FOOTHILL COLLEGE
Institutional Research and Planning

DATE: July 2, 2013

TO: Integrated Planning and Budget (IP&B)

FROM: Elaine Kuo, College Researcher
Thomas Margesson, Student Assistant

RE: 2013 Governance Survey

Overview

Foothill administrators, classified staff, full-time faculty, and part-time faculty were surveyed to provide an evaluation of the college's planning and resource prioritization process. Students who participate in the shared governance process were also included but none completed the survey. There were 71 respondents with full-time faculty representing almost half of the participants (33 of 71 or 46%).

Survey Highlights:

- The majority of respondents (69%) are informed about college planning discussions and decisions by email. Of those informed by email, 94% felt they received the information in a timely manner.

- Of the respondents who are informed about college planning discussion and decisions through the PaRC website, only 11% felt they received the information in a timely manner.

- At least three-fourths of respondents "strongly agreed" or "agree" that the college's planning process requires documentation, assessment, and reflection (82%); is accessible and undergoes continuous improvement (75%); and is driven by evidence (73%). However, full-time faculty responded “strongly agree" or "agree” at a lower percentage rate compared to the other respondents—at least 20 percentage points difference.

- Over half of respondents "strongly agree" or "agree" that the college's decisions are based on student learning (67%); made through a process emphasizing student success related to ILOs (67%); and disseminated in a timely manner (55%). However, full-time faculty responded “strongly agree" or "agree" at a lower percentage rate compared to the other respondents—at least 10 percentage points difference.

- Less than one-third of classified staff and full-time faculty "strongly agree" or "agree" that college decisions are inclusive and transparent (33% and 29%). In comparison, over half of administrators and part-time faculty "strongly agree" or "agree" that college decisions are inclusive and transparent (86% and 70%).

- When feedback was provided for program review, Perkins requests, resource requests, and/or SLOs, it was generally considered helpful.

- One suggestion for improvement is creating a clearer template for comprehensive program review (89%).

Methodology

All Foothill employees and four Foothill students who served on PaRC were sent an email invite with the survey link provided. Access to the survey was also provided for employees through MyPortal. The survey was made available from Monday, June 10 to Friday, June 14.

Source

Foothill IR&P- 2013 Governance Survey

1. What is your primary role at Foothill?

Reponses	N	%
Administrator	7	10%
Classified Staff	21	30%
Full-time Faculty	33	46%
Part-time Faculty	10	14%
Student	0	0%
Total	71	100%



2. Please indicate how you are informed about college planning discussions and decisions.

2a. Check the box if you use this method.

Reponses	N	%
Email	49	69%
Division mtgs	35	49%
College website	25	35%
Senate mtgs	25	35%
Dept mtgs	21	30%
MyPortal	17	24%
Other	10	14%
PaRC mtgs	8	11%
PaRC website	7	10%

NOTE:
Participants were able to select more than one response, so percentages do not equal 100%



2b. If checked, do you receive information in a timely manner?

Reponses	Yes N	Yes %	No N	No %
Email	45	94%	3	6%
Senate mtgs	22	85%	4	15%
MyPortal	16	80%	4	20%
PaRC mtgs	7	70%	3	30%
College website	18	67%	9	33%
Division mtgs	23	59%	16	41%
Dept mtgs	14	58%	10	42%
Other	5	56%	4	44%
PaRC website	1	11%	8	89%

NOTE:
Participants were able to select more than one response, so percentages do not equal 100%



3. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements:

3a. The college has a planning model that is accessible and undergoes continuous evaluation in order to promote student success.

Reponses	N	%
Strongly Agree	7	10%
Agree	45	65%
Disagree	15	22%
Strongly Disagree	2	3%
Total	69	100%



3b. The college's planning and resource prioritization process is driven by data/evidence (e.g. program review).

Reponses	N	%
Strongly Agree	7	11%
Agree	41	62%
Disagree	15	23%
Strongly Disagree	3	5%
Total	66	100%



3c. The college's planning model requires the documentation, assessment and reflection of its instructional and student support programs and services on a regular basis.

Reponses	N	%
Strongly Agree	9	13%
Agree	46	69%
Disagree	10	15%
Strongly Disagree	2	3%
Total	67	100%



3d. The college makes planning and resource prioritization decisions based on whether students will gain skills, knowledge and/or abilities related to the institutional learning outcomes.

Reponses	N	%
Strongly Agree	4	6%
Agree	41	61%
Disagree	12	18%
Strongly Disagree	10	15%
Total	67	100%



3e. The college makes planning and resource prioritization decisions through a process that emphasizes student success.

Reponses	N	%
Strongly Agree	6	9%
Agree	39	58%
Disagree	13	19%
Strongly Disagree	9	13%
Total	67	100%



3f. The college's planning discussions are inclusive and transparent.

Reponses	N	%
Strongly Agree	4	6%
Agree	23	35%
Disagree	27	41%
Strongly Disagree	12	18%
Total	66	100%



3g. The college's planning discussion and decisions are disseminated to constituents in a timely manner.

Reponses	N	%
Strongly Agree	3	4%
Agree	34	51%
Disagree	21	31%
Strongly Disagree	9	13%
Total	67	100%



Q3. Comments:

"As part time faculty (75-80% of all faculty in CA. Community Colleges are considered part time) we are left out of most decision making and informed last about decisions that affect the college, our students and ourselves."

"I feel that SLO's are completely bureaucratic and at best, minimally, contribute to resource prioritization. The program review is a template that does not allow for thinking outside of the box. Also, because the faculty provide the first go-around in the department program review, for the most part, the faculty never again see the program review for the division (which is compiled by the dean) and certainly not the responses by the V.P. I don't know how it works in other divisions, but our dean ends up making most of the decisions. We get together and he will say, ""oh, this was a request by the dept, I don't think the school will fund it so let's prioritize something else."" The decision process is not very transparent at all."

I really can't respond to these as I am not a member of any of the committees and do not feel any of this is relevant to my job.

"I'm checking agree, but it's only because there isn't a ""don't know/ NA"" category. I really don't know the answer to these questions as I haven't participated in planning; I only hear about decisions after the fact."

It seems to me some deans go around the process and straight to cabinet to get what they want or just overspend their B budgets or Perkins allocations with no penalty.

"The college planning model seems to work well in theory. However, it is very complicated to follow--at least for someone not on PaRC. Further, the executive cabinet seems to make most, if not all, of the decisions, which seems to render the entire PaRC structure optional or moot. It would be helpful if we received PaRC updates in the same way that we receive board updates after each board meeting. It's very challenging to keep going to the PaRC website and keep track of the important events and decisions. A brief synopsis (the College Curriculum Committee does this as well with its communique) would ensure that the college is informed of the most important decisions. Further, it could increase transparency by providing a brief rationale when the executive cabinet (or even just the president) overrules a committee decision. That would minimize or possibly eliminate speculation as to why decisions were made."

"There is no empirical evidence that the SLO process improves student learning, yet we have heavily invested in the process."

"There should be a ""neither agree nor disagree"" choice."

"We are one of the few colleges that do not have an independent newspaper. Sad. We also have no regular newsletter that tackles these issues, except for the FA Bulletin. I wish we had a quarterly newsletter sent to faculty and staff that discusses recent statistics about FH students, enrollments, etc and deals with news of the issues administrators are grappling with."

4. Who are the PaRC voting members? (check all that apply)

Correct responses: Academic Senate president, ASFC president, ASFC student trustees, ASFC student representatives, Classified Senate president, and Core mission workgroup tri-chairs.

Results	N	%
Correctly identified the 6 positions	1	2%
Did not correctly identify the 6 positions	51	98%
Number of responses	52	100%



Frequency table

Reponses	N	%
*Academic Senate president	34	65%
*Core mission workgroup tri-chairs	34	65%
College president	34	65%
*Classified Senate president	31	60%
*ASFC president	26	50%
College vice presidents	23	44%
*ASFC student trustee	16	31%
*ASFC student representatives	16	31%
FA representative	12	23%
ACE representative	9	17%
Other	7	13%
CSEA representative	6	12%
Teamsters representative	6	12%
MSA representative	3	6%
Operating engineer representative	3	6%



NOTE: Participants were able to select more than one response, so percentages do not equal 100%

5. How often is the comprehensive program review conducted for each program?

Reponses	N	%
Once a year	19	29%
Every other year	4	6%
Every third year	27	41%
Once per accreditation cycle	2	3%
Not sure	14	21%
Total	66	100%



6. Where do requests for B-budget augmentation get prioritized?

Reponses	N	%
OPC	40	70%
PaRC	17	30%
Total	57	100%



7. Where do requests for new faculty get prioritized?

Reponses	N	%
OPC	16	28%
PaRC	41	72%
Total	57	100%



8. When is the next accreditation site visit scheduled?

Reponses	N	%
Fall 2014	1	1%
Fall 2015	2	3%
Fall 2016	5	7%
Fall 2017	39	57%
Not Sure	22	32%
Total	69	100%



9. Indicate if you participated in any of the following planning activities in this academic year (check all that apply).

Reponses	N	%
Identifying/Assessing/Reflecting on student learning outcomes	37	54%
Writing an annual program review	31	45%
Writing a comprehensive program review	10	14%
Submitting a Perkins resource request	10	14%
Submitting a resource request (not Perkins)	9	13%
None of the Above	0	0%
Other	0	0%
Number of respondents	69	
Number of responses	97	

NOTE: Participants were able to select more than one response, so percentages do not equal 100%



Annual Program Review Process

9.1a. Did you receive feedback regarding the program review document and/or process?

Reponses	N	%
Yes	19	61%
No	12	39%
Total	31	100%



9.1b. If you received feedback, did you find it useful?

Reponses	N	%
Yes	4	57%
No	3	43%
Total	7	100%



9.1c. Select all the options you think might improve the annual program review process.

Reponses	N	%
Clearer instructions re: program review document/template	20	65%
Shorter program review template/document	20	65%
More discussion/feedback at department and division levels	19	61%
More feedback from dean/VP	12	39%
Additional time	11	35%
Additional data	8	26%
Less data	1	3%
Other	1	3%
Number of respondents	31	
Number of responses	92	

NOTE: Participants were able to select more than one response, so percentages do not equal 100%



9.1c. Other responses:

More faculty input in what is included in program reviews and changing the wording of questions to make them less leading.

9.1c. Comments:

Program Review Committee was overly negative and unnecessarily threatening. This was the first year and a few committee members were over the top with criticism. This did not work well.

Program Review Document is remarkably complicated and not particularly intuitive without assistance. There is no significant difference between the comprehensive document and the annual review

Program review would feel more meaningful to me if it seemed connected to the granting of resource requests.

"The document should be clear and succinct as to what we are being asked to do. The feedback I got regarding the program review document was only from the dean and these comments were mainly in response to the department's resources requests. We got back nothing from the dean. And, I can't find the final division program review document from in the Dropbox at all. Apparently, the division document is the one used by OPC to determine resource allocation, but since faculty never see this document, the process itself isn't very transparent."

The program review process has become so onerous that we have given up having entire programs because it is too much work to do the program review. This does not benefit students.

Comprehensive Program Review Process

9.2a. Did you receive feedback from the Program Review Committee (PRC) regarding the program review document and/or process?

Reponses	N	%
Yes	4	40%
No	6	60%
Total	10	100%



9.2b. If you received feedback from the PRC, did you find it useful?

Reponses	N	%
Yes	3	75%
No	1	25%
Total	4	100%



9.2c. Select all the options you think might improve the comprehensive program review process.

Response	N	%
Clearer instructions regarding the program review document/template	8	89%
More discussion/feedback at department and division levels	6	67%
Additional time	5	56%
Additional data	3	33%
More feedback from dean/VP	3	33%
More communication with PRC	2	22%
Less data	1	11%
Other	1	11%
Shorter program review template/document	0	0%
Number of respondents	9	
Number of responses	29	

NOTE: Participants were able to select more than one response, so percentages do not equal 100%



9.2c. Other responses:

The PRC needs more time for review of these documents; hopefully next year's process will seem less rushed.

9.2c. Comments:

Have an administrator complete the program reviews and then have a dialogue with related faculty to finalize.

New committee with better guidance on their role. Less focus on punitive consequences. More of a learning experience.

The process was unclear. There was an opportunity to revise the PR doc after the feedback from the Dean and VP comments that was not advertised.

Perkins Request Process

9.3a. Did you receive feedback or update from the Workforce workgroup or the Workforce office regarding the status of your Perkins request?

Reponses	N	%
Yes	5	100%
No	0	0%
Total	5	100%



9.3b. If you received feedback or update, did you find the feedback or update useful?

Reponses	N	%
Yes	5	100%
No	0	0%
Total	5	100%



9.3c. Rate the amount of time you spent on your Perkins request forms and reports.

Reponses	N	%
Less than 2 hours	2	50%
2 to 5 hours	0	0%
More than 5 hours	2	50%
Total	4	100%



9.3d. Select all the options you think might improve the Perkins process.

Reponses	N	%
Clearer understanding about the Perkins criteria	2	50%
Clearer understanding about the Perkins timeline	2	50%
Clearer understanding about the Workforce workgroup's role	2	50%
Clearer understanding about the Perkins process	1	25%
Other	1	25%
Clearer understanding of PaRC's role	0	0%
Number of respondents	4	
Number of responses	8	

NOTE: Participants were able to select more than one response, so percentages do not equal 100%



9.3d. Other responses:

more vetting of the perkins requests, more funds for allied health

9.3d. Comments:

Other colleges dedicate much more of their perkins funding to allied health programs. These programs are excellent, but must have funding for tutoring (retention), faculty development (accreditation), and equipment (to teach to current standards). Our college is reducing the Perkins funding that was traditionally granted to allied health. With national health care plan coming into effect, this needs to be recalibrated in favor of more funding for allied health programs.

Resource Prioritization Process

9.4a. Did you receive feedback or update from OPC or PaRC regarding the status of your request?

Reponses	N	%
Yes	4	44%
No	5	56%
Total	9	100%



9.4b. If you received feedback or update, did you find the feedback or update useful?

Reponses	N	%
Yes	4	57%
No	3	43%
Total	7	100%



9.4c. Select all the options you think might improve the resource prioritization process.

Reponses	N	%
Clear understanding about the resource prioritization process	4	57%
Clearer understanding regarding OPC's role	4	57%
Clear understanding about the rubric used by OPC	3	43%
Clearer understanding of PaRC's role	3	43%
Clearer understanding of the VP's role	1	14%
Other	0	0%
Number of respondents	7	
Number of responses	15	

NOTE: Participants were able to select more than one response, so percentages do not equal 100%



9.4d. Comments:

Consistency. Do not allow certain deans to go around the process and do what they want.

Funding decisions & faculty positions are being granted so late, it's difficult for implementation at the division & dept. level in a timely manner.

Student Learning Outcomes Process

9.5a. Did you receive feedback regarding the SLO process (from department, division and/or administrative levels)?

Reponses	N	%
Yes	13	35%
No	24	65%
Total	37	100%



9.5b. If you received feedback, did you find that feedback useful?

Reponses	N	%
Yes	12	75%
No	4	25%
Total	16	100%



9.5c. Select all the options you think might improve the student learning outcomes process (course, program, administrative, service, institutional).

Reponses	N	%
More department/division support	18	51%
More SLO discussion (department, division and campus levels)	18	51%
Clearer instructions	17	49%
Increased TracDat training	8	23%
Other	7	20%
Number of respondents	35	
Number of responses	68	

NOTE: Participants were able to select more than one response, so percentages do not equal 100%



9.5d. Other responses:

a library of samples that other divisions and colleges have done

ability for part time faculty to access their SLOs

Compensate part-time faculty for taking part in the process

Eliminate SLOs

Everything is there and available

make it go away

9.5d. Comments:

"A collegial approach to the process. Again, not punitive, but a learning experience."

Are we still doing SLOs? I haven't heard boo about them since we finished our accreditation report & followup.

"Do you know that part-time faculty do not have access to TracDat and SLOs online, yet are encouraged to take part in the process, and to do so without being compensated?"

haven't heard anything about SLO this year

"Hire more full-time faculty so that willing faculty like myself would be more available to do the work, and so that the existing full-timers did not have so much work on their shoulders. Then the work would be easier and probably done better, which would ultimately benefit the students."

"Honestly, it seems like SLOs are just a compliance issue, we have to do it, but I don't see it is being used in any significant way in terms of learning, curriculum reform, or teaching methodology. Unfortunate. For more seasoned faculty, it just seems like work that has no reward or purpose. The SLO coordinators are well meaning, but not very effective."

"I strongly oppose the SLO process, but there seems to be no escaping it. We faculty statewide should have stood up against it much more strongly."

"Most of the faculty believe that SLO's are simply busy work. They do not contribute to our students' success nor do they contribute to the improvement of our teaching. If you don't have faculty buy-in, then the SLO's don't contribute anything much to the dept."

9.5d. Comments, continued:

There is no evidence that SLOs are necessary or improve student learning AND the process requires an onerous amount of paperwork that takes faculty away from working with students. Have an administrator complete the paperwork and then have faculty approval. We are drowning in administrative paperwork at the faculty level.

"TracDat, like any other technology, requires consistent use to become proficient."

"When writing our administrative SLO for campus committee, we had to refer to other SLO's to figure out what was really being asked for. It wasn't as clear as it could have been, especially when adapting a template designed for faculty (to evaluate classroom performance) to the same issues in committee terms. They don't necessarily translate easily or equally."

10. Indicate the planning committee(s) you participated in this academic year:

Reponses	N	%
Academic Senate	9	13%
Classified Senate	9	13%
Planning and Resource Council (PaRC)	8	12%
Program Review Committee	8	12%
Core Mission Workgroups	6	9%
Operations Planning Committee (OPC)	3	4%
Associated Students of Foothill College (ASFC)	1	1%
None of the above	43	62%
Number of respondents	69	
Number of responses	87	

NOTE: Participants were able to select more than one response, so percentages do not equal 100%



10.1a. Indicate how often you disseminate college planning discussions and decisions to your constituents.

Reponses	N	%
Weekly	3	60%
Bi-Weekly	2	40%
Monthly	0	0%
Quarterly	0	0%
Does not apply	0	0%
Total	5	100%



10.1b. Indicate all the methods you use to disseminate college planning discussion and decisions to your constituents.

Reponses	N	%
Email updates	6	67%
Reporting out at meetings (Academic/Classified senate, ASFC, division/department meetings)	6	67%
Informal discussions with colleagues	5	56%
Does not apply	0	0%
Other	0	0%
Number of respondents	9	
Number of responses	17	

NOTE: Participants were able to select more than one response, so percentages do not equal 100%



11. Please include any additional comments about the planning and budget process:

Do what you say you are going to do. Do not let deans submit requests out of the process. Have consequences for deans that overspend.

"From what I see and hear, we claim to make our decisions to improve student success. But when a student success goal conflicts with a financial goal, money wins. It's clear to me what's really important to administration: maximizing revenue. As a single example, there is tons of research about the positive impact that authentic assessment has on student success. But authentic assessment demands a great deal of faculty time and attention. You can't get that at 535 productivity. So why do we budget for 535? Because of what's important to us. Hint: it's not student success. Another example? We cancelled a class designed for an underserved population because initial enrollments don't always meet financial targets, regardless of the greater student persistence and success the class generated. What's important to us? Seems pretty clear."

"I don't think the process is very transparent. I think minutes of the PARC meetings should be disseminated to the entire college. Or a reminder sent after each meeting about where the minutes can be accessed. I also don't think the budgeting decisions are transparent at all. It is not clear that these decisions are based on data or student outcomes. Again, posting minutes would be helpful here ... or perhaps assigning members of the committee the duty of relaying information to divisions/departments, much like FA does after each of its Executive Council meetings."

I need more opportunities to take part of this process.

"I would like to see regular email reports from PaRC meetings, like I see from Academic Senate and Board of Trustees."

"IMHO, planning and budget processes should be a management task."

It needs to be more transparent. There needs to be a balance in who votes in PaRC -- there are more faculty from PSME than any other division.

"Neither the Academic Senate nor FA does a good job representing PT faculty. We are a small minority of seats, and while I served on both thee bodies for over 5 years each, I am disgusted that so many vital decisions happen without including any of us or at best very few part timers. at most just 9 part timers out of a couple thousand of us. Should any of these 9 vote differently from their FT colleague leadership, they will soon find themselves off these bodies."

"There are numerous areas for improvement. In particular, the allied health faculty & especially directors work so many hours, we rarely can serve on committees. This is a huge loss for the college. Allied health directors have a wealth of experience in accreditation, budgeting, curriculum....and many other areas, but Foothill does not give adequate release time & encourage participation by these important stake holders."

Please find a way to have us have to do less paperwork. Thanks.

11. Please include any additional comments about the planning and budget process, continued:

"Overall, PaRC is a great idea, but there needs to be clarity about the relationship between PaRC and the executive cabinet. There needs to be more transparency with the executive cabinet and more communication from the EC--especially when the EC overrules a campus committee recommendation. The president and EC need to be more proactive in communicating the highlights of each meeting (akin to a brief synopsis or communique) so that the campus is kept up to speed on the most relevant events and decisions. Finally, we need more opportunity to have open dialogues and give feedback. It feels as if the faculty and staff are under a microscope with program reviews, SLOs, and constant evaluations, but the administration seems insulated from these processes. The level of scrutiny, assessment and critique needs to be comparable at all levels for faculty, staff and administrators. This extends to the planning and budget process as well. If faculty and staff resource and hiring requests have to be supported with data, then the same should be true of administrators. Overall, I'm sure that more communication, openness and transparency will resolve many of these issues and get us closer to the model of transparency that PaRC offers."

Thank you your survey. I'm new and know very little of the process. I hope to hear more.

"We must try that as many part time faculty gets involved in this process by departmental meetings, which can then be summarized by the Division Dean and forwarded to decision makers. Also, we should be informed of the outcome."

"What is the purpose of filling out a program review, if those who don't still get resources they request? It still appears that favored programs, or those with the loudest cheerleader, get what they want and those who don't have that kind of support are pushed aside."

Would appreciate more timely reporting out from PaRC - a newsletter or web page issued with quick turnaround after meetings. Minutes from PaRC not easy to access and usually not posted to web page for quite a long time after the meetings. Also need training for PaRC reps about their responsibilities for reporting to their groups.