

think that they are given enough opportunity to provide input. Along the same vein, their response to the statement that the results of outcomes assessment are utilized in budget and planning at the program/discipline level (#18, mean 3.77, s.d. 1.61) indicated that they did not believe that this was the case. The response to item #18 is particularly interesting, given the responses to the statements about the use of outcomes assessment results at the course level (#17) and general education level (#19) discussed earlier. These perceptions might be reflective of the differential roles that faculty and staff play in the process of budget planning and development across campus.

Ambivalent perceptions were also apparent in the mean responses to the following statements: (a) classified staff, through their respective supervisors, are provided with adequate opportunity to get involved in the budget process (mean 3.42, s.d. 1.63); (b) faculty, through their department chairs, are provided with adequate opportunity to participate in the budget process (mean 3.64, s.d. 1.66); (c) the results of outcomes assessment are utilized in budget and planning at the program/discipline level (mean 3.66, s.d. 1.72); and (d) at the College, clear links exist between planning, resources allocation, and institutional evaluation (mean 3.77, s.d. 1.61). Among the respondents in the survey, there was no firm certainty that the “College tracks and monitors progress being made on plans” (e.g., Facilities Master Plan, ISMP) and evaluates its performance regularly (mean 3.96, 1.59). These are areas of knowledge and training that the College employees need further engagement and involvement.

Mean responses to the statements below ranged between disagreement and neutrality: (a) the College in its participatory governance process, systematically dialogues, reviews and modifies, as appropriate, all parts of the planning cycle, including institutional and other research