

Spring 2011

Organizational Structure Review Survey

Appendix

<p>Question 4: One of these recommendations states, "Selected staff reductions that can be made without significantly impacting the organization and which bring expenditures in line with comparable districts, including reduction of "management" costs for academic, student affairs, and administrative service organizations within the colleges (from the department chairs through the vice presidents)" In your opinion, do you feel the reorganization has achieved cost reductions without significantly impacting the organization? Why or why not?</p>
<p>No. We have not been given the cost reductions. When we have asked to see the cost of the reorg, we've been told "later." And here we are, being asked to comment on the survey about cost reduction.</p>
<p>No opinion - have not seen costs analysis that shows cost benefit. I feel that reorg has greatly impacted the organization.</p>
<p>Don't know enough about how much in cost reductions were achieved to state my opinion.</p>
<p>Do not know. Cost reduction information has not yet been supplied.</p>
<p>Because of the nature of the review -- looking at the fiscal aspect separately -- the question can't be answered as financial data is so far unavailable.</p>
<p>No I have seen no cost savings, now we have administration on all levels of hiring, tenure teams etc. How has this saved money</p>
<p>The number of administrators seems to have proliferated and I fail to understand how that can be a budget savings.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">There are too many Vice-Presidents and Deans.</p>
<p>There has been not cost reductions when to consider that the reorganization has added additional administrative positions. Where is the cost savings?</p>
<p>No, we just added a new layer of administrators, who get top dollar and know nothing about our departments and how they actually run, and reduced control from below. I see no evidence of a staff reduction at the top at all, only the bottom so that now offices are closed during school hours, SOCs are hard to find, etc.</p>
<p>It has significantly and adversely affected the organization and is therefore not worth any small savings that have been made.</p>
<p>In some ways this doesn't make sense, and yet, as proposed, the new structure was intended and explained as a cost saving. Regardless of savings, it works MUCH better than before.</p>
<p>Cost reductions were achieved, but not without impact to the college. Our capacity for workforce development, strengthening CTE programming, grant management and community partnerships have all been reduced. This, during a time when the state's economy and educational priorities require our college to focus on resource development, workforce</p>

development, new initiatives to improve CTE, basic skills, transfer, STEM, and more community and industry engagement.
NO. Classified positions are being hit the hardest. Administrators seem to be proliferating. The testing center, in particular, needs more staff.
No. Classified staff reductions have taken place, we are feeling the strain, while management positions have been creased along with their span of control. Remaining classified staff workload has increased due to the mangers span of control.
NO, only classified staff has been reduced and more administrative personnel hired.
No, Based on the extra work that the lower staff has received and the amount of increased responsibility that classified staff has received .
No, as a member of the classified staff I feel that the only people that were affected were classified and the administrative staff was not affected.
No. We lost one of the five positions required to operate the library's circulation and technical processing units at Mission College (we used to have 7). We are still open 55 hours a week, are once again processing a high volume of materials provided by grant monies and donations, and operate with a skeleton staff, without any managerial assistance. Faculty here is mercenary and unsupportive. If anyone is absent, the library does not open. The library at West Valley has a circulation/processing staff of 7 serving statistically similar usage and circulation needs. Morale is exceptionally low-one staff member has been granted a month-long sick-leave, now leaving only the three of us. Thanks to Mission I am very well trained and qualified-I've been here 8 years-but I am very demoralized. It is really inefficient of an organization to drive away experienced and qualified staff. You are fortunate the economy is so bad-I'm just waiting for positions to open up elsewhere.
The reorganization created increase (salary realignment) salaries at the management and Dean level while classified staff were laid off and classified positions that are necessary were deleted.
No. Cost savings data has never been shared with the college or presented to anyone as far as I know. It seems unlikely that the reduction of reassign time and one SOC makes up for the additional deans. Impact: the remaining SOCs are overloaded; the 3 educational deans workload has doubled, resulting in too much work for staff to be totally effective/efficient in their jobs or to best meet their goals and objectives.
No. There are still areas of additional cost expenditures that are not needed eg. additional Deans. Very difficult to know who does what.
I'm not sure. I like the dean structure for management, fiscal, and 12 month availability. I assume the deans do not cost the college undue moneies and think that holding the line on release time for DCs/Depart. Chairs has helped off set the salaries.
No, I don't entirely feel that this has occurred yet. I think there may be places where such reductions could occur but the reduction in the number of divisions was not as effective as it was hoped. There were not as many reductions in administrative services as there might have been. The consolidation of departments did not result in department groupings that work as well as they could - this might have worked better if the consolidated groups had not kept separate PGC allocations and separate "program" or "department" status under their

consolidated dept. chairs.
The deans are working very hard to support "their" divisions, but they are also being pulled away to handle more and more for the administrative needs of the college which makes them less effective in supporting the Division Chairs.
In short, whatever cost savings have occurred have indeed had a "significant impact".
No. We have added more deans and reduced department chairs. Those department chairs left have more work to do and are not as energetic to do it.
No. Our department is a mix of chem and biology now. Way too much for the chair to handle all issues
No. We lost a Director. We also lost a classified in the layoff last year and a Librarian through attrition..
Part of the re-org included a circ manager for the Library. We're now down three positions and the open hours have remained the same.
No. Fewer people are asked to do more - things are put off and fall through the cracks - faculty are asked to hurry up and turn something in one day after the requests are made - this has happened a number of times - we're running around putting out fires instead of rational planning.
No. The reduction impacted the organization -- it moved extra duties to those left behind.
No....we have paid a price for the reductions--we have fewer support hours in labs and fewer students being served; we have gutted the # of DCs so that now their workload is too much. The new structure is not working.
Our division has seen an increased work load, which delays services to students.
I'm not sure what cost reductions we have experienced other than less dept and division chairs and this is not positive.
I see little cost savings relative to the loss in services that affect students and faculty directly.
I don't know that there were any cost reductions at all. Positions were eliminated, but higher level positions with more salary were also created. Some vacant positions were filled which had higher salaries than those laid off. I think that the changes, whether cost reducing or increasing, came at the expense of students. Instructional staff working daily one-on-one with students in very busy labs were laid off, while more expensive unfilled positions (e.g., Sr Admin Asst) were filled, and administrator positions were created. We operated on the principle: "Make the cuts as close as possible to students." Is that a kind of a cost?
No. I believe the management has been over-burdened to the point that their physical health is being impaired. I also believe that many managers have such awkward assignments that they are being obliged to only work with unknown areas so they can get somewhat of a handle on their work assignments.
My department has not had a department chair since the beginning of February this year, which has negatively impacted my Fall 2011 teaching schedule
Yes. I believe that the reductions in cost from reduced reassigned time have allowed for an improved accountability and information sharing structure. I actually believe the organization

is more effective as a result of these changes.
Yes! We needed to shed some weight in some areas. I think we have become a more efficient organization.
I'm afraid not. More manager's that remain outside the student faculty interaction. We are asked to be more independent and less synergistic in the educational approach.
There seems to be more stress, more workload for everyone.
NA
I don't know what it was like before the reorg, but my Division seems to be doing fine so far.
Do not see any differences
In my observation, there was no plan or strategy to support or, take the place of, the completion of the tasks that seasoned, experienced staff efficiently completed. Typically, in a for profit organization, staff reductions are completed only after technology is in place or planned to take the place of the staff that is reduced. As an example, laptops and software training is given to managers before the cuts are made. Or, staffed is cut, and then their functions are out-sourced to India or the Philippines. Should we do this? Could we do this? I observe more confusion, lower morale, and less efficiency. What would happen if the research director lost their support staff- how would that impact his/her work load? The solution may be to go back to a system of full time Deans who concentrate on efficiently running the school.
I have no idea about "cost" reduction, however, it seems the only actual reduction was done to the faculty leadership role (Dept chairs and Division Chairs). Those positions are closest to faculty and students. I saw no reduction in upper management - in fact we now have "Instructional Deans" where we once had "directors" etc. The impact to the organization has been negative. As a faculty member, I have little substantive contact with my "dean" and my division chair is spread so thin that the contact we have is rather cursory. In my opinion the changes were done disingenuously under the guise of "cost savings" and rather more for the purpose of management "control". Any time that is the motivation (de jure or de facto) nothing good can come.
The reductions may have achieved the desired cost reductions but it has definitely impacted the organization significantly. I am a Senior Office Coordinator and am currently supporting 21 departments. The SOCs were also given the added duty of processing section change forms. While these additional duties are cost-saving, they prevent me from being able to provide the type of support that faculty have come to expect because I am overloaded with work. The reduction in force does not come with a corresponding reduction in duties.
No, it's make the current staff do more work with lesser pay. We are people, we are not machine.
No, I do not feel the cost reductions have been achieved. There is more work for the staff, faculty, and others involved. The departments are not getting the information and the college appears to be more disorganized than usual. Not enough notification to faculty about changes that occur, too much micromanaging, and too many orders from management.
Yes and No; I would say yes, rather than no, but I've found a lack of employee interest in change. It isn't all an issue with all employees, but it has been evident in significant employee positions.

<p>Somewhat. The real impact has been having to have the reduced office support and therefore adding those responsibilities to our teaching load, especially because I teach off campus a lot. BUT I understand and can deal with it because the cuts have to come from somewhere.</p>
<p>The selected staff reductions carried out have not significantly impacted the organization. By re-organizing areas and functions, the duties performed by the staff reduction was absorbed.</p>
<p>I cannot determine if there have been cost reductions, but I do know that I don't know who is in what division. There is no convenient "on the web" resource to identify the divisions, department chairs, the SOCs. When I need to contact someone, I have to ask 5 different people who is in charge of what. There is a lot of organizational stress and too many responsibilities for any division chair or dean. So, while I expect we saved money it feels like there are lots of organizational wholes.</p>
<p>I don't see this - especially at the District level. They seem to have increased staff, reclassified positions without any noticeable change in job duties.</p>
<p>No. I think there has been a big impact on the "organization" and the service it provides to those who supposedly are our mission, the students. It was done without any thought to the training that would be necessary to shift people around to essentially "new" positions and I'm sure that the loss of productivity with these position shifts is not in the calculations of "savings" achieved for the district.</p>
<p>I think the reductions in SOCs has negatively impacted operations within the divisions. Other reductions have seemed to have a minor impact.</p>
<p>I believe it has significantly impacted the organization. Staff are stretched thin and more and more are expected and it gets difficult to keep up with the demands.</p>
<p>We have achieved cost reduction by decreasing the use of duplication, encouraged all instructors to place all documents on angel (students share in costs of education), equipment, reduced waste by cutting all operating budgets over 60% and more each year. However, now the departments can not reduce any more. Additional budget costs will effect instruction in a significant way, we will not be able to give tests to students, equipment is starting to break and can not be replaced, and our students can not print another packet of information because they are out of funds too! First line staff do not have the time to assist our students and in the long term it will have a negative effect on enrollment. The students will leave Mission and go to other colleges who will assist them with the admission process, registration, etc. We should remember our roots, that the students come first!</p>
<p>NO, customer service, services in general and retention and our little reputation have suffered significantly.</p>
<p>I do not think that reorganization has achieved cost reduction without impacting organization. We lost our telephone operator and a lot of students say that they cannot reach anybody in A&R or they cannot leave a message for their instructor. Actually, they have to come on campus or do business on our web site. It does not seem that technology works the way we would like it to work. Students prefer to talk with a person. As to staff reduction there is no discussion on the college level or the district level on how to improve services and procedures just how to shift around responsibilities.</p>
<p>No, we still seem extremely top heavy. Our organization moves slowly and is very</p>

cumbersome in it's processes.
As a Dept Chair, I feel the college is less effective now because of unintended consequences on the reorg. Reorganization was never completed properly because we could not negotiation job duties of ACE members (Dept and Division Chairs). We could never talk about the elephant in the room.
unsure
no opinion
No Opinion
no opinion
no opinion
This makes sense. The question would be the criteria for "significantly impacting the organization".
What cost reductions?
yes

Question 5: One of these recommendations states, "Enrollment Management. The colleges have a number of procedures and practices in place that make it difficult to achieve and sustain efficiency. These must be examined and revised if the institutions are to improve WSCH/FTEF." In your opinion, do you feel the reorganization has improved enrollment management? Why or why not?
No. I think Admin & Records is regressive, not willing to make changes that would ease the enrollment process. The department is a huge impediment rather than a huge help.
I feel the reorganization has achieved the improved numbers for the present, however actual student learning outcomes should be evaluated. We have a better WSCH/FTEF for some departments has the students learned what is required of them? What is happening with retention? Are the students staying and getting their degrees/certificates?
On many levels it HAS improved enrollment management. We still have an untenable bottle neck in the office of instruction in Aileen's position. That job needs to be diversified and covered by more than one person.
No, the enrollment was miscalculated last semester and the workload is placed on faculty.
With so many variables with the budget process it is difficult to know if this reorganization is ok or not. One thing is sure, with less money we cannot do the job no matter what the reorg. is.
Yes.the culture of us vs them is changing and the accountability of underachieving departments has improved.
The question is has there been a significant increase in enrollments? No! IN all actually there has been a decrease in student participation. But there are additions to the administrative staff.
No. Reorganization has not affected enrollment management. Enrollment management is

only improved when those in charge (dept chairs on up) do their job correctly.
no. the new division chair structure is too minimal in number and can't see the larger picture of the college as a whole.
Maybe for admissions and records, but not for the faculty member. Less support and more reliance on computer programs. Distance Learning courses are not the same as traditional classroom environment and needs to be addressed. Far too many students are lost at the beginning of the semester in DL.
I think class efficiency has greatly improved due to the focus that faculty, dept. chairs and division chairs placed on this task and the fact that most faculty members were willing to take on the challenge of taking and teaching more students in their classes, increasing their workload initially for the good of the college and now to accommodate the state budget cuts.
Again, I haven't been around long enough to know...
I don't know what the observers had in mind, but I have NOT seen an improvement in procedures and practices. Hurdles in registration persist.
No. Our enrollment management has been more chaotic this year than any year with shorter notices, shorter deadlines, more superstitious approaches to enrollment - late start - not spending ftef so we need larger winter and summer at the "drop of a hat". Just crazy management. In fairness, the division chairs were new and trying - but what guidance did they get from all the really superior "management changes" that were implemented elevating folks who had been deemed qualified for their roles as deans?
I believe that a significant start has occurred, but we aren't as far down the road as one would hope. More time is needed for this...
No. Insufficient classified support staffing in the Offices of Instruction.
No, because we are not really focus on students need. We are more into ourself and greed with moneys. Sample: If one of the custodian decided to retire, the college is not going to replace that person. Would this will be effect to student(s)? bathroom are not clean, class room and equipments are filty. This create a very bad environment for students to learn aon study. And why are we only offer classes for non-worker students, but not in favor for current workers in our area. Most of the worker don't get off from work until 5PM, but we offer classes start from 3:30pm, 4:30pm. This does not make sense.
No. I don't know what procedures and practices you're talking about. We still have students joining wait lists in more than one section of a course. How are we supposed to know how many are actually trying to add a section when we allow students to do this? We can't drop the classes that don't really have the students, and don't know if we should open new sections because we don't really know what the demand is until the classes actually start!
NO, there is no retention and no cultural diversity.
NO, not all constituencies are involved in the process. Faculty and administration only point out the team effort when WSCH/FTEF's are low. Otherwise ignore the collaboration it takes.
Enrollment managemnt has improved; however, the room management system to accomodate increase section creation. There are not enough multimedia room to accomodate the faculty room with section requests.
Partially. I think that PGC still finds it hard to make decisions that negatively impact other faculty or programs. I know the district has put a committee into action but have no idea as

to that committee's impact or efforts.
There has been a streamlining of processes, but due to software limitations there is only so much that can be done.
Not at all. Registration screw-ups continue to plague the district.
Improved, yes--but not enough. There still appears to be a lack of clear direction and understanding when it comes to enrollment. I believe things, however, are better than in past years and that the reorganization has only improved things.
No. Enrollment seems the same as it was before the reorg. This duty falls heavily on one person still, the Dean of Instruction. The "new" instructional deans do not seem to have any involvement in this aspect.
There have been positive advancements seen with the enrollment process, but have also experienced procedural changes by A & R that have a negative impact on the department in regards to enrollment of students in my department (extra duties for dept. faculty that should stay in A & R).
It's definitely tried. however, we still have situations of not wanting to hurt feelings by cutting or discontinuing programs that have long needed their plugs pulled. Carrying dead weight hurts the entire campus!
Somewhat, but there is still a LOT of room for improvement. Data used for scheduling is not reliable. There are problems with some of the reports (COGNOS, etc.)
No. I hear a lot of grumbling from students about the lack of service, especially in Admissions & Records.
Enrollment has not improved. In fact, students are unable to register for some courses because new requirements from the State prevent us from making course sections available until a control number is obtained. In addition, some of the processes are still requiring the over use of paper instead of quicker electronic methods.
I don't know, however, I personally have listened to an increasing number of students that complain about not being able to get into the core classes they need. In some cases, to remain full time students, they are forced to take classes they do not want or need. I have heard complaints that this is done so the school can get money out of them.
The reorganization has marginally improved enrollment management. The increased level of administrator's versed in enrollment management has lessen the amount of data errors. Many systemic and contractual obligations/precedences hamper the college in achieving and sustaining efficiency.
No. The processes employed by PGC are not workable to address efficiency, enrollment management, priority reductions. No venue exists for close collaboration between faculty leaders, instructional administration and student services to develop, agree on and implement effective enrollment management. Deans do not have authority or influence needed for effective enrollment management within departments.
Our department is being asked to "cut back", but the classes that we can cut from the program are the ones that generate the most WSCH/FTEF.
Of course. The deans are active, hands-on managers of enrollment. We have/had too few faculty who were actively involved outside their own classrooms.
Again, no. We're top-heavy and always have been.

until we fix our datatel issues and get the DATA ACCURATE to make decisions, the reorg has done little to help with this.
Yes, It took much fighting for the proper equipment to track our WSCH/FTEF but once we received it I do believe we are on the right track.
I don't think so. By cutting sections we are cutting growth and many of the methods of measuring efficiency are based on flaws in our data. When the data is flawed or limited- the management decisions are flawed.
I do not think the reorganization played a large role in enrollment management for my division. The processes at the college have a much greater impact that the overall reorganization. Also enrollment management is an ongoing process, so it needs constant improvement and attention.
This is still a work in progress
No we had to add section the end of spring to make our goal, how was that effective.
Enrollment is up because demand is up. I don't believe that was managed; it just happened. I can't speak to the efficacy of steps taken to "manage" enrollment.
No. What a convoluted wording!
Not really. I think each dept. working with the DC has allowed increase in efficiency. Having a dean has not made this happen.
na
no opinion
NO do not understand the verbiage
No opinion
no opinion
Enrollment management has been improved because of circumstances not related to the reorganization, but the economic crisis in our state. So, I cannot really evaluate this item.
N/A
I don't know. But I question if our sudden aggressive push for students to enroll in late start courses came off as manipulative of students?
I don't know.
No information to base an opinion on.
?
no opinion
Not sure
No opinion
no opinion
"no opinion
Only in that we got a response when the emphasis was shifted/focused on accomplishing increased enrollment as well as fewer sections with larger enrollment.
Have not heard one word about this all year.
Soon this college will need to chase enrolment again. Enrollment has improved in some areas- but not all. Local and state conditions are reasonable for our growth.
Yes.
Yes.

Yes

Question 6: One of these recommendations states, "The District should review reassigned time for non-department head and division chair functions to determine if some faculty currently released could be returned to teaching duties." In your opinion, do you feel the changes in release time been positive, neutral, or negative? Please explain.

Our department head has always taught classes so it is difficult for me to answer this question. I believe that all department heads should teach classes, but I know that it is difficult for ours.

All faculty needs to teach. If you get four months off- you need to have some face time with the students. How much money is wasted paying non- teaching " faculty" here?

Negative, reduction of division chairs (fewer division chairs) with additional responsibilities(more departments) has decreased timely communication to the faculty and staff, created more bureaucracy, and a hierarchical structure. To discuss any matter with the division chair, an appointment needs to made weeks in advance. If the VP has an important initiative it will take even more time to communicate via the division chair structure to faculty and front line staff. The change has helped administration because they have less reports. It has hurt our college and we will not be able to be creative and innovative in our course offering to stay attractive to younger students!

Positive, if in fact that release time adjustment has resulted in more time in the classroom for teachers.

I for one am very critical of the assignment of reassign time to the Director of Nursing. This is substantial and is a burden that all faculty much share. The reductions in reassign time without any consideration of workload should be revisited. The current practice is unfair.

head and division chairs are redundant except in dept. which are required by regulation

Division Chairs continue to deal with the management of faculty and student interactions, while management remains aloof.

I think the duties assigned to Dept. Chairs and Div. Chairs is well above that of what their reassigned time allows.

Negative. There are some department chairs that have more responsibilities then to just the college; ie maintaining state regulations to a board. There doesn't seem to be enough time allotted to do this.

No. Our department is a mix of chem and biology now. Way too much for the chair to handle all issues

Depts are compressed and division chairs reduced to the point that the impact is negative. As a dept chair, I am receiving less release time and still doing what I did before and more. I am far above my institutional obligations so I am now doing some things for free. Division chair duties have grown so much in the number of people represented that the impact is negative.

I think that our DC and department chairs need more release time, not less.

negative, I think the faculty are doing appropriate work that needs to remain at that level

<p>Negative - it appears that there is much more work and not as efficient.</p>
<p>Again - asking fewer people to do more jobs. No wonder they're struggling to do them. Faculty have had to take on much of what A&R used to do - check records, clean up records, submit records, learn and apply the rules as they are changed by admin or A&R without input from faculty. Setting up faculty to fail is what it looks like - trying to prove that faculty aren't up to the job, by making it more difficult for them to do their job.</p>
<p>Positive. However, given our many challenges and many new initiatives and strategic directions the college wants to take on, there is simply not enough horses to pull the cart. Also, the same few faculty take on new projects and institutional responsibilities. The work needs to be somehow spread around.</p>
<p>Has it really happened? I haven't observed it.</p>
<p>I don't know for certain. I know we have four full-time faculty members, and only one of them teaches at all. When she does it's in the summer so she receives additional financial compensation. The librarian/faculty serve on committees, which I presume, grants them release time. In this instance I think it may be being grossly misused. I don't understand why if they don't teach, they still receive the full benefits afforded (and deserved by) "true" teachers.</p>
<p>The impact is not fully in for our department/programs yet, but lessening these allocations will be devastating for our department and again put more on our classroom instructors.</p>
<p>Negative for all the reasons I stated above. The department and division chairs were the only roles decreased, and they were closest to the rank and file work that needs to be done. The result was that the experienced chairs could see what was happening and quit. The new chairs - while well intended - really had a hard role to fill and received little if any support and training. The "deans" were elevated from roles that they did well and found themselves in over their heads - again with what appears to be little training and support.</p>
<p>Negative. The system does not promote any stability for processes and chain of command issues. People that teach are hopefully good teachers. That does not mean they are good administrators. Thought should be given as to what the position actually requires and if it makes more sense to have permanent "chairs" in place like they do at other schools. More stability and accountability.</p>
<p>I think in most areas discretionary release time has decreased and rightfully so. In the past, if you were "connected" to certain people in management you could get a lot of extra pay for little work. We almost went in the opposite direction in expecting faculty to take on huge amounts of work without commensurate reassign time. It seems we are close to having the right balance now. I would also add that too much work has been assigned to dept. chairs, some with a reduction in reassign time. I would say we are still not achieving/assigning fair and equitable workloads/reassign times in some areas.</p>
<p>Again, I think we need to have full time Deans to focus only on running the school. I don't think that the current system is working.</p>
<p>NEGATIVE. I realize that this question applies to release time other than Dept/Division chairs. There is not enough release time allocated through the college to adequately carry out critical faculty roles such as overseeing curriculum development, accreditation, and other areas. We could use another 2.0 release time for Mission College to deal with all the jobs that are</p>

necessary.
Negative. The old organization functioned much better.
In light of the reduced # of DCs, I think we need to abolish the DC structure and return to a Dept./DC relationship. Give a bit more release time to the dept. chairs as well. Hire 2 more Deans to be distributed across the divisions.
Job Descriptions are really not clear at any of the levels. No one is certain about who does what. Everyone is a Dean or a Mgr. There is a great deal of work and one does not know who does what.
NO, there is a lot of wasted time by administration.
Positive... I think that we've been completing more, general-college responsibilities, despite the reduction in release time.
Negative
no opinion -- not sure I am aware of all changes.
neutral, have not seen decrease of teaching duties because of release time or an increase of teaching duties because reassigned time was removed.
Neutral. Overall this has work okay, but some areas such as SLO and Staff Development have been impacted by not having a person partially assigned to these functions.
What changes? There has been no communication about this.
Neutral
neutral since on student services side. can't assess well.
I feel the change has been neutral in my area. There has been little impact to my department. My department is now combined with another. No one in my department previously received load for Departmental operations, so there was no cost savings. The department still makes decisions and the "chair" from another area does the administrative functions. I think small departments could go back to acting in the Department chair role and not receiving load and the difference would be nil.
Neutral. I do not know anyone affected by this change so I cannot make a determination.
Perhaps
Not anything I encounter, so I don't have an opinion.
Besides fewer Division Chairs, what has been done? I'll answer your question with a question.
NA
Need more information in order to answer this question
no opinion
Have not seen any results for this yet.
no opinion
I do not have any opinion on this issue.
The changes have actually been all three. Some reshifting of faculty to teaching has been positive. However some has been negative as well. I think that the division chairs should really be deans or teach only one class. However, I am not a division chair, so their opinion should be solicited.
This has yet to be determined
N/A
I was glad to see release time 'regulated'. Too many faculty were abusing release time

refusing to do any work without it.
I don't know.
I have no opinion
No opinion
no opinion
I don't know enough about this subject manner to comment.
no opinion
No opinion.
I wasn't working at Mission College before the changes in release time were instituted so I am unable to give a fair personal assessment.
Some need to return to faculty positions. Experience and skills are needed to perform these duties - not all have those capabilities. If they take on a two year position, by the end of two years, they are a little more knowledgeable and a lot more frustrated and decide not to return for more at any price.
no opinion
Yes.
This is positive. You can't monitor institutional hours that are part of load.
Positive. Isn't this a rewording of the statement in #2?
Extremely positive. There had been too much duplication of duties and confusion with the old system.
Positive. I think that the housecleaning regarding release time has been successful.
Yes
positive in giving the department chairs more release time; negative in reducing the number of division chairs.

Question 7: What do you feel have been weaknesses with the new organizational structure? Please explain.
Adding a dean and cutting support structure makes no sense to me.
The deans are generally overwhelmed with responsibilities. In addition to what they used to do, they are now managers over faculty. We are all feeling the frustration that important issues are neglected because of the time it takes to work with faculty.
A few instructional deans still have WAY too much work on their plate! And, at least one isn't totally effective at his/her job (but then, they weren't hired to be an instructional dean...)
A couple of the deans appear to be overloaded with responsibilities.
The new instructional deans have very little to do with instruction. They spend most of their time assisting the president and not assisting their divisions. This first year has not provided much evidence that their transition was worth the effort and cost.
Delay and slowness of decisions. Do something so we know what we are trying and if it doesn't work, try something else. This has been much better since Laurel has come on board.
We need to have the district and ACE do this the correct way. We should have Deans or DC's.

<p>12.335 RT is a lot of money that can be spent on teaching & learning. I would love to see Office of Instruction run well but under the current structure it can't happen- 12.335 is not enough RT for DC and Dept Chairs (we can't have both).</p>
<p>DCs are over loaded with way too much work.</p> <p>Deans that had full time jobs before now have way too many responsibilities and their previous responsibilities have become neglected.</p> <p>Some Deans are not adapting to the new structure very well; for example--The dean of technology was doing well as the dean of technology but does not have the desire or the aptitude as an academic dean. Training could be a factor as well.</p>
<p>Division chairs responsible for so many more departments - have little time to focus much attention on specific problems.</p>
<p>No. Our department is a mix of chem and biology now. Way too much for the chair to handle all issues</p>
<p>the division chair structure is too small to be effective. It should return to the original 10 divisions. It was more comprehensive and impartial and provided better overall governance.</p>
<p>Too few division chairs. These folks have too much to do so that they spend their time taking care of the problems instead of being able to work with the whole divisions. I haven't seen much support from my dean so I don't see how this is helping.</p>
<p>I know a few faculty taking on Departmental and Divison level duties are working their behinds off - more than release time makes up for - and that more faculty should probably step up and serve.</p> <p>I would like to see Deans both cajoling faculty to be on committee, etc. (FT and PT), and mentoring some when necessary.</p> <p>I really think faculty NEED to be responsible for helping run the college, but I think they sometimes need a little friendly push and some encouragement and assistance (we teach; and sometimes get lost in the acronyms and beaucracy).</p> <p>Administrators ought to resist the urge to 'take over'. I am not going to do my students' assignments for them; I'm not to give them the encourage and help they need to succeed...</p> <p>I hope that makes sense.</p>
<p>It is too top heavy. The word does not get to the department heads quick enough - some departments are overlooked because too much work is placed on Division Chairs.</p>
<p>I think having a dean structure is great - I don't know if we need both Division Chairs and Department Chairs.</p>
<p>Weaknesses: Increased workload for all; faculty, confidential, managers, teamsters, seiu, poa employees.</p>
<p>The Deans. What on earth are they doing? They don't respond to questions or emails, they aren't making command decisions, and they are taking up resources.</p>

morale
we are so micro managed and not trusted
There is a lack of trust and clear job descriptions about who is to do what. No one tells anyone what is going on. Lack of communication is all over the place.
Arrogant attitudes from above, including disrespect for the efforts of faculty (AND classified!) in the office of instruction.
Four SOC can not serve 5 Divisions. it is really confusing who does what. They need another SOC.
The greatest weakness is that enough time hasn't passed. I can realize changes, but I don't know which are intended to be sustainable and which are not...
We're in transition it is really too early to judge.
I worry that the Instruction side sometimes dictates to Student Services - not healthy for the organization or for student success. Communication can be poor. I think that when we deliberately cut positions of instructional lab staff in favor of filling various unfilled administrative positions (regardless of the unit), then we are diminishing student services and student success. The organization is then not bearing the burden of cuts where the burden should have been. This is true because we were already down to a skeleton crew in the labs when the cuts occurred, and I see the impact on a daily basis.
It feels as if the cost-cutting measures have fallen disproportionately harder on the direct service staff-classified employees in particular.
It seems very disingenuous to say, for example, that layoffs for classified employees are absolutely unavoidable, then to announce a new research department with 3 new positions the following week. It seems as if there is always money around to hire more administrators.
Lack of transparencies. We were suppose to "work together", "collaborate" and "share" the burden of the organizational change but only classified had reduction in staffing and NO ONE else.
No circ manager. No one is minding the store, and we are down to three classified staff. If one person reports out sick- the Library doesn't open. A circ manager would be paid more and would be expected to fill in as needed.
Although we have fewer people the process has become more complicated – this is not efficient.
Centralization and de-centralization of functions happening at the same time. Who is the primary lead for items-- Dean of Instruction or Area Dean
No training. Staff moved where they don't want to be. Administrators forced to work with staff they did not choose and would not choose. Transitions were not planned well. No overlap or procedure for transition caused major gap in continuity of services.
Ambiguity in roles and expectations at all levels. Processes are not clear and too cumbersome. There is duplication of effort, yet, it does not prevent failures in the systems or processes. Deans and department chairs do not work closely. Everyone is being asked to do too much and there is lack of sense of priorities, cohesion leading to an inability for folks to be effective with core responsibilities.
Lack of clarity as to which dean to go to for specific situations/problems.

We don't know what the job descriptions are for the key positions.
I stated the weakness before. If I ask someone what division is faculty x in, or who is the division or dept chair for faculty x--most people just don't know. How do I find out the answer easily? If I say who is the SOC for division x, no one knows. If I say what division is hospitality management in (for example) three different answers from 5 people are given. How about a website that has they key divisions, dept. chairs, SOCs deans with current phone numbers and major responsibilities listed on the web.
Lack of clarity and understanding in the roles and responsibilities for all parties within the revised structure. Also, I feel not everyone is truly held accountable.
We have no organizational chart so the structure is unclear. I am only familiar with my area changes but the direction the college is going in as a whole is not defined. The affect on my area is that the reorganization may be too broad not well thought out or not clearly defined.
Lack of clarity about the relative roles of deans and division chairs. The roles of division chairs, which are spelled out in the contract, are being undercut by administrative actions and decisions at the same time that DCs are being asked to work with bigger divisions.
The new Deans assigned to each department can sometimes not know the department so that are not of much help in mitigating problems within that department. Also it appears to be more costly!
Need additional faculty and staff to teach students! Since we have not grown why do we need to increase administration? Do they teach and increase our WCSH/FTEF?
new layer of administrators to go through up the chain of command; this has marginalized the DCs.
to many higher level people and not enough middle management
Again, we are too top heavy. There isn't an open door policy, faculty have been intimidated NOT to speak to administration.
Too many administrators, not enough workers. Top down mandates. Changes implemented without thinking it through. Uninformed decision making. Not including the workers in establishing procedures or problem solving. Some administrators not collaborative.
Again, administrative positions within the colleges and within the district have grown -- with little to show. The colleges and the District don't seem to be anymore efficient -- just costlier.
Too top heavy. Less support for the work that is done closest to the students. Smaller locus of control and therefore less span of responsibility - meaning that the college community feels less inclined to take responsibility for the work of the college as they feel that the managers will/should do it all. Lessening of voices heard.
Students services seems Administration heavy.
None
See answer above.
Honestly, the Division Chairs.
I think that some programs still struggle with having a department chair that isn't in their specific field. I suspect this will eventually shake out as people learn more about other programs.
NA
No opinion

no opinion
no opinion
The lack of a department chair for the past 3.5 months has had a negative impact on my Fall 2011 teaching schedule
Lack of service, during "Peak Times" in Admissions & Records.
Never understood "fixed and variable costs, therefore, data was tainted from the very beginning. No way to evaluate actual dollar cost savings, since services provided are not the same, nor is the productivity to service ratio.
unknown
No Comment
I don't think the assignments make much sense.
Lack of skilled, experienced, knowledgeable, thoughtful, professionals in key positions.

Question 8: What do you feel have been strengths of the new organizational structure? Please explain.
There has been more accountability from faculty. This is not to say all faculty were not accountable. But those who were not accountable are becoming moreso.
It's easier for administrators to implement the changes they want as dictatorships are always most efficient. Democracy is messy and time consuming, but it generally is considered to yield the strongest government and most creative work. Democracy, it seems, should be the goal of any college especially.
The goals of streamlining and documenting procedures, automating processes where possible. Implementing a structure where problems are identified, although the new structure still seems to punish all for the non-compliance of a few.
Better accountability for administrators. I see certain administrators being held accountable for their areas in a way that has not been present in the past.
Better integration of administration within instructional programs. Deans have better understanding of the needs and challenges of faculty, departments and programs.
A greater level of communication among all employee ranks, and across the instruction and student services divisions seem to be the norm. Other strengths may be situational, only, verses systemic.
Better chain of communication; improved abilities to share process changes and collect input.
Improved communication to Departments since fewer are involved
Increased awareness of Departmental needs since communication is streamlined and Dean can play a greater role in the Division needs
We have a new President who seems to be very motivated to understand what is happening and to get the show on the road. She has to know that it is not just a few people being unhappy but that there is a great deal of confusion and no positive leadership. Faculty like to be treated with respect.

Bringing the deans into closer contact with faculty.
Deans can beat people up for not doing their jobs (joking way to say it...!), where before, there wasn't enough time in the year to track down every slacker and get them up to speed.
Some of the divisions are aligned better than before.
Reducing the number of divisions was a good idea.
Having a more robust level of administration to oversee the instructional component of the college. The consolidation of Divisions into larger units.
I don't think there are an strengths to the structure. The big improvement has been in the individuals at the Dept., Division and Dean levels.
Deans can beat people up for not doing their jobs (joking way to say it...!), where before, there wasn't enough time in the year to track down every slacker and get them up to speed.
I am patiently awaiting for the positive results of the new organizational structure. Most of communications is usually directed to the area Dean as the Division Chair lacks skill sin many areas.
Change with new people as division chairs and department chairs, new energy.
That we haven't completely ignored or removed the faculty from the managing of an academic institution - although we've tried to wear them out.
We finally start making those full time faculty to do the work they get pay for.
Full time instructors don't have to teach full time.
The dean for my division has provided additional support.
none
Not aware of any
No improvement from the previous Division Chair Structure.
NONE
So far, I don't' know of any.
none.
None
None. Except more pay for Tim.
None.
none
I am not sure what the strengths are, as I classified staff member it has not been long enough for me to see a lot of them.
Not sure.
Other than cost savings, if they were realized, I can't speak to the improvement (if any) in the operation of the college.
I love the new president; she's excellent and has wonderful vision. However, our current structure seems punitive.
The president cares
Unknown. Roles and responsibilities haven't been clearly defined nor communicated to employees.
A more streamlined organization.
We have likely reduced costs. I suspect in the prior system there was some waste. I'm concerned that we have cut too much and now we are running around a bit in crisis mode

because we cannot do everything. However, that is not just a problem at Mission and is caused by the economic realities. So, the strength of this new structure is it is lean for sure!
It seems to take quite a while to get an answer from the chain of command
Again, I wasn't around to experience the weaknesses of the old one...
NA
No opinion
N/A
Not sure.
I don't know
no opinion
No Opinion
No Comment
no opinion
It was a nice idea that didn't work.
There are none.
None
none
I have not seen any.
I dont know of any.
The removal of some under performing staff.
?
Still looking for some--maybe not as many people report directly to Norma.
Not sure.
no comment

Question 9: If you could further revise the organizational structure, what would you do? Please explain why you would make the change and how it would lead to improvements.
Admissions & Records needs to be open for business five days a week, except in the Summer. Students having problems with applications, or trying to register for classes will eventually go to other institutions.
Change the self-righteous attitude of some admins. Continue to encourage and value more involvement (as our new president seems to be doing).
Have every administrator evaluated by the faculty and staff yearly.
Get rid of all deans and give the control back to the DCs
I do not see much improvement yet. Instruction needs to work more on the Division structure.
Change the reporting structure by grouping likeness of span of control of Deans and DC and empower the end user to make more decision making abilities.
Fewer committees--more decisions and action.
Fill the department chair vacancy ASAP so that teaching assignments can be determined

before class schedules are published
Put full time dedicated Deans in place to manage the school and hold them accountable for their areas.
Further consolidate the Division Chair level and redistribute release time to department chairs.
In short, get rid of the Deans. They are an extra layer of Administration and cause too much hardship and create too much work. I thought the Deans were here to make our lives easier, and yet I find that we are having to do more work because of them.
Build some trust. Look at the jobs that need to be done and write some clear job descriptions.
Less top brass and more instructors. We need to look at the courses we are offering to get more students through our doors.
Library needs a supervisor for the classified staff.
I would hire more deans or make division chairs a full-time or .8 position. Or hire more classified to support some of the clerical functions so that the managers time was focused on management not on tasks best done by clerical support.
Assign instructional and non-instructional assignments to new Dean of Instruction. Position can still shepherd OI processes, but many of those should be delegated to respective divisional deans. Deans should work more directly with department chairs. PGC cannot be the only venue for enrollment management. There should be venue for deans, division chairs and department chairs to discuss programs, services and enrollment management. This will allow more cohesion within divisions, but also across divisions.
My comments would be to provide more time for analysis, perhaps, a second year; it seems too early to comment on greater revision, at the moment.
One thing that concerns me is the transition faculty make to positions of responsibility. I'm pretty new at this; so maybe I don't understand it as well as I ought to, but I think it IS difficult to learn the ins and outs of governing and the expectations when one steps into a Dept Chair or Div Chair position. The college should have structures designed to assist with these transitions.
The problem has not been the DC structure, faculty, or staff. It is one of instability of Administration, in their revolving door management. No Administrator stay more than 2-3 years. And the ones that do, are not competitively qualified in their skill-sets, therefore unable to search for the next career step. Just count the number of Interim and full-time presidents that have passed through our doors and you will know the 'real' problem with Mission College. No vision. No stability in top management.
I would not do anything until the state budget improves. Do not reorganize again. One problem at a time please.....
I would develop an organizational chart for visual transparency. I would use surveys like this one to poll opinion in the future so others that don't feel included in the process would have some understanding of the rational in the final decision process.
I don't know exactly what I would do but there continues to be something about PGC that just doesn't allow it to work efficiently or quickly. Sorry, I don't have any suggestion for improvement, though!

<p>promote from within. value qualified staff. quit hiring administrators-make the existing ones work and produce for their generous salaries.</p>
<p>Reduce District, and take the cost saving and divide the funds to West Valley and Mission for new programs and faculty to teach.</p>
<p>I would have a reduction of deans because they are not cost effective and the burden of work is placed on faculty.</p>
<p>I observe that Division Chairs are in a very difficult spot, as they are both faculty and administrator. It seems difficult for them to make decisions that would be unpopular with their colleagues given this role. I believe the people in these positions deserve the utmost respect and do their best, but the nature of the position creates the problem. These positions should be reviewed to see if some of the items can either be moved to Dean purview or else make Division Chairs full administrators.</p>
<p>Deans--->Department Chairs (no Division Chairs)</p>
<p>Remove the dean struction from instructional side of the organization - there has been no demonstrated value. There needs to be more support for the dept chairs that are doing the actual work.</p>
<p>return to the original division chair structure and reduce the number of deans.</p>
<p>Given the structure we now have in place, I would suggest immense professional development for administrators (including DCs and Dept. chairs) on effective management techniques and improved communication techniques. Many administrators communication style appears to their "underlings" both faculty and staff as autocratic and disrespectful or at best benignly ineffective. It is almost as if we were the enemy or the recalcitrant child who caused all the problems of this institution when in reality - we had a president and the same person was vice president of instruction when many of the issues were coming forward and that person - who was in a position to make changes - did nothing and landed us in WASC trouble. It was also a former VPI that insisted on HBA - not the faculty. But it seems that the faculty are the people who are being punished and blamed for it - for example. We are a community that needs the talents and skills of all its members to be effective. Each persons contributions should be valued and respected. It may be that they are currently, but it doesn't feel like it.</p>
<p>Hire administrator not promote individuals to positions they are not the best qualified for.</p>
<p>Stop the micro managing, treat faculty with respect</p>
<p>Return the instructional deans to their original positions. Alternatively utilize them for their original purpose: to assist the divisions. This would relieve a lot of the work placed on the dean of instruction (and could possibly lead to the elimination of this position).</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have enough staff to adequately perform tasks. 2. Create "floating" staff support that could be used during peak times to perform duties common to most areas and departments. 3. Provide training and clear guidelines for tasks that must be completed by all departments.

4. Create desk manuals for positions so they do not become so "person" dependent.
5. Team building that sets the tone for cooperative work relationships and not adversarial ones.
6. Team approach to staff support for departments across both campuses.
Too early to make recommendations.
To this day I do not understand the logic behind renaming "Dean" positions to "Educational Dean" positions. Would not common sense tell us that because we are an educational institution, education is the overall focus of the job? I believe this was an unnecessary addition to titles that already seemed to working.
More managers/administrators need to be working managers - able to take on jobs that those they supervise perform as needed.
I would not have 3 Educational Deans and 1 Dean of Instruction. I would let the 3 Deans who already had a full time position (Workforce et al, Inst. Technology and Library) go back to their previous roles and do a focused, great job in those positions. I would hire the Dean of Instruction as planned to handle operational responsibilities (schedule, state reporting, curriculum, catalogue) and one Educational Dean to work with 8 Division Chairs (a more reasonable division of workload) on all problems and issues with faculty but with a huge focus on how to better serve and teach and ensure the success of our students in the classroom. I think the V.P. of Instruction would have the administrator support she needs to achieve her goals and be successful and we would not be so top heavy and the administrators would not be stretched so thin. We risk not being successful and efficient and effective when administrators and workers are overloaded with an unrealistic amount of responsibilities, goals and tasks.
None for my area
None
Ibid.
I have no option in this regard since I come to work and I stay busy all day long from morning till night.
no opinion
not sure
No opinion
Can't say.
no opinion
No Comment
no opinion
Don't know.
No opinion
Somehow, I'd get another person or two to support the desk and functions that Aileen DeGuzman does. We depend way too much on that one-person/office.
Take out the different additional levels of reporting that have been done and mainstream processes.

Take a look at campus Center staff.
I said this earlier but I would
a) eliminate the DC structure
b) hire 2 more academic deans
c) return more release time to department chairs
I would like to see the Deans have time to do more of what they used to do. For example, I believe that more could be done with Community Services. There are opportunities and the opportunity for fees to be generated. As it is now, this doesn't seem possible.
I think that the college should revisit the previous organizational structure to see if there were flaws or weaknesses. We moved ahead with evaluation but with direction and conviction for the previous president.
I still question if that have been by-in by of all those individuals who were forced to accept the change.
Separate out Biology from Chemistry and give each chair release time
I would centralize the SOCs to provide more effective coverage and support for all divisions at all times the college is open, to ensure that PT faculty are better supported. I would also try to figure out some way to put instructional support services such as the library and the computer labs into a single division similar to Student Services. This proposed division actually straddles student services and instruction, because these areas support the academic programs of the college directly while providing services to students. (DISC and the tutoring center and academic skills would also fit into this division.) Since all these areas also supervise facilities, and have both faculty and classified staff, and handle significant budgets, here are major commonalities that would make management of the functions "fit" better together.
If the deans were not appointed but were actually hired because of their knowledge and experience that would have been better. You now have some who don't have the qualifications to do the job in the position so they are not helping and the DC is the one doing most of the work.
don't know enough to comment

Question 10: Under the reorganization, the Senior Office Coordinators, or "SOCs", were realigned with the new division structure. What are your thoughts on this new alignment?
Asking the SOC's and truly giving weight and credence to their views is the best course of action. They are hard working and willing to do their best. We have fewer SOC's than WVC. In areas where two SOC's were assigned, this is confusing.
Things are much better but things aren't perfect.

Who are the SOC's and what is the realignment? Has that been communicated to everyone?
Disaster. The amount of training time required to bring an SOC up to speed was a drain on the already stressed system. The method of assignment (seniority and bumping) did not take into account matching skills to tasks.
Some SOC's have better knowledge and abilities than others but this is not due to the structure.
Look at morale.
SOC's report being over worked. However, I believe the Office of Instruction REALLY needs support- the front and back office.
We never have enough support but that's what was reduced. Staff is always doing more with less. We have more responsibilities without acknowledgement of any sort. And the "we all have to make difficult decisions" answer just makes things worse when you have the administration and other earning two, three and more than classified.
too few SOC's for the current structure.
NOT ENOUGH SOC's! Period. The one's I interact with are nothing less than stellar, but overworked. I, for one, understand how much they do to support me and I also understand when they forget or don't get around to something. I know they always have SO much going on at once; I think I'd lose track or just not manage it all.
SOC's run the College, in case you didn't know....
The SOC's are overwhelmed with their duties and responsibilities.
SOC's still seem stressed.
Are you asking the SOC's? Our SOC seems to be dreadfully overworked.
SOC's have seen increase workload without the added support staff to fulfill the increase demand; lack of IT added resources as well.
Just not enough office support, but understandable in tough times, as explained above.
They seem overworked and under paid for what they do.
Not enough SOC's, so some have too much work. Every division has different needs, so it is hard to divide up the duties by division alone.
The SOC's are miserable (I do believe them when they say the SOC's at WVC do less), so I don't know how to remedy this. Listen to them and make improvements where improvements can be made..
Not enough SOC's. Difficulties for SOC to handle everything and issues have arisen
There need to be more SOC's. They are overworked and as a result paperwork is very delayed. Load sheets are given out months into the semester for which they are relevant. Contracts for overload pay are very late, thereby requiring multiple months' payment in one paycheck which means that we get taxed at a higher bracket and won't see that money back for over a year. This isn't entirely their fault: they have too many divisions for which they are working.
Our SOC is so stressed, she is often out sick. She is rarely at her desk so is not around to offer help and advice. If the goal was to centralize these folks so they are working for the deans and Office of Instruction, it succeeded. The loss was, again, at the front line where we meet and help students and staff. Maybe that was the sacrificed needed, but it wasn't

communicated clearly.
If there cannot be an adequate number of SOC's (5), the assigned tasks and/or services must be reduced as 4 people cannot do the work of 5, or 4 plus a PT permanent assistant in each office as it used to be before we had summer school and winter session. The SOC for Health Occ, Fire Tech and PE seems to have the responsibilities of 2 people and the workload should be fairly re-assessed and changed accordingly for the good of the SOC and the programs she supports.
Each SOC, has too many departments, faculty and assignments here at Mission. Administration should be asking for additional SOC positions to spread the work and make it equitable to West Valley.
The new alignment hasn't had enough time to flourish.
Workload is uneven. Processes differ greatly from individual to individual. Use of floating staff to help during peak times for contracts, load sheets, schedule changes could be implemented.
There needs to be a reset of expectations of the position.
Still confusing on the distribution of responsibilities--have had a difficult time finding out who is responsible for load sheets for some p/t faculty.
There is still lack of clarity on roles and responsibilities.
There are inconsistencies in the assignments of workloads and job duties. There was little consideration of the needs of faculty in many areas or of the demands on certain SOC's. Perhaps an SOC rotation should be considered.
SOC's need to perform the functions that they were hired to do - not those that they have become used to doing.
These people should not report to the Office of Instruction. They belong to the Divisions and that is where they should report. Doesn't the Office of Instruction have enough to do?
It is based on the premise that instructional deans will have a greater span of control. SOC's are the closest person between faculty and students. They are now operating with too many disciplines and too little SOC's.
As divisions learn to work within the framework of dean, division chair, departments AND as deans are supervisors of staff within divisions, SOC's should be aligned within divisions and not straddle across different divisions.
further refinement is needed. Multiple SOC's still support a single division. This can lead to confusion.
I do not think that division sharing between 2 SOC's is reasonable.
Students are no longer a priority and it shows, Sending everyone to the welcome center is not the answer.
I feel the SOC's know best what is working and what is not. As one who does not perform their job duties, it is not wise to give an opinion. I do know that students are not being given the same service.

Question 12: For each of the following items, indicate what aspects need immediate improvement. If you are unsure or are unable to think of anything, please write "unsure."
<u>access to information?</u>
unsure
pretty good
Earlier information about needs and plans.
IS resource tools and training
NA
unsure
Needs immediate improvement.
unsure
unsure
accurate data, regular data and informational reports distributed, dean's ability to get information from SOCs
This is based on individuals not on positions.
be honest , don't scare faculty. For the VP of instruction to state faulty should retire this year if they want to keep their benefits
web site
Make it available to all faculty
More collaborative tone is needed.
unsure
point of contact designation
To be honest, as a midlevel manager, it is hard for me to get information. I have to ask those above me what is going on.
Unsure
unsure
Datatel UI is coming. There are many employees that don't know this. Emails are OK, but there are too many of them to All User and staff begins to ignore them. How about some mandatory meetings? One of the big lecture halls that would get everyone on the same page.
information meetings aren't varied enough to allow all faculty to attend
Need actual leadership and accountability
A website of the structure
Inst. administrators: tell the workers what you're doing.
There needs to be a consistent way to communicate with Associate Faculty at the DC and Dean level
yes
Information should be accurately summarized and distilled with the fuller versions of any

document attached. No one has the time to read through all the 'stuff' that's being emailed out.
Computer driven, need more A & R support
unsure
needs improvement-like, who is my supervisor???
Communication from the Division Chair
unsure
Unsure
yes
Simplify the path
need more information
unsure
needs improvement
Clear directions set and communicated consistently
unsure
budget, planning for the future, in house admin.
it is better
It comes too late.
unsure
need to fix reliability of scheduling information.
information difficult to find; when it is found, it is often out of date.
more division chairs needed; fewer deans
we never know where our boss is.
many times information is not accurate--look at all datatel problems with loads, etc.
conflicting information is given
<u>understanding of policies and procedures?</u>
unsure
pretty good
Clearer communication - especially when they CHANGE!
a greater level of training
NA
needs improvement
Needs immediate improvement.
unsure
unsure
insufficient/outdated written policies and procedures, especially related to Office of Instruction/division processes
Same as above
There is NO communication, policies change with an email
district communication
Process mapping still needs work

unsure
have policies and procedures revised to reflect reorganization
point of contact designation
This may be the only improvement for me. There is better enforcement of policies and procedures now.
Unsure
yes
More training needed to highlight policies and procedures used in individual areas. New employees should be made aware of them, while continuing staff should be updated regularly.
These are extremely unclear and trying to make changes seems to be overwhelming.
Need actual leadership and accountability
Difficult to do, but clear policies and processes for common tasks
immediate improvement
Consult those who DO the work before making changes.
More policies and procedures need to be written out
yes
My division and department chairs to a good job.
Same
are these published online or word of mouth?
needs improvement
Communications from the Division Chair
creation of manuals to learn processes, short tutorials on line format
Unsure
yes
unsure
need more information
unsure
improvement
They are changing rapidly, and need to be codified
all parts
better
Who is suppose to tell us these?
unsure
staff need better awareness of how to find many procedures.
I find myself going to a person to clarify what I've read - just because I'm not sure: a) what it is saying, b) if it is true or not
see above
not sure
if a procedure is made, no one knows until later
<u>communication within your division or area?</u>

a mid semester meeting would be helpful
good
improved district resources, as email access for all part-time faculty
NA
The Faculty and Staff in my Division are rock solid and easy to communicate with.
unsure
unsure
dean-department chair communication channel
No change
unsure
good
more updates
unsure
increase divisional meetings
unsure
Communication is good in my area but it seems difficult to explore areas for possible collaboration.
Unsure
no
Better definition of chain of command. Follow through should be monitored for those charged with moving processes along.
SUCKS!!! Dept. Chair micro manages, is letting things fall through the cracks, it feels like a "divide and conquer" mentality.
Need actual leadership and accountability
unsure
unsure
Consistent meeting times.
unsure
Fine
No communication, abbreviated at best.
we don't meet as a division with all faculty and staff together
definitely needs improvement
Lack of communications from the Division Chair.
unsure- pretty good right now
Unsure, N/A
we're fine
need more information
unsure
Very wide span of control
Admin. is spread too thin.
ok here. we get along fine . cd. include more part timers
good, we meet monthly and DC sends out information quickly

There is less time for meetings.
unsure
My department has major problems between classified and managers of the department
I communicate and collaborate with my 3 immediate colleagues the most.
see above
none
need immediate improvement
<u>collaboration within your division or area?</u>
knowing what other departments are doing
decent
culture shift involvement by all
NA
The Faculty and Staff in my Division are rock solid and easy to collaborate with.
unsure
unsure
dean-department chair collaboration; collaboration around new initiatives, curriculum, programs, etc
No change
unsure
good
unsure
unsure
unsure
unsure
unsure
Unsure
no
With looming cuts staff becomes possessive of knowledge and information. Promotion of team work needed.
We put the "dys" in dysfunction. We are not encouraged to voice our opinions because people get too offended when you do.
Need actual leadership and accountability
unsure
we collaborate well
unsure
Great
None
we don't meet as a division with all faculty and staff together
not applicable really
What collaboration? Division Chair weakness.
unsure- we have been positively collaborating
N/A

A-okay
need more information
unsure
Meetings are so large that we only discuss compliance items and have little discussion on substantive issues.
Lack of time
cd. include more part timers
actually I think there has been no direct impact within my area
People seem to be pulling back and are fearful.
unsure
good for faculty; not so good for manager/classified
see above
none
need immediate improvement
<u>collaboration with other divisions or areas?</u>
knowing what other divisions are doing
perhaps could use improvement
Expect more from ALL players.
unsure
NA
needs improvement
Needs improvement.
unsure
unsure
ad hoc; no venue or methodology
no change
there are so few DC'd they are overwhelmed
good
unsure
projects across disciplines
unsure
point of contact designation
This is very frustrating for me. There are many overlapping areas of concern and interest between my area and the college. But I am seldom if ever asked to collaborate outside my area.
Unsure
yes
Fight over resources does not promote collaboration. Students must become the focus and collaboration for their benefit should be the goal.
unsure
Need actual leadership and accountability

unsure
unsure
All divisions need to have meeting schedules.
yes
Not sure.
None
sometimes more competition than collaboration
not applicable really
What collaboration? Division Chair weakness.
More all campus meetings, opportunities to discuss planning as a whole
N/A
unsure
need more information
unsure
There has been none. Divisions are too large.
cd. have some joint meetings
The divisions are still silos, operating better with the new organizational structure within themselves. Work needs to be done to communicate across those silos. Larger meetings (ugh, more meetings)? I don't have a real good answer for this.
People are more territorial now.
unsure
good at present
I communicate and collaborate with 3 or 4 other areas also.
I don't get out of here much.
not sure of necessity
need immediate improvement
not sure what other divisions are doing

Question 15: Would you be interested in college "blogs" or "wikis" where all college members can share their views and thoughts regarding important topics? Please indicate your interest in participating in a blog or wiki for each of the following topics:
Institutionalizing best practices
How about a blog for all email correspondence from Bob Miller that is not related to work. I don't know if I would feel comfortable participating, but getting things off email into another kind of online forum is probably a good idea. If these are public blogs, however, Mission College would need to be careful???
There would have to be a purpose rather than just posting opinions and views. Who takes the information and does something with it? If there were a specific purpose and owner for action, I would participate in these, otherwise it would be a total waste of my time.
Region-wide college news

<p>Question 16: These are all the questions we have for you today. Thank you for taking time to complete this review. Please use this space for any additional comments.</p>
<p>I'm not sure, as others have expressed in email, that this was a very good survey. Some said they don't know enough to fill it out. I'm pretty new; so I have a reason for not knowing.</p>
<p>The crazy thing about communication is that one need not only speak, the other must listen. Both are often a problem at Mission, but at every other college (there are many) that I've worked at too.</p>
<p>My one suggestion is premising questions on a survey like this with data and background; maybe people will pay attention in that case.</p>
<p>I remain hopeful...</p>
<p>Primarily wanted to share thoughts on dean positions.</p>
<p>Please get the cost analysis done and out to all users soon.</p>
<p>Thank you for taking the time to create this survey.</p>
<p>Thanks for this opportunity.</p>
<p>I would welcome more collegiality</p>
<p>A cost analysis for reorganization savings.</p>
<p>I would like to encourage the administration and the union to negotiate a more effective mechanism for evaluating staff performance and implementing consequences and rewards for work performed.</p>
<p>When making changes the "cost" for random (although negotiated) staff moves should be factored in to the supposed savings. Overtime is more easily calculated but loss of productivity is probably more costly but less obvious.</p>
<p>Thank you for taking the time to create this survey and asking us for our opinions.</p>
<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment and evaluate. It is important that we all be included in the results and follow-up actions/recommendations to this evaluation.</p>
<p>It would have been nice had you distinguished between the 'amount' of communication and the quality.</p>
<p>Please make sure that the results are posted and available for all who participated.</p>
<p>Someone I know who is a member of the staff in a different dept commented that they would not complete this survey because they don't believe our views matter to those making decisions.</p>
<p>I disagree that the survey is only being conducted for the changes and that the monetary issue will be presented with the results. They are tied together and thus should be evaluated together not separate. It's a direct result of the monetary "savings" or lack thereof that is partially responsible for my answers in this survey. My answers would probably change if I saw that the savings justified even a little of the changes. But knowing the individuals who no</p>

<p>longer have a job or a job they didn't apply for just doesn't seem worth the heartache and life changes for what we have now. When it's all said and done, classified took the brunt of it all. We paid for everyone else and continue to do so.</p>
<p>I hope I do not sound too negative. I meant my comments to be constructive. I thank you for taking the time to seek feedback.</p>
<p>I like this organization. I like the increased communication from the President. I would like to have more knowledge of the excellent work done by student services groups (Admin & Records, MESA, and Counseling do a great job but the other groups.....not sure what they do!). The Office of Instruction I ASSUME funnels information through the Deans and DCs but do not know for sure. The Admin. Services group only forwards things from the state - how is the COLLEGE doing would be nice to know, especially financially in these times.</p>
<p>The most annoying parts of the communication system at Mission are: 1) The Room Reservation Triumvirate and their convoluted responsibilities and lack of information about what is available and what is not, 2) The lack of a posted schedule that includes office hours, best times/ways/days to contact an instructor or staff person, 3) The paperwork maze and lack of directions for getting through it, 4) The downright rudeness of administrators who do not respond nor return messages, 5) The plethora of sandwich boards, and 6) the mishmash of out-of-date/updated, poor grammar/well-written, missing/too much information that is found on the web site and in the course schedule and catalog.</p>
<p>I don't think this survey is pertinent any longer. Those studies and changes were proposed two years ago. In that time, we have massive economic hits to our resources as well as cuts to our staffing. We do not have resources to even address some of the proposals that came out of the organizational review.</p>
<p>In certain department(s) I have seen a faculty act as a department chair, only favor for his own courses and his own associate, but does not take care of his colleague full time.</p>