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Purpose of the Participatory Governance Process Survey

1. To evaluate the impact of our processes on planning annually
2. To meet accreditation standards
3. To make changes
Survey Process

- emailed to Cañada Employees in May 2016.
- one reminder
- 23 questions were asked
  - 16 Likert-Scale questions, 1 open-ended questions, 6 demographic questions
- 57 surveys completed
# Participants' Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Classified</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Participatory Governance Members</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Classified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Non Participatory Governance Members</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Committees (multiple)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Budgeting Council</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator/Supervisor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Instructional Planning Council</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Student Services Planning Council</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Planning Council</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Senate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Students of Cañada College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Questions (1 of 2)

Strengths

- I am satisfied with the amount of opportunity I have to participate in college-wide planning. (mean: 3.05; agree or strongly agree: 73.7%)

- I see how assessment can inform decisions about curriculum, resource allocation, etc. (mean: 3.04; agree or strongly agree: 66.6%)

- I use assessment results to inform subsequent plans. (mean: 3.00; agree or strongly agree 61.4%)

4-point Likert Scale: 1=strongly disagree and 4= strongly agree
Summary of Questions (2 of 2)

Challenges

- Employees have adequate opportunities to participate in the development of financial plans and budgets. (Mean=2.57, Agree or Strongly Agree=49.1%)

- There are clear divisions of authority and responsibility between and among the District Office, the Board of Trustees, and Cañada College. (Mean=2.69, Agree or Strongly Agree=51.8%)

- The program review process helps to promote positive change on campus. (Mean=2.74, Agree or Strongly Agree=49.2%)

4-point Likert Scale: 1=strongly disagree and 4= strongly agree
Recommendations

- In-depth Analysis for PBC in fall 2017
- Possibly set PBC goals
Comments and Questions