To: Institutional Planning Committee

From: Anita Martinez on behalf of the Staffing Subcommittee

Date: April 22, 2008

Re: Recommendations on staffing requests

Comments:

We have reviewed all program review requests for additional staffing from the staffing program review template materials provided us for instructional and student services programs as well as from other materials in student service program reviews completed in their format.

We developed and used both rubrics and rating sheets to consider all requests, and would have asked for clarification, if time had permitted. Wherever a cost estimate was included in the Program Review, we included it on the rating sheet. We have attached our rating sheets showing our ratings for all staffing requests as follows:

- Part-time faculty units
- Fulltime faculty positions
- Classified positions
  - Clerical, usually office assistants
  - Lab assistants
  - Lab technicians
  - Computer technicians
  - Librarian
  - Student assistant hours
  - Other

Please note that some programs also asked for coordination hours, chair hours, and funding for other administrative hours. We can complete work on those areas in the near future.

We recommend that

1. IPC evaluate the merit of our recommendations considering information contained in the entire Program Review submission, and not just the staffing section, and on how such staffing would support broader college goals.

   a. We found that many of the reviews either only partly completed justifications for this area or did not complete them at all.
b. We also did not feel we had sufficient data or evidence to fully justify all requests, and so some of the ratings could be over or under rated.

2. requests be funded from any and all possible sources, as justified by both program and college-wide data and the Program Reviews

3. funding be provided in priority ranking, as determined by IPC findings (e.g., college data and goals, other information in the rest of the Program Review for each program, information from other relevant Program Reviews, such as the Transfer Program Review) and our subcommittee findings, as noted in the attached sheets

4. funding for some classified requests be considered and perhaps allocated to be shared by more than one discipline or program, for example,
   a. several allied health programs requested classified support at IVC; these requests could be combined
   b. Biology and geology requested classified staff that could be shared
   c. funding for computer technicians be coordinated with IT

Our subcommittee recognizes that some of our recommendations will need to be considered by other parties; our intent was solely to rate program review staffing requests and forward those ratings as needed or required.

We ask that future Program Review templates be modified to

- provide clearer guidelines, perhaps in the resource section of the Program Review template;
- have separate sections and justifications for each of these three areas: part-time units, fulltime faculty positions, and classified staffing; and
- generate a spread-sheet for use by a future rating group, including program name, priority listing of requests, college goals addressed in the justification, district data (such as current enrollment and enrollment trends, demographics, and current staffing), anticipated cost of the request (should it be approved), and greater specificity whenever possible.

We also recommend that

- programs submitting Program Reviews in a format or a mode different from the template be required to also complete the template;
- data such as FTEF (now in the Student Access and Success section) be moved to this section or be sent to a future rating group for consideration along with the information in the current program review section on staffing; and
- workshops be provided to faculty and staff on how to complete the template and to describe what will be used to rate and recommend requests.

We can provide further clarification at the Institutional Planning Committee meeting if needed.