

2016 RARS Effectiveness Survey

11/29/2016

	Survey Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1.	I am familiar with the SAC Resource Allocation Request (RARs) process?	54%	23%	12%	8%	8%	
2.	The communication throughout the Resource Allocation Request process was satisfactory.	15%	15%	35%	31%	4%	
3.	The intent of the Resource Allocation Request process is clear, and I believe the RAR process has a high level of validity.	15%	27%	38%	12%	12%	
4.	I was satisfied with the RAR process outcomes at the end of the funding cycle.	8%	19%	46%	23%	8%	
	If you disagreed or strongly disagreed with #4, please explain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have no idea what the outcomes have been! That doesn't seem to be shared with all faculty, just those who get what they asked for, I guess. I would be nice to know the results, how non-funded requests were evaluated, etc. There seems to be no follow-up.</li> <li>• I think the departments, and the division, are underfunded. Departments don't even have budgets to work with. We have no monies for supplies or professional development. We need more input on how to use these resources, if we even had them to begin with. Also, we need more information from our deans explaining how that money is allocated to each division and each department. That has not been made clear.</li> <li>• I fill out a RAR and get no feedback as to why nothing was funded. It's possible that nothing requested should be funded; however, to be left hanging with no feedback is not appropriate.</li> <li>• The process changes each year, along with the due dates, form, etc. Decisions related to how the requests are prioritized is never clear or transparent.</li> <li>• The process is not transparent to all levels of the institution.</li> <li>• The process is obscure beyond the department level. I don't know how the final decisions are made.</li> <li>• I have requested items for many years and have had little response.</li> <li>• The lack of satisfaction is with the lack of communication when requests have not been approved. RAR's are turned in but information as to why the request was denied etc. never comes back to the originator in any form.</li> <li>• Feels like the RAR is turned in but never any further information.</li> </ul>					
5.	I participated in the RARs process at the division/department level.	54%	35%	8%	0%	8%	

2016 RARS Effectiveness Survey

11/29/2016

	Survey Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
6.	I was kept informed by my supervisor as we progressed through the RARs process.	24%	24%	20%	16%	20%	
7.	The RAR process effectively linked our division/department goals to our program review objectives.	19%	27%	31%	19%	8%	
8.	Once the overall RARs process was complete, the funded division/department requests information was shared within our department.	19%	42%	12%	8%	19%	
9.	Did you experience any challenges with the overall RAR process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing was shared with any COMPLETE status.</li> <li>• the form itself is sometimes hard to work with.</li> <li>• The challenge was filling it out correctly in order to get funds.</li> <li>• None</li> <li>• Had no idea what was going on</li> <li>• The form is difficult to complete and not user friendly</li> <li>• It took a long time from submission to final funding.</li> <li>• The only challenge was how time consuming it was to complete.</li> <li>• Yes. The process is not transparent, timing is limited and the form changes regularly.</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• After the funding is approved, and stuff bought and paid for, what is the result of intended outcomes? This would guide us in producing RARs for the following year.</li> <li>• The process changes frequently.</li> <li>• What belongs in a RAR? All identified instructional materials? We've been told too many varying explanations of what is and what isn't a RAR associated equipment and instructional materials request.</li> <li>• Not really. Is pretty straight forward.</li> </ul>					
10.	What changes to the RAR process, if any, would benefit the effectiveness and/or efficiency of the process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Put the entire process online. So that I can look for myself what was prioritized, by whom and the results.</li> <li>• The form is somewhat daunting to complete. can we have a more streamline form?</li> <li>• Educate the deans, clerical staff, and especially the faculty on what this is, what the process is and what the actual budget numbers are.</li> <li>• N/A</li> <li>• More explanation</li> </ul>					

2016 RARS Effectiveness Survey

11/29/2016

	Survey Questions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have more transparency related to organizational priorities for funding, timelines and timeframes that are standardized and articulated clearly, developing a user friendly form.</li> <li>• RARs need to include only those items that are above &amp; beyond operating budget. The ranking process should work by category of funding (personnel, facilities, equipment, etc) rather than as an over ll.</li> <li>• None</li> <li>• It would be great if the RARs for each department could be tied electronically to program review SLOs, and institutional information.</li> <li>• My Department is very thoughtful when it comes to requesting resources. We only ask for items that are truly critical to success of our program and students. So it feels abandoned sometimes when our requests which have been put in RARs for a couple of years and not approved. In addition, any guidance on why items are not approved would be helpful.</li> <li>• The RAR process is one of many processes in place. There are separate processes for lottery funds, one time purchases, and maybe others. The RAR requests are often bypassed by these other processes.</li> <li>• Program review should impact decisions. It appears that funds are distributing based upon program size, FTES generation, or something?</li> <li>• Closing the loop whether the request was approved or NOT approved.</li> </ul>					
11.	To better evaluate our data, please indicate your job classification below.	16 Faculty	1 Staff	9 Administrators			