FH Integrated Planning Survey Spring 2011

SurveyMonkey

1. I am a/an:

	Response Percent	Response Count
Student	15.6%	5
Classified Staff Member	21.9%	7
Part-Time Faculty	0.0%	0
Full-Time Faculty	**31.3%**	**10**
Administrator	**31.3%**	**10**
	answered question	**32**
	skipped question	**0**

2. Primary Campus:

	Response Percent	Response Count
Foothill	**100.0%**	**31**
Middlefield	0.0%	0
	answered question	**31**
	skipped question	**1**

3. Select all planning committees you were a member of in 2010-2011

		Response Percent	Response Count
PaRC		**59.4%**	**19**
Core Mission Workgroup (Basic Skills/Transfer/Workforce)		56.3%	18
Operations Planning Committee (OPC)		25.0%	8
ASFC		9.4%	3
Academic Senate		21.9%	7
Classified Senate		18.8%	6
(none of the above)		9.4%	3
		answered question	**32**
		skipped question	**0**

4. Select all activities in which you were directly involved

	Response Percent	Response Count
Writing SLOs/SAOs/AUOs	51.9%	14
Assessing SLOs/SAOs/AUOs	59.3%	16
Reflecting on SLOs/SAOs/AUOs	59.3%	16
Writing Program Review/Plan for your area	48.1%	13
Discussion of Program Review/Plan for your area	**81.5%**	**22**
Drafting/compiling resource and/or faculty requests	44.4%	12
Discussion and/or prioritization of resource and faculty requests	59.3%	16
	answered question	**27**
	skipped question	**5**

5. To what degree have you seen the Learning Outcomes (SLOs, SAOs, or AUOs) integrated into the college planning process:

	Response Percent	Response Count
Not integrated at all	3.7%	1
Slightly integrated	29.6%	8
Moderately integrated	**55.6%**	**15**
Highly integrated	11.1%	3
	answered question	**27**
	skipped question	**5**

6. To what degree have you seen Program Review integrated into the college planning process:

	Response Percent	Response Count
Not integrated at all	7.4%	2
Slightly integrated	22.2%	6
Moderately integrated	**37.0%**	**10**
Highly integrated	33.3%	9
	answered question	**27**
	skipped question	**5**

7. This year, the Core Mission Workgroups were created to serve as a clearinghouse for activities, goals and projects related to their respective core mission. Do you agree that the Workgroups accomplished this?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Disagree	7.7%	2
Slightly disagree	15.4%	4
Slightly agree	19.2%	5
Agree	**57.7%**	**15**
	answered question	**26**
	skipped question	**6**

8. Do you agree that the Core Mission Workgroups supported Student Learning Outcomes at the course and program level?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Disagree	11.1%	3
Slightly disagree	3.7%	1
Slightly agree	22.2%	6
Agree	**40.7%**	**11**
I was not a member of a Core Mission Workgroup	22.2%	6
	answered question	**27**
	skipped question	**5**

9. To what degree have you seen the core missions of Basic Skills, Transfer and Workforce integrated into the college planning process:

	Response Percent	Response Count
Not integrated at all	0.0%	0
Slightly integrated	22.2%	6
Moderately integrated	**40.7%**	**11**
Highly integrated	37.0%	10
	answered question	**27**
	skipped question	**5**

10. To what degree have you seen the Educational and Strategic Master Plan as informing the college planning process:

	Response Percent	Response Count
Not informing the process at all	11.5%	3
Slightly informing the process	26.9%	7
Somewhat informing the process	**38.5%**	**10**
Highly informing the process	23.1%	6
	answered question	**26**
	skipped question	**6**

11. Regarding resource and staffing requests, to what degree do you feel learning outcomes (SLOs, SAOs, or AUOs) were integrated into the allocation process:

	Response Percent	Response Count
Not integrated at all	22.2%	6
Slightly integrated	25.9%	7
Moderately integrated	**40.7%**	**11**
Highly integrated	11.1%	3
	answered question	**27**
	skipped question	**5**

12. Regarding resource and staffing requests, to what degree do you feel program review plans were integrated into the allocation process:

	Response Percent	Response Count
Not integrated at all	18.5%	5
Slightly integrated	14.8%	4
Moderately integrated	**44.4%**	**12**
Highly integrated	22.2%	6
	answered question	**27**
	skipped question	**5**

13. This year, Deans and ESMP Appendices plans (e.g. Equity Plan, Disability Support Programs & Services) were invited to present their goals and needs to PaRC. To what degree do you feel this informed PaRC about the planning and resource needs of these groups?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Not informative at all	7.4%	2
Slightly informative	11.1%	3
Moderately informative	18.5%	5
Highly informative	**44.4%**	**12**
I did not serve on PaRC	18.5%	5
	answered question	**27**
	skipped question	**5**

14. If you actively participated in a resource or staffing prioritization process (at a department, division, or committee level), indicate to what extent you felt adequately prepared in making a recommendation.

	Response Percent	Response Count
Not prepared at all	0.0%	0
Slightly prepared	21.4%	6
Moderately prepared	25.0%	7
Highly prepared	**28.6%**	**8**
(did not participate)	25.0%	7
	answered question	**28**
	skipped question	**4**

15. Thinking of your answer above, indicate which of the following would have helped you to feel more prepared, please check all that apply:

	Response Percent	Response Count
Further/clearer instructions	45.0%	9
Additional time	35.0%	7
Additional information or data	55.0%	11
Ability to ask questions of request makers	**65.0%**	**13**
	Other (please specify)	3
	answered question	**20**
	skipped question	**12**

16. Thinking about the following aspects of planning, please indicate to what extent you agree with each of the following statements

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Response Count
The Integrated Planning and Budget structure was clear to me	18.5% (5)	**37.0% (10)**	25.9% (7)	7.4% (2)	7.4% (2)	3.7% (1)	27
Program Review instructions were clear	18.5% (5)	**40.7% (11)**	18.5% (5)	3.7% (1)	7.4% (2)	11.1% (3)	27
Program Review components were thorough	14.8% (4)	**48.1% (13)**	14.8% (4)	14.8% (4)	3.7% (1)	3.7% (1)	27
Adequate time was given to complete Program Review	11.1% (3)	22.2% (6)	**25.9% (7)**	22.2% (6)	7.4% (2)	11.1% (3)	27
Data provided was sufficient to complete Program Review	14.8% (4)	25.9% (7)	**29.6% (8)**	14.8% (4)	7.4% (2)	7.4% (2)	27
Program Reviews were used in decision making	25.9% (7)	**37.0% (10)**	22.2% (6)	3.7% (1)	11.1% (3)	0.0% (0)	27
Resource and staffing request forms were clear and simple to complete	18.5% (5)	29.6% (8)	**33.3% (9)**	14.8% (4)	0.0% (0)	3.7% (1)	27
Adequate time was given to complete resource and staffing requests	14.8% (4)	25.9% (7)	**33.3% (9)**	22.2% (6)	0.0% (0)	3.7% (1)	27
All members of your area were encouraged to be involved in planning	**33.3% (9)**	**33.3% (9)**	11.1% (3)	14.8% (4)	7.4% (2)	0.0% (0)	27
Discussion and decisions were data driven and supported by sound evidence	25.9% (7)	**33.3% (9)**	22.2% (6)	11.1% (3)	7.4% (2)	0.0% (0)	27
Overall I'm satisfied with the Integrated Planning and Budget structure	18.5% (5)	**40.7% (11)**	18.5% (5)	18.5% (5)	0.0% (0)	3.7% (1)	27
					Other (please specify)		7

answered question	**27**
skipped question	**5**

17. This question only for members of PaRC (skip this question if not a member). Consider your experience on this planning committee. For each statement below please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of the statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Response Count
Agendas and Minutes were distributed in a timely manner	**85.7% (18)**	14.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
Discussions usually followed the agenda	**71.4% (15)**	28.6% (6)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
PaRC completed the agendas efficiently	**66.7% (14)**	23.8% (5)	9.5% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
PaRC had appropriate information to make informed planning decisions	30.0% (6)	**35.0% (7)**	25.0% (5)	10.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	20
Discussions were data driven and supported by evidence	**33.3% (7)**	**33.3% (7)**	19.0% (4)	14.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	21
All campus constituents were represented at PaRC	**38.1% (8)**	**38.1% (8)**	19.0% (4)	4.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	21
All members of PaRC were encouraged to participate in discussions	42.9% (9)	**47.6% (10)**	9.5% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
There was a sense of respect between members	**47.6% (10)**	33.3% (7)	19.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
Meetings were positive and constructive	**47.6% (10)**	**47.6% (10)**	4.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
PaRC was a worthwhile use of my time	**42.9% (9)**	33.3% (7)	23.8% (5)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
					Other (please specify)	3
					answered question	**21**
					skipped question	**11**

18. Please give us any additional comments or information that can help to improve the Integrated Planning and Budget Structure.

	Response Count
	7
answered question	**7**
skipped question	**25**