

## PGS Member Survey Results, Spring 2011

**Instructions for 2011 Participatory Governance System Committee Member Survey: Please evaluate your experience as a member of the PGS committee you select below for 2010-2011. Your responses are anonymous. Survey results will be used by the Governance Review Council to evaluate the system and make recommendations for improvement.**

<b>1. I am</b>		
an Administrator	12	29%
a Faculty Member	8	20%
a Classified Staff Member	18	44%
a Student	3	7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>2. I am:</b>		
Full time	39	95%
Part time	2	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>3. Check each committee you served on this Academic year:</b>		
College Council	14	34%
Educational Planning Committee	2	5%
Facilities Planning Committee	5	12%
Governance Review Council	9	22%
Instructional Equipment Committee	4	10%
Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC)	9	22%
Professional Development Committee	4	10%
Student Access and Success Committee	3	7%
Technology Planning Committee	6	15%

**4. Check the committee you are evaluating on this survey.**

College Council	9	22%
Educational Planning Committee	2	5%
Facilities Planning Committee	5	12%
Governance Review Council	6	15%
Instructional Equipment Committee	4	10%
Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC)	4	10%
Professional Development Committee	3	7%
Student Access and Success Committee	3	7%
Technology Planning Committee	5	12%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>

Consider your experience on the Participatory Governance Committee you selected in the four categories listed below. For each statement please mark: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

**COMMITTEE TASKS****5. Agendas, minutes and ancillary materials were provided electronically prior to the committee meetings.**

Strongly Agree	33	80%
Agree	4	10%
Disagree	2	5%
Strongly Disagree	2	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>

**6. In general, the objectives of each committee meeting were clear and understood.**

Strongly Agree	26	63%
Agree	11	27%
Disagree	2	5%
Strongly Disagree	2	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>

**7. The discussions usually followed the agenda.**

Strongly Agree	24	59%
Agree	14	34%
Disagree	1	2%
Strongly Disagree	2	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>

**8. Meeting agendas were completed in a constructive, timely and efficient manner.**

Strongly Agree	25	61%
Agree	13	32%
Disagree	1	2%
Strongly Disagree	2	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>

**9. Action items and parties responsible were clearly articulated.**

Strongly Agree	20	50%
Agree	15	38%
Disagree	3	8%
Strongly Disagree	2	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>

**10. Committee chair or co-chairs were effective in managing meetings.**

Strongly Agree	24	59%
Agree	14	34%
Disagree	1	2%
Strongly Disagree	2	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>

**INFORMATION ADEQUACY****11. Committee members had appropriate information to make informed recommendations.**

Strongly Agree	22	55%
Agree	13	32%
Disagree	2	5%
Strongly Disagree	3	8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>

**12. Discussion and recommendations were data driven and supported by evidence.**

Strongly Agree	20	50%
Agree	17	42%
Disagree	1	2%
Strongly Disagree	2	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>

**PARTICIPATION****13. Committee members attended regularly.**

Strongly Agree	11	28%
Agree	23	58%
Disagree	4	10%
Strongly Disagree	2	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>

**14. All members were encouraged to participate in discussions and provide input into decisions and recommendations.**

Strongly Agree	29	72%
Agree	8	20%
Disagree	2	5%
Strongly Disagree	1	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>

**15. Decisions and recommendations were made by consensus.**

Strongly Agree	26	65%
Agree	11	28%
Disagree	2	5%
Strongly Disagree	1	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>

**16. Participation in this PGS committee was important and valuable to the College.**

Strongly Agree	26	65%
Agree	13	32%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly Disagree	1	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>

## RESPECTFUL DIALOGUE

### 17. Different opinions and values were respected.

Strongly Agree	29	72%
Agree	9	22%
Disagree	1	2%
Strongly Disagree	1	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>

## COMMITTEE CHARGE

### 18. I understand my committee's charge and responsibilities.

Strongly Agree	25	61%
Agree	12	29%
Disagree	2	5%
Strongly Disagree	2	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>

### 19. Our committee worked effectively towards fulfilling its charge and responsibilities.

Strongly Agree	19	49%
Agree	17	44%
Disagree	1	3%
Strongly Disagree	2	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>

### 20. Our committee's recommendations and proposals moved through the Participatory Governance System and received a response.

Strongly Agree	10	25%
Agree	17	42%
Disagree	1	2%
Strongly Disagree	2	5%
Not Applicable	2	5%
Unknown	7	18%
Other, please specify: We never met.	1	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>

**21. Overall, I am satisfied with the Participatory Governance System.**

Strongly Agree	18	45%
Agree	18	45%
Disagree	3	8%
Strongly Disagree	1	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>

**22. Please use the space below to provide any written comments about the Participatory Governance System in general and/or specific committees. Feel free to include general comments, specific observations regarding positive or negative occurrences, or suggestions for improvement. Thank you.**

10 Responses:

Respondent #

Response

- 1 It seems at times that the aim and outcome are to "invented" in that all the information needed by committee is not provided by the administration
- 2 In general, I think the PGS is working pretty well.
- 3 This committee seemed especially thoughtful about wanting to make the right decisions to make beneficial contributions for the College, organized and productive
- 4 Participatory Governance works if it is clearly defined and implemented correctly. Having served in the California Community system for over 30 years, it is rare that I have seen it defined and implemented correctly. In my opinion, Participatory Governance has created a system by which managers and administrators are hampered from performing their duties and responsibilities in a timely manner. It is as if one is looking at th workings of an organization in slow motion.
- 5 Because Ed planning did not meet, please disregard the disagree remarks for the first batch of questions. REally they are N/A

- 6 The Instructional Equipment Committee used a pretty vague rubric that was hard for the committee to assess given limits of its knowledge & the complicated tasks at hand. It was simply impossible to fulfill the tasks using the prescribed process without devoting whole days to a thorough reading of all Program Reviews, together with interviews of chairs or others who might provide additional info - something that is clearly impossible to do in a meaningful & effective way given everyone's time constraints. Program Reviews used were too much for the committee to work with, and again, responses were vague or interpreted differently by folks. (E.g.; "How many students will this serve?" - does this refer to annually, per semester, by course, etc.? Everyone answered the question differently, so that Auto Collision apparently serves more students than does English Skills!) The Program Review process would be useful for chairs in gathering information and prioritizing needs in their own areas - however it would then seem more effective to have elected chairs work with
- 7 My experience in SAS this year is counter to any other experience I have had in COM governance over the past five years. The committee needs a new format and charge. We met only once with a quorum this year and the time spent in the non-meetings was unproductive. This committee has important work in implementing the Equity Plan and the
- 8 Our committee unanimously agreed that elimination of the instructional equipment funding in Sacramento left our committee with the need to re-examine its purpose and procedures. We also agreed that the data provided were not sufficient to allow us to make the best decisions. As for the participatory governance system in general, it will never be more than a social exercise as long as its decisions are only recommendations and not binding on the College.
- 9 encourage everyone to express your thoughts

10 We all serve as equal members and are driven by a strong sence of american knowhow and duty. I am very happy to part of this commitee.