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INTRODUCTION

The Human Resources Division (HRD) has the mission of fostering a District-wide culture of service and accountability. HRD achieves its mission by providing services and products that allow our college clients to function as highly effective and efficient independent entities, while simultaneously enjoying the unique benefits that come from participation in a large, multicollage district. HRD is committed to monitoring and continually enhancing the quality and delivery of its services and products. As part of an ongoing improvement effort, HRD campus clients were surveyed to assess satisfaction with the division’s services and products.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The survey was created by HRD staff (S. Tramel) using SurveyMonkey survey development software to enable electronic (email link) distribution and web-based participant response. The survey was designed to measure satisfaction among the college clients in five areas:

(1) Services for new monthly rate employees;
(2) Services for monthly rate employees;
(3) Policy compliance resources;
(4) Communication and collaboration; and,
(5) Overall client satisfaction with services and products provided by HRD.

To ensure that the survey elicited information from HRD product and service users, the survey included blind respondent identification by asking respondents to self-disclose employee classification and worksite location. As survey respondents were guaranteed anonymity, no information was requested that would allow for the individual identification of any survey participant. To elicit information that may not have been discernable through responses to fixed questions, the instrument included a section for respondents to provide comments. In addition to measuring clients’ satisfaction with HRD products and services, it was hoped that the survey design would provide a glimpse of clients’ basic knowledge of HRD products and services. For this reason survey questions were devised to rate service areas rather than specific processes or actions to elicit satisfaction ratings of a more general nature.

A request for survey participation, with access to the web response link, was directed to those positions identified as HRD service and product users, with HRD service users defined as those positions within the organization with responsibility for hiring, discipline, evaluation and/or other use of HRD services and products. A survey invitation distribution list was created for delivery to college presidents; academic, administrative and student services vice presidents; academic and classified managers and supervisors; and, campus SPOCs. The initial request for survey participation was distributed via email in April 2009. The initial administration yielded a response rate of only twenty-three percent (23%); therefore, a follow-up administration was performed in May 2009 to provide an additional opportunity for potential survey respondents to participate. In order to avoid duplicate responses, the second administration requested responses only by those who had not responded to the initial (April 2009) survey administration. The survey was administered to one hundred and sixty-nine (169) potential respondents; the April 2009 administration garnered responses from thirty-eight (38) participants and the May 2009 administration garnered an additional twenty (20) responses. Responses from the two administrations were combined, for a total cumulative response from fifty-eight (58) participants, which is equivalent to a thirty-five percent (35%) overall response rate.
Before rating their satisfaction with HRD relative to the five (5) aforementioned criteria, survey participants were asked to identify their employee classification. Of the 58 survey respondents, 55 identified their employee classification. The itemization of respondent employee classification is provided below.

- **Academic Administrator** 3.4% (2)
- **Vice Pres (AA, AS, SS)** 10.3% (6)
- **Classified Manager** 20.7% (12)
- **Faculty, Teach** 0.0% (0)
- **Faculty, Adjunct Only** 0.0% (0)
- **President** 8.6% (5)
- **Academic Supervisor** (Dean Series) 48.3% (28)
- **Classified Supervisor** 1.7% (1)
- **Faculty, Non-Teach** 1.7% (1)

Respondents were next asked to disclose their work location. Because the survey pledged anonymity, college presidents were excluded from identifying their worksite because of the singular nature of their position (i.e., only one per college). Of the fifty-eight (58) total responses, five (5) respondents did not identify their work location because of their position as College President; of the remaining fifty-three (53) respondents, fifty-two (52) identified their worksite, with results that indicated representation from all ten (10) LACCD locations. The itemization of work locations is listed below.

- **LACC** 13.5% (7)
- **ELAC** 13.5% (7)
- **LAMC** 9.6% (5)
- **LASC** 5.8% (3)
- **LAVC** 11.5% (6)
- **DISTRICT** 5.8% (3)
- **LAHC** 9.6% (5)
- **LAPC** 9.6% (5)
- **LATTC** 7.7% (4)
- **WLAC** 13.5% (7)
I. SERVICES FOR NEW MONTHLY RATE EMPLOYEES

Survey questions in Section 1 were directed at assessing client satisfaction with services provided in the hiring of new monthly rate employees. Rating categories included satisfaction with the processing and timeliness of selection packets; minimum qualification evaluation and rating-in of new monthly rate employees; and, the minimum qualifications evaluation of adjunct employees. The overwhelming response in this section of the survey was a Neutral/No Opinion result, with this response option garnering the largest percentage of responses for all of the four (4) questions asked. The results suggest that clients are not familiar enough with the new monthly-rate hire process to rate satisfaction with the services provided. Individual survey results for the four (4) questions in Section I are provided below.

1. **Satisfaction with the processing of selection packets for hiring new monthly rate faculty:**

   Total Responses: 57
   - Very Satisfied: 0.0% (0)
   - Dissatisfied: 22.8% (13)
   - Satisfied: 31.6% (18)
   - Very Dissatisfied: 0.0% (0)
   - Neutral / No Opinion: 45.6% (26)

2. **Minimum qualifications evaluations and rating-in of new monthly rate employees:**

   Total Responses: 58
   - Very Satisfied: 0.00% (0)
   - Dissatisfied: 20.7% (12)
   - Satisfied: 31.0% (18)
   - Very Dissatisfied: 8.6% (5)
   - Neutral / No Opinion: 39.7% (23)
3. **Minimum qualifications evaluations for adjunct employees:**

Total Responses: 57

- **Very Satisfied**: 1.8% (1)
- **Dissatisfied**: 26.3% (15)
- **Satisfied**: 15.8% (9)
- **Very Dissatisfied**: 7.0% (4)
- **Neutral / No Opinion**: 49.1% (28)

4. **The length of time to process a selection packet:**

Total Responses: 57

- **Very Satisfied**: 5.3% (3)
- **Dissatisfied**: 24.6% (14)
- **Satisfied**: 26.3% (15)
- **Very Dissatisfied**: 10.5% (6)
- **Neutral / No Opinion**: 33.3% (19)

II. **SERVICES FOR MONTHLY RATE EMPLOYEES**

Survey questions in Section II focused on assessing client satisfaction with services
provided in the processing of assignment information for monthly rate employees. Rating categories included satisfaction with the processing of assignments; rate change audits, personnel data audits, salary screen completions, and differential input; the auditing of employee leave and eligibility requests; and, the responsiveness to request for retirement resignation assistance. As with the results generated in Section I, the overwhelming response in this section was a Neutral/No Opinion result, indicative of insufficient client awareness with the monthly-rate hire process to rate satisfaction with the services provided. Individual survey results for the four (4) questions in Section II are provided below.
4. **Processing of assignments and rate change audits:**

Total Responses: 58
- Very Satisfied 1.7% (1)
- Dissatisfied 12.1% (7)
- Satisfied 25.9% (15)
- Very Dissatisfied 5.2% (3)
- Neutral / No Opinion 55.2% (32)

6. **Processing of personnel data audits, salary screen completions, differential input:**

Total Responses: 58
- Very Satisfied 3.4% (2)
- Dissatisfied 17.2% (10)
- Satisfied 22.4% (13)
- Very Dissatisfied 0.0% (0)
- Neutral / No Opinion 56.9% (33)

7. **Auditing of employee leave requests and eligibility requirement requests:**

Total Responses: 55
- Very Satisfied 0.0% (0)
- Dissatisfied 10.9% (6)
- Satisfied 25.5% (14)
- Very Dissatisfied 1.8% (1)
- Neutral / No Opinion 61.8% (34)
8. **Responsiveness to requests for resignation due to retirement assistance:**

   Total Responses: 58  
   Very Satisfied 1.7% (1)  
   Dissatisfied 5.2% (3)  
   Satisfied 19.0% (11)  
   Very Dissatisfied 1.7% (1)  
   **Neutral / No Opinion 72.4% (42)**

---

**III. POLICY COMPLIANCE RESOURCES**

Section III of the survey was directed at assessing client satisfaction HRD’s role in providing policy compliance resources. Rating categories included satisfaction with HRD’s role in the facilitation, support and encouragement of District-wide compliance with District policy, collective bargaining agreements and other resources to support employee performance. The overall response in this section of the survey was a **Satisfied** result, with this response option garnering the largest percentage of responses for the three (3) questions asked, followed by a comparatively high rating **Neutral/No Opinion**. The itemization of Individual survey results for Section III questions are provided below.

9. **Facilitates, supports and encourages District-wide compliance with all Board Rules, Administrative Regulations, and District policy guides:**

   Total Responses: 58  
   Very Satisfied 8.6% (5)  
   Dissatisfied 10.3% (6)  
   **Satisfied 44.8% (26)**  
   Very Dissatisfied 5.2% (3)  
   Neutral / No Opinion 31.0% (18)
10. *Facilitates, supports and encourages District-wide compliance with collective bargaining agreements:*

Total Responses: 58
Very Satisfied 6.9% (4) Dissatisfied 12.1% (7)
**Satisfied 46.6% (27)** Very Dissatisfied 3.4% (2)
Neutral / No Opinion 31.0% (18)

11. *Provides access to human resource and related documents to support employees in the performance of their duties:*

Total Responses: 58
Very Satisfied 12.1% (7) Dissatisfied 22.4% (13)
**Satisfied 36.2% (21)** Very Dissatisfied 5.2% (3)
Neutral / No Opinion 24.1% (14)

IV. **Communication and Collaboration**

Survey questions in Section IV focused on assessing client satisfaction with HRD’s efforts at maintaining communication and establishing a collaborative environment among our clients. Respondents were asked to rate HRD’s continual and effective communication with human resource related college counterparts; efforts to achieve maintain and support a collaborative culture relative to District-wide issues; and, efforts to meet the Division’s goal of fostering a District-wide culture of service and accountability. Of the three topics survey, respondents indicated they were **Satisfied** with the Division’s efforts at communication and collaboration. As for the third category,
Division’s goal of fostering a District-wide culture of service and accountability, the over fifty percent (50) of respondents indicated equal ratings of **Neutral / No Opinion (26.3%)** and **Dissatisfied (26.3%).** The rating of **Satisfied** scored an almost equal percentage of responses, with a rating of twenty-six and four-tenths percent (26.4%). Individual survey results for the four questions in Section IV are provided below.

12. *Maintains continual and effective communication with college SPOCs and related personnel to ensure the progress of processes:*

Total Responses: 57

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfied</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>36.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / No Opinion</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. *Works to achieve, maintain and support a collaborative culture that ensures resolution of District-wide issues:*

Total Responses: 57

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfied</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>35.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / No Opinion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Successfully fosters a District-wide culture of service and accountability:

Total Responses: 57
Very Satisfied 7.0% (4)  Dissatisfied 26.3% (15)
Satisfied 24.6% (14)  Very Dissatisfied 15.8% (9)
Neutral / No Opinion 26.3% (15)

V. OVERALL SATISFACTION

Respondents were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with the products and services provided by HRD. The response to the overall rating for the Division was Satisfied, yielding a response percentage of 49.1%, more than double the rating percentage for any of the other rating categories. Individual survey results for the four questions in Section V are provided below.

15. Please rate your OVERALL SATISFACTION with the services and products provided by HRD:

Total Responses: 57
Very Satisfied 5.3% (3)  Dissatisfied 21.1% (12)
Satisfied **49.1% (28)**  Very Dissatisfied 10.5% (6)
Neutral / No Opinion 14.0% (8)
RESPONDENT COMMENTS

Lastly, respondents were asked to share comments. Of the fifty-eight (58) sets of responses, nineteen (19) comments were generated. The overall tone of the comments suggests a lack of client familiarity with the products, services and staff assignments in HRD, coupled with client frustration as a result of less than successful interactions with HRD. The comments are reproduced below, without edit.

1. Rather than having "Neutral/No Opinion" for an average rating, there should be an additional NA (not applicable) box to check.

2. They lack knowledge, organization or follow-through. Frequently no one answering the phone or calling back. No point in calling them at all.

3. Lack of HRS reports (ad hoc) for management uses:
   1. Staffing trends by EE group and bargaining units (3-5yrs)
   2. Position control system for hiring and salary cost planning
   3. Faculty assignments and class scheduling by term and by college
   4. Adjunct faculty assignments by college
   5. Release time/reassigned times by college

4. Having worked for the district 30 or more years I find it difficult to adjust in receiving miscalculations on salary three years after and be made to repay $ that I had no idea I was not suppose to get. The district snatch the total of over 4,000 from 1 salary warrant. I was able to engage SPOC and then put together a monthly bill; but it is very discouraging when payroll decides without consultation to take an employee's salary.

5. Unfortunately the process, especially the rating in of faculty is really slow and frustrating.

6. When there are problems, the colleges says the problem is at the district and vice versa. It then becomes more difficult to resolve issues when there is not someone who will say, let's solve it and do it.

7. HRD is mostly invisible to me; many of these questions I do not know anything about.

8. There is the feeling that things that go to the District fall into a black hole. There is no notification when paperwork did not go through or their are problems. Not until there is a complaint do we find out that paperwork had been held up. The hiring process seems tedious to those processing the interviews. Sometimes the change in disciplines is not conducive to the actual degrees that are out there for those disciplines. It is very confusing. I commend the personnel commission for doing the best that can do under the circumstances.

9. Thank you for the services.

10. Shawn Tramel is a terrific help - very professional and competent.

11. I am extremely pleased with the outstanding level of service that HR provides to my division. In particular, the assistance that Mr. Carlos Covarrubias, Academic Personnel Specialist and Ms. Patricia Martinez always provides to our college.

12. Not all offices are equal. Some are much, much better than others, so it was hard to answer these questions. It also depends on whether the issue relates to a fulltime
faculty, an adjunct, or a classified. The response time varies based on the complexity of
the issue.

13. The major HR problem is that faculty paperwork is not handled in a timely manner
resulting in ending a current assignment even after the instructor has taught for more
than a year. Instead of dealing with this situation, there was a move to make the deans
responsible for min quals. This function should be handled by HR at the District level.

14. Responses are very, very slow.

15. Process and procedures are too cumbersome and takes way too long.
Minimum qualification for faculty are too narrowed and does not meet the constant
changing needs of the professional fields as well as the changing degree offerings at 4
year institutions.

16. My own hiring process is a good example of how poor the hire services are. It took
nearly a month for the approval to come through. Many months later I received
retirement packets. My tax deductions were wrong my first month and I lost nearly
$1000 and was told, "well, you can get it back just change it and then change it again." I
signed up for one retirement company, and was put in the other one. I had to get a
union head to help me straighten everything out. I never received a formal offer letter,
which is the only place of employment in my entire career that does not put a hire in
writing with salary. I was expected to give notice to a very good job based on what in
the end was faith alone. A really shocking operation in every way.

17. SPOCs are overwhelmed and difficulty to reach.

18. The Personnel Commission hampers the effectiveness of the HRD. I hope the
Chancellor’s push for abolishing the Personnel Commission from LACCD happens
swiftly.

19. You're invisible; I hardly ever hear anything from you and get frustrated when I do.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The survey results and comments were reviewed, for the purpose of formulating actions to
increase client satisfaction. The overriding theme observed in the survey results is that
HRD may be best served through action to increase its clients’ overall knowledge of the
products, services and staff in the Division. After client knowledge of the HRD’s offerings
has been increased, future survey administrations should focus on HRD unit-specific
satisfaction measurements.

The following recommendations are provided to increased client satisfaction with services
and products provided by HRD.

- **Recommendation 1**: Awareness campaign to increase client familiarity with products
and services provided by Human Resources Division, and to enable campus clients to
distinguish Human Resources from other divisions offering related services (e.g. Payroll, Personnel Commission). [Comments: 4; 7; 18; 19]

- **Recommendation 2:** Awareness campaign to identify Division personnel, relative to areas of service. [Comments: 4; 8; 12; 18]

- **Recommendation 3:** Improve responsiveness to clients, shortening response times and providing regular status communications. [Comments: 2; 6; 8; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16; 17; 19]

- **Recommendation 4:** Increase communication with clients. [Comments: 2; 7; 8; 16]

- **Recommendation 5:** Increase support and communication with campus SPOCs. [Comment: 17]

- **Recommendation 6:** Increase management reporting to clients. [Comment: 3]

- **Recommendation 7:** Define and/or enforce accountability. [Comments: 6; 13]

- **Recommendation 8:** Streamline and standardize processes. [Comments: 5; 6; 8; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16]

- **Recommendation 9:** Continue to produce policy information (HR Guides; Discipline-related publications) and client- and employee-directed resources (Tip Sheets and FAQs). [Comments: 6; 7; 8; 15]
ATTACHMENT A: HRD CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

HR CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

The Human Resources Division (HRD) has the mission of fostering a District-wide culture of service and accountability. HRD achieves its mission by providing services and products that allow our college clients to function as highly effective and efficient independent entities, while simultaneously enjoying the unique benefits that come from participation in a large, multi-college district.

HRD is committed to monitoring and continually enhancing the quality of its services and products. As part of an ongoing improvement effort, the following survey was developed to assess client satisfaction with HRD services and products. Your feedback about is vital as we strive to provide the highest level of service to our clients.

All submissions are anonymous, and the results will be shared when the survey is complete.

Please select the employee classification that best describes you:

- Please select the employee classification that best describes you: Academic Administrator
- President
- Vice President
- Academic Supervisor (Dean Series)
- Classified Manager

If not a College President, please indicate your work location:

- If not a College President, please indicate your work location: DO
- LACC
- DO
- ELAC
- LAHC
- LAMC

SERVICES FOR NEW MONTHLY RATE EMPLOYEES

How satisfied are you with the:

- Processing of selection packets for hiring new monthly rate faculty
- Minimum qualifications evaluations and rating-in of new monthly rate employees
• Minimum qualifications evaluations for adjunct employees
  
  Very Satisfied  Satisfied  Neutral / No  Dissatisfied  Very Dissatisfied

• The length of time to process a selection packet
  
  Very Satisfied  Satisfied  Neutral / No  Dissatisfied  Very Dissatisfied

SERVICES FOR MONTHLY RATE EMPLOYEES

How satisfied are you with the:

• Processing of assignments and rate change audits
  
  Very Satisfied  Satisfied  Neutral / No  Dissatisfied  Very Dissatisfied

• Processing of personnel data audits, salary screen completions, and differential input
  
  Very Satisfied  Satisfied  Neutral / No  Dissatisfied  Very Dissatisfied

• Auditing of employee leave requests and eligibility requirement requests
  
  Very Satisfied  Satisfied  Neutral / No  Dissatisfied  Very Dissatisfied

• Responsiveness to requests for resignation due to retirement assistance
  
  Very Satisfied  Satisfied  Neutral / No  Dissatisfied  Very Dissatisfied

POLICY COMPLIANCE RESOURCES

How satisfied are you that HRD:

• Facilitates, supports and encourages District-wide compliance with all Board Rules, Administrative Regulations, and District policy guides
  
  Very Satisfied  Satisfied  Neutral / No  Dissatisfied  Very Dissatisfied

• Facilitates, supports and encourages District-wide compliance with collective bargaining agreements
  
  Very Satisfied  Satisfied  Neutral / No  Dissatisfied  Very Dissatisfied

• Provides access to human resource and related documents to support employees in the performance of their duties
  
  Very Satisfied  Satisfied  Neutral / No  Dissatisfied  Very Dissatisfied
COMMUNICATION AND COLLABORATION

How satisfied are you that HRD:

• Maintains continual and effective communication with college SPOCs and related personnel to ensure the progress of processes

  - Very Satisfied
  - Satisfied
  - Neutral / No Opinion
  - Dissatisfied
  - Very Dissatisfied

• Works to achieve, maintain and support a collaborative culture that ensures resolution of District-wide issues

  - Very Satisfied
  - Satisfied
  - Neutral / No Opinion
  - Dissatisfied
  - Very Dissatisfied

• Successfully fosters a District-wide culture of service and accountability

  - Very Satisfied
  - Satisfied
  - Neutral / No Opinion
  - Dissatisfied
  - Very Dissatisfied

Please rate your OVERALL SATISFACTION with the services and products provided by HRD:

  - Very Satisfied
  - Satisfied
  - Neutral / No Opinion
  - Dissatisfied
  - Very Dissatisfied

Please share any comments.

Thank you for participating in the HRD Client Survey!