

As the table above shows, some items were stated negatively in order to encourage more mindful responses, i.e., respondents were more thoughtful of their answers to a combination of positively and negatively worded statements, as opposed to a set of statements worded in the same direction.

Responses to the two items about results of outcomes assessment at the course level (#17) and at the general education (GE) program level (#19) indicate a strong belief in the use of outcomes assessment in budget and planning. The items are negatively worded, as reflected in the mean scores (mean 2.73, s.d. 1.34 and mean 2.68, s.d. 1.42, respectively), which indicate that most of the responses were between strong agreement to agreement to the use of outcomes assessment in budget and planning. The moderately high standard deviations suggest some divergence in opinions among the respondents, however, which should be taken into account when interpreting these results.

Similarly, survey respondents indicate belief that the College uses ongoing and systematic evaluation (e.g., assessment program review) and planning to refine its key processes (#3). They also agree that there is a consistency between institutional mission, goals, planning, and action (#6), and that the processes for implementation and revision of the curriculum are clearly understood by faculty (#10). Furthermore, there is agreement that, with the new College administration, changes to institutional process and policies are guided by dialogue (#7) and that GCC planning processes offer opportunities for input by appropriate constituencies (#9).

Mean responses to the items referring to the adequacy of opportunities given to faculty (#11, mean 3.64, s.d. 1.66) and to classified staff (#12, mean 3.42, s.d. 1.63), through their respective supervisors, to get involved in the budget process indicated faculty and staff do not