Mission College Staff /Faculty Diversity Plan Annual Update 2010

In Spring 2009, Mission College adopted the Staff/Faculty Diversity Plan. This annual update illustrates the progress made towards completion of plan goals.

The Mission College Staff/Faculty Diversity Plan is made up of four primary sections:
Section 1: Implementation of standing Staff/Faculty Diversity Committee
Section 2: Review of Success, Retention, and Hiring Data
Section 3: WVMCCD Equal Employment Opportunity
Section 4: Strategies for Success and Retention

Section 1: Implementation of Ongoing Staff/Faculty Diversity Committee

Status: (Completed) The Mission College Staff/Faculty Diversity Committee meets on a monthly basis (Fall/Spring Semester). Consistent faculty membership has been challenging. The District Diversity Advisory Council has not met in 09/10.

Section 2: Review of Success, Retention, and Hiring Data

Status: (Pending) Mission College has been without a college researcher since Spring 2009. Review of data and creation of diversity survey will begin Fall 2010.

Successful implementation of a diversity plan necessitates a routine schedule of review of available data. Data collected by the WVMCCD Human Resources office on an annual basis specifies applicant characteristics across the hiring process. These data are to be examined for potential trends and to identify possible recommendations to be given to the college and/or district. This has most recently occurred in 2007, reviewing data from 2005-2006 (see Appendix A).

In addition, a report detailing employee demographics and the demographics of employees who leave the college is to be produced to inform the college on potential trends. Given current limitations of data, additional collection processes and further reports will need to be developed to understand the reasons behind the loss of employees (see below).

The above reports will be produced biannually in collaboration between district Human Resources and the college Research Analyst. These reports will be shared with the highest shared governance group at the college on an annual basis, as well as available electronically to the entire college.

Additional reports will be developed. First, a staff diversity survey will be designed and distributed at least once every three academic years. Results from this survey will be shared with the highest shared governance group at the college, as well as available electronically to the entire college. Second, the college will work with Human Resources to develop a process for conducting exit interviews or surveys with all departing faculty, staff, and administrators. The systematic collection of such information will aid in understanding the reasons that lead employees to leave the college and district. Results will be shared with the highest shared governance group at the college on an annual basis, as well as available electronically to the entire college.

The cycle of implementation for data review and a schedule for report presentation will be coordinated with the Master Planning Calendar developed through the Governance and Planning (GAP) Council following adoption of the plan.

Section 3: WVMCCD Equal Employment Opportunity

Status: (Completed) The District has completed its Equal Employment Opportunity Plan. District Human Resources has responsibility for implementation/monitoring of the plan.

Section 4: Strategies for Success and Retention

Status: (In Progress) The committee has begun implementing phase 1 action items, which includes:

- ***Creation of the Staff/Faculty Diversity Webpage***
- ***Established a spot light feature***
- ***Established an annual Diversity/Pluralism Award (Spring 2010)***
- ***Provided recommendations related to Administrative Turnover Survey (Appendix A)***
- ***Flex Day Activities (January 2010) on Stress Management and Classroom Management***

The following strategies are presented within two phases, based on their importance and practicality "Phase 1" strategies are considered the most important and most expedient ways to promote positive professional climates for success and retention. "Phase 2" strategies include those which may take significant planning or involve significant financial investment.

<u>Phase 1</u>

Provide training for Division, Department, and Office Managers

Ideally, success and retention plans will be tailored to each department's specific composition and needs. Among the most important components, accordingly, is training for those with supervisory duties in the areas of managing diverse faculty and staff, conflict resolution, and communication.

Communication training should focus on ways of encouraging employees, letting employees know they are valued, and on explaining reasons behind decisions.

Department managers and directors should be culturally aware and be taught to be sensitive not to act, intentionally or unintentionally, in a way that results in bias against any one group or person.

Department managers and directors should understand how to create a supportive environment that encourages mentoring and collaboration, with specifics on building mentoring opportunities. Opportunities for training and professional development related to diversity should be particularly encouraged. Some possibilities include involvement in diversity conferences or associations (for example, the National Community College Hispanic Council).

Additionally, managers and directors should be encouraged to foster participation and leadership in diversity-related special events, such as global awareness days. Typically such events are led by a small group of devoted individuals, which leads to burnout and sometimes the dissolution of popular events which promote cultural inclusion. The Diversity Committee will develop strategies to increase participation

Create a Diversity Web Page for Mission College (COMPLETED)

Establish Awards Focused on Diversity and Pluralism (COMPLETED)

Create Regular Opportunities to Spotlight Staff and Faculty (COMPLETED)

Implement a Staff and Faculty Survey

A survey will be developed that focuses on the campus climate and issues related to diversity. This survey will solicit wide-ranging input on what is working and what might be improved. Questions could ask about why people came to Mission, why they stay, and why they might consider leaving, in addition to gauging their perception of diversity at

the college. Such a survey, similar to the one conducted for administrators in fall 2088, would also create a way to ask about issues that are important to retaining employees that are beyond salary, such as having flexible hours.

Phase 2

Create Opportunities for Discussion

The college will increase opportunities for discussion and dialogue related to diversity and cultural pluralism. One way to increase discussion is through the creation of a forum series focused on issues of diversity and cultural pluralism.

Another opportunity would be through the creation of affinity networking groups, similar to groups within the Associated Student Body. These groups would be created as safe places to share experiences and build community. Centered around a particular group, (such as employees of a specific ethnicity, employees with physical disabilities, or gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered employees). Participation in these groups would be voluntary and open to anyone who wishes to participate.

Increase the Number of Opportunities for Skill Building and Professional Development

While department managers and directors are encouraged to foster involvement in existing opportunities, there is need for additional opportunities as well.

Some possibilities include computer application trainings, public speaking, and management skills training. As the college offers many classes in these areas, the consideration of a system of tuition reimbursement for classes approved by supervisors as matching job skill needs may be one way to increase access to training. Another route for consideration is a system of classified growth leaves in a model modified from the faculty sabbatical.

Interweave Diversity into Existing Funding Opportunities

Existing funding models will be reviewed for ways in which they can incorporate considerations of diversity. For example, prioritization of funding opportunities such as training, conferences, and sabbatical leave could include diversity as part of the ranking process. In practice, screeners could assign additional weight for projects that promote diversity and inclusion. This step will involve discussion to work out the details, but could create real opportunities for inclusion and build public awareness of the college's commitment to diversity.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Mission College Administrator Turnover Survey Recommendations

Mission College Administrator Retention Study Spring 2009

Purpose

In the 2007 Mission College Application for Reaffirmation of Accreditation, the college identified high senior level administrative turnover as a significant impediment to serving college and student needs. A lack of consistent leadership had been cited as leading to "a lack of consistency in processes and procedures," as well as other structural and planning constraints. Planning Agenda 4.5 specifically asserted that, "The college will assess the reasons for frequent administrative turnover, and develop and implement solutions to improve retention." This report reviews reasons former and current administrators cite as contributing to issues of turnover.

Methodology

The data for this report was obtained through a series of surveys conducted in December 2008 and January 2009. These surveys ask respondents to consider key elements related to job satisfaction, level of job satisfaction, reasons they would consider leaving (or that caused them to leave), and ideas that would prevent future turnover.

The first survey was conducted with current senior administrators at Mission College, as well as with a comparison pool of senior administrators from West Valley College and District Central Services. The second survey was conducted with former administrators who left the college within the previous fifteen years.

Potential participants were contacted through District Human Resources and invited to participate with full anonymity. All current senior administrators were contacted via electronic mail, and twenty-eight former regular, full-time administrators were contacted through standard mail. These former administrators include positions at the director level and above who left the college between 1994 and 2008. Participants had the option of completing the survey instrument electronically, or through an included stamped, self-addressed envelope.

In all, a total of eleven current Mission College administrators responded to the survey—with four at the executive level, four deans, and three managers at the director or supervisor level. Comparison surveys were received from six West Valley College administrators and eight District Central Services administrators. Among former Mission College administrators, one survey was returned as undeliverable and a total of thirteen completed the survey, representing a response rate of 48% among those contacted.

Findings

When asked about the level of satisfaction in their current position, the majority of current administrators indicate they are satisfied—although four of eleven are either neutral or dissatisfied (Table 1). When compared to levels of satisfaction in the district, West Valley College had the highest percentage with 83.3%, followed by Mission College at 54.5%, and only 37.5% at the District Office. Only one administrator altogether (located at Mission) rated their satisfaction level as "highly satisfied."

Table 1: Mission College Current Administrator Survey

I would rate my level of satisfaction in my current position as:		
Answer Options	**Response Percent**	**Response Count**
Highly Satisfied	9.1%	1
Satisfied	54.5%	6
Neutral	18.2%	2
Dissatisfied	18.2%	2
Highly Dissatisfied	0.0%	0

A further exploration of factors related to job satisfaction, indicates that the top three factors to current administrators are a sense of accomplishment, having challenging and stimulating responsibilities, and compensation in terms of salary and benefits (Table 2). The next highest factors are related in terms of relationships in the workplace, with working relationships, support, and respect all ranking quite high. It is clear, however, that many factors come together to provide satisfaction in the workplace, as eight of the twelve listed factors are considered at least somewhat important.

Table 2: Mission College Current Administrator Survey

Please indicate the importance to you of each of the following factors related to job satisfaction.						
Answer Options	**1=Not important at all**	**2=somewhat unimportant**	**3=neutral**	**4=somewhat important**	**5=very important**	**Average Rating**
Sense of accomplishment	0	0	0	1	10	4.9
Challenging/Stimulating responsibilities	0	0	0	2	9	4.8
Compensation (salary/benefits)	0	0	0	5	6	4.5
Working relationships	0	0	0	3	8	4.7
Support	0	0	0	4	7	4.6
Respect	0	0	1	4	6	4.5
Service to students	0	0	0	4	7	4.6
Vision/direction provided by leadership	0	0	0	4	7	4.6
Performance appraisal/feedback	1	0	2	4	4	3.9
Position/title	0	1	3	3	4	3.7
Recognition	0	1	5	2	3	3.6
Participatory governance environment	0	1	5	5	0	3.4
Other (please explain)	0	0	0	0	3	1.5
Response Count=11						

With so many factors contributing to satisfaction, what do current administrators cite as reasons that might cause them to leave? Interestingly, the highest rated items are “respect” and “job satisfaction” (Table 3). While there may be many factors which lead to satisfaction, the subsequent satisfaction is highly important. Rounding out the top five items of importance include the working relationship with one's supervisor, job stress, and job benefits (note also that the next two items also connect with compensation with parity in the district and overall salary). Several items rank near the top, with average ratings higher than “somewhat important,” including three factors related to working relationships (participatory governance, relationships with direct reports, and relationships with faculty) and two related to resources (resources and clerical support)--plus one related to the vision provided by management. The least important factors are the commute and expectations to retire in the near future.

Table 3: Mission College Current Administrator Survey

If I were to consider leaving the College or District, the following reasons would apply.						
Answer Options	**1=Not important at all**	**2=somewhat unimportant**	**3=neutral**	**4=somewhat important**	**5=very important**	**Average Rating**
Respect	0	0	0	5	6	4.5
Job satisfaction	0	0	1	3	7	4.5
Working relationship with supervisor	1	0	1	2	7	4.3
Stress	0	0	4	2	5	4.1
Benefits	0	0	3	4	4	4.1
Wage equity/parity within the District	1	0	0	4	6	4.3
Salary	0	1	0	4	6	4.2
Functioning of participatory governance	0	0	2	6	3	4.3
Clerical support	0	0	3	4	4	4.1
Vision/direction provided by management	0	0	1	8	2	4.1
Working relationships with direct reports	1	0	1	5	4	4.0
Working relationships with faculty	0	0	2	7	2	4.0
Resources (including budget, staffing, and facilities)	0	0	1	9	1	4.0
Workload	1	0	1	7	2	3.8
Performance appraisal/feedback	1	0	3	3	4	3.8
Working relationships with staff	0	1	1	6	3	3.8
Vision/direction provided by Board of Trustees	1	0	2	6	2	3.9
Working relationships with unions	1	0	4	4	2	3.5
Working relationships with management	1	1	2	5	2	3.4
Policies and procedures	0	1	4	4	2	3.6
Family considerations	4	0	2	2	3	3.2
Plan to retire (other factors may not apply)	4	0	3	4	0	2.6
Commute	3	1	5	2	0	2.4

At West Valley College, the most frequently cited factor was “Job Satisfaction,” with 5 out of 6 respondents. There were a number of noteworthy differences in responses between administrators at the two colleges. Salary, benefits, and wage parity were far more important considerations at Mission College (cited by 54.5% of the respondents) than at West Valley College (16.7%). While job consideration was important for administrators at both colleges, it was more so at West Valley (cited by 83.3% of respondents) relative to Mission (63.6% cite satisfaction).

The following are several quotes from the open-ended responses that fall in line with the responses cataloged above:

> (There's a) Lack of accountability, incentives, consequences tied to performance.
>
> (There's a need for) Better wage equity within the district; organization structure that leads to increased accountability and responsible supervision span of control
>
> (There's a need for) Clear organizational structure coupled to logical processes and procedures and culture of trust that is strengthened with accountability/rewards.

Administrative rights, responsibilities, and authority must be re-established as a matter of collective bargaining and district policy. Administrators are expected to be accountable but do not have sufficient authority in most cases, thus finding themselves in a no-win situation.

There is a culture of administrator bashing that is professionally and often personally distressing.

Participatory governance needs to be clarified and better understood. The process has become the end, not the means, and the inability to move forward as necessary is both frustrating and sometimes frightening as process issues threaten the very survival of the colleges and district.

What keeps me in my job are the chance to contribute toward the college's mission, the students, the management team I work with, and those faculty and staff who are positive participants within the college community. I continue in my job because there are more good days than bad in the sense that I feel as though I've accomplished something, even if it is a small thing. However, I've learned that recognition for those accomplishments will most often have to come from myself as there is often little or no acknowledgement from faculty, staff, etc. Administrators are taken for granted or worse, it is assumed that they are paid to take abuse and it is unacceptable if they respond.

These are strongly worded statements that reflect issues of serious concern. These issues could lead to additional resignations and further problems of retention if not addressed. Let's turn now to those administrators who have left Mission College in recent years (Table 4). Of the former administrators who responded to the survey solicitation, seven had retired and only six had actually resigned or moved away.

Table 4: Mission College Former Administrator Survey

Characteristics of Respondents	
Answer Options	**Response Count**
Reason for Leaving: Retirement	7
Reason for Leaving: Resignation/Move	6
Avg # of Years in Position	5
Avg # of Years at Mission College	14
Avg # of Years at Mission College	19

Similar to the survey with current administrators, these former administrators were asked to share their ratings of factors that may have led to their decision to leave Mission College. Analysis of the results is partially hindered in that multiple respondents chose not to rate all of the factors directly, and a few respondents didn't rate any of the factors. As a result, averages of the ratings are based on differing numbers of responses depending on the factor (see Table 5). Removing the highest rating for

“other”--which was one individual indicating a decision to move for their family—the highest rated factor on average was “stress.” This is followed closely by job satisfaction (which was important to the current administrators as well), two items related to vision (of managers and of the Board of Trustees), participatory governance issues, and career advancement. While not quite as high as with current administrators, once again issues related to relationships in the workplace were ranked very highly. In addition to the already cited shared governance, the next highest grouping of factors includes respect, working relationships with one's supervisor, and working relationships with faculty.

Table 5: Mission College Former Administrator Survey

Please rank the following factors in your decision to leave the college .						
Answer Options	**1=Not important at all**	**2=somewhat unimportant**	**3=neutral**	**4=somewhat important**	**5=very important**	**Average Rating**
Other (please explain)	0	0	0	0	1	5.0
Stress	1	0	0	2	3	4.0
Job satisfaction	2	0	0	2	3	3.6
Vision/direction provided by management	1	0	2	0	3	3.7
Functioning of participatory governance	1	0	2	0	3	3.7
Career advancement	2	0	0	2	3	3.6
Vision/direction provided by Board of Trustees	1	0	3	0	2	3.3
Respect	3	0	0	2	3	3.3
Working relationship with supervisor	4	0	0	0	2	2.3
Working relationships with faculty	3	0	0	2	1	2.7
Resources (including budget, staffing, and facilities)	3	0	2	1	0	2.2
Salary	3	0	1	1	1	2.5
Wage equity/parity within the District	3	0	1	1	1	2.5
Performance appraisal/feedback	4	0	0	2	1	2.4
Policies and procedures	4	1	1	0	1	1.7
Commute	5	0	0	2	1	2.5
Working relationships with unions	3	1	1	0	1	1.8
Benefits	3	0	2	1	0	2.5
Planned to retire (other factors may not apply)	5	0	0	0	2	2.1
Family considerations	4	1	0	2	1	2.1
Working relationships with staff	4	0	1	1	0	2.2
Performance appraisal/feedback	3	1	1	1	0	1.7
Clerical support	4	2	1	0	0	1.3
Working relationships with management	4	1	0	1	0	2.0
Working relationships with direct reports	5	0	1	0	0	1.7
Workload	2	2	0	1	0	1.2
Housing	7	0	0	0	0	1.6
Response Count varies (all respondents did not answer all questions)						

Former administrators were asked to share reasons they felt “pushed away” from Mission College or “pulled towards” somewhere else, as well as what the college or district might have done differently. Here are some responses that illustrate the numbers in Table 5:

Push:

With my variety and depth of responsibilities, I was making less money than a person with less experience and responsibilities. I felt stressed for years before deciding to retire, a year earlier than planned.

The primary factor was the realization that I could never build an effective and high performing and happy staff to sustain the work the unit requires. I would never get the support I needed to do an effective job.

Inadequate administrative structure. So much that it proved impossible to do the job well. No academic deans, asst. deans, even dept. chairs are ½ fac. And ½ admin. Which means they are on the faculty contract which meant they are 100% faculty. Overall stressful climate.

Pull:

My reward for excellent work only meant more work – no financial considerations, always budget constraints.

The inability of management to achieve a balanced relationship with both faculty, staff and unions caused administration to be overly fearful of union retaliation, thus minimal support for line managers to take just performance and disciplinary actions regarding faculty and staff.

Done Different:

Respect the work of its employees, treat people fairly.

The Mission culture is sick, and will not be easily cured. I suggest the following: Allow the President to formulate an organization that allows for reasonable lines of management controls. Limit the number of direct reports to the President and Managers. Change "Shared governance" from a faculty veto process to one of participation and consideration of all view points, but no one's veto; other than the board. Allow a process of review of faculty concerns when a faculty member feels he/she is being punished by their peers.

Understand the roles of board management and faculty. Management is not the enemy. Rather assist in bringing resources and long term projects/goals.

Solutions

Due to the complex nature of the issues and the limited nature of this report, it is difficult to reach definitive conclusions. That said, while no single response would address all the concerns of all administrators, there do seem to be a few areas that could be immediately addressed to improve administrator retention.

A primary common theme is working relationships within the existing organizational structure. Salaries and benefits often rise to the top, and are often the hardest to solve. Looking at the many factors

listed and the comments given, it seems that while wages are highly important, respect and positive working relationships can override these concerns. When working relationships and accountability are lacking, however, compensation becomes increasingly important.

Written comments suggest a common frustration both in terms of respect for the role administrators play in the college, but also in the ability to fulfill that role due to structural constraints and a general lack of a shared understanding of roles and accountability. There is a need to establish a clearer understanding of participatory governance and the ways in which administrators both have the authority to make decisions (and subsequent accountability).

Issues of administrator retention demand immediate and continued attention, as the ability of the college to establish stability in planning and operation will allow for focus to be centered on student learning and success. This report should serve to illustrate the challenges that face administrators at Mission College and provide a foundation for discussion of issues of sustained leadership and retention.