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Purpose of the Participatory Governance Process Survey

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

• emailed to Cañada Employees in May 2016.
• one reminder
• 58 questions were asked
  • 45 Likert-Scale questions, 7 open-ended questions, 6 demographic questions
• 120 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>28</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Participatory Governance Members</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Classified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Non Participatory Governance Members</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Budgeting Council (19)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator/Supervisor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Instructional Planning Council (15)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Student Services Planning Council (23)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Administrative Planning Council (11)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Academic Senate (11)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Classified Senate (7)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Associated Students of Cañada College (8)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Questions (1 of 3)

• Overall, I feel safe on campus
  (mean: 3.4; agree or strongly agree: 95.8%)

• Overall, Cañada College provides a high quality learning experience for students
  (mean: 3.4; agree or strongly agree: 95.6%)

• Overall, the participatory governance process is working well at Cañada.
  (mean: 2.8; agree or strongly agree 71.2%) (last year 3.2; 85%)

4-point Likert Scale: 1=strongly disagree and 4= strongly agree
Summary of Questions (2 of 3)

Strengths

• My supervisor encourages me to do high quality work.
• Providing excellent service to students is acknowledged in my area.
• I know where to refer students to various support services on campus (e.g., financial aid, DRC, learning center, etc.)

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

• Cañada College provides sufficient opportunities for promotion.
• Cañada College provides adequate opportunities for training in technology related to my area of responsibility.
• Employees have adequate opportunities to participate in the development of financial plans and budgets.

4-point Likert Scale: 1=strongly disagree and 4= strongly agree
Summary of Comments

Strengths
- Great place to work
- Student first climate
- Good planning processes

Challenges
- Transparency of the processes on decision making related to hiring, participatory governance system, budget, and enrollment.
- Too much work, not meaningful, waste of time related to program review and assessment.
Comments and Questions