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## Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total respondents: 21

Possible respondents include all PaRC members, Academic Senate, Classified Senate, Core Mission workgroups members.
Top Five Planning Activities

- Student Learning Outcomes
- Program Review
- Resource Allocation Process
- Core Mission Workgroup objectives
- Faculty/Classified staff prioritization

- At least 50% indicated they participated in these activities (out of nine).

Participants can be involved in multiple planning activities.
PaRC’s Role:  
Making informed recommendations

• Receives information in timely manner 92%
• Receives enough information 91%

• How information disseminated?
  – Email updates
  – Reporting out at meetings

• How often?
  – Monthly

These four questions were answered by only those who served on PaRC this academic year.
Top Information Sources

• Division/Department meetings
• Email
• College website
• Senate meetings
• Other
  – PaRC, other meetings (committee/task force), self-research

Top three information sources were selected by over 50% of respondents
Planning Process Reflections

| Strongly Agree/Agree | 87%  
|----------------------|------
| Disseminated in a timely manner? | 87%  
| Inclusive and transparent? | 86%  
| Disseminated effectively? | 81%  
| Informed by data? | 76%  

Planning Process Reflections

• “For the first full year of this system, things went well. We can do better in the future…”
• “PaRC has gotten better at building feedback time…”
• Suggestions
  – Have Cabinet report out regularly.
  – Senates should agendize PaRC discussion.
  – Make sure to give time to receive input on decisions before they are made.
Is the Information Appropriate?

- TracDat reports: 28%
- Program Review documents: 21%
- Core Mission workgroup objectives: 16%
- Resource allocation documents: 10%

Question asked how well the above documents/reports provide the appropriate information needed to support college decision-making.
Are the Planning Pieces Incorporated?

• Core Mission workgroups 42%
• ESMP 22%
• Program Review 19%
• SLOs 10%
• ESMP appendix plans 5%
• Resource allocation process 5%

Excellent

Question asked how well the above entities/documents are incorporated in the college decision-making process.
Improvements

• SLOs
  – Increased discussion
  – Clearer instructions, expectations, examples
• “Possible to have an SLO-day?”
• “Direct examples from each division, sharing examples...”
Improvements

• Program Review
  – Shorter template
  – Additional time
• “Received not even one comment or feedback from anyone...not enough accountability.”
• “Time set aside by managers to get it done...”
Improvements

• Resource Prioritization Process
  – Revise Criteria

• “We need to go through this a couple years before we really know how it works.”

• OPC’s role:
  – OPC is trying to take on too much responsibility with a very limited core group.
  – A lot of overlap between OPC and PaRC
Summary

• Information dissemination
  – Timely, inclusive, effective

• Integrated planning process
  – Still a work in progress
  – Will be tested with next round of cuts

• Improvements
  – Shorter program review template
  – Support (instruction, examples)
  – Discussion (present more data, continue dialogue at dept/div/campus levels)