


Participatory Governance Survey 2024-2025

October 15, 2025

Prepared by the Office of Planning, Research & Institutional
Effectiveness (PRIE)

For the Planning & Budgeting Council (PBC)

Response Rates




- # completed surveys down relative to other years


- 2025 = 72
- 2024 = 201*
- 2023 = 96
- 2022 = 88

*All enrolled students were sent the survey link this year and prizes were given out


Respondent Constituency (n=72)




Did you serve on a college participatory governance Council, Senate, or Committee during the 2024-25 year?



Rating of committee fulfilling their roles and responsibilities




Other service in 2024-2025




General Participatory Governance

4 = Strongly Agree
3 = Agree
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree



Program Review

4 = Strongly Agree
3 = Agree
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree



■ I understand the program review process and its role in aligning program and college goals.

■ I engage in dialogue with others in my department or service area about how to improve our program (via PLOs, SLOs, or SAOs)


■ The program review process is an effective way to evaluate programs on campus to identify the future direction, needs and priorities of those programs.

Takeaways

- Time is a concern for most groups when it comes to participatory governance
- Largely the same results as last year, though part-time Faculty disagree less that roles and responsibilities are clear
- Generally program review seems to be understood and viewed as effective.
- Little to no change year over year


Budget

4 = Strongly Agree
3 = Agree
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree




- I understand the College's annual resource request process and how it relates to both comprehensive program reviews and annual updates.
- Cañada College employees and students have adequate opportunities to participate in resource prioritization and budgeting.

I am aware of Cañada's goals for the College.



Planning

4 = Strongly Agree
3 = Agree
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree



■ The College works collaboratively towards the achievement of college goals.


■ I am satisfied with the amount of opportunity I have to participate in college-wide planning.

Takeaways

- Generally the budget process is understood and participation is adequate
- Compared to last year, part-time faculty moved from disagree to agree on both budget questions
- Faculty are less aware of faculty goals compared to last year
- The results are extremely similar to last year

Overall Participatory Governance

4 = Strongly Agree
3 = Agree
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree



■ I feel the voices of the four major constituent groups of the College (students, faculty, classified staff, and administrators) are balanced in Cañada's participatory governance processes.

■ Overall, the participatory governance process is working well at Cañada.

Free response themes by constituent group

- Classified
 - Limited student voice
 - Limited participation from Classified (time and motivation issues)
- Faculty (PT)
 - Concerns with hiring
 - Administration has outsized weight on committees
- Faculty (FT)
 - Participatory Governance feels exclusively advisory/no impact on ultimate decisions
 - Administration is overrepresented

Final takeaways

- Time to participate is one of the major hurdles for most groups
- The *outcomes* of participatory governance are perceived to be low impact
- However, the *process* of participatory governance is generally felt to be operating well