

Rancho Santiago Community College District Districtwide Planning Process Survey Results

November 2016

Rancho Santiago Community College District (RSCCD) implemented a new planning and decision-making process in 2013. Staff has had a chance to work with the model envisioned for the district. After three years of implementation, we need to ensure that staff fully understood the model and the roles and responsibilities of the different governance committees. In late fall, members of the RSCCD Governance Committees were invited to give opinions on this district-wide planning and resource allocation processes, as well as the district operations resource allocation. Twenty-six of the 68 members (38%) from across the district participated (22% from Santa Ana College, 37% Santiago Canyon College, and 42% district operations), with representation from all staff (26% classified, 16% faculty and 58% management), but none from students, and nearly equal representation from the six governance committees.

	Count	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
I am familiar with the RSCCD Planning Design.	21	10%	67%	19%	5%
The district-wide planning process is clear.	21	5%	38%	48%	10%
I understand the roles and responsibilities of the following RSCCD Governance Committees:					
District Council	21	24%	52%	24%	0%
Fiscal Resources	22	14%	64%	23%	0%
Human Resources	21	24%	48%	29%	0%
Physical Resources	21	10%	48%	43%	0%
Planning and Organizational Effectiveness	21	14%	52%	33%	0%
Technology Advisory Group	21	29%	48%	24%	0%

	Count	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	don't know
The committees collaborate to support the work of District Council.	22	5%	50%	14%	5%	27%
Please tell us your level of agreement on the <u>district-wide</u> resource allocation:						
The process to identify and prioritize district-wide resource requests is clear.	20	0%	30%	30%	10%	30%
I am satisfied with the district-wide resource request and prioritization process.	19	0%	32%	32%	5%	32%
There is coordination between district-wide and college-based resource requests.	20	0%	35%	35%	10%	20%
The district-wide resource allocation timeline is clear.	20	0%	40%	15%	15%	30%
The district-wide resource allocation timeline is satisfactory.	20	0%	35%	15%	10%	40%
Please tell us your level of agreement on the <u>district operations</u> resource allocation:						
The process to identify and prioritize district operations resource requests is clear.	20	0%	35%	30%	10%	25%
I am satisfied with the district operations resource request and prioritization process.	20	5%	25%	30%	10%	30%
There is coordination between district operations and college-based resource requests.	20	0%	35%	25%	10%	30%
The district operations resource allocation timeline is clear.	20	5%	30%	35%	5%	25%
The district operations resource allocation timeline is satisfactory.	20	5%	30%	35%	5%	25%

Changes to the District-wide planning and resource request process you would recommend:

- I would make certain timelines are published by sending out campus wide emails. My main concern is that one group may know more about the allocation timeline than others and therefore are not participating to the fullest or getting requests into the departments for prioritization. I serve on committees but I am wondering if all departments and divisions hold meetings to let their staff know and have a say as to what the department needs might be.
- The BAM needs to be re-done to allow for more resources to go to the colleges!!! Stop spending so much money at the District Office whole programs are cut and campus resources reduced!! We are here for the students not the District.
- This has not been explained well to most employees.
- Ensure that district level resource requests make their way to the colleges in a timely fashion so that they can be considered in college-level resource request prioritization. There is a perception that the District often gets what it needs, whether on the front end of the funding allocation process or on the back end through the services back-charge process. Further, over the past several years the district has had "extra" funding for technology related and other projects. If there is leftover money at the district level, they are OVER-CHARGING the colleges. While this may not be directly related to the resource request process, this does impact the viability of district level requests as they are reviewed by the colleges.

Changes to the district operations planning and resource request process you would recommend:

- There needs to be more communication between district operations and college-based resource. It is the college campuses that generate the funds necessary to run district operations. It appears that more money is spent at the district level for the same resources, i.e. staffing then at the college level.
There is a general improvement in the communication process between district based resources and college campus based resources however it is not as good as it can be.
- Send more resources to the colleges.
- Clearer articulation of channels of communication and decision making.

Governance Summit Planning

To ensure that we plan a productive and effective Governance Summit, members of the RSCCD Participatory Governance Committees were invited to give feedback on the structure and issues that they would like to address at the upcoming February 9th summit. Of the twenty-six survey respondents, slightly less than half (46%) attended the 2016 summit.

As a result of your attendance, how much more knowledge of the RSCCD Participatory Governance Structure did you gain?

- 8% I now fully understand the RSCCD Participatory Governance Structure
- 31% I gained much knowledge of the RSCCD Participatory Governance Structure
- 38% I gained some additional knowledge of the RSCCD Participatory Governance Structure
- 23% No gain, I fully understood the RSCCD Participatory Governance Structure

	Count	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	I don't know
My committee's needs are sufficiently addressed at District Council.	17	6%	59%	6%	6%	24%
District Council activities are shared regularly at my committee meetings.	17	18%	35%	12%	18%	18%
My committee has planned a process to produce an annual report.	17	12%	59%	6%	0%	24%

Most effective component of 2016 Participatory Governance Summit, and why:

- Group discussions to be informed of the planning, goals, needs of governance committees.
- A brief review of each committee's charge
- None, the group broke down into POE and FRC. The issues related to planning vs. budget need to be addressed outside of this summit in order to move forward in any positive way.
- Getting to understand what each committee is responsible for.
- For me, it was the explanation of each branch. Why and how the committees exist.
- Talking about issues
- Break out groups and sharing of ideas.
- Table discussions

Least effective component of 2016 Participatory Governance Summit, and why:

- Reviewing the goals. There was no point to reviewing something we had no ability to alter or discuss from a change standpoint. It should have been stated that it was for informational purposes only and not been brought forth as a potential item for discussion.
- Given there has been nothing that has come out to even tell us what the intended purpose of such a meeting is, I think that is ineffective. Why isn't there an agenda that tells us what to expect? Why haven't the committees been given a charge to be prepared ahead of time to make the meeting useful?
- Most of the people that presented their committee just read off the internet page we have available to everyone. We just want a little more than reading off the web page.
- Group setting does not encourage individual feedback

Expectations of 2017 Participatory Governance Summit:

- There needs to be a revision of the BAM. The District is taking too much money away from the colleges (esp. SCC) and programs are suffering.
- Clarity in the roles of each committee and the members of the committee. Some committee members may need to be reminded to bring information back to their respective groups/constituents.
- It needs to have a more focused agenda, and follow Robert's rules of order. For a group of that size and shape personalities and politics start creeping in very early.
Issues that are hot topics may need to have breakout sessions or a separate meeting to address prior to the summit. Much of the other groups outside of POE and FRC seemed to have been glossed over as those two were the main centerpieces of 90% of all discussions.
- The committee responsibilities need to be addressed/updated. Should consider matching the district planning portfolio cycle to match the college planning cycle.
The Budget Allocation Model states that District Council will review District Services and Institutional Costs each fall. I don't believe this has ever occurred.
The planning Guide states that FRC will review changes to allocations for District wide services but needs to be updated to state POE as indicated in the BAM.
Under Resource Allocation section, I don't believe items 2 and 3 are being done.
Under Process for Allocating Resources, the timeline needs to be updated to be more useful, and likely based on these changes, other calendars will likely need to be updated as well.
- Set the agenda to shared goals that will impact all. Time it at a non-critical time for colleges.
- Possible results
- To plan dates of meetings and make sure you attend.
- Allow for all to share their responses to questions in real-time. The most vocal are heard within the groups, and it is their opinions that are ultimately shared. Maybe we could employ technology to facilitate the discussion?
Ask the question --> allow time for choice selection --> discuss aggregate and write-in responses
- Include assessment of Strategic Plan
- Focus on one theme and create joint meeting to discuss that theme
- Copies of Planning Design Manual
- Real examples (evidence) of where the committees tie directly to District Council.
How the process is actually being used in real life to direct District-wide decisions.
- Make it meaningful and connect the dots for me.