15 - 133; # of Contacts & Grants Handled as of FY18 - 175; 32% increase in Contracts & Grants. The unit cannot continue to effectively handle contracts and grants at the current pace that they are being obtained without additional staffing.
- Fewer conflicting projects, primarily those that overtax the time and energies of faculty and staff (such as having Guided Pathways, Multiple Measures, SLO's, AB-705 and other major projects all going on at once). Also, it is VERY necessary to SEPARATE the funding model from student success data. Linking funding to student success will almost certainly lead to grade inflation, thus loss of integrity of student standards.
- Structuring within the colleges for fiscal and business services should be the same but each campus does things differently.
- Decisions for supply and equipment funds are campus procedures: Need a set procedure that works from experts, then committee can follow guidelines. Upper management must go back to committees if there is a disagreement to avoid unilateral decisions. Disconnect between that the District does and at the College level needs to be clarified.

Human Resources

- Hiring panels should be volunteers, not stacked/filled by the hiring college managers.
- Make requisition process easier. Let the constituents issued with procurement card use the card even with lottery accounts. It will make things easier to buy supplies for student needs. Deliveries could be received within 1 to 3 days instead of waiting for a month to have the requisitions approved and merchandise delivered.
- Banner is so slow, antiquated, and difficult to use. We need modern, user-friendly technology to easily access our information.
- HR needs a complete redo. The colleges know what is best for them and should not be told what they need by HR. DAC rules change by the week. Colleges need to use the same course numbers, course descriptions, and unit hours for the same class. Very confusing for students. Faculty should be allow to advise students in their perspective areas. You don't need a degree in counseling to advise a student how to proceed in a particular field. Too many silos and too much secrecy.
- I would support more centralization of efforts and consistency throughout the district.
- Institutionalize non-credit procedures, contract language, programs.
  Remove bottlenecks in HR.
- Figure out which committees are important and which are not and stop wasting time.
- Better allocation of funding to each school (ie if you are not bringing in as much money to the district you should not be able to receive the same funding as a school that is).
- Respond in a reasonable amount of time to student and staff safety concerns.

Leadership

- Move away from 1980s schedule management to true enrollment management based on student demand and needs. Allowing faculty to select when they will offer to teach and not challenging that enough leads to the same results, and those results = no real change in enrollments. Deans "manage" the schedule and have the right of assignment; however, the status quo will not change until the leaders support student driven enrollment management strategies. The many initiatives require added work. We have the capacity to support people to do the work with stipends or honoraria or other mechanisms. However, it is EXTREMELY difficult to hire internal and external people to do projects ... stipends are narrowly defined, honoraria are too, and professional experts and provisional hires are so hard to get approved. The result is work not getting done, people feeling devalued and not motivated as well as burnt out, and the work that is getting done by the few who will work for free is not done at an optimal level because they are doing it all. Other districts pay for the work with stipends and honoraria. We are turned down to hire in the same ways for the exact same work and with identical PDs from our counterpart colleges. VCCCD cannot be competitive or successful when we do not pay people or hire when we need TEMP help, especially when our counterparts can and do this with ease. It is demoralizing and suggests a lack of value in our human capital.
- Oxnard's budget process is a joke. Program reviews are good to help facilitate new and replacement hires as well as additional departmental needs but the way it is working now, no department is really guaranteed a base operating budget. Every year the departments are required to submit requests for the most basic needs. Often the PGM process recommendations are not followed and hires are made based solely at the discretion of the VPs and not based on the work of the committees. The HR process needs serious review. It takes far too long to get someone on board. I'm aware of multiple instances of where potential hires are screened out in the initial HR screening due to excessively strict guidelines, while other times the guidelines are ignored in order to transfer or promote. Not sure the colleges or the district administrators are fully aware of the additional work that the new state mandates require, especially for data collection and analysis.
- No appreciation for what the Football program did for the community and the district! Highest transfer rate, free advertising from Jared Goff video 14 million views! Poor leadership at VC especially at VP positions!

- Train new employees on procedures at the colleges and District, in order to be able to do their work. Managers need to be fair in situations that arise among employees. Listen to all sides. Managers and supervisors need training in order to supervise the employees in their department. Managers need to learn their job and not delegate their work to staff. Hire more staff in the division offices. If complaints of sexual harassment or annoying behavior are reported to managers, do not sweep these under the rug. Find ways to boost employee moral because they sure do not know how to do it. Managers should listen to the concerns of employees especially when hiring incompetent managers.
- We could hire a Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs again but have their job include all of these things this time. Last time _____, the duties and responsibilities weren't clearly delineated or at least it didn't appear to us that these kinds of issues fell under that position but they should. This position could oversee a district wide approach when necessary, make sure all colleges are following the rules, could keep on top of new legal and state requirements, and it would be essential this be a person with years of experience in this area that would be a resource to the colleges, not someone learning on the job.
- Administrators need to make sure employees get to work on time and not just assume. In addition, make sure that work is equally distributed and follow up to make sure employees complete the job. The District Office needs to make sure that employees at all 3 colleges are treated equally. At some of the colleges, the presidents give more opportunity for professional growth to their classified staff.
- The role of Performing Arts needs to be brought into this millennium. Basically, we are still using a model that was used decades ago. If you look at other colleges that do what we do they have more faculty and staff. They also have more performance, rehearsal, construction, lighting, audio and storage spaces. The technical side of Performing Arts has change significantly in the last 20 years. Audio, lighting, projections, carpentry and rigging, and scene painting are now specialities where as before one or two people could handle all of them. Years ago the technicians could handle the design needs but now the design and the execution of the design is much more complicated and time intensive than our model is able to support. Believe it or not this is not a complaint, everyone here is aware of this and really trying to do the best job possible. The District and Colleges way of evaluation and implementation is not working in this area.
- We need a clear chair of command for dealing with behavior issues. We need open communication between everyone on campus to prevent a tragedy from happening on campus. We need more open, honest and transparent communication. The rumor on campus should be that if you are critical of one of the administration, the President will come after you. I have experienced this myself and it is incredibly hypocritical to have a leader say he is all for civil discourse and open communication but in actuality it is all just a facade. I have seen behind the curtain and its not pretty.
- We need a "champion" at the district level for implementation of new statewide initiatives. A position that helps each college move in the direction of compliance and innovation with regard to AB 705, Equity, AB 19, new allocation model, Title IX, and vision for success. Currently, the Vice Presidents at each college must take on this role while also fulfilling their campus responsibilities. There is extreme "burnout" and over work for the VPs. As a result, each college is working in isolation. We need a strong and knowledgeable Vice Chancellor of Instruction/Student Services at the district office to help push for changes that impact multiple areas such as HR, IT, budget, planning, and evaluation.
- Push back when State requirements don't make sense.
- With a renewed emphasis on acceleration and less interest in providing support and remediation for students at the basic skills level, we need to be able to innovate, create and develop other options. Specifically, better guidance about non-credit, community resource partnerships and other options for students that may not fit into guided pathways or acceleration to a university. Partnering with workforce development, business and industry and other community resources will allow for success for all potential stakeholders.

- We may have the right number of employees but the distribution among departments may not efficiently meet our needs.
- A need to establish a district wide master plan, for instruction, student expectations, well prepared and qualified administrators, and infrastructure. Also, establishing a community task force for input.
- Need a VP of student Service that actually understand and cares about programs and services.
- Honestly, there are so many problems with the way this district is organized and managed that I don't know where to start. This is the fourth community college I've worked at, either as a part-time or as full-time faculty, and it is by far the most incompetently and inefficiently managed place I've ever been. For starters, the district level of management is a giant, gassy bloated bureaucracy that reduplicates things that could be and should be done at a local level. This creates a bureaucratic forest that anyone must wade through to get even the simplest thing done. Early on I learned that it is absolutely futile to try to communicate with the district about any issue, not even Human Resources issues that directly affect my life and work. I've literally had multiple crucial e-mails go unanswered from Human Resources and others at the district level, and I'm told by my colleagues that I am not alone . . . that this is a regular thing. I have never seen anything like it. The level of unprofessionalism, as well as the arrogant, dismissive attitude of district level management employees toward faculty make working in the district barely tolerable. Moreover, if VCCCD ever wants to get serious about putting student needs and success first, then they will start taking seriously what EVERYONE on the ground level is saying--giant class sizes that are roughly double the industry standard in the rest of the United States create ineffective, shallow, depersonalized, factory-like learning environments for students who don't know just how rotten of a deal they're getting. We hear rhetoric about "evidence-based" teaching strategies, but then have a district that summarily dismisses and ignores the evidence-based damaging effects of having such enormous class sizes, all so that they can continue to pad their profitability (as if this were a publicly traded company). And this doesn't even touch the issue of teacher morale and the direct effect that such policies have on pedagogy. I for one have had to modify my pedagogy tremendously from previous places I've taught--away from collaborative, personalized and engaged teaching and assessment strategies, toward depersonalized, lecture-heavy, power point presentations and shallow multiple-choice/T/F exams (because no one has the time or energy to grade that many assessments if they contain actual substance). I physically can't move around my classes, or use the white boards on the sides of the classrooms, because students are jammed in so tightly, far beyond what the classes were actually designed for. Moreover, the dean is no help. He or she is simply someone with marching orders from those higher up; if they don't toe the upper management line (no matter how ignorant, blind, or out of touch it may be), they will simply be replaced by another mid-level manager. Gone are the days where deans are themselves seasoned academics and teachers who can effectively relay things from the troops with their boots on the ground, and even advocate for the rights and interests of those who are actually engaged in the process of education (students included!). If VCCCD ever wants to get serious about "student success" and education in general, there needs to be a serious reconsideration of the way in which it is currently organized. The myopic, top-down bureaucratic approach currently in use is causing the emperor to have no clothes.
- There is an over-saturation of state policies that are changing the future for community colleges. I fear that these continuous changes whether it's AB705, SEA funding, Guided pathways etc. need to be intentionally processed and with the focus on students first and foremost. A lot of times at the micro level personal agendas and politics gets in the way of truly serving our students. CA community colleges across the state are faced with changing how we approach student success. This can only happen if we all are on the same page vs. trying to fulfill our personal agendas.
- Have a district committee with faculty from each college and management to oversee and advise on these things for each college. This should be a shared process. And when you form the committee remember that faculty teach and typically cannot meet early in the day
- Economically-driven policies do not serve students well. No idea how to "organize" to change this.

- Develop an Emergency Manager or Unit at the District Level.
- All three colleges should use the same course numbering system, articulation, PEP system, etc.
- Focus less on recruitment and focus more on keeping the students that we do have to ensure they have the tools, emotional capacity, coping mechanisms, and ability to complete successfully. This will heavily boost marketing as they will report to others the support they received.
- I believe we would benefit from a full organizational change to decision making procedures - from scheduling, budget allocation, governance, curriculum, student services, etc.   I am fairly new to the district but am regularly amazed by the resources and approval process required for minor activities. In my opinion, decision making for non-critical areas should be pushed down to the lowest levels. If the decision maker is empowered and also held accountable, we can move nimbly, reduce organizational fifedoms, and be effective at responding to the changing environment. We waste a tremendous amount of manpower and resources on multi-layered, archaic policies that could be used to improve the student experience. Quick example: What is the approximate time to order a set of 10 textbooks for classroom use from Amazon (because they had a significantly lower price than the bookstore)? I tracked over 13 hours: time for the admin to enter the requisition, the college and district to approve the requisition (despite the funds being previously approved through program review, the grant submission process, the dean, and college administration), the PO to be issued, the bookstore manager to raise contract issues from ordering direct from Amazon, filling out forms in triplicate (who does this in the 21st century?), tracking the forms, following up with warehouse delivery, collecting invoice paperwork from the delivery and forwarded that paperwork back. For a $500 purchase that was previously approved through multi-tiers, we spent a minimum of $2,500 in labor hours. In addition, this lengthy process reinforced that we are not in the business of serving our students because of the many, many hurdles that needed to be jumped. We need to streamline and empower people so they keep their passion and avoid being chocked by bureaucracy...please.
- Leadership (a Vice Chancellor) is needed in the area of educational services
- I believe that due to the high turnover of deans, we are starting to feel a lack of consistency in our leadership. Perhaps their roles and duties can be reevaluated to make them more available to students. They seem to spend quite a lot of time in meetings and I feel their time could be used more efficiently and effectively. The other question is why are so many deans leaving? I think consistency is crucial and it is important to know why so many are leaving so quickly, this is a major concern for me. Is there a way to make the job more doable, sharing the loads more evenly, so that we get some seasoned deans instead of new ones? In addition, with AB 705 looming, it would behoove us to increase the amount of money given to the tutoring centers as the need for student support will go up dramatically as the lower level of math courses is pulled. We will want to maintain the pass rates and embedding tutors is one way to assist with this but it will need funds. Lastly, we are facing so many continual changes and it seems that many of us are spinning in our heads trying to be flexible with all the legislative changes, district changes and leadership changes. Perhaps we need to focus on one big change at a time instead of multiple, simultaneous changes.
- GET RID OF ALL VICE CHANCELLORS AND EACH COLLEGE SHOULD HAVE ONLY ONE VICE PRESIDENT. IN ADDITION, THERE SHOULD BE A MINIMUM NUMBER OF DEANS AND DIRECTORS. SELL THE DISTRICT OFFICE AND PUT THAT MONEY BACK INTO RESERVES.
- Administrators should listen more to faculty especially pertaining to hiring effective instructors.
- Increased executive level management support at the DAC to take the lead on working with the colleges on implementation of districtwide initiatives many of which are state mandated.
- The _____ is ineffective and making decisions based on personal agendas. We have management that has made decisions on programs and personnel for personal gain. It is frustrating to work where there is so much dishonesty and people working in positions that are not qualified.
- Reduce district oversight where colleges can perform functions effectively and financially prudent.
- Better enterprise systems and less cumbersome processes.

- In the eight short years I've been at Ventura College I have witnessed three District Chancellors; three College Presidents AND one interim College President; four "Vice Presidents"; two Deans, including an interim Dean and extended periods without a Dean. Need I say more? What would you make of this in regards to moral, to investment, to support? The irregularity in leadership has created inconsistencies, doubt, disengagement, lack of interest and commitment, disbelief, etc. etc. This is not to say that those that have been in these former positions are not committed nor good people/leaders, its simply to say we need long-term commitment to our college. That said, we are also faced with hiring leaders who lack experience or skills to get the job done. We have hired individuals that make one wonder if our priorities are about doing favors and promoting movement up a ladder rather than promoting student success. A classic example is when the ASVC Student Coordinator was hired as the 3SP Supervisor, which now no longer exists and has been moved to supervise other areas where his experience has continues to limit him. In this case this 3SP hire was responsible for all of matriculation at a time where funding was hinged to the matriculation process. This hire had not previous experience related to any of these areas other than exposure through the students he supervised. If you were on the hiring committee for this position and new the other credible and qualified applicants one might be alarmed as to how this individual was hired.for this position. Currently there is an interim Dean that is serving our department who again, has exceptionally limited experience in the area she has been assigned to supervise. Admittedly, she is trying to learn on the fly...is that how we hire? We don't hire math instructors to teach English. Are we scratching backs again? Again, this is not about the person(s), but the practice. For those of us thoroughly committed to student success, these types of practices are an insult.
- I would advocate for merging the 3 colleges into a one-college district. This would reduce the financial burden of three separate management structures. It would combine three governance structures into one as well, allowing for a greater degree of agility in dealing with changing student needs, state initiatives, and funding models.
- Roles and responsibilities need to be clearly delineated to provide clarity, reduce redundancies, and create coordination that works for everyone. Re-evaluate faculty pay scales to attract and retain high quality faculty members. District-wide committees need to have clear functions and procedures and ensure that meeting time is valuable to all stakeholders.
- 1. Vice Chancellor of Institutional Effectiveness and Research 2. Facilities Director at the DAC 3. Associate Vice Chancellor or Executive Director of Fiscal Services 4. Payroll Manager 5. Accounting Manager 6. Budget Manager 7. Purchasing Manager
  The managers under the Vice Chancellor of Business & Administrative Services needs to be reorganized to better fit the duties as well as provide services to the colleges and students. Why do we have a VC of HR but not a VC of IE/Research? There is not a program review or resource prioritization process at the DAC. When positions are created, there is a feeling of resentment since the process is unclear, not transparent, or a process does not exist. Resources are provided to those who are the loudest.
- Currently there is a VP of Student Services, VP or Academic Affairs, and a VP of Business Services at each school. The District has a Vice Chancellor of Business Services. Perhaps a centralized vice chancellor or vice president role at the DAC for Student Services and Student Affairs would help to coordinate the efforts across campus by creating a specific lead for multi-college changes and new program efforts. If that is not possible, then assigning one specific VP as the "lead" for each project may accomplish the same thing. District IT should have a larger role in deciding to implement new software at our campuses. It seems that new software is implemented and only used to about 25-75% of it's capacity. This leaves our campuses with many different types of software with overlapping capabilities, a lot of re-training needs, and higher software costs.
- More thought in the process of management and the road to management
- Eliminate the Chancellor of Human Resources position and have one VC for business and HR and one VC for academic and student services

- Communication and management with the appropriate skills to truly organize and spearhead these initiatives. I see very few administrators with the necessary skills needed to appropriately implement all of the above. Currently, all I see from the top down is individuals working their own agendas and the students and their needs are ignored.
- A Vice Chancellor of Educational Services or Institutional effectiveness who could collaborate with the colleges and organize the information and compliance responses.
- With regard to Guided Pathways, the District has been very slow to respond or provide opportunities for districtwide conversations. The first Districtwide meeting that I am aware of will be happening Jan 30, 2019, two years after it should be occurring. I am not suggesting that the District needs to dictate what is happening at each college, but the District should be facilitating districtwide conversations so that all 3 colleges have an understanding of what is happening at each and to provide support for each other and to provide an opportunity to discuss promising practices at each. District should currently be providing opportunities to review SEAP funding and reporting structure across the 3 colleges. The District should be encouraging and facilitating instead of dictating as is the case with hiring. With regard to efficiency of hiring processes, HR overrides decisions that take months of time and results in a high waste of money and resources. An example is the failed attempt to hire a dean in student affairs at VC for the past 3-4 years.
- I understand that the District is utilizing texting to communicate with students which is a step in the right direction. I'm glad that the new Governor wants FYE-type "free college" for second-year students like it used to be. So changing up student communications to better stay in-touch and making community college free for two years are two important changes that are very positive.
- Encourage, provide structure and opportunities for areas that support students (tutoring, FYE, library, etc.) to collaborate.
- The district and colleges have too much management. Management needs to be streamlined with savings going for additional classes and services to students.
- Better responsiveness from the District office in implementing new and innovative software solutions to automate tedious manual work. A few examples - completely paperless hiring processes, degree audit software, etc.
- A Vice Chancellor of Educational Services would be helpful given that there appears to be a need for more centralized oversight and management of various programs that involve all three colleges.
- There is too much district-level oversight of office supply money provided to departments. If I wish to print a document, I can either use a printer located near my office or print to the nearest photocopier which requires me to leave my building. Recently, the DAC has asked our department to stop purchasing toner and paper for the printer. This means that if I wish to print a letter of recommendation for a student (for example), that I need to leave my building, walk up a set of external stairs (possibly in the wind/rain), load the letterhead in the photocopier, leave the building and walk back to my office to click the print button, leave the building again and walk back to the photocopier to pick up the letter, and then walk back to my office - all to save a few fractions of a cent in ink cost. Obviously if someone else clicks print during this process, I have to start all over and the cost is probably higher than the amount that could have been saved. This has been explained to my department chair and dean, but both respond that "it's district policy." This level of micromanagement suggests that there may be too many employees at the DAC (or at least not enough at the colleges). Instead, these decisions should be made at the department level.
- Avoid overloading the colleges with upper-level positions when there aren't enough support positions to allow them to function as intended.
- Same organization structure within committees, programs, decision making for all colleges.
- Faculty and classified are well aware on how to run a college, there are just too many mangers. We should have one institutional research manger for all our district. The district should reach out to industry for more public/private partnerships.

- Our biggest challenge right now is that we haven't had stable, consistent leadership for several years. Every time we have a new President or VP come in, they don't know what programs and initiatives we've already started or tried--and sometimes it seems like they aren't interested in learning about that. Faculty feel overlooked and undervalued because decisions are made without their input that demolish or diminish work that has already been done. Having a unified campus goal/theme would help us to embrace some of the myriad changes that are upcoming. It would also give a positive way to think about the changes.

Staffing
- More varied schedules to cover overlapping needs, it makes no sense to me to schedule events without supporting staff. Staffing balance would ensure coverage with needs to have time off.
- Classified staff increases are needed across the campus. MC Classified hiring ranking process through Fiscal Planning committee every year has 30-35 classified positions that are desperately needed across many departments and Moorpark rarely is able to hire even 1 or 2 of the positions needed. These needs continue to go unmet and are most can be directly tied to student success. New funding models continue to leave departments unclear as to how the budget will be affected by the changes. "Student Centered Funding Formula White Paper" did not take into consideration that Ventura College is going to a smaller "level" so annual total District funding will be cut as a result. Are they going to be held accountable for cutting their staffing to accommodate this major change? Or will Moorpark again be forced to absorb this loss?
- These programs need to be staffed with appropriate administrative support. Moorpark is notorious for overworking it's faculty with too many duties and little administrative assistant support. When faculty is spread too thin, the work can't be done appropriately. This would impact student success.
- We are leaving an excessive amount of money on the table by not auto awarding certificates at a minimum with the states new funding model. We are GROSSLY UNDERSTAFFED in many departs in the area of faculty.
- Smaller divisions
- Hire more full-time classified staff at 100% as they are the backbone of students and faculty. The current _____ Regime has bottomless funds to create more and more glorified (lower) management positions; however, they tell us there simply is no funding to hire full-time classified staff. In other words, upper management would rather students and faculty get crappy service with part-time employees while they continue to pad the Ivory Tower with unnecessary newly created and highly glorified managers. _____ conveniently had plenty of funding easily available to purchase _____ only to have it sit and collect dust. But there's no money for full-time classified staff, right?
- Talk to your faculty and staff at my work location without the upper management team present. Student success is going to be impacted negatively with the policies the present management team has put in place and a hostile work environment is being created. Hiring committees should not be hand picked by department managers. _____ This is not only wrong but a waste of taxpayer dollars.
- Strongly feel that the IE departments need to have a Director of Research under the Dean position as the Deans regularly get pulled into college administrative or DAC meetings. This removes the only manager in the IE department from being available and communicating with the research staff.
- Having more staff members that work with students directly than hiring managers that don't work with students. It seems like the district has been hiring ineffective managers, when we need more staff who work with student's directly. Also hiring people with a background in Guided pathways and who have knowledge or want to learn about the new state requirements and funding models. Hiring people who go above and beyond to implement great programs and are willing to do research that show the success of programs, not hiring people who do the bare minimum.
- More staff in HR. HR staff on campus has been a help.

- Smaller departments that report to larger units is a proven and effective system. Our college seems to do the opposite.
- Better staffing.
- Hire a Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and hire a General Counsel.
- If the DAC and the colleges are really interested in better serving students they need to have more support staff and not so many managers. They also need to have more training opportunities for the constantly changing policies and procedures and to not get so obnoxious with staff who are trying to do the right thing but have not been able to keep up with the nonstop changes in polices/procedures and the constantly rotating staff in different offices.
- The District Office is incredibly OVER staffed. The number of Vice Chancellors, managers, etc is outrageous. Management seems to be really into having a beautiful org chart without any sense of whether their duties can be combined. Just because the people around you are busy, doesn't mean that the need elsewhere isn't even greater. Management costs up 15% in one year- how can the District not be embarrassed by this. Also, why is the only question about staffing in this survey is if the district is "adequately" staffed. Why isn't over-staffed an option? I don't think whoever put this together has their eyes wide open.
- I cannot speak to what the DAC should do or not do. On my campus I am very involved in the Guided Pathways project. My experiences there lead me to believe we will need to significantly reorganize our campus to meet the demands and expectations of this new initiative/funding model. (And I do understand that some employees would come completely unglued by that suggestion.) Nevertheless, the division model of counselors and other student services isolated in one building (under one dean) and discipline faculty dispersed across the campus in other buildings (under multiple other deans) is (I think) increasingly outmoded. Other colleges who have already adopted a GP model seem to have more integrated approaches to department organization. I don't know what the best model for VC (VCCCD) is; but surely there are some best practices at other colleges that we can learn from.
- Add a classification for Transcript Evaluator to ensure upfront award of transfer credit so students know from the outset how many units and how much time it will take to complete intended requirements. Completions are more important now in the funding formula... so Counseling case load management and transcript evaluation processes must be aligned with Pathways best practices. The credit award should not wait for a student initiated Graduation Application at the end of their time at the college.

Students
- *Encourage all new students to enroll Math and English (coordinated campaign at each college) *Easy tool to identify and reach out to students as they enroll for their 2nd semester if they have not completed transfer-level Math and English. *Automated awarding of degree and certificates (with opt-out option and ability for students to update their degree goals for FA purposes) *Revise district Academic Renewal policy so that Ds and Fs are automatically removed from a student's GPA once they have completed the transfer-level Math and/or English course *Develop online guided self-placement process that is easily customizable to each college
- The planning for Guided Pathways and basic IEPI is going well throughout the district. The college staff/managers/faculty have a good deal of work to serve their tasks for individualized campuses. Having each college take on a unique version of challenges that are not specific to their location creates a greater work load. Individual colleges can be less strained, save funding greater payroll and professional development in areas not specific to the colleges location. - Move Distance Education to be served by district management and support. -Create by District Office a method to support High Schools throughout the District in educating students with college and workforce preparedness beginnings. -Create by District specific workforce preparedness plan and courses to be equally shared across the district. (Not a reference to CTE courses that need buildings/labs.)

- Start with focusing on how district can support student success rather than what additional funding is needed at the DAC and for the Trustees.
- Budgeting for departments requesting it. Reallocation of student workers for departments who clearly show the necessary need in order to better serve our students. More training for certain departments on what their position is meant to do for students instead of just throwing everybody to one department when they don't know the answer even though they should. Review schedules of student so that there is always someone available for each department.
- Need to address "older" students returning to school for various reasons
- Every student is unique. However students can be bracketed into certain segments. A. Straight out of high school looking to pursue a two and then 4 year degree. B. Been out of high school for a while and now looking to pursue a two and then 4 year degree. C. Looking to learn a trade - Ex. Dental Hygenist. D. Student Athlete looking to compete and then secure a scholarship to transfer to complete a university degree. .E. Member of community curious about something or looking to learn something to improve for their career. When the district identifies a pattern of customer they can build a path for each pattern that allows students to follow that path with less obstructions. Also a community of students on similar path will appear which will enhance the students experience at VCCCD. Right now it seems there is only one path (A.) and if you're not on it you are in trouble.
- No one ever attempts to support students by walking in their shoes, but acts based upon their sense of entitlement, bias, and lack of understanding students previous academic experiences. Therefore, little if any attempt at REVISING curriculum, course units, or accelerating developmental courses has occurred, instead, faculty continue to do the same thing, but expect different results. For some faculty, failing to educate themselves of diverse students needs and rejecting to revise curriculum will and has resulted in a loss of jobs literally working themselves out of teaching since they refuse to change. Finally, district and college managers are too focused on simply hiring to fill classes, rather than comprehensive departmental needs to meet the new state mandates, laws, and funding models, therefore, furthering decreasing enrollment. There's absolutely NO enrollment management, No consideration of block scheduling, keeping many students from taking classes successively. We must have open, honest conversations and dialogue reviewing other "like" colleges and their successful transitions into boosting student success from day one of a student entering as a freshman. Also, we must establish clear communication lines between student services and faculty as advisors often causing students to become confused, frustrated, and draining their financial aid taking unnecessary classes. Finally, I'd encourage every manager to spend a day walking along with a student as they endure barriers, misinformation, and frustration wanting to quit college to become aware of the actual difficulties of enrollment, advisement, schedule offerings, and misperceptions of students' abilities to navigate such an archaic, obfuscated, convoluted pathway. Many students spent over six hours in person just to enroll in classes this spring with their parent pushing every step of the way. That's uncalled for, and many students received messages when enrolling into a developmental course keeping them from registering in a class due to a prerequisite, when the law clearly states otherwise. WHY, why, why? We're our own worst enemy so focused on completing forms, but never actually assessing the results of decisions regarding scheduling, faculty placement, access to services, etc.
- We should set up structures that will focus first on the highest need (and return on investment in the new funding model). Each student should have his/her own TEAM of college employees to access at any time for service and support.

Others
- The state funding models require the distribution of more degrees and certificates upon graduation and transfer. Students don't often know the number of degrees and certificates for which they qualify, particularly in the STEM areas. Having these degrees automatically generated would be very helpful.

- VCCCD centralized efficient software/ programming that tracks any and all student information, data, enrollment and needs (educational and services) through ID cards with electronic chips. That's the only way we can keep up with state demands for data, success, and closing the equity gap. Not more measures and committees, but connection through electronic programming to end silo working and duplications.
- I don't have meaningful input since I don't know the DACs role.
- This is a stupid question. Too many topics to cover in one response.
- It feels as if we "jump" every time there is a new suggestion from the state instead of evaluating whether or not we already have that suggestion under a different title and whether or not that suggestion will be in the best interest of our students. When we are told that it is "state mandated" that does not hold true as other California Community Colleges do not institute those changes. So, my only way to resolve these two items is that the state probably suggests and we immediately institute while other institutions consider the consequences and sometimes do not take the suggestion, if it is not in the student's best interest. Students first and they are here for an education. It feels as if, over all, there is little consideration for faculty/staff well being. And to put students first, faculty/staff have to be cared for. I did not see any questions on this evaluation regarding how things were going for faculty/staff. Perhaps, that should be included as we are the front lines with the students. Analogy: if you want children to be put first in a family, make sure the parents are supported and they will be able to focus solely on the children. We don't even ensure that we meet ADA guidelines if the impacted person is faculty/staff. Guided pathways, may help some...but we need to keep it professional and on a higher academic level. The suggested names for the areas of study presented to us were preschool level terminology. Analogy (not the terms presented, but equivalent): It would be embarrassing, humiliating and a discredit to the quality of the education we provide (which would reflect poorly on our students, faculty, staff and institution) if we switch Geology to "Rocks". This was the level of change suggested. We are a higher education institution and our documents should reflect that. Reducing units in classes while eliminating pre-requisites is impacting the quality of education we can provide. Other community colleges are NOT instituting unit reductions and ARE maintaining pre-reqs. Please fight to keep our quality where it needs to be for us to articulate with four year institutions. I also disagree with the wording of the questions in #13 of this questionnaire. I think there are multiple solutions, and though I understand the approach they are taking about "financial well being" I think there are other solutions that would work equally as well for maintaining financial health while spending differently. And you do not compete with salary and benefits. We are 116 out of 118. We are here because of our love. NOT the money. All those following the money have left and it is hard to attract quality candidates...because you are not spending appropriately for the faculty. Therefore, my "agree" is that I know what you say...NOT that I agree that you are actually accomplishing that goal.
- What the heck is IEPI?
- DAC should be asking to meet with those at the colleges who handle budgets as well as those who are responsible for overseeing the budgets. Often times as budget overseers we know our budgets best and work well with our college business offices but then the district office questions everything and at the end of it all makes our jobs more difficult. The lack of knowledge, in the end, hurts the way we serve our students. The hiring process needs to be revamped. The diversity training is useless when the DAC does not even implement improvements. There is a lack of guidance for those of us that need to hire employees. The having to go through established lists becomes ridiculous when we see the same people that are often problem employees on these lists. We need a better hiring process. One way to improve this is by improving communication and ensuring that those that these policies impact are at the table. We shouldn't have to fight to be included when the decisions that are being made impact our programs and our students directly. Also, there should be no surprises as to what the district office is doing.

- I notice that the college appear to operate as individual districts. There is little at the director level that connects me to job-alikes on the other campuses to share practices worthy of attention. I notice that conversation tends to pit one school against another. Systems that you'd imagine would be consistent are not. The disparity of performance from one institution to another underscores the lack of needed collaboration. I imagine the policy shifts and programmatic efforts (Guided Pathways) would be easier to manage as a district rather than isolated schools. Students are aware and bothered by the disconnect.
- DAC should not push solutions, but merely support the colleges.
- The way we handle AB540 and Dual Enrollment documents. Not all students can make it to school while in high school, however, we ask that they submit these forms in person.
- The main suggestion is to move forward with online functions in both Human Resources and Business Services to reduce paperwork.
- Broader, available shared data such as student dashboards, all levels need greater access to more data and information on students and student outcomes

Additional Comments/Concerns Respondents Shared About the District's and Colleges' Organizational Structure(s)

Note: While the CBT evaluator attempted to group the open-ended comments by topic, many individual comments address multiple concerns/issues. The evaluator chose not to separate any given comment in order to ensure respondents' thoughts are kept in its entirety. Additionally, any time one individual position or name is, or can be, identifiable and referenced negatively, a blank line, "_____" appears.

Communication

- Employees need to be informed immediately when organizational structures occur even if it is temporary. At least we have a chart to refer not try to guess who is doing what.
- OC has lack of communication down to staff and faculty. If you don't know a person on a committee, you won't find out what is happening. Many times budget items are not discussed, staff and faculty find out after the purchase has been made, no shared decision making. Staff positions are moved about and no real reason is given as to why the person is being moved from their office. Interim positions are becoming permanent, when there are more qualified applicants.
- Many employees are dissatisfied with the management at Oxnard College. _____ People talk about a hostile work environment. Decisions are made with little input and there is limited communication about those decisions. Continual display of intimidation and favoritism by _____. The morale is the worst at the college in years.
- Communication between all four locations on structure and procedures could use improvement. I find there is confusion regarding who/what department handles different functions and while it may be defined, it is not always communicated in an easily discernible manner.
- The colleges need to stop blaming HR and Business Services for problems and delays that occur as a result of poor communication and bad planning at the colleges. The finger pointing needs to stop and people need to be held accountable for their actions.
- In our area, there is little to no communication from the Division Office to the staff members providing the work. This needs to be improved. Various regulations are being broken routinely with absolutely no consequences. This is an overall risk issue for the College District as a whole.
- The major concern is the lack of transparency in decision-making and poor communication between campus administration, faculty and staff. For instance, administration may make decisions without consulting faculty and staff while severely affecting the ability for faculty and staff to conduct classes and support student needs. However, if people air their concerns, frequently, these same people suddenly find themselves under scrutiny as if to find any reason to penalize them. No open discussion is encouraged nor is their consistency during meetings between various administrators on the vision or mission on how the goals for the college and between colleges and district are to be accomplished. As a result, morale and effective teaching are seriously affected.
- The governance process at our college has been in revision mode for about a year and a half and we cannot seem to establish a process. We have also had administrators "abolish" committees/workgroups because "they were not needed" (Academic Senate quickly resolved the matter). Communication is a huge issue at our campus, 1) because we have no well-established communication venues for faculty and staff, 2) when we receive communication from our direct supervisors/administrators the information is not correct or continuously changing, and 3) faculty and staff go through established processes like program review or processes for equity or SEA funding and the process is not transparent.

Compensation

- I am concerned and disturbed by the amount of money the district has in reserve when faculty pay is so low --and the state has set aside COLA for address this but the district doesn't use the money for this purpose.   I am concerned and upset that students who have classes with adjuncts don't benefit from the same number of office hours. I tell my students to ALWAYS try to take classes from full time faculty so that they have access to faculty office hours and offices.   I am concerned and frustrated that adjuncts do not get paid to attend more department and division meetings.   I do not think the district is bargaining in good faith with faculty, particularly adjuncts. The state offers a lot to the districts to help them achieve equity yet the district does not utilize those funds to help faculty.   Often it seems like the district is trying to turn adjuncts against the tenured and vice versa. If the district moved to a 15 week calendar, adjuncts would have the opportunity to use their unemployment and see a raise of 2k or more a year.   It costs the district very little to increase adjunct offices hours and attendance at division and department meetings and more than anything else this could benefit students.
- I need a raise in salary
- I believe that the faculty have sort of given up with trying to enhance the students experience; i.e. field trips and other excursions, because of all the brick walls put before them. I think they get frustrated with the amount of time it takes to move through all the procedures required with very little assistance from those that wield the power to approve or disapprove. It seems to me that I work twice as hard as I should have to in order to get things accomplished.
- There are not many advancement opportunities for classified professionals. As internal candidates, we still need to go through the entire hiring process, which is fine, but we should be allowed to apply for a transfer opportunity across the board and not only when it opens to the public.
- Give more weight to the faculty's voice. We are on the front lines. We have been humiliated by not having a pay raise, not even COLA even when the state gave it to all colleges. We are constantly being asked to do more for less or no pay or compensation. It is not surprised why so many faculty leave this district. The faculty needs to be respected and have a competitive salary.
- I have been teaching for thirty years at the college. I have NEVER felt so exploited, unappreciated and disrespected as I do now. This is no longer a place for education. It is now a business, with profit as the main goal. Those who are in power, are disconnected, uninformed and have no knowledge of how hard the faculty works. We are replaceable and expendable. It makes me feel sad that after I completed this survey, my overall responses are negative and unsatisfactory. It is a good thing I love what I do.
- There is a gross inequity regarding class size and compensation. This is arbitrary and feels very exploitive. There is no standardized guidelines and the VP's and deans are making decisions without input from faculty.   There needs to be equity in this process.
- There are local high schools that pay teachers the same as our district.
- We are one of the lowest paying community colleges in the state and at our last negotiation, it was clear that administration does not care. As they received high raises (_____ got a large raise right around our negotiations) we were told no raise for you. Ventura has become so expensive to live in that we have full time faculty barely able to afford an apartment even in the cheapest parts of the city. Yet, we are overworked because there is no communication (so it takes forever to figure out how to do anything), we are given way too many outside things to do as full time faculty, are treated very poorly by administration, and our supervisors don't really know how to supervise, so we are constantly trying to put out fires due to their incompetence. It is a mess. Just in our department in the past 10 years, we have lost two full time faculty for higher pay community college positions (lateral) but we lose dozens of part time faculty because the pay is better anywhere else in the area. With the FT faculty we have, several of them are currently applying for other community colleges. None of these faculty are having trouble with the tenure process. It is lack of quality pay, lack of support, and a lot of bad relationships that keep them up at night.

- As a full-time faculty member, it was demoralizing to learn how the pay in our district compares to those of other districts in similar areas. It is also discouraging that we have not receive a raise.
- I would recommend a shift in organizational structure that creates opportunities for faculty to share how they teach and what they need to succeed in the classroom. For me, this would include smaller class size, active furniture classrooms, and state of the art technology. My hope is that we provide this at least for the faculty whose pedagogy is not large lecture style classrooms.
- Ventura County has a relatively high cost of living, however our salaries do not meet that need and I've seen people leave the district due to higher wages at other community college districts, more vacation, and education incentives. Also some employees have left due to the lack of accountability on the part of managers and administration, managers and administration need to be held accountable for their lack of work ethics and job production.
- There should be real incentives for career advancement through education. If you earn an advanced degree *while* working for VCCCD you do not receive any increase in salary or other forms of pay. However, when applying into the classification you can receive step increases based on advanced degrees. In my opinion, I think that there should be a benefit for current employees to receive accelerated step increases or percentage increases if an advanced degree is earned. It seems illogical that if I applied for my position now. I would receive two extra steps but if I gained my degree while working for the college I can't receive those extra steps. The second suggestion I have is that a clear path be established for classified wanting to transition into teaching as faculty. Many other districts accomplish this with no problem but currently it is not allowed or at least not clearly laid out. The same goes for classified wanting to work their way into administration. If the educational minimum qualifications are met then the district should find a way to provide opportunities for staff to gain the hands on experience needed to meet the non-educational minimum quals e.g. supervisory experience or experience writing grants.
- Some classified positions in the district are paid significantly less than lateral positions in surrounding districts; i.e. LACCD and Santa Barbara. Hopefully these will be reexamined in the new salary analysis/study happening at the district level.
- Our department can't keep faculty due to low pay and overload of responsibilities. DAC has no idea what our department needs.
- 1. Having been an adjunct for several years before getting hired, I've seen first-hand how other schools that are similar in size (and class size) have been able to provide more elaborate professional development opportunities, fully-funded conferences (even for adjuncts and even when going out of state), and offer significantly higher salaries for their adjuncts AND full-time faculty members. My biggest complaint is that our district is constantly unable to provide basic and necessary opportunities to faculty due to financial strain. Other similar districts have found ways to do more with less. It seems that our district may have significant issues with managing finances. I highly recommend that we find out how other colleges are making ends meet more efficiently. 2. Due to the lack of resources, competitive pay, etc., there seems to be an overall dissatisfaction among faculty and a distrust between faculty, classified, and admin. I believe this need to be improved to enhance the overall culture and well-being of all. 3. I've known many faculty who have attempted to compensate for their lower pay by getting classes approved through HR (Notice of Intent). More times than not, HR doesn't respond to these requests and any opportunity to move columns is squelched by a lack of response. This process should be clarified/analyzed to provide ample opportunity for pay increases via graduate level professional development classes. Otherwise, faculty have the impression that they can't improve their situation even when following the protocol spelled out in the contract. 4. Create a full-time position for organizing professional development opportunities. Often, the information is provided last-minute, professional development events are the same every semester, or the college creates events that are not very helpful. At other colleges, all professional development events are scheduled a semester in advance and faculty are given ample notice to attend.

- I e-mailed _____ twice about the possibility of being reimbursed after breaking a very expensive pair of glasses while teaching (I teach KIN activity courses). She never responded. How is that supposed to make me feel with respect to the DO's priorities towards faculty?
- If professional development is really that important at the college and the district, full funding needs to be available. I have opportunities that greatly help me in specific areas of professional development, yet I have to partially fund or pass on them. These opportunities help me to do my specific job. I don't need as much general professional development like what has been offered during FLEX.
- We do not pay our faculty enough.
- The cost of living in Ventura County if getting higher, when state gives our district a COLA, DCS should pass it along to all employees. If managers are getting a raise, then we should all get a raise. If managers get a new clause, then faculty and classified should also benefit from a similar clause.
- Need to have job duties better defined...you will find the same duties on someone that makes twice the amount of pay (Director vs. Accounting). Each desk should have a manual so that the next person has something to help with the training. Training should overlap so that the person leaving can train the new person for a bit. The number of people that need to sign off on some things is unnecessary and too time consuming, also the people's signature that is required are not necessarily the correct people that need to be signing. Clear and defined roles, for example, each campus should have one person to handle sending payroll to DAC and each college should be as closely set up with the positions the same to help with training, transfers, etc. finding the correct people to ask questions to.

Police/Safety

- The police department is grossly and irresponsibly underfunded and understaffed. There are FAR too many Lieutenants than operationally necessary. The budget can be trimmed by the elimination of a Lieutenant position and the creation of an additional Sergeant position. The third lieutenant is counterproductive and greatly detrimental to operations and morale. The previous occupants of the 3rd lieutenant position produced no new growth, change, or positive movement within the department. Maintaining the 3rd lieutenant position would be an egregious mismanagement of resources and opportunities. The creation of a Sergeant position would provide adequate supervision, improve morale, improve retention and recruitment, and result in cost savings of several thousands of dollars annually. The elimination of the 3rd lieutenant and creation of an additional sergeant also serves to provide more patrol availability to each campus by removing some administrative duties.   Formerly, a sergeant was the commanding officer at Ventura College, and currently, a sergeant is the commanding officer at Moorpark College. So any argument that a sergeant cannot command a department alone is untruthful and incorrect.
- Develop an active shooter response plan. Currently, MC, OC, VC and the VCCCD are attempting to accomplish these goals without a qualified person or centralized unit to develop and deliver the training. As best they try, many of the goals are not being met. Personnel not trained in emergency preparation and emergency incidents are trying to develop and deliver the training with very limited success. I strongly feel that an "Emergency Management Coordinator" position needs to be created at the District level. This centralized position would be able to develop and deliver training to all three colleges in order to meet AB767 and the State Chancellor requirements. All three colleges and the District would receive identical and consistent training that would provide Police Department within VCCCD is comprised of four supervisors, with one vacant and approximately 10 Police officers with one position vacant. Supervisors make 30% of whole Police Department which impacts the opportunity for officer promotion, salary pay, job distribution, and fleet. Supervisors vehicle fleet also impacts the Officer Vehicle fleet. With Police Vehicles inoperable, and cost of maintenance rising for the remaining and aging fleet Police Department operates at a

dangerous level.   Ideas at a lower level are not sought, but Police department personnel continues to rise and go above and beyond District expectations.

- AB 767 and the State Chancellor's office require that each of the 72 Districts in the State of California develop an Emergency Preparedness Plan, establish a Campus Emergency Management Team, provide employee emergency training, provide specialized emergency training and the utmost safety for employees and students.
- The police department is understaffed and needs better pay and equipment (aging vehicles).
- The district and college tend to be reactive (we'll deal with it after it happens) rather than proactive (this situation was brought to our attention and could easily injure, kill or cause harm) when it comes to safety concerns.

Environment

- Our community wants to see the college provide and grow its current Chicana/o Courses/Ethnic Study courses. They also want a degree, more transferable courses offered and more faculty to teach these courses. The college must make a commitment to hire full-time faculty and fix this embarrassing gap that we have. Part timers cannot provide what this college needs in support of our diversity initiatives and committee input. Other colleges have departments with multiple full-time faculty to teach courses, promote diversity and equity and be pro-active in the college and community.
- The morale is dismal. I hear more from faculty talking about resigning/retiring rather than discussing the future of the college.
- I love the work I do and that's why I stay...for now.
- I have decades of experience in public education. I have been astonished by the lack of coherent systems at the school site and the virtual disconnect from the district as instructional leader. As a result, the institution is personality driven. The relationships are rocky and the work environment is inhospitable. People (faculty) don't say anything because...they are just waiting for the leadership to leave. Information is protected and transparency is spoken about but not practiced. There's focus on doing things right but little energy on trying to figure out what are the right things to do. It is tricky to do things right when there isn't an established system or template of what 'right' looks like. The poor leadership pushes the good people out. Two administrators are actively looking for new jobs.
- Because the colleges operate more like individual districts they are able to continue without intervention. That's likely why there is such an amazingly wide spread of individual performance when you compare the three schools. There is easily accessible data that points to trouble...FTE, success rates, retention. It makes me wonder why something hasn't been done sooner.
- It is a shame because there is such untapped talent in the educators and the learners. That's what bothers me the most. There is simply so much promise here that is being squandered because individuals are not being held accountable and the talent that is here isn't celebrated or synergized.
- 1. Have a district gathering meeting (all three campus together) on the Mandatory Flex Day.   2. Establish a friendly working environment for faculty and staff on campus. 3. Campus managers (decision makers) should have open minds to different voices.
- The District is in pretty good shape overall. Students are being served and faculty are doing pretty well. There are some adjustments needed but have observed so much territorial behavior and fear that paralysis sets in. This area of the State is incredibly filled with opportunity that gets missed by the glacial speed of change the District operates as the standard. Identifying student opportunities needs more focus, so many businesses need entry level employees, focus from the District could enhance those opportunities. This District is a great place to work and know change is difficult. Adding an opportunity for feedback is incredible and I am happy there is a way to do that.

Budgeting

- I don't know how lower levels input is received to the higher levels and if it is considered when looking at budgets and student needs. Oxnard College receives the least amount of attention and consideration when it comes to it's needs vs the sister campuses. OC has the highest potential to grow and there needs to be much more effort put into rebranding this campus and the community that surrounds it. There is a very low presence of support here from the outside. New programs need to be implemented. One I feel would be incredibly successful and is not available around us is Psych Tech Program. We have many many people who want to work in Behavioral Services that will not go the distance to the Master's level but can succeed at this certificated program and have gainful employment. We need to invest into the words of our graduates and how we impacted and supported them. The campus needs much more focus on the emotional and social health of it's students.
- Be more transparent about how funds are allocated. With a high-need population, it is inappropriate for someone to spend over $10,000 on a new golf cart, or $3,000 on a graduation brochure misprint. Shared funding should include shared discussion on its distribution, particularly when some students go hungry or have insufficient housing.
- Question #13 is very misleading. Management, faculty, staff, are "mis-informed" about the districts financial health. The financial health of the district is strong, however, there is a constant message there is no money because the working people of the district are overpaid and have health benefits. Faculty work is not valued by this district and faculty morale is at its lowest point since I started working at the VCCCD. There are less classes than 10 years ago, higher class sizes, and salary increases have not kept pace with inflation. This is the worst work environment ever and many faculty are looking for jobs in other districts.
- Savings should begin at the DAC. Since unitary college districts successfully meet state mandates, we only need the DAC for coordination. Let the campuses lead. District financial health is a false goal. Individual college ability to offer quality education to our students is our only goal. If the "district" impedes that (meaning both DAC personnel and expenses and campus-based activities that don't directly to help students)
- The District has more funds in reserve than the State recommends. Some of this excess money should funnel back into the classroom and support student learning rather than just stockpiling money far beyond what is recommended.
- District budget allocations to various departments needs to be reevaluated. In order to better serve the students, staff, and faculty at each campus proper staffing levels need to be addressed.

Human Resources/Hiring Practices

- Please consider the deleterious effect on our colleges of hiring part-time faculty and staff. The practice of utilizing adjunct faculty and part-time staff undermines their expertise, devalues their work, and erodes institutional effectiveness. This ultimately affects students' success and the value of their educational experiences. Institutions that want to play a critical role in addressing student equity should understand that their faculty implicitly share the inequities they face on the job with their students. Institutional leaders should be asking 'what are the implications of this?' A brief look alone will show that they are insidious and far-reaching.
- HR needs to do a better job of supporting the needs of the colleges. HR creates more bureaucratic road blocks when colleges need to be quick to respond to change.
- Hiring practices for classified staff in particular in certain categories become a stepping stone instead of creating a position that truly attracts people can do and want to do the job. The minimum qualifications are set to high therefore it excludes those truly qualified and creates the stepping stone for those who truly have no interest in the position to began with.
- Too many staff are being hired at the District. The District is not a fourth campus which it thinks it is. Very concerned about classified staff making policies that affect faculty.

- The hiring process for faculty is well defined, but not for classified positions. Nor is the process for new classified positions well defined. 1) It is not clear who holds tenured faculty accountable. Tenured faculty seem to be able to do whatever they please in the classroom and are not held accountable for working with department chairs, deans and classified staff to take a holistic approach to class needs for degrees. Deans do not seem to have the authority they need to enforce this. 2) Faculty also do not seem to be held accountable for their shared governance responsibilities. It seems very few faculty are involved in the shared governance committees (they are assigned but don't go to the meetings or disseminate information about meetings they do attend). When I attend these meetings it seems that the same core of hardworking individuals are in attendance, but many "representatives" are not present. Who has the authority to hold faculty accountable for this?
- The Human Resources department needs another structure that works. The current one is too reactive in the operation style that it has. The departments work against each other and instead of identifying the who it should focus on the why. The department needs to have people that can make ideas, see the full picture, promote change and collaboration. The department needs to have managers that are present the ones that they have are there but are not present in the day to day issues. They are full with meetings, investigations, negotiations, etc etc and ultimately expect the department to run on a book. Yet all of the issues that arise do not follow the standards in the book and need manager input to resolve, but if the employees that you are operating on its not in the process or procedure, they hit a roadblock and it sits until a manager is present to share the issue and then address it. This ultimately creates a backlog of issues that stresses the employees because they want to handle it and yet don't want to show a weakness because they don't know now.
- Areas that have to do with compliance should be centralized in DAC. Matters such as student's rights and risk management can be pushed to the wrong office and put the district in a bind.   HR Tools is cumbersome and difficult to navigate. We need to be able to retrieve what we need with more ease. We can't always call HR staff to for assistance, especially when they don't get back to us in a timely manner.   Consistency in forms, the ability to have them be fillable, an updated is needed. Hoping DAC can get more staff and be able to organize and align information.
- I like how people that don't have the minimum qualifications get put in interim positions and get full time positions.
- Some of these questions are worded as assertions that I may disagree with, which makes any choice of response possible inaccurate, without any opportunity to modulate the answer. I also see nice improvement at the district's level to try and streamline processes. I greatly support and appreciate the presence of 2 district office employees on campus 2 days/ week to answer questions and help with concerns that I have tried top address for several years before that and unsuccessfully. Please keep this "decentralization".
- Nepotism - biased employment of new employees
- Have HR use outside panel-members to ensure "fair" hiring practices. Although panel members sign a confidentiality waiver, they still influence other panel members or hiring managers as to which way to rate the candidates.
- When interim positions are created, open them to all through the application process, not hand selected candidates, who then have an advantage during the hiring process. This circumvents the merit system and has happened on several occasions. Provide more advancement opportunities, and training. Allow interested staff to go to job enhancing professional development conferences that pertain to their job. This doesn't seem to be equitably distributed budgetwise, when relevant conference opportunities are refused for some but regular attendance for multiple staff at other locations is approved. Provide training and leadership opportunities regularly so when opportunities arise for promotions, staff is adequately prepared and trained to apply.
- The workload is unfairly distributed. The amount of pay and the amount of work do not necessarily coincide. There should be some merit-based pay.

- Creation of new positions without evaluating and upgrading existing current positions
- It is helpful to have the breakdown of staff and responsibilities within departments, on the District website (e.g. Human Resource, Purchasing, Accounts Payable, etc.). If this could be kept more updated, it would be even more helpful, as when there is a change in the breakdown of who works with which alpha vendors. More face-to-face communication would be helpful in District to campus relationships. It is always good to put a face to someone we normally correspond with by email, but due to busy work schedules it can be hard to take a day out to attend Training & Tours. Some efforts are being made to have District representatives on campus e.g. Human Resources. What if the District staff responsible for liaising with specific campuses were to visit that campus from time to time and make themselves available, maybe in a "Coffee with..." session, to get to know the campus employees? This could soften the impersonal and sometimes chastising emails that come from District staff. There are occasional instances where District staff castigate or embarrass a campus employee on a Reply All email.
- I am concerned that unqualified instructors are being hired. This is partially because better instructors both FT and PT are choosing to work at districts with better salary. This leaves only less qualified instructors to work here. This will have a negative impact on student achievement and learning.
- We can not continue to hire individuals that are here to build their resume and then depart, namely in management. Additionally, we need to hire experienced and skilled individuals for the positions they are assuming.
- 1) Human Resources: Reevaluate the structure of career advancement/pay based on merit, performance and overall contribution and offer career opportunities to individuals excelling. Overall, I find there is lack of career advancement within this institution... this may be in direct correlation to VCCCD's attrition of human assets. I would recommend an 'onboarding' for all new employees (not just paperwork). In most companies/institutions there is an orientation which includes an overview of the organizational structure, mission, processes/systems and faq's. I understand HR may be short-staffed, yet you could hold a monthly onboarding at DAC, 1/2 day to capture all new faculty/staff. 2) Cross-training: I would suggest a one week overlap of cross-training between an incoming classified employee and the employee departing. What I've come across is a loss of institutional knowledge due to lack of cross-training and the hours spent searching for information and understanding the processes/structure of an organization could be significantly reduced and shorten the learning curve of an incoming employee. 3) One Stop Shop/Communication: Navigating the institution's and college's procedures has been a bit challenging. I understand we have access to sharepoint, yet that is not 'interactive'. It would be wonderful to utilize an interactive application (or even a internal project management tool within departments) to receive notices/updates.
- The instructional side has a clear path for advancement. This is severely lacking on the operations/administrative side and is often why we lose good people to other colleges.
- Perhaps improved transparency regarding advancements and how applicants are scored so that people can plan their development and work towards improvement. How can we improve hiring when there is a less than satisfactory hire list. Improved on the job training, not just "look at what was done in the past and do the same". This is not always the correct process. Policies and Procedures in writing. sometimes process is based on an individual preferences not policy & procedure.
- My concern on a campus level is the slow hiring process and the lack of consistent leadership (frequent "interim" positions) which leads to gaps in services and an inability to plan with maximum efficiency for long-term programmatic changes.
- The Human Resources and Business Services departments need more staff to better meet the needs of the colleges. Distributing HR staff at the colleges for part of the week has resulted in less efficiency and more stress.

- The District has increased in size (employees) however positions at the colleges have not. We are the ones supporting students and they have no idea what we do. Example: Deaf student enrolls in classes and has to have ASL interpreter to meet ADA laws. District holds up the paperwork for this person to be hired and blames the college for not following the "proper" procedures when there is not where to be found what the "proper" procedure is. This happens time and time again. No understanding of what we have to do on the campus to meet student needs in a TIMELY manner.
- Funding and resource allocation is always going to be a major area of contention, due to limited resources. However, the micro areas of funding need more attention. For instance, supply budgets should be made adequate for areas needing simply the basics, such as enough markers and pens, working printers, paper supplies and the like. On the broader level, additional funding from the state which has been earmarked for "new faculty hiring" should actually be used to increase staff, not to be used to defray the costs of existing faculty members, which was done on this campus.

Leadership
- Communication, innovation, and effectiveness are not values of the college. They are stated as values when people talk, but in reality, the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing, fear and avoidance based decisions trump making choices that will allow us to advance and grow and achieve excellence, and we are asked to run around chasing our tails to do 100 things at 5% effort, rather than 5 things at 100% effort - with no data to support the initiative / grant / project IDEA of a Sr leader will work.
- There are many dept supervisors with little or no skills in personnel supervision. They are ill equipped when it comes to human interaction
- I feel there are employees that do not carry their own workload and work gets distributed to others. Too many managers and not enough employees to do the actual work. Knowledge and processes are not the same at all locations and do not like to be shared between each other. Funding is not distributed fairly.
- I, like so many in this district and on our campus in particular, have serious concerns about top level managers doing unethical things and how we can get the Chancellor to do something about it. These managers hire without going through proper procedures or following policy. They promote without going through proper procedure. On our campus, one VP promoted 3 employees into "interim" positions, and then of course they all ended up with the jobs. The interim jobs were never posted and there was no process. Now these were all great employees, I have no complaints about them personally, but everyone should be following the same rules. Going around them is unfair to everyone else. Frequently, during summer, when no faculty or committees are around, people are promoted. _____ No deans will probably respond to this survey for fear of their responses being traced back to them. They are all in fear for their jobs. _____ Morale is at an all time low. It is really depressing. People who never complain are complaining. People want to leave and some of us keep telling them to just hold out and maybe _____ will retire or the Chancellor will do something about the complaints that have been filed. As an employee I still worry as I write this that somehow I will get in trouble for expressing what so many want to. As for the District, we need raises, plain and simple. This is one of the most expensive counties to live in and our pay isn't keeping up. Some positions are very hard to fill or keep qualified people in due to the level of responsibility for the salary in classified positions (especially in more technical areas) and there are faculty positions in some disciplines that are hard to fill because either their industry pays way more or other districts do. Our district also has fewer steps than many meaning you max out on pay early in a career and there isn't much of a pay differential for a doctoral degree. We are all hopeful the new Board will better support the district and colleges now _____. We hope and trust that our Chancellor will keep them in check as far as overstepping their role or doing anything unethical.

- Lack of accountability of managers at department head level. Lack of vision and planning. Lack of collaboration between management and staff (both classified and faculty). The Peter Principle in action.
- The district has often tried to create high level divisions that focus on the academic and student learning side of the house. After the elimination of a VC for Student Learning, the district never did get it right. The departments were either in appropriately staffed (VC level) or morphed into something more business oriented than student centered. Until the district truly understands the need for addressing student service related issues or institutional effectiveness, it will never be whole. Another note - the Board often micromanages resulting in in bad decisions for the colleges.
- I think we have a dean who has too many assignments, we need an experienced Dean or Athletic Director one of the two that understands what it takes to be successful not just worrying about his job! We went thru a semester without an Athletic counselor and our VP let that happen with no succession plan!
- No classes should be offered by the District offices, only by the colleges. The district should focus on the administrative role and leave the instructional role (credit, noncredit and not-for-credit) to the colleges.
- FIRE the vice president he causes problems among employs. He is always negative and assumes that the employees are not performing there job duties.
- In my opinion, we are not adequately meeting the needs of the students, staff or faculty. _____ was a VERY different place when I started working there. We lose more and more good people every day because our _____ and _____ are not doing their jobs effectively. _____ African American are NOT the only minority group on campus. We could do a much better job of serving our students if we showed a diverse approach to our faculty development, trainings, etc.
- Ventura College is a mess. We need stability and have none. Certain individuals (faculty/counselors) wield more influence than is appropriate, and they do not represent the majority of the others at the campus. We have abandoned the needs of the "real" people who attend community college and why. Instead, we have gotten caught up in an agenda that shows preference to transfer students and only those who don't struggle.
- Need qualified and experience managers/supervisor are needed not inexperience ones. Need to update equipment and more Preventive Maintenance on all equipment in M/O. Need more leadership from upper management to boost moral and not dictators. All employees need to recognized for there hard work. Need more experience employees to perform the work at hand not giving them position that they are not qualified for or as a favor which in turn is a form of nepotism. Employees are given supervisor position with no management experience or clerical experience and require a specific degree which they do not poses. Some M/O position are needed to work out the job description to complete a task that is needed and this is not happening. The _____ bought a golf cart the is not being used on a regular bases.
- Four failed middle manager searches, another interim president and tremendous hostility among departments all lend itself to a challenging work environment.
- In my observation at Moorpark College, many staff and faculty have transferred to another college do the leadership style of an administrator. It's impacting our student success and moral at the college overall. Many Faculty do more with less. The college needs additional administrative support so the duties are distributed evenly within the college. Faculty (Instructors/Counselors) need to be accountable for their contract service hours by accurately documenting the service hours on a spreadsheet. This will allow more collaboration, distribution of responsibilities, and increase the moral at Moorpark College.
- Less high school authoritarianism and more academe.
- There are far too many managerial positions and not enough focus at student/instructor level

- I work at Oxnard College. I am relatively new in my job. In only a few years it is clear to me that the college is woefully under-resourced, lacks vision, and fails to meet its potential (and responsibility) as a resource for this community. Even without knowing the history of the development of the school and its relationship with the district, it is clear that OC has been neglected and allowed to wither. Our facilities are in disrepair, there is little sense of campus community, few opportunities for students outside the classroom, ineffective support for successful graduation or transfer, and no sense of direction beyond the platitudes of the community college mission. I don't think this situation can change with new leadership on campus (that may help, but the problem is larger than this). What needs to happen is a more substantial and meaningful investment on the part of the district in the health and well-being of this college. The district should exercise more direct and purposeful leadership oversight and commit whatever additional funding would be required to ensure that OC operates with the same level of institutional vision, integrity, and impact as do VC and MC.
- I feel the district has put more of its money in the investment of managers rather than faculty that is needed. The district is too heavy with lots of management, which only creates barriers to completing tasks for faculty and students. It is wrong to continuous give management raises and not faculty.
- I am concerned with the growing number of management positions, lack of tenure track faculty positions and the unwillingness of the district to pay competitive salaries for faculty
- Dr . Gillespie is a great chancellor...I know he can improve district and college structure to best serve students. We need more support for foster youth, AB540, undocumented, homeless student. The equity funds are not serving these students...ask for proof that services have been provided.
- Vice Chancellors at district seem to be out of touch with campus issues regarding compensation and salary of faculty.
- Many faculty are concerned with the change in culture at Moorpark College that has happened in the last couple years. Things seem to be much more top-down.
- _____
- The District did well to provide HR reps on the OC campus. OC just has low spirits and morale and that is due to management. The Chancellors one on one sessions has done a lot to improve visibility to what is really going on at OC.
- We have too many managers as previously stated. Because of the money being spent by them, for them and their staff, we as staff and faculty are told there is "no money". We have management at my location that are not listening to the concerns of our deans, faculty, or staff. If a concern is voiced you risk being singled out and your work life being made more stressful. The feeling on this campus is that there is no one at the district level that we can talk to without fear of losing our job. The upper management has made it clear to us that it does not matter what the District policy is or what the other campuses are doing, our work location is run independently without thought of accountability or consequence. If the VCCCD really is about our students, they would have less vice presidents, vice chancellors, and deans and put the money into education. It is time for the Chancellor and Board of Trustees to intervene. Taxpayers deserve better.
- No one seems to be in charge.
- It is essential for campus administrators and faculty to be actively involved in decisions affecting their individual campus. It is also essential for District administrators to listen and respond proactively to the needs and requests of the campuses in making their decisions. Program expansion should be driven by the colleges, not the District. Faculty are effectively involved in understanding the needs of their programs as it relates to industry needs. Industry Advisory Boards actively participate with faculty, making recommendations for building and enhance programs to meet the needs within their specific industries and the needs of the students.
- Seems to be very top heavy with management and no support staff. Most support staff are covering two offices and doing the job of more than on person.

- I feel like the structure at _____ College is confusing. How do we have 3 vice presidents and all the deans and very little gets accomplished. The vice presidents appear, at least to me, that they are all worried about how to become the president. The dean that I work for is very clearly worried about himself and not the programs he deals with. He has repeatedly messed with the interview process and has broken several rules by explaining who his top candidate was before they were interviewed. Obviously, showing bias towards a candidate before the interview process started.
- To be clear, I do enjoy my job very much and have one of the best bosses on campus. My department and immediate co-workers, including my department faculty, are all terrific. The majority of our campus is a close-knit community and most people are truly lovely to work with. There are some adjustments that could be made to make things even better. Our chancellor leads with compassion and empathy which is exactly what we need. He's a first-rate person and wonderful leader. However, our on-campus executive team needs a bit of improvement. Their intentions are good, but something feels off. I can't put my finger on it. Perhaps they come off as disconnected. This district as a general whole appears to be going in four different directions. That may not be the case, however that feeling and opinion are rampant on this campus. Get it together! Also, hire someone to be in charge of the counseling department and get that EOPS department whipped into shape. Many, not all, but certainly many of our EOPS and counseling staff are lackadaisical in their care and willingness to properly direct students into the right classes. This makes jobs much harder for division staff and faculty. Counseling needs a tough, hands-on experienced manager. At least on the _____ campus. Other than that, this is a great place to work.
- Never see the managers walking the campus. The only manager that I have seen in the last year or two is the division dean.
- Our district needs to take a serious look into the leadership of the administration at VC. There are people being hired and programs being promoted that are not based off the date and or success. _____ and _____are running our college into the ground with some of their decision making. The dishonesty that these two work with is damaging to the college and the heart beat of the staff.
- District should drastically reduce staff allowing the colleges to function more efficiently and free up money for more classes.
- We need to allocate the tasks of deans and managers more efficiently and reduce their numbers. Also we need to downsize the district administrative center. These changes will allow us to save funds, which could be used to improve the compensation of faculty/stuff and provide more services to our students.
- There has been an impulsion over the last few years to hire more managers. Some of this hiring has been specifically proposed to deal with changing state requirements relative to categorical funding. But my view is that a significant amount of the hiring that has transpired is because we have a number of ineffective managers that are not held to account. This creates a greater burden on other managers and on the subordinates of the ineffective managers. Rather than setting performance benchmarks for the managers in question and holding them to these benchmarks, it seems like the ineffectiveness is allowed to continue and more managers are hired to pick up the slack. This creates a negative working environment, financial strain on the district, and it does nothing to address the underlying problem (i.e. unchecked performance problems). My suggestion is that we spend more energy hiring effective managers, holding them to clear performance standards, and letting go of those managers that don't live up to these standards.
- Invest in directors or department chairs. We need more champions behind our programs.
- Management at OC seem to be so strict to the point that people are fearful to speak up because they might lose their job or be given hard time. I meet top management along the way on campus and

try to greet them "Good Morning" or Good Afternoon" but they either look the other way or maybe they did not see me.

- My biggest concern with the District and college's structure is the lack of training. The organization will hire personnel for a position, but then not give them any training towards the new position. Along that same vein is the fact that at least on my campus, a huge margin of management have no knowledge of how to do their position. Their admin assistants or business services do all of their work for them and when they are asking to complete a simple task, they will claim to have never learned that procedure. So, even the management that does receive training doesn't retain the information. This is because there is no repercussions for management not doing their job. Everyone underneath them are forced to do managements' jobs to meet deadlines while the management gets paid the big bucks.
- The District Office is incredibly OVER staffed. The number of Vice Chancellors, managers, etc is outrageous. _____ seems to be really into having a beautiful org chart without any sense of whether their duties can be combined. Just because the people around you are busy, doesn't mean that the need elsewhere isn't even greater. Management costs up 15% in one year- how can the District not be embarrassed by this.
- It's been a long time since I have seen an organization so poorly managed which has lead to such low morale. There is no accountability at most levels (district, administrative, faculty, classified staff).   I see a lot of lip service stating that "we care" but the actions I see tell a very different story. I don't see how we stay open.
- I love my job, but we REALLY need long-term, dedicated leadership on my campus. The number of individuals in leadership the last 5-7 years with "Interim" parked in front of their name is remarkable. In what used to be my division (we have been split up and departments assigned to other deans who already have full loads....again) we are currently on year 2 with no permanent dean. The president and VPs have been a revolving door for years. If one is permanently staffed the others are likely not. You get the idea. I'm sure the chancellor and others who must continually recruit and hire for these positions are equally frustrated. It is a very challenging problem that I hope can be effectively addressed.
- If a position is continually having to be opened up due to terrible executive management, why isn't there something that is done to evaluate this person. People keep coming and going for executive management, but nothing changes. People continue to be miserable under this person. Something should be able to be done in this situation.
- I used to be more informed and thought I understood issues of AFT contract, FTES, class size, etc. But I am puzzled by recent events and can no longer say that I understand the situation, nor do I know exactly where to go to find out more. Really opaque decision making at OC, not transparent. Troubling. People retiring early and going elsewhere, people leaving due to job dissatisfaction. The lack of dialogue about the real future of higher ed (in California, in the US) is troubling. It's as if no one in leadership has much clue about lies ahead - younger faculty feel caught in the headlights.
- The board of trustees need to understand that their role is NOT operations. Human Resources is not in support of college programs and services. It takes months to fill a vacant position.
- We have become too beholden to a business model and top down management and have lost the right to claim that we work for "Students First", which I still live by as a teacher. Most administrative decisions that I have observed in the last 5-10 years ignore that motto, to the detriment of higher education. Give back more autonomy to the individual campuses and managers.
- The _____ president's decisions are not made in the best interest of the college to execute the mission, goals, objectives, and initiatives of this institution. Administration's manipulation of the District's systems/rules when it relates to budget, staff hiring/firing, and finding loopholes where

they can hide their machinations is paramount and detrimental to the wellness and function of providing stellar student instruction and support systems.

- The budget at each college seems to be an area of secrecy unless you are in management. Prior to my time at _____ College, I worked at _____ College. As a department chair at _____, I was regularly involved with budget oversight and had a regular meeting to review line items. At _____, this has never happened including my 2 years as department chair. I find this very troubling especially in the case of what was formally SSSP funds, Equity funds, and Basic Skills funds (now all part of SEAP). If the budget is a secret to staff and faculty and only privy to managers, how can there be any attempt at a culture of trust and open communication? I am also concerned about the accountability of some of the actions that have occurred over the past few years at Ventura College. There are days/weeks when managers are all absent from the college and no communication has been provided about who is in charge should a major issue arise. Grants have not been funded because forms were not completed properly or were not submitted properly by the district, or were clearly copied from other grants.
- The lack of trust in the staff in my department is frustrating. The supervisors micromanage the staff and make completing tasks take longer than normal. I feel like my supervisors don't care about me as a person, but only as an individual who is here to complete the tasks required in this position. My department head only interacts with me with work-related matters and has never taken an interest in me. There are many ideas I have for process improvements within the department, but when I share them with my immediate supervisor, I don't believe the information is rolled up to the department head and I don't feel comfortable interacting with the department head or making suggestions or recommendations.
- I think the district is out of touch with what we do a the campus level. The District arranged a date & time to be physically available to us at our campus. It was scheduled during a day faculty were on break.
- I would like to see Admin/Managers work more closely with Faculty. We should be a team.
- Divisions and Departments are currently ill structured, favoring large mono-departments (English and Math) and discounting the organizational mechanics and needs of small disciplines that have been put either in a mega-department or into a corner of a large department. (Visual Arts, World Languages, Dance, Music, Theater, and others). Departments with too many distinct disciplines are suffering and the faculty are getting burned out and bitter. What faculty need to best serve the students is more time to be with students, instead, we are faced with small (1-2 faculty) department paperwork, scheduling, program planning, assessment, advocacy, that the elected department chair cannot complete because he/or she does not know the discipline or its needs. The variety within a department should go into consideration as well as the number of faculty when organizing the department chairs and their load allocation for the job.
- There is a lack of accountability for managers/supervisors. If they had to attend less meetings/committees they can then focus on what they were hired to do "supervise". Decide which committees are important and which are not. Get rid of the unimportant ones so that staff can get back and do what they were hired to do!!!
- The more top-bottom the organizational structure remains, the last rung, students, fails to receive the focus, attention, and decision-making concerns, therefore, working ourselves out of a job sooner. The focus must be the students and if you build it, they will come. TOO many managers believe online education is the way to go, however, their high failure rates never seems to become part of the equation of whether or not to continue offering the same instructional mode. Again, doing the same thing and expecting different results. VERY few students want online education, especially as entering freshman, yet last summer, most courses were ONLY offered online with dismal retention and completion rates. If we actually used the data to make future decisions, we should realize the failure of online classes at a community college, especially in our service area where a digital divide exists.

- Some centralized services and elimination of outdated and unnecessary processes will provide opportunities for cost-savings and efficiencies.
- When senior managers and administrators make staff wait for meetings to start though they arrive on time, it is demoralizing. I contend that we must disrupt and flip the situation where management models the behaviors it expects from employees... start meetings on time. Do not reschedule meetings without sharing an important reason. Treat employees with respect. Be present.
- The wording of some of the questions in this survey did not allow an adequate response to the situation. For example, "Is there an adequate number of managers?" is a loaded question; "yes" means we have enough, and "no" means we need to hire more. There is no option to indicate the possibility that we have too many managers. The organizational structure at the college is dysfunctional. We have deans with no subject knowledge of the departments they supervise, and therefore little understanding of the needs of faculty. The two largest departments on campus (English and math) are lumped into a single division, and one of the career/technical deans is leading the history department on an "interim" basis (which means multi-year at VC). We need a complete re-examination of the college's organizational structure, starting from scratch, taking into account that at least two deans have either been reassigned or are about to retire. It should also be easier to replace deans when they have poor evaluations or votes of no confidence from faculty. The district seems to prefer to hire outsiders rather than to promote from within. This restricts advancement opportunities for people who would rather not move out of the area. If the talent within the faculty ranks seems insufficient, perhaps we should entice "better" faculty to apply by making their salaries competitive relative to the cost of living in Ventura County.
- The colleges managers seem ineffectual at correcting staff action, they much rather ignore problems. All systems should be reviewed consistently, there are many staff members who are burnt out and angry at work. The employee is not at fault, it is the ineffectiveness of the system as a whole. It is demoralizing to work with angry coworkers. The development series should be geared to our promotions and should actually be of some benefit to us.
- Lip service being paid to shared governance and decision making is not enough for the faculty and staff at the colleges and is detrimental to the students and the long term well being of the colleges themselves. When administration does not hear and appropriately respond to the concerns and needs of those who actually do the work, the structure is doomed to fail, and fail all those involved. Students and employers are not being provided with the skills needed in many areas because "education" has taken a back seat to "business".
- In the years I have been here, I have seen the District hire more and more managers and fewer full time faculty. I am in a STEM field where it is difficult to staff classes with part-time faculty. We did get one full time hire, but it was touch and go as to whether we would get it, which is crazy because as I mentioned we are in a STEM field. I have also seen management increasingly take over faculty areas such as New Faculty Orientation, which have always been under the purview of faculty members. Both full-time and part-time faculty members are leaving for other jobs with better pay and smaller class sizes. Faculty morale is as low as it has ever been since I have been with the District. Faculty members are overworked and squeezed for every drop of productivity.
- On all three campuses and at the district I have met really amazing people who are smart, talented, mission driven, and dedicated to their work. But everywhere I see people who are discouraged and deflated and whose efforts are spent too often fixing things that don't work or that chronically go wrong. We could be doing so much more in service to the students and to their educational achievement if we had better systems and processes in place. It's not just a matter of rewriting shared governance. We need better tools and procedures to streamline everything we do!
- Just because a college has a governance structure that allows for input from all constituents that in no way means the college is adhering to the outlined structure. My college has multiple examples of not adhering to the outlined structure. Try and move past looking at the structure "on paper" and dialogue with the constituents about functionality.

Other

- Make it happen!
- We are in desperate need of an intelligent electorate. Our community, state, nation and corporations have trillions of dollars at their disposal and we still have people that are without clean drinking water, healthy food to eat and safe shelter from mental and physical harm. If money and jobs are the answer we would be there. To "preserve our more perfect union..."maybe we need to be educated on how to live together on this planet, instead of how to effectively compete for jobs and resources.
- I've already said many things in a previous comment.   However, after reading a couple of the other questions, I found myself even more frustrated. Even the way the questions are being asked (as well as the kind of question) is slanted by a myopic, self-serving administrative vision. For example, "The colleges deliver instruction in a way that also considers the financial health of the District."   This question has a definite slant to it. Of course the management takes into account the financial health of the district. That hasn't been an issue for a very long time, if it ever was. The district likes to think of themselves this way, as the noble guardians of financial health who are willing to take into account the difficult, unpopular issue of financial health when making educational decisions (as opposed to those doggone short-sided teachers who never want to take such difficult things into account).   Why not ask a question that actually matters, such as "The colleges balance financial consideration with quality of instructional delivery in a healthy fashion?" Now there is a question that actually needs to be asked, but of course no such question was in fact asked because the district and college management simply don't want to hear honest answers to questions that would challenge their current status quo.   I found many of the questions to be along those lines--asked in such a way that no truly honest feedback is possible. Maybe that was inadvertent . . . but I doubt it.
- At _____ the separation of the math department from the other science departments is detrimental to a cohesive, effective educational development plan for STEM students.
- Those things seam are separate issue than effective education. Data take so much time that there is less time to spend in the classroom. And what are they practically for anyway? Not for the classroom, but they seem like they are for State check-the-box issues.
- Numerous approvals needed to do anything which is a bottleneck to getting things accomplished. There isn't a culture of change and efficiency - stuck in the "this is how we've always done it so why change it" mentality.
- IT should be a centralized department in operation and funding. The fact that each college organizes and funds individual campus oriented IT teams causes drift in system configuration, use, identification of needs, and diminished effectiveness of staff and dollars spent. A cohesive IT department would be able to work closely with campuses for specific local needs, while aligning financial and staff resources to best address independent campus needs while still being efficient, consistent, and maximize value of software/hardware/service purchases.
- 1. Bring back the student run college newspaper. 2. bring back food service at VC. The machines are full of poison...3. Fix the wifi in many areas of campus.
- Business Services and Human Resources Departments are under-staffed and struggle to keep up with ever-increasing workloads.
- We still have ongoing issues of a lack of transparency and understanding of how the district comes up with its institutional research numbers in comparison to the colleges. Would be lovely if we had a Director at the district who was guiding the transparency and facilitating agreement amongst the colleges on how the figures should be calculated, then supporting that.
- The district should serve the needs of the students at each college.
- Now that the DAC has been up and running in this building for over 1 year.   I think some departments need to be relocated. The noise level is very great and nothing has been done about it.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS REVIEWED

The CBT team members reviewed numerous documents and reports and collected data on benchmark colleges and districts. The list of sources, data and reports includes:

- Current VCCCD Organizational Charts
- Moss Report
- Annual Budget documents 2018-19,2019-20
- Chancellor Forums: Statewide and Local Priorities
- Data Mart staffing (2013-18)
- 320 Annual FTES Reports (2013-18)
- Chancellor's Forum:2017 report
- Fall 2018 Forums report
- 2019 Proposed Reorganization
- Several Job Descriptions (VC of Bus and Education, Budget Director, Director of Fiscal Services)
- Ventura Report-Student Centered Funding Formula
- VCCCD All College Day August 17, 2018 report
- Budget Overview and Priorities 2018-2020
- Employee Retirements by class
- Parts of Employee Contracts
- State Fiscal Trend Analysis
- District Provided Cap/Loads
- District Provided Legal Expenses- 3 years
- Fusion Reports (multi-year)
- VCCCD Master Plan, 2013-2019
- VCCCD 2013-2019 Strategic Goals
- Moorpark College Educational Master Plan 2009-2019
- Oxnard College Educational Master Plan 2013-2019
- Ventura College Educational Master Plan 2017-2023
- VCCCD college websites and multiple posted documents for each college's planning activities
- VCCCD college Institutional Self Evaluation Reports and Evaluation Reports from ACCJC
- Selected college department "annuals" and program reviews
- IEPI Institutional Innovation and Effectiveness Plans 1/8/2019
- VCCCD 75/25 FON statistics

California Community Colleges

Sound Fiscal Management
Self-Assessment Checklist

1. **Deficit Spending** - Is this area acceptable? **Yes / No**
   - Is the district spending within their revenue budget in the current year?
   - Has the district controlled deficit spending over multiple years?
   - Is deficit spending addressed by fund balance, ongoing revenue increases, or expenditure reductions?
   - Are district revenue estimates based upon past history?
   - Does the district automatically build in growth revenue estimates?

2. **Fund Balance** – Is this area acceptable? **Yes / No**
   - Is the district's fund balance stable or consistently increasing?
   - Is the fund balance increasing due to on-going revenue increases and/or expenditure reductions?

3. **Enrollment** - Is this area acceptable? **Yes / No**
   - Has the district's enrollment been increasing or stable for multiple years?
   - Are the district's enrollment projections updated at least semiannually?
   - Are staffing adjustments consistent with the enrollment trends?
   - Does the district analyze enrollment and full time equivalent students (FTES) data?
   - Does the district track historical data to establish future trends between P-1 and annual for projection purposes?
   - Has the district avoided stabilization funding?

4. **Unrestricted General Fund Balance** – Is this area acceptable?   **Yes / No**
   - Is the district's unrestricted general fund balance consistently maintained at or above the recommended minimum prudent level (5% of the total unrestricted general fund expenditures)?
   - Is the district's unrestricted fund balance maintained throughout the year?

5. **Cash Flow Borrowing** - Is this area acceptable?   **Yes / No**
   - Can the district manage its cash flow without interfund borrowing?
   - Is the district repaying TRANS and/or borrowed funds within the required statutory period?

6. **Bargaining Agreements** - Is this area acceptable?   **Yes / No**
   - Has the district settled bargaining agreements within new revenue sources during the past three years?
   - Did the district conduct a pre-settlement analysis identifying an ongoing revenue source to support the agreement?
   - Did the district correctly identify the related costs?
   - Did the district address budget reductions necessary to sustain the total compensation increase?

7. **Unrestricted General Fund Staffing** - Is this area acceptable?   **Yes / No**
   - Is the district ensuring it is not using one-time funds to pay for permanent staff or other ongoing expenses?
   - Is the percentage of district general fund budget allocated to salaries and benefits at or less than the statewide average (i.e. the statewide average for 2003-04 is 85%)?

8. **Internal Controls** - Is this area acceptable?　**Yes / No**
   - Does the district have adequate internal controls to insure the integrity of the general ledger?
   - Does the district have adequate internal controls to safeguard the district's assets?

9. **Management Information Systems** - Is this area acceptable?　**Yes / No**
   - Is the district data accurate and timely?
   - Are the county and state reports filed in a timely manner?
   - Are key fiscal reports readily available and understandable?

10. **Position Control** – Is this area acceptable?　**Yes / No**
    - Is position control integrated with payroll?
    - Does the district control unauthorized hiring?
    - Does the district have controls over part-time academic staff hiring?

11. **Budget Monitoring** - Is this area acceptable?　**Yes / No**
    - Is there sufficient consideration to the budget, related to long-term bargaining agreements?
    - Are budget revisions completed in a timely manner?
    - Does the district openly discuss the impact of budget revisions at the board level?
    - Are budget revisions made or confirmed by the board in a timely manner after the collective bargaining agreements are ratified?
    - Has the district's long-term debt decreased from the prior fiscal year?
    - Has the district identified the repayment sources for the long-term debt?
    - Does the district compile annualized revenue and expenditure projections throughout the year?

12. **Retiree Health Benefits** - Is this area acceptable?　**Yes / No**
    - Has the district completed an actuarial calculation to determine the unfunded liability?
    - Does the district have a plan for addressing the retiree benefits liabilities?

13. **Leadership/Stability** - Is this area acceptable?　**Yes / No**
    - Has the district experienced recent turnover in its management team (including the Chief Executive Officer, Chief Business Officer, and Board of Trustees)?

14. **District Liability** – Is this area acceptable?　**Yes / No**
    - Has the district performed the proper legal analysis regarding potential lawsuits that may require the district to maintain increased reserve levels?
    - Has the district set up contingent liabilities for anticipated settlements, legal fees, etc?

15. **Reporting** – Is this area acceptable?　**Yes / No**
    - Has the district filed the annual audit report with the System Office on a timely basis?
    - Has the district taken appropriate actions to address material findings cited in their annual audit report?
    - Has the district met the requirements of the 50 percent law?
    - Have the Quarterly Financial Status Reports (CCFS-311Q), Annual Financial and Budget Reports (CCFS-311), and Apportionment Attendance Reports (CCFS-320) been submitted to the System Office on or before the stated deadlines?

CBT CONSULTING TEAM BIOGRAPHIES

Brice Harris, Project Lead

Brice W. Harris was named Chancellor Emeritus of the California Community Colleges by the system's Board of Governors upon his retirement in April of 2016. He was selected as the leader of the largest system of higher education in the nation in 2012 after serving 16 years as chancellor of the Los Rios Community College District in the Sacramento region, five years as president of Fresno City College and nearly two decades as a faculty member and vice chancellor in the Kansas City, Missouri community college system.

Dr. Harris spent his 45-year career working to improve student success and access in American community colleges. While California Community College Chancellor, he was instrumental in leading the implementation of the nationally acclaimed Student Success Initiative, piloting the community college bachelor's degree in California, and enhancing career technical education in the system. In Los Rios he led the charge to expand access for thousands of students by overseeing the establishment of the district's fourth college, Folsom Lake, and developing five additional educational centers in underserved areas of the region enabling the district's enrollment to nearly double during his tenure.

Dr. Harris understands the important connection between community colleges and the economy and served as a member of the board of the California Chamber of Commerce. As an active member of the business community, he chaired the Sacramento Area Commerce and Trade Organization (SACTO), was the first educator to serve as president of the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce and served as chairman of the board of the Northern California World Trade Center.

Julie Slark

Julie Slark is recognized throughout the U.S. as a pioneer and expert in strategic and educational master planning, accreditation, program review, research design and analysis, and student learning outcomes, as well as the development of organizational systems and processes. After 31 years of service, she retired in 2008 as Assistant Vice Chancellor of Educational Services at Rancho Santiago Community College District, where she was the planning officer and a leader of major change efforts, and where she had administrative responsibility for economic development centers, institutional research, child development centers, grants, district coordination for college accreditation, and several collaborative partnerships. Her experience is broad and includes academic, student support services, and administrative services responsibilities.

In 2013, Ms. Slark was awarded the K.C. Parsons Founders Award by the international Society for University and College Planning (SCUP) for Distinguished Achievement in Higher

Education, and she received the ACCCA Leadership Award for Administrative Excellence in 2006.

During the last 20 years, Ms. Slark has provided consulting services to more than 40 colleges and agencies in all areas of institutional effectiveness. She has recently participated in CBT teams leading and facilitating planning projects for Peralta Community College District, MiraCosta College, State Center Community College District, College of Western Idaho, Santa Monica College, and Monterey Peninsula College.

In addition to authoring and publishing numerous articles, and membership on numerous publication boards, Ms. Slark was one of the founding presidents of The RP Group and the principal author of The RP Group's "Planning Resource Guides", used by many colleges and one of the few "how to" publications about community college planning.

Nga Pham

Nga Pham has more than 25 years of experience in the California community college research field. She is currently the Executive Director of District Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness at Rancho Santiago Community College District, where she coordinates district planning, accreditation and research needs, oversees the IRB review and approval process, manages external data requests, as well as ensures the integrity of the data warehouse used by district and college researchers. Ms. Pham also serves on various committees (college, district, regional and statewide), coordinates evaluation efforts for state and federal grants and collaborative partnerships, and oversees the district's and colleges' IPEDS data collection and other reports.

Ms. Pham has designed, conducted and coordinated program evaluations; created, implemented and analyzed survey and focus group research; facilitated student learning outcomes programs and assessment; and developed evaluation templates for faculty and staff to use in their research and inquiry efforts. She has also served in various capacities for the statewide Research and Planning Group (the RP Group), including serving on the Board. She was one of the original steering committee members of the very successful Strengthening Student Success Conference, a role which she continues today. In addition, she has also co-chaired its program committee for the last eight years.

Jean Malone

Jean Malone retired in June 2004 with 40 years in public education. A retired Vice President of Human Resources and District Chief Negotiator, she spent 28 of those years at the Citrus Community College District.

Upon her retirement, Dr. Malone was asked to manage the Online Collective Bargaining Database (OCB) for the Community College League of California. She managed the database until the program's termination. Dr. Malone has been with the Collaborative Brain Trust since 2008 successfully assisting districts in her field of expertise. She also developed and maintained CBT's online program CAPTURE! a subscription service which was a central repository of live

links to negotiations-related documents from all California community colleges. Dr. Malone managed that program until its termination.

Dr. Malone has conducted compensation studies; organizational assessment of human resources operations; assessed staffing needs; long-range staffing plans; acted as Skelly Hearing Officer; acted as negotiations advisor; provided workshops on negotiations, conducted compensation studies, advised on issues surrounding adjunct parity pay; and participated on CBT consultant teams to address staff reorganization and cost-saving measures.

Dr. Malone holds a Bachelor of Business Administration, a Master of Arts in Management, and a Doctorate of Education in Educational Leadership.

Jon Sharpe

Jon Sharpe has his Master's of Education, School Business Administration from the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater. He served as the Chief Business Officer for K-12 school districts and two California Community College Districts in his 35-year career. In 2014, Mr. Sharpe on retired as the Deputy Chancellor at the Los Rios Community College District.

As Deputy Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor at the State Center Community College District, Mr. Shapre was responsible for many support functions including finance, human resources, labor relations and negotiations, facilities, purchasing, and risk management. He also served as the Interim Chancellor at both State Center and Los Rios acting as the Chief Executive Officer.

In addition to overseeing most non-student support functions at his educational institutions, Mr. Sharpe has served on many District, local, and state committees and boards. Mr. Sharpe has participated in multiple accreditation teams and was an active task force member in helping to develop several California community college funding models. Since his retirement he has worked with CBT to assist community colleges with financially related matters.

Mr. Sharpe believes some of his most significant achievements relate to maintaining a collaborative and respectful relationship with employees during several significant economic downturns over the past 35 years, while simultaneously providing financial stability within the Districts during these challenging times.

James Walton

James Walton serves as Vice President of the Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT), leading the operational aspects of the firm. His responsibilities include leading the recruitment and placement of CBT consultants on projects, as well as marketing and business development for the community college and university divisions. Prior to this role, Mr. Walton founded and led Walton Advisories Limited, an Ohio LLC specializing in transformative and disruptive solutions in higher education and other industries.

Mr. Walton also served as the Vice President of Business Development at Science and Technology Campus Corporation (SciTech) at The Ohio State University. He was responsible for leading all business development initiatives in the future development of the research park. He also served as the Associate Director of Strategic Relations in the Office of the President and The Office of Economic and Workforce Development at The Ohio State University. He was responsible for coordinating strategic relationship efforts across all units and colleges at the university, and focused on creating positive customer experiences with all industry engagements. He was part of a team that recruited and established the IBM Client Center for Advanced Analytics, the first of its kind within IBM's strategic direction in data science. He helped structure the partnership between IBM and the university to create a pipeline to talent, which was part of IBM's goal to create 500 new data science jobs over three years.

Prior to this role, Mr. Walton spent many years leading various projects at the university, including those for information technology, athletics, development, legal affairs, real estate and physical planning, and student life. He holds a BA in Middle Childhood Education and an MBA from The Ohio State University.