MIRACOSTA COLLEGE

STAFFING PLAN

2011-2014

3/12/13

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

MiraCosta Community College District Mission Statement

Institutional Goals 2011-2020

Human Resources Mission Statement

Planning Considerations for Staffing 2

Planning Processes for Staffing 3

Historical Overview

Current Overview

Historical Growth in Staffing 4

Current Staffing Levels 5

Future Staffing Needs 6

External Factors Related to Hiring 7

Evaluation of the Staffing Plan 9

Appendix I i

Appendix II iv

Appendix III v

INTRODUCTION

Founded in 1934, MiraCosta College is based in Oceanside, California with two additional sites: the San Elijo Campus, located in Cardiff and the Community Learning Center on Mission Avenue in Oceanside. The College's service area stretches along the coast from Oceanside south to Del Mar/Carmel Valley.

MiraCosta Community College District Mission Statement

"The MiraCosta Community College District mission is to provide educational opportunities and student-support services to a diverse population of learners with a focus on their success. MiraCosta offers associate degrees, university-transfer courses, career-and-technical education, certificate programs, basic-skills education, and lifelong-learning opportunities that strengthen the economic, cultural, social, and educational well-being of the communities it serves."

Institutional Goals 2011-2020

Institutional Goal I:

MiraCosta Community College District will become a vanguard educational institution committed to innovation and researched best practices, broad access to higher education, and environmental sustainability.

Institutional Goal II:

MiraCosta Community College District will become the institution where each student has a high probability of student success.

Institutional Goal III:

MiraCosta Community College District will institutionalize effective planning processes through the systematic use of data to make decisions.

Institutional Goal IV:

MiraCosta Community College District will demonstrate high standards of stewardship and fiscal prudence.

Institutional Goal V:

MiraCosta Community College District will be a conscientious community partner.

Human Resources Mission Statement

The Human Resources Department is committed to providing timely and effective customer service in recruitment, salary and benefit administration, employee relations and staff development. We seek to exceed expectations of applicants and employees in order to attract and retain world-class administrators, faculty and staff. We seek to ensure a diverse workforce and a positive and productive work environment.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS FOR STAFFING

Staffing levels at the district are guided by the following:

1. Hire a sufficient number of qualified faculty, staff and administrators to provide the level of services necessary to support the institution's mission and purposes.
2. Integrate human resource planning with institutional goals.
3. Use data to make decisions and set priorities for staffing during each three year time period in the college's strategic plan, divisional plans and program review.
4. Maximize human resources within the constraints of the district's financial resources and regulatory obligations.

How does the staffing plan relate to the other planning processes?

In Fall 2011, the District completed the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP). The Educational Plan portion of the CMP analyzes the current status of the District's communities, instructional and student service programs, and projects the challenges and opportunities for the coming decade. With this information as the foundation, the District developed institutional goals to direct the District's energies and resources in ways to further enrich services to students and increase student success. The Facilities Plan follows the Educational Plan and presents an integrated approach to translating educational planning needs into site and facilities recommendations. Additional plans are then derived from the CMP including a Technology Plan and a Staffing Plan.

Other college plans including the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Plan and the Student Equity Plan address diversity related components of the district's employee and student populations.

Purpose of Staffing Plan

The primary purpose of the Staffing Plan is to provide information and guidance to the district as it analyzes human resources needs and prioritizes human resources requests in program review and planning processes. It aligns with the district's mission and Strategic Plan to ensure that the staffing level meets the current needs and future goals of the district and that the diversity of the district's staff continues to reflect the diversity of the students and the community.

PLANNING PROCESSES FOR STAFFING

Historical Overview

Planning methods for staffing at the District have evolved greatly over the past 10 years. The evolutionary path falls into three major phases:

1) **Hiring Committees** – During the early 2000's departments or programs submitted requests and documented their justifications for new positions which were then prioritized by the classified or academic senate hiring committees. Recommendations were then forwarded to their respective councils which in turn provided a prioritized list of recommendations to the superintendent/president.
2) **Total Cost of Ownership (TCO)** - The process by which a proposal for a new program/service/facility is funded on a permanent basis. All costs associated with the program/service/facility, both "direct" and "indirect" were taken into consideration. Permanent funding could be requested following a period of either one or two years of temporary funding in categories known as "enhancements", "innovations" or "new initiatives". Requests for classified and administrator positions competed alongside all other requests in the TCO process, while requests for faculty positions proceeded in a parallel but separate process.
3) **Program Review only** - Beginning in 2009-10 the institution-wide program review process has been used for all requests for permanent positions. For classified requests, funding recommendations are made by the Budget & Planning Committee (BPC) at the conclusion of the program review process. Although requested through Program Review, faculty hiring remains a parallel process, with specific funding set aside in the budget each year.

A more detailed history, and definitions of terms, can be found in Appendix I.

Current Overview

The CMP contains a projection of 2% per year growth in student enrollment over the next decade. This is based on projected population growth in the district of 2.6% per year by 2020 and the fact that the district has set a goal of increasing the participation of residents in the district. The 2011-14 Staffing Plan reflects this 2% growth assumption. Rather than identifying specific jobs that will need to be filled within the 3 year time frame of the 2011-14 Strategic Plan, the Staffing Plan spells out planning considerations that are to be used by departments and programs as they complete their annual Program Reviews and submit requests for various resources needed, including personnel.

HISTORICAL GROWTH IN STAFFING

Where have we been?
As the size of District's student enrollment (whether looked at in terms of FTES or headcount) has grown, so has the workforce.

Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES)

	FY03-04	FY04-05	FY05-06	FY06-07	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11
Credit	5,708.82	5,651.06	5,399.23	5,264.20	6,561.58	6,508.85	9,787.95	10,132.28
Noncredit	1,050.63	1,075.44	1,064.20	1,055.95	1,057.37	1,094.63	1,208.60	937.03
Total	**6,759.45**	**6,726.50**	**6,463.43**	**6,320.15**	**7,618.95**	**7,603.48**	**10,996.55**	**11,069.31**

Data from the Chancellor's Office Data Mart

Headcount of Students

	FY03-04	FY04-05	FY05-06	FY06-07	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11
Credit	16,427	15,995	16,701	16,749	17,906	19,837	22,409	23,211
Noncredit	6,580	6,314	6,307	6,298	6,239	6,078	6,726	5,384
Total	**23,007**	**22,309**	**23,008**	**23,047**	**24,145**	**25,915**	**29,135**	**28,595**

Data from the Chancellor's Office Data Mart

The overall growth in student enrollment from 2003 through 2011 was 64% in terms of FTES or 25% in terms of headcount.

MiraCosta workforce
(counted as of 7/1 for all employee groups except part time faculty for which August is used as the census)

	FY03-04	FY04-05	FY05-06	FY06-07	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11
Educational Administrators	12	11	13	12	13	14	15	15
Classified Administrators	12	12	12	13	14	13	13	13
Classified	217	216	219	224	242	249	256	238
Fulltime Faculty	129	137	140	149	157	164	176	173
Part time Faculty	372	393	436	432	441	478	504	501
Total:	**742**	**769**	**820**	**830**	**867**	**918**	**964**	**940**

The overall growth rates from 2003 through 2011 for each employee group are:
Educational Administrators – 25% growth
Classified Administrators – 8.3% growth
Classified – 9.7% growth
Full Time Faculty – 35% growth
Part Time Faculty – 35% growth

CURRENT STAFFING LEVELS

Where are we now?
As of Fall 2011 the number of employees in each category of regular/contract staff and the contingent workforce of part time faculty were as follows:

Employee type	Headcount
Educational Administrators	15
Classified Administrators	13
Classified	257
Full Time Faculty	177
Part Time Faculty	512
TOTAL	**974**

Since the district has a strong commitment to having a diverse workforce, the breakdown by ethnicity of the entire employee population as of Fall 2011 is also included:

	Total	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black/African American	Hispanic	White	Other/ Unknown
Exec/Admin	28	1	2	2	5	18	0
Professional/non faculty	17	0	2	1	1	13	0
Secretarial/Clerical	124	2	10	4	30	78	0
Technical and Paraprofessional	75	2	9	2	13	49	0
Skilled Craft	7	0	1	2	0	4	0
Service and Maintenance	34	1	6	4	8	15	0
Faculty–Full Time	177	3	13	10	29	122	0
Faculty–Part Time	512	5	23	17	57	404	6
GRAND TOTAL	**974**	**14**	**66**	**42**	**143**	**703**	**6**

The district's employee population is largely reflective of the diversity of the credit student population (by ethnic categories) as of Fall 2011 – see appendix II. Focus will continue to occur in employee groups and category which are not yet fully reflective.

FUTURE STAFFING NEEDS

Where do we need to be?

During the development of a program review submission, requestors should review the checklist below when deciding whether to submit a request for either an additional position, or an increase in the hours or months worked in an existing position:

1. Review the growth projections contained in chapter 4 of the CMP. Comparing actual changes in enrollment to the projections in the CMP may be useful in supporting a request for new positions.
    a. For example, growth projected for XYZ discipline was anticipated to be "stronger" than the overall 2% enrollment growth. If actual enrollments do demonstrate that degree of growth, then evidence may support a request for a new full time faculty position.
2. Review the 2011-14 Strategic Plan and institutional objectives with outcomes identified for the upcoming fiscal year. Include any staffing requests needed to fulfill those objectives.
    a. For example, institutional objective III.1 identified the need for a new Dean of Institutional Planning, Research & Grants.
3. Review the program review data provided by the Office of Institutional Research (or other sources) to determine whether evidence to support a request exists.
    a. For example, if data related to weekly student contact hours, the ratio of full time to part time faculty, student enrollment etc indicates that there is sufficient load for a new full time faculty position then a request may be appropriate.
4. Was a request for personnel submitted in a previous year's program review? If so, review the information and update the data, as necessary. Additional evidence may be added from the last fiscal year to bring the request up to date. If no changes to the supporting data have occurred, the previous request can simply be carried over as is.
5. Review the data provided by Human Resources about ongoing use of temporary classified workers. If temporaries have performed the same work for a number of years, a conversion of dollars from the temporary budget to fund a permanent (either full or part time) classified position should occur (see appendix III for exceptions). In some cases this will not necessitate a request for additional funds, but the program review process is still the only method of obtaining approval for a new permanent classified job. On the other hand, additional district funds may be necessary to cover the cost of health and welfare benefits for new positions which consist of 20 or more hours per week. A request for those funds must be made in the program review submission.
6. Discuss the possible request with your supervisor, dean or vice president (if you report directly to a vice president). Expected levels of service or performance should be discussed.
    a. For example, if a department is expected to provide service to students from 7 am to 7 pm, the number of staff required to keep the doors open will be different than for an 8 am to 5 pm operation.

EXTERNAL FACTORS RELATED TO HIRING

Budget

After a series of years in which there were double digit increases to the district's revenues, the year-over-year revenue increases have dropped to one percent and less. That level of revenue increase has been inadequate to cover the district's enrollment growth and structural cost increases. General fund revenues have been less than expenses for three years in a row (fiscal years 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12). Operating expenses during these years were covered by using general fund reserves. The reduction of available discretionary income caused the district to moderate the hiring of all categories of employees. Because of the fiscal prudence of ensuring that expenses do not exceed revenues, the Board of Trustees required, and the district achieved, an operationally balanced budget for the 2012-13 fiscal year.

Revenue projections

The 2012-13 fiscal year final budget includes the following projections regarding revenues:

- The projected increase in property tax revenues for FY2013 has been increased from 1.9% in the Tentative Budget to 2.4% in the Final Budget. The 2.4% increase includes supplemental taxes from sales during the FY2013 year.
- Additional revenue from enrollment fees and nonresident fees is expected to increase in FY2013 due to both an increase in the legislatively set fees and an increased number of students; however, there is not a dollar-for-dollar increase due to the Board of Governor's fee waiver.
- The FY2013 Final Budget reflects a sharp increase in revenues generated from Community Services and Business Development. As tuition assistance becomes available to Active Military Duty, Community Services continues to experience significant growth. New programs that will be offered in FY2013 include High Threat Protection and the Machinist Program.
- Other revenue generated from Other Local Sources includes the following fees: course fees, transcripts fees, testing fees, student ids, and business development contracts. Also, revenue from redevelopment agencies (RDA) is considered Other Local Sources. The district anticipates a slight increase in this revenue due to the dissolution of RDA's and the redistribution of local assets.

Hiring frost

A hiring "frost" has been in place for fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12. Due to a strong desire to avoid possible future layoffs of permanent staff, all vacant positions have been reviewed by the Executive Management Team (EMT) and decisions are made as to how available headcount can be best utilized to meet the greatest needs. For example, in January 2011 following the resignation of a classified employee the FTE was redirected from one department and the funds were spread over three different departments to meet the highest needs identified by administrators.

50% law

As staffing levels change, the district will continue to comply with the 50% law requirement that a minimum of half of the district's operating budget be allocated to direct, instructional expenses as defined in the Budget Accounting Manual.

Full time faculty obligation number (FON)

Title 5 regulations impose specific requirements on the district in terms of the ratio of full and part time faculty known as the full time faculty obligation. The District's number of full time faculty consistently exceeds the minimum number of full time faculty the district must maintain. Since 2008 the district's obligation number has been steady at 108.1 (the number has remained unchanged due to the determination by the Board of Governor's that there are insufficient state funds to implement the regulations). MiraCosta's actual number of full time equivalent faculty (FTEF) has grown as follows:

Fall 2008	159.60
Fall 2009	168.68
Fall 2010	166.72
Fall 2011	171.19

As decisions are made in the coming years about whether to replace faculty who retire or leave the district, this obligation number must continue to be taken into consideration.

75/25 ratio

Separate regulations in the Education Code set a target for the percentage of classes to be taught by full time faculty (75%) versus part time faculty (25%). MiraCosta's numbers continue to fall significantly below the target. From 2007 to 2011 the full time percentage has ranged from 52% to 49%. A decline in this ratio is due to two primary forces:

1) Due to the budget constraints of the last several years and the discontinuation of adding to the number of full time faculty.
2) The District has increased the number of classes to meet increased enrollment demands.

As growth in revenue allows, the district should place a higher emphasis on moving towards the 75/25 statutory goal.

EVALUATION OF THE STAFFING PLAN

The effectiveness of the staffing plan will be evaluated annually at the conclusion of the program review cycle. Indicators that the Staffing Plan is effective will include:

a) Dialogue is occurring within divisions about short and long-term staffing needs.
b) Program review submissions requesting new staff are supported with data and are in support of the college's institutional objectives.
c) The progress report on the Strategic Plan will show that positions identified are requested in the appropriate year's program review.

Human Resources and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness will review program review submissions and associated processes for the number and robustness of dialogues related to hiring (e.g. minutes of meetings, interviews with committee chairs etc.) Findings will be reported to the Budget and Planning Committee (BPC).

APPENDIX I – HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Planning methods for classified staffing at the District have evolved greatly over the past 10 years. The evolutionary path falls into three major phases:

1) Hiring Committees

a) During the early 2000's departments or programs submitted requests and documented their justifications for new positions which were then prioritized by the classified senate hiring committee. Recommendations were then forwarded to the classified senate council which in turn provided a prioritized list of recommendations to the superintendent/president. The number of growth positions each year was determined by the superintendent/president and the vice president of Business and Administrative Services during the budget development process. Once the number of growth faculty positions was determined, the Classified Senate was given 50% of that number for additional classified positions.

2) Total Cost of Ownership (TCO)

a) Beginning in FY2005-06 a budget analysis process called "baseline" was conducted to set budgets for departments and programs such that they were able to meet their current requirements. In addition, new processes were developed to encourage proposals for innovative ideas using temporary funding to gather evidence for the viability of a program/positions/idea before requesting permanent funding. The categories for temporary funding were "Enhancements", "Innovation" and "New Initiatives" and were defined as follows:

i) **Enhancements**: A funding request to complement or add to an existing activity which is already in place. Enhancement requests may address unexpected funding needs due to internal/external shifts or requirements. Enhancements may also be initiated for one-time expenditures. Funding for enhancements lasts for one year. If an enhancement has ongoing funding needs, a TCO proposal must be submitted with evidence that supports institutionalization. Enhancements are generally assumed to be closely aligned with Board Policy Goals, PBC Operational goals, and the Educational Master Plan areas of emphasis.

ii) **Innovation:** A project, program or service completely different, brand new and innovative. Innovation funding is for a one year period. If subsequent funding is needed, the request must be submitted as a New Initiative, which allows for two years of temporary funding. This funding mechanism is designed to encourage innovation, new views, and new ideas. By nature, Innovations often anticipate or suggest future directions for the department and/or the college. In this respect they differ from Enhancements and New Initiatives and may not be easy to align with current planning goals and emphases.

iii) **New Initiative:** A project, program or service which may arise from an existing activity but proposes a new, expanded direction. New Initiative funding allows 2 years of trial period in order to develop evidence and begin a process for future institutionalization. If the evidence points towards institutionalization, a TCO proposal for permanent funding would be initiated. If institutionalization is not feasible, the project would terminate at the conclusion of two years. Under special circumstances PBC may grant a second New Initiative funding round if progress toward TCO needs additional information and the information to date supports awarding more time in order to gather this information.

b) Beginning in FY2006-07 a more comprehensive process known as "Total Cost of Ownership" (TCO) was developed as a means of identifying both the direct and the indirect costs associated with funding new proposals. For example, it was recognized that additional funding would be required by the Facilities department when a new building was constructed and would have to be cleaned by a custodian. Over the four years that this system operated (through FY 2009-10) various means were developed to

allocate monies to be included in funding requests to account for the indirect impact of new projects. A requestor who received an amount of money in indirect funds could save up those funds until the impact of the growth in work reached a "tipping point" and they had enough evidence to convert those funds to pay for permanent staff.

i) **Total Cost of Ownership (TCO):** The process by which a proposal for a new program/service/facility is funded on a permanent basis. As the name implies, Total Cost of Ownership includes all costs associated with the program/service/facility. Most TCO proposals originate as Enhancements or New Initiatives in order to gather evidence for permanent funding. Though less likely, some TCO proposals can be considered and funded without prior funding as Enhancements or New Initiatives, provided that sufficient evidence to support institutionalization has been gathered through other means.

Requests for classified and administrator positions completed alongside all other requests in the TCO process, while requests for faculty positions proceeded in a parallel but separate process.

3) Program review only

Beginning in 2009-10 the institution-wide program review process has been used for all requests for permanent positions. Funding recommendations are made by the Budget & Planning Committee (BPC) at the conclusion of the program review process.

Planning methods for full time faculty staffing have also changed greatly from primarily a persuasive speaking exercise to data driven and based in program review:

1) Department Chairs

Prior to 1999, faculty hiring priorities were set by Department Chairs. Each chair would present his or her department's hiring request(s) at a department chairs meeting, and all department chairs would vote on these requests. The Vice President of Instruction would then take the list of requests with the highest number of votes to the Superintendent/President for approval.

2) Hiring Committees

In 1997, with approval of the first Academic Master Plan, the Academic Senate charged an ad hoc committee to write a faculty hiring plan and develop procedures for setting faculty hiring priorities. The faculty hiring plan was completed and approved in 1998. Procedures for the Academic Senate Hiring Committee were developed and approved in 1999. The Academic Senate Hiring Committee would be comprised of 5 tenured faculty members, none of whom was a department chair, and the VP of Instruction, who would serve as a non-voting resource member. The committee was structured to have a rotating membership with two-year terms, including representation from career technical education, nonclassroom, and classroom faculty. Members must have previously served on one or more key committees, including Academic Master Planning, Academic Senate Council, or AP&P (our curriculum committee). They began in the fall by reviewing the Academic Master Plan and hiring criteria. Meanwhile, faculty developed and submitted hiring requests, including detailed justifications based on data provided by the Research and Planning Office. The Hiring Committee read all requests and reviewed the associated data, interviewed each department requesting a position (interview attendees typically included the program lead, department chair, and dean), and then deliberated according to its criteria to arrive at a list of priorities and written justifications for them. This list went on to the Academic Senate Council for approval as a recommendation to the Superintendent/President, who met with the Academic Senate President and the chair of the Hiring Committee to arrive at the final prioritization list. In

spring, the Academic Senate Hiring Committee reviewed, evaluated and revised its hiring prioritization criteria and procedures and brought revisions to the Academic Senate Council for approval.

3) Academic Affairs Committee

With the governance reorganization in 2008, the Academic Senate Hiring Committee was folded into the Academic Affairs Committee, which formed a subcommittee to review the faculty hiring requests in program review and prioritize them. The resulting prioritized list was reviewed and approved by the Academic Affairs Committee as a whole for recommendation to the Academic Senate Council. Academic Senate Council reviewed and approved the list of priorities as a recommendation to the Superintendent/President who made the final decision.

APPENDIX II –DIVERSITY OF EMPLOYEES AND STUDENTS

ETHNICITY BREAKDOWN OF ADMINISTRATORS (Fall 2011)

Ethnic Group	Number	Administrator percent	Credit student percent	MCC service area population
American Indian / Alaskan Native	1	3.6%	1%	1%
Asian / Pacific Islander	2	7.1%	8%	9%
African American	2	7.1%	4%	4%
Hispanic	5	17.9%	19%	26%
Caucasian	18	64.3%	51%	56%
Multiple ethnicities	not available	not available	14%	4%
Other/unknown	--	--	3%	--
Total	**28**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

ETHNICITY BREAKDOWN OF FULL-TIME FACULTY (Fall 2011)

Ethnic Group	Number	Faculty percent	Credit student percent	MCC service area population
American Indian / Alaskan Native	3	1.7%	1%	1%
Asian / Pacific Islander	13	7.3%	8%	9%
African American	10	5.6%	4%	4%
Hispanic	29	16.4%	19%	26%
Caucasian	122	68.9%	51%	56%
Multiple ethnicities	not available	not available	14%	4%
Other/unknown	--	--	3%	--
Total	**177**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

ETHNICITY BREAKDOWN OF CLASSIFIED (Fall 2011)

Ethnic Group	Number	Classified percent	Credit student percent	MCC service area population
American Indian / Alaskan Native	5	1.9%	1%	1%
Asian / Pacific Islander	28	10.9%	8%	9%
African American	13	5.1%	4%	4%
Hispanic	52	20.2%	19%	26%
Caucasian	159	61.9%	51%	56%
Multiple ethnicities	not available	not available	14%	4%
Other/unknown	--	--	3%	--
Total	**257**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

ETHNICITY BREAKDOWN OF ASSOCIATE FACULTY (Fall 2011)

Ethnic Group	Number	Faculty percent	Credit student percent	MCC service area population
American Indian / Alaskan Native	5	1.0%	1%	1%
Asian / Pacific Islander	23	4.5%	8%	9%
African American	17	3.3%	4%	4%
Hispanic	57	11.1%	19%	26%
Caucasian	404	78.9%	51%	56%
Multiple ethnicities	not available	not available	14%	4%
Other/unknown	6	1.2%	3%	--
Total	**512**	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

APPENDIX III –ONGOING USE OF TEMPORARY WORKERS

MiraCosta has undergone efforts in the last several years to convert ongoing temporary assignments into permanent classified jobs, through the program review process. While those efforts are ongoing, they do not extend to all current usage of temporary workers. There are some temporary assignments which can be excluded from consideration for conversion. Those assignments generally fall into one of the following categories;

1) Student workers and others hired under the title of "apprentice" because the work experience they gain at MiraCosta specifically prepares them to do similar work outside of the college. The primary example is apprentices hired in the Child Development Center. These temporary workers generally do not maintain an assignment longer than 1-2 years as they are typically students in the child development program who leave the college after completing their academic studies. If the assignments were made into permanent classified jobs it would negatively affect the laboratory nature of the center and the academic program it is intertwined with.

2) Student workers and others hired as instructional campus aides, instructional apprentices, and instructional aides in the Retention Services: Tutoring and Academic Support Center. These temporary workers generally do not maintain an assignment longer than 1-3 years as they are typically students in the general education program who leave the college after completing their academic studies. If the assignments were made into permanent classified jobs it would negatively affect the peer to peer nature of the center and the academic disciplines it is serving. This transient employee group provides knowledge and expertise in the wide range of courses for which academic support is provided based on MiraCosta faculty referral.

3) Student workers and others hired as instructional apprentices, campus aides and instructional aides in the Writing Center since it prepares these employees to do similar work outside of the college and since supplemental instruction roles are best filled by former students of particular faculty/course combinations.

4) Student workers and others hired as campus aides and instructional aides in the Math Learning Center since it prepares these employees to do similar work outside of the college and since these roles are best filled by former students of the MiraCosta mathematics department.

5) Student workers and others hired as campus aides for very short durations of time to meet "seasonal" needs. The primary example is registration aides in A&R and cashiers who are needed for only specific time periods during the semester. Conversion to permanent classified jobs would not be reasonable since retention of permanent staff would be a challenge due to the intermittent nature of the work.