

ECC Planning Feedback

96 Responses

A. Employee Group

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 1.87
Faculty	39	41.94	
Staff	27	29.03	
Manager/Administrator/Supervisor	27	29.03	

C. Administrative Area

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.28
Academic Affairs	34	45.95	
Administrative Services	12	16.22	
Presidents Office	1	1.35	
Student and Community Advancement	27	36.49	

E. Employment Status

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 1.08
Full Time	85	92.39	
Part Time	7	7.61	

2. How involved were you in creating the current (2010-11) plan?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.34
Very involved	33	35.11	
Somewhat involved	23	24.47	
Rarely involved	11	11.70	
Not involved	27	28.72	

B. Location

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.05
Compton Educational Center	1	1.10	
ECC Main Campus Torrance	84	92.31	
Other	6	6.59	

D. Years employed at your location

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.10
Less than 1 year	4	4.35	
1 to 5 years	16	17.39	
6-15 years	39	42.39	
16 years or more	33	35.87	

1. How often have you logged in to Plan Builder in the past year?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.65
Two or more times per month	10	10.64	
Monthly	6	6.38	
A few times in the year	23	24.47	
Once or twice	23	24.47	
Never	32	34.04	

3. If not involved, would you be interested in participating in the process in the future?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.55
Definitely	19	31.67	
Probably	11	18.33	
Maybe	13	21.67	
Not likely	12	20.00	
No interest at all	5	8.33	

4. Did you participate with updating the goal and objectives status in the current (2010-11) plan?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 1.54
Yes	58	63.04	
Not yet	18	19.57	
Not applicable	16	17.39	

5. What was your main role in the planning process?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.53
I was a plan leader.	23	24.47	
I was a plan editor.	4	4.26	
I participated in plan development.	22	23.40	
I am not sure of my role in the planning process.	13	13.83	
Other please specify	9	9.57	
Not involved	23	24.47	

6. My role and responsibilities in this process were clearly communicated to me.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.94
Completely Agree	35	44.30	
Somewhat Agree	21	26.58	
Neutral/Not Sure	12	15.19	
Somewhat Disagree	5	6.33	
Completely Disagree	6	7.59	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

7. I understand how the planning process relates to the College's strategic initiatives.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.92
Completely Agree	34	38.64	
Somewhat Agree	27	30.68	
Neutral/Not Sure	16	18.18	
Somewhat Disagree	8	9.09	
Completely Disagree	3	3.41	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

8. The planning process prioritizes resource allocations.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.77
Completely Agree	27	31.03	
Somewhat Agree	32	36.78	
Neutral/Not Sure	15	17.24	
Somewhat Disagree	7	8.05	
Completely Disagree	6	6.90	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

9. The planning process has helped me to focus on improving my program/unit/area.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.36
Completely Agree	20	24.69	
Somewhat Agree	20	24.69	
Neutral/Not Sure	20	24.69	
Somewhat Disagree	11	13.58	
Completely Disagree	10	12.35	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

10. I see a link between the planning process and the students we serve.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.67
Completely Agree	28	31.46	
Somewhat Agree	27	30.34	
Neutral/Not Sure	20	22.47	
Somewhat Disagree	5	5.62	
Completely Disagree	9	10.11	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

12. I am clear on the kinds of things that are appropriate to be included in our annual plan.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.53
Completely Agree	21	24.42	
Somewhat Agree	29	33.72	
Neutral/Not Sure	19	22.09	
Somewhat Disagree	9	10.47	
Completely Disagree	8	9.30	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

14. I am beginning to understand the relationship between Program Review, Plan Builder, and Student Learning Outcomes.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.72
Completely Agree	26	30.59	
Somewhat Agree	27	31.76	
Neutral/Not Sure	20	23.53	
Somewhat Disagree	6	7.06	
Completely Disagree	6	7.06	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

11. This planning process has been good for El Camino College.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.58
Completely Agree	23	26.74	
Somewhat Agree	21	24.42	
Neutral/Not Sure	31	36.05	
Somewhat Disagree	5	5.81	
Completely Disagree	6	6.98	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

13. My program/unit/area plan includes objectives that we plan to implement even though they may have no additional cost (i.e., outside resources are not needed or already exist to support them).

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.84
Completely Agree	30	36.14	
Somewhat Agree	22	26.51	
Neutral/Not Sure	24	28.92	
Somewhat Disagree	2	2.41	
Completely Disagree	5	6.02	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

15. On-going or additional training is needed for faculty and staff.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.30
Completely Agree	46	52.27	
Somewhat Agree	24	27.27	
Neutral/Not Sure	17	19.32	
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00	
Completely Disagree	1	1.14	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

16. Recommendations from the last program review are included in the annual program plan.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.88
Completely Agree	29	34.52	
Somewhat Agree	20	23.81	
Neutral/Not Sure	32	38.10	
Somewhat Disagree	2	2.38	
Completely Disagree	1	1.19	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

18. I know that the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) reviews, discusses, and makes recommendations to the President regarding College planning and budgeting issues.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.06
Completely Agree	40	44.44	
Somewhat Agree	28	31.11	
Neutral/Not Sure	14	15.56	
Somewhat Disagree	3	3.33	
Completely Disagree	5	5.56	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

20. I understand the role of the Enrollment Management Committee in the planning process.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.04
Completely Agree	14	15.56	
Somewhat Agree	15	16.67	
Neutral/Not Sure	34	37.78	
Somewhat Disagree	15	16.67	
Completely Disagree	12	13.33	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

17. Program review recommendations inform the planning process.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.92
Completely Agree	30	34.88	
Somewhat Agree	27	31.40	
Neutral/Not Sure	25	29.07	
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00	
Completely Disagree	4	4.65	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

19. Information from the PBC is distributed/communicated campus wide.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.11
Completely Agree	12	13.33	
Somewhat Agree	22	24.44	
Neutral/Not Sure	31	34.44	
Somewhat Disagree	14	15.56	
Completely Disagree	11	12.22	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

21. I am aware that the Enrollment Management Committee oversees a small amount of innovation funding each year to support campus efforts to improve student success and to grow enrollment when needed.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.94
Completely Agree	15	16.67	
Somewhat Agree	15	16.67	
Neutral/Not Sure	28	31.11	
Somewhat Disagree	14	15.56	
Completely Disagree	18	20.00	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

22. I understand how the planning process works.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.61
Completely Agree	18	20.22	
Somewhat Agree	35	39.33	
Neutral/Not Sure	24	26.97	
Somewhat Disagree	7	7.87	
Completely Disagree	5	5.62	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

24. I understand that sometimes the process requires us to update current plans while creating plans for the next year.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.22
Completely Agree	39	43.82	
Somewhat Agree	37	41.57	
Neutral/Not Sure	9	10.11	
Somewhat Disagree	2	2.25	
Completely Disagree	2	2.25	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

26. The deadline to submit the annual plan does not work for my Program/ Unit/Area.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.96
Completely Agree	7	8.64	
Somewhat Agree	10	12.35	
Neutral/Not Sure	46	56.79	
Somewhat Disagree	9	11.11	
Completely Disagree	9	11.11	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

23. I know the difference between Program, Unit and Area plans.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.74
Completely Agree	32	36.78	
Somewhat Agree	22	25.29	
Neutral/Not Sure	18	20.69	
Somewhat Disagree	8	9.20	
Completely Disagree	7	8.05	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

25. I am confused by all the deadlines for the different plans.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.33
Completely Agree	18	21.18	
Somewhat Agree	27	31.76	
Neutral/Not Sure	18	21.18	
Somewhat Disagree	9	10.59	
Completely Disagree	13	15.29	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

Open Ended Questions and Comments

Question: 5. What was your main role in the planning process?

Respondent	Response
20	submitted revision suggestions along with other faculty
31	i informed supviser of our needs
33	I was asked to update information about a program
46	Data Entry
62	asked to review my area
65	Attended Planning Summit
67	I was a plan reviewer
73	led and participated
80	Plan reviewer

Question: 27. If these submittal dates do not work, then when should annual plans be submitted?

Respondent	Response
19	The plan builder process needs to be more flexible so that it can be continually updated by more than one person in the department. If the department is large it is too much for one person to manage. The inflexibility of the deadlines has caused outdated plan items to be funded while current needs are overlooked. We seem to be two years behind in the funding and the process has been so inflexible that faculty cannot make changes to what gets funded, even though items are out of date by the time the money comes through. This has been very frustrating.
29	Annual plans only works for section/departments that are politically and fiscally supported by the Administration. This obviously does not apply to all sections/departments on campus. Taking into account the current era of micro-management that the campus is experiencing I would suggest that planning be done on a five year cycle similar to the former Soviet Union. Micro-management worked for them, sort of, so it only makes sense for ECC to follow their five year planning cycle. This also promotes long-term planning which no one in the current ECC Administration is doing or is capable of.
47	I have not been here long enough to make a suggestion or judgement
58	Near the end of the semester.
64	Mid- November
66	n/a
79	Should be pertinent to the type of support program. Some are semester-cyclical, some annually-cyclical.
81	Later in spring. By that time, one has a better pictures of current plan accomplishments.

Question: 28. What changes or additions should be made to improve the current planning process?

Respondent	Response
8	The meetings are a waste of time. There is a lot of discussion on how to do things better, yet very little, if anything is implemented. Too many wasted man hours on meetings that yield very little improvements. We are the epitome of a bureaucracy.

Question: 28. What changes or additions should be made to improve the current planning process?

Respondent	Response
19	It seems as though the planning process has been used to create obstacles to funding rather than vice versa. When funds are requested for anything, one is asked if it is in planbuilder. If one did not anticipate the need a year ago, one is told you cannot subvert the planning process. Yet things that have been in there for years as top priority get overlooked when funds come available, and when an administrator decides on a whim to fund something, it will get funded whether or not it has been in planbuilder. It seems like a sham.
25	It is a joke that you want faculty input on planning. The administration makes the decisions and they want the facade of faculty input.
29	Actually showing any correlation between the current planning process and what actually gets done and/or supported on campus. Removing the justification process for items/services that have been entered into Plan Builder when funding has been allocated for those items. If the item in question was not needed it would not have been entered into Plan Builder. Why do I need to justify something in Plan Builder when the only reason why the item was entered into Plan Builder is because I need the item?
33	I'm unclear of how smaller programs, or programs that have been recently de-funded fit in plan builder. Relying on your division for information could be problematic - I would rather have campus-wide trainings.
35	I think the only change I would recommend is the process of evaluation since many programs are looking to our (Institutional Research Office) for research to include in their program plans. All of the programs submit research request at the same time and this causes a back log with our research department, thereby delaying or extending the turn around time for a research request to be completed. The department does an excellent job of accomodating request but when "Program Plans" are due this presents a problem.
38	I believe most faculty in my department are completely removed from the planning process and Plan Builder. There needs to be greater awareness of how the process works.
40	Have only one plan - combine program review with plan builder - it is so confusing - allow for updates to be made during the year
45	I am fine with the current process.
47	I have not been here long enough to make a suggestion or judgement
55	I think that planning is only as good as it's Dean or leadership. I believe these people need training. Too often we are asked for feedback when the deadline is literally tomorrow. This is frustrating and makes everyone feel helpless. No time is given to make appropriate recommendations especially in this time of fiscal crisis, why is this happening right now? why are we asked today to give feedback by 10 am tomorrow. It is our responsibility to do better, but why is our Dean asked to come up with something today for tomorrow regarding cuts that should be made, this should be part of planning. Where we grow and where we can decline. It is very frustrating.
57	Better communication and willingness of administration to consider and implement faculty input.
61	Send out deadlines earlier. So many things on this campus are done at the last minute.
64	Include more stakeholders.
65	My manager has not involved our office in the planning process (i.e. program review). Are managers being encouraged to involve staff? Are they being asked to identify who was actually involved in the process?
66	n/a
70	More trainings to understand what the plan is for, what should be included in it, and the format that it should be written.

Question: 28. What changes or additions should be made to improve the current planning process?

Respondent	Response
75	Make instruction, not administrative convenience, the focus.
77	Would be nice to have all the plans copied over to a public access page where anyone could see plans for any Dept. I believe that part of the problem with communication of Plan Builder and its purpose is that only password access users can see the plans. Therefore, making the "submitted" plans accessible for viewing without the need for password access would improve communication and sharing of plans and expand awareness of Plan Builder and its purpose.
89	The use of Strategic Initiatives as planning goals this year seemed artificial. Some of my goals fit this model and some did not; I would have liked the opportunity to include goals that don't fit current SIs.
93	More information sent to all faculty and staff to better understand outcomes and why those outcomes are being implemented. More transparency

Question: 29. What suggestions do you have that would help you understand the planning process? Be specific if possible.

Respondent	Response
12	Availability of an on-line brochure or tutorial.
17	When structuring the plan make it more simple to understand.
19	The process should be more flexible. Everything needs to be accessible to faculty on and off campus. Faculty should be able to update their plans at any time. The yearly deadline is unworkable and leads to funding of outmoded plans. When funds become available they should apply to the current plan. If it is continually updated it will always reflect the current needs. Administrators should not be able to pick and choose what gets funded. The departments should prioritize and the funding should follow that prioritization.
23	communicate the process and allowed to be an active participant
25	LISTEN! The campus atmosphere should tell you something about how serious input is taken.
29	Less micro-management would be a great benefit. Letting employees do their job and supporting those employees instead of causing employees to work in an atmosphere of fear and retaliation from the Administration. A change in ECC Administration personnel starting with the VP of Academic Affairs and the President/Superintendent. You did state "be specific if possible".
35	I would also recommend that managers are fully trained in the context of program plans because I'm not confident that everyone understands how to interpret the program plans in front of them and that causes concerns in the minds of those creating the plans.
45	I clearly understand the planning process.
47	I feel that all new supervisors/managers should be provided some brief level of training.
64	None.
65	Getting my feet wet
66	n/a
70	More trainings to understand what the plan is for, what should be included in it, and the format that it should be written.
71	The frequent reminders about what is due and when have been helpful for those of us who think about plan builder only when submission dates are near. We need more of them.
75	Relate to instructional, rather than administrative, goals.
79	Just seems like there is a lot of re-iteration and overlap in the plan builder, program, review, and other management reports.

Question: 29. What suggestions do you have that would help you understand the planning process? Be specific if possible.

Respondent	Response
80	I understand the process fairly well. People in other areas are not as lucky as I am to have a manager that constantly informs me and updates me on the planning issues on campus. My input is always requested and valued. Having open communication encourages me to continue to participate in the planning process.
93	periodic forums
94	Not directly related to the planning process but division/program/unit directions should consult and/or reflect the items in the plan builder when developing or implementing a process change or structural change.

CEC Planning Feedback

32 Responses

A. Employee Group

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 1.69
Faculty	17	53.13	<div style="width: 53.13%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Staff	8	25.00	<div style="width: 25.00%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Manager/Administrator/Supervisor	7	21.88	<div style="width: 21.88%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>

C. Administrative Area

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.36
Academic Affairs	12	42.86	<div style="width: 42.86%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Administrative Services	5	17.86	<div style="width: 17.86%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
CEOs Office	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0.00%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Student Services	11	39.29	<div style="width: 39.29%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>

E. Employment Status

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 1.07
Full Time	28	93.33	<div style="width: 93.33%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Part Time	2	6.67	<div style="width: 6.67%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>

2. How involved were you in creating the current (2010-11) plan?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 1.84
Very involved	17	53.13	<div style="width: 53.13%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Somewhat involved	7	21.88	<div style="width: 21.88%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Rarely involved	4	12.50	<div style="width: 12.50%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Not involved	4	12.50	<div style="width: 12.50%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>

B. Location

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 1.00
Compton Educational Center	32	100.00	<div style="width: 100.00%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Other	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0.00%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>

D. Years employed at your location

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.94
Less than 1 year	2	6.25	<div style="width: 6.25%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
1 to 5 years	8	25.00	<div style="width: 25.00%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
6-15 years	12	37.50	<div style="width: 37.50%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
16 years or more	10	31.25	<div style="width: 31.25%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>

1. How often have you logged in to Plan Builder in the past year?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.81
Two or more times per month	9	28.13	<div style="width: 28.13%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Monthly	3	9.38	<div style="width: 9.38%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
A few times in the year	9	28.13	<div style="width: 28.13%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Once or twice	7	21.88	<div style="width: 21.88%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Never	4	12.50	<div style="width: 12.50%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>

3. If not involved, would you be interested in participating in the process in the future?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 2.06
Definitely	5	29.41	<div style="width: 29.41%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Probably	7	41.18	<div style="width: 41.18%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Maybe	4	23.53	<div style="width: 23.53%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
Not likely	1	5.88	<div style="width: 5.88%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>
No interest at all	0	0.00	<div style="width: 0.00%; background-color: #0000FF;"></div>

4. Did you participate with updating the goal and objectives status in the current (2010-11) plan?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 1.56
Yes	20	62.50	
Not yet	6	18.75	
Not applicable	6	18.75	

5. What was your main role in the planning process?

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.06
I was a plan leader.	10	31.25	
I was a plan editor.	4	12.50	
I participated in plan development.	8	25.00	
I am not sure of my role in the planning process.	1	3.13	
Other please specify	2	6.25	
Not involved	7	21.88	

6. My role and responsibilities in this process were clearly communicated to me.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.87
Completely Agree	17	56.67	
Somewhat Agree	3	10.00	
Neutral/Not Sure	2	6.67	
Somewhat Disagree	5	16.67	
Completely Disagree	3	10.00	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

7. I understand how the planning process relates to the College's strategic initiatives.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.34
Completely Agree	19	65.52	
Somewhat Agree	6	20.69	
Neutral/Not Sure	0	0.00	
Somewhat Disagree	3	10.34	
Completely Disagree	1	3.45	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

8. The planning process prioritizes resource allocations.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.10
Completely Agree	15	50.00	
Somewhat Agree	8	26.67	
Neutral/Not Sure	4	13.33	
Somewhat Disagree	1	3.33	
Completely Disagree	2	6.67	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

9. The planning process has helped me to focus on improving my program/unit/area.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.96
Completely Agree	13	46.43	
Somewhat Agree	7	25.00	
Neutral/Not Sure	4	14.29	
Somewhat Disagree	2	7.14	
Completely Disagree	2	7.14	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

10. I see a link between the planning process and the students we serve.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.17
Completely Agree	16	55.17	
Somewhat Agree	7	24.14	
Neutral/Not Sure	2	6.90	
Somewhat Disagree	3	10.34	
Completely Disagree	1	3.45	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

12. I am clear on the kinds of things that are appropriate to be included in our annual plan.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.37
Completely Agree	18	60.00	
Somewhat Agree	8	26.67	
Neutral/Not Sure	2	6.67	
Somewhat Disagree	1	3.33	
Completely Disagree	1	3.33	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

14. I am beginning to understand the relationship between Program Review, Plan Builder, and Student Learning Outcomes.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.40
Completely Agree	18	60.00	
Somewhat Agree	8	26.67	
Neutral/Not Sure	2	6.67	
Somewhat Disagree	2	6.67	
Completely Disagree	0	0.00	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

11. This planning process has been good for Compton Center.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.24
Completely Agree	17	58.62	
Somewhat Agree	4	13.79	
Neutral/Not Sure	7	24.14	
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00	
Completely Disagree	1	3.45	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

13. My program/unit/area plan includes objectives that we plan to implement even though they may have no additional cost (i.e., outside resources are not needed or already exist to support them).

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.14
Completely Agree	16	57.14	
Somewhat Agree	3	10.71	
Neutral/Not Sure	6	21.43	
Somewhat Disagree	3	10.71	
Completely Disagree	0	0.00	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

15. On-going or additional training is needed for faculty and staff.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.70
Completely Agree	20	74.07	
Somewhat Agree	6	22.22	
Neutral/Not Sure	1	3.70	
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00	
Completely Disagree	0	0.00	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

16. Recommendations from the last program review are included in the annual program plan.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.14
Completely Agree	11	39.29	
Somewhat Agree	10	35.71	
Neutral/Not Sure	7	25.00	
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00	
Completely Disagree	0	0.00	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

18. I know that the Planning and Budget Committee (PBC) reviews, discusses, and makes recommendations to the President regarding College planning and budgeting issues.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.00
Completely Agree	17	54.84	
Somewhat Agree	5	16.13	
Neutral/Not Sure	4	12.90	
Somewhat Disagree	2	6.45	
Completely Disagree	3	9.68	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

20. I understand the role of the Enrollment Management Committee in the planning process.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.97
Completely Agree	12	38.71	
Somewhat Agree	12	38.71	
Neutral/Not Sure	3	9.68	
Somewhat Disagree	2	6.45	
Completely Disagree	2	6.45	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

17. Program review recommendations inform the planning process.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.29
Completely Agree	14	50.00	
Somewhat Agree	10	35.71	
Neutral/Not Sure	3	10.71	
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00	
Completely Disagree	1	3.57	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

19. Information from the PBC is distributed/communicated campus wide.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.45
Completely Agree	8	25.81	
Somewhat Agree	9	29.03	
Neutral/Not Sure	7	22.58	
Somewhat Disagree	3	9.68	
Completely Disagree	4	12.90	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

21. I am aware that the Enrollment Management Committee oversees a small amount of innovation funding each year to support campus efforts to improve student success and to grow enrollment when needed.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.17
Completely Agree	15	51.72	
Somewhat Agree	8	27.59	
Neutral/Not Sure	4	13.79	
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00	
Completely Disagree	2	6.90	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

22. I understand how the planning process works.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.06
Completely Agree	15	48.39	
Somewhat Agree	8	25.81	
Neutral/Not Sure	4	12.90	
Somewhat Disagree	3	9.68	
Completely Disagree	1	3.23	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

24. I understand that sometimes the process requires us to update current plans while creating plans for the next year.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 4.55
Completely Agree	20	64.52	
Somewhat Agree	10	32.26	
Neutral/Not Sure	0	0.00	
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00	
Completely Disagree	1	3.23	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

26. The deadline to submit the annual plan does not work for my Program/ Unit/Area.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.03
Completely Agree	5	17.24	
Somewhat Agree	4	13.79	
Neutral/Not Sure	11	37.93	
Somewhat Disagree	5	17.24	
Completely Disagree	4	13.79	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

23. I know the difference between Program, Unit and Area plans.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.97
Completely Agree	13	44.83	
Somewhat Agree	10	34.48	
Neutral/Not Sure	1	3.45	
Somewhat Disagree	2	6.90	
Completely Disagree	3	10.34	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

25. I am confused by all the deadlines for the different plans.

Response	Frequency	Percent	Mean: 3.30
Completely Agree	8	26.67	
Somewhat Agree	8	26.67	
Neutral/Not Sure	4	13.33	
Somewhat Disagree	5	16.67	
Completely Disagree	5	16.67	
Not applicable	0	0.00	

Open Ended Questions and Comments

Question: 5. What was your main role in the planning process?

Respondent	Response
15	Formally, I signed as a "reviewer only"; however, informally (as in via email communications and at one-on-one meetings with the official "contact" person), I contributed much!
32	could not get in

Question: 27. If these submittal dates do not work, then when should annual plans be submitted?

Respondent	Response
3	N/A
4	not applicable
5	At the end of each spring for the upcoming year
6	N/A
9	N/A
15	I'd like to suggest a master calendar (explained below) provided at the beginning of an academic semester on Flex Day. Faculty can then scan this document to find relevant steps and/or deadlines for themselves, AND faculty will have a clearer overview of these various planning processes, their interconnectedness, and the current phase or stage of each. It seems this survey doesn't even cover additional frameworks Compton faculty are supposed to have in mind, particularly accreditation frameworks. How does this fit into accreditation timelines?
18	Give enough notice for due dates
21	all parties need to discuss solid plans for cohesiveness amongst one another.
23	They should be at least 4 months before they are due to ensure that the committees have an opportunity to make some suggestions.

Question: 28. What changes or additions should be made to improve the current planning process?

Respondent	Response
3	To provide an opportunity for faculty to serve as the lead in this process
4	Continue to allow faculty to lead the program plans for academics.
5	More clear directions. Furthermore, when programs complete their plans, the deans usually do not include program prioritizations when they create unit plans. So what is the point to all this work?
6	I believe that the current planning process or any planning process for faculty become a part of their negotiated contract.
9	None
14	It seems this plan is for changes and expenditures (growth). However, we are in a period of contraction and the current model does not take input about prioritizing declines.
15	We need a "master calendar" or central calendar online where faculty can find major campus deadlines clearly indicated!!! I suggest such a calendar to be located in MyECC-- visible to faculty and administrators, but not necessarily visible to students.
18	One marathon meeting is not enough. Make it at least 2 days
21	More input from every single faculty / staff member and some input from part time employees.
23	Start the planning process sooner.
27	Simplify it as much as possible from year to year.

Question: 28. What changes or additions should be made to improve the current planning process?

Respondent	Response
28	We are in need of more efficient services for students, e.g. mental health (health services).
29	Faculty and other staff should receive training or some kind of information about all plans. It should also be made clear for them how the plans are linked to the school budget.
32	what to do when asked to review a Plan and the program will not let me and others "in?"

Question: 29. What suggestions do you have that would help you understand the planning process? Be specific if possible.

Respondent	Response
3	An opportunity to review and continue to provide time for unit collaboration.
4	Continued opportunity to review, reflect and collaborate with other faculty members. Reflection and review comments from Academic Administration.
5	Make sure that there is collaboration between faculty and administrators after the program plans have been completed so unit plans include what the programs have found important.
6	None.
9	None, I understand it
11	Have more mature administrators in charge
15	The proposed central planning calendar presented on each academic semester flex day should contain brief definitions of one to two sentences each, explaining as footnotes key information: what is the purpose of each process and what each process entails.
18	Show results of planning/planned activities.
21	Some plans have not been adhered to, or seem to be altered. A cohesive structure means that the persons running these so called plans is out there looking at what the request is, and why. Empowerment is needed from staff members for another reason, which is they are here on campus more than anyone. Especially from those who move around campus regularly performing tasks, they see a lot of the infrastructure, exostructure, and deal with a lot of different personalities. The needs should be focused on what will keep students on this campus and in support of it, for growth, and longevity.
23	A workshop for a refresher course.
27	Include brief examples in the plan.
29	We were provided with few samples of well defined plans, which helped us in developing our own plans. In addition to that, I would like to see the effectiveness of those sample plans in terms of money allocations and actions taken toward the implementation of the plans
31	increase clarity re whether plans should include ongoing costs for budget development