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Response rate

• 156 People started the survey
  • Non-completer by Constituency
    • 5 Classified Staff or Manager/Supervisor
    • 4 Faculty
    • 56 students

• 88 surveys completed
  • Nearly double from last year
  • Student participation increased 1,100%
  • 1 partial completer included
Survey Question Scale

• Most questions had participants rank from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1)

• When looking at averages, the more intense the agreement/disagreement the further the average will be from 3

• 3-4 indicates general moderate agreement (2-3 general moderate disagreement)

• 4-5 indicates general strong agreement (1-2 strong disagreement)
Respondent Constituency

Count by Constituency Group

- Student, 36
- Classified Staff or Manager/Supervisor, 18
- Administrator, 3
- Faculty, 30
- Faculty (full time), 21
- Faculty (part time), 9
Overall Information on Meetings

- Administrator: 4.2
- Classified Staff or Manager/Supervisor: 3.9
- Faculty (full time): 4.1
- Faculty (part time): 3.6
- Student: 3.5
Information on Meetings

- PBC
- ASCC
- IPC
- SSPC
- Academic Senate
- Classified Senate
- GP Steering
- College committees

- Administrator
- Faculty (full time)
- Student
- Classified Staff or Manager/Supervisor
- Faculty (part time)
Information on Meetings

- Administrator
- Classified Staff or Manager/Supervisor
- Faculty (full time)
- Faculty (part time)
- Student
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- Academic Senate
- Classified Senate
- GP Steering
- College committees
Overall Comfort with Recording

- Administrator: 4.3
- Classified Staff or Manager/Supervisor: 3.6
- Faculty (full time): 3.9
- Faculty (part time): 3.8
- Student: 3.7
Comfort with Recording

- Administrator
- Classified Staff or Manager/Supervisor
- Faculty (full time)
- Faculty (part time)
- Student

- PBC
- ASCC
- IPC
- SSPC
- Academic Senate
- Classified Senate
- GP Steering
- College committees
General Participatory Governance

The campus community are encouraged to participate
Roles and responsibilities are clear
Overall Participatory Governance

The participatory governance process is working well at Cañada.
Program Review Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff or Manager/Supervisor</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (full time)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (part time)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I understand program review’s role in aligning program and college goals
I engage in dialogue about program and/or course assessment results
I understand how program assessment informs decisions about curriculum, program development and/or resource allocation.
The program review process is an effective way to evaluate programs on campus
I understand the resource request process and how it relates to program reviews and annual updates.

Cañada College employees have adequate opportunities to participate in resource prioritization

Budget average
I am aware of Cañada's goals for the College.
The College works collaboratively towards the goals.

I am satisfied with the opportunity I have to participate in college-wide planning

Planning average
Overall District Procedures

- Administrator: 4.3
- Classified Staff or Manager/Supervisor: 3.5
- Faculty (full time): 3.4
- Faculty (part time): 3.6
- Student: 3.5
I am aware of SMCCCD policies and procedures.

The District procedures for hiring full-time, permanent employees are clearly communicated.

District planning and evaluation are integrated with college planning and evaluation to improve student learning and achievement.

There are clear divisions of authority between the District Office, the Board of Trustees, and Cañada College.