

**Santa Barbara City College  
College Planning Council  
Tuesday, April 7, 2009  
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm  
A218C  
Minutes**

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, O. Arellano, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, S. Broderick, S. Ehrlich, J. Friedlander, T. Garey, M. Guillen, J. Meyer, K. Molloy, C. Ramirez, J. Sullivan

GUESTS: S. Coffield, M. Lin (for C. Avendano), A. Scharper, L. Stark, B. Partee, K. O'Connor

ABSENT: C. Avendano, S. Knotts

**Call to Order**

Superintendent/President Dr. Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of the minutes of the March 17, 2009 CPC meeting.

**M/S/C [Guillen/Molloy] to approve the March 17, 2009 CPC meeting minutes with one minor change.**

**Information Items**

2. Update on the status of state appropriation of funds for SOMA.

- a. Superintendent/President Serban reported that Senator Ducheny, who is the Co-chair of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, has instructed the Department of Finance to not allow us to go for approval of the preliminary plans for SoMA in front of the Public Works Board at their April 10 Meeting. The Senator has directed the Dept. of Finance to take the SoMA Project all the way back to having the entire project re-appropriated as an amendment to the 09-10 Budget. This means that the preliminary plans for SoMA would not be approved until July 2010 at the earliest, taking the project back two years. This committee has the ultimate authority and power to direct the Department of Finance regarding the status and appropriation of money for construction projects, including SoMA. The reasons for the Senator's decision are a combination of unfortunate circumstances. Superintendent/President Serban and VP Sullivan have talked to the State Chancellor's office, the District's public officials, and some of her staff members plus many more people to explain in detail the huge impact this delay would have on the SoMA Project.

- b. Kathy Molloy asked if there is a deadline for the Measure V funding for SoMA to be expended, would it cause problems if SoMA is ultimately denied and would we be able to use those funds for something else on the list?
- c. Superintendent/President Serban responded by saying that legally we can use the funds for something else. However, 85% of the first issues of the bond have to be expended within 3 years and that would be November 2011. If we do not spend 85% then the interest on the bought bonds become taxable, whereas now the interest on these bonds is tax free – the major incentive for buying them. If we spend the money on something else then we may not have money for SoMA. The delay would impact the fundraising efforts as well. There was further discussion regarding a contingency plan if SOMA is delayed and expending 85% of the Measure V bond money. Superintendent/President Serban stated that we will have more concrete information next week and will continue the discussion then.

### 3. Academic Senate resolution on equipment funding – Ignacio Alarcon

- a. Academic Senate President handed out a Resolution passed by the Senate on March 25, 2009. He reported that the Senate has been discussing the process of allocation of funds for equipment that would start a new process beginning in the Fall. He said the Senate feels that the current process together with the program review templates plus all the work the Senate has done on the program review that complies with the accreditation requirements is a good one. He reported that the Senate is concerned that the suggested new process would take the decision away from the people who are closer to the needs: the departments and divisions. After consultation with Superintendent/President Serban, Executive VP Friedlander and Academic President Alarcon will work on a chart to look at the similarities and differences in the processes to the Academic Senate Steering Committee. The Resolution would then be brought back to CPC for discussion. There will be further discussion on this in EC also.
- b. There was further discussion and clarification regarding Fund 41000. Superintendent/President Serban provided a report showing the balances available in each cost center for this fund. Superintendent/President Serban clarified that in the event of a truly critical situation where there is a strong need to pull money from this accounts, it will be pulled. The other point she wanted to make clear is that what is currently available and dispersed to the cost centers is a significant amount which took awhile to build. After the program

## Discussion Items

### 4. Discussion of program reviews resource requests

- a. Educational Programs Non-faculty led student services units.
  - i. Executive VP Friedlander handed out the Resource Requests for Non-Faculty-Led Educational Programs items. He presented and briefly explained the number one Overall Ranking and the Deans' Council Rankings Department by Department.
- b. Approach to ranking resource requests identified in the program reviews.
  - i. Superintendent/President Serban started the discussion with the Equipment and Facilities needs and the money set aside for those needs, money used for E & F purposes only. Depending on how much growth money the college receives, there is still a possibility that we will have some money to spend on at least one or two staff positions, so ranking staff needs is important. Superintendent/President Serban stated that since this is the first time we have gone through this process of ranking technology computer related items for Ed Programs, she questioned if we had time to do what we have done in the past which is to have the ranking go ITC, then to DTC, then to CPC.
  - ii. She stated that there is money for technology and it is coming from sources that can only be used for that. Academic Senate Member O'Connor reported that at the last ITC meeting a motion was approved to have the Ed Program's technology requests sent to ITC for ranking, thereby taken out of the P&R ranking. ITC could start that process of ranking and send the ranking from Ed Programs to DTC. Further discussion about timing ensued. Superintendent/President Serban stated that by the July CPC Meeting, when we will, hopefully, know what happened with the California State Budget, it will be clear what we will be able to spend on the items CPC has ranked. It was decided that the final technology rankings will be brought to the May 5<sup>th</sup> CPC Meeting.
  - iii. Superintendent/President Serban opened the discussion of how CPC wants to rank the various categories. VP Bishop offered his suggestions as he looked at some of Ed Programs requests. He is taking his suggestions to his Directors who can look at the nature of the requests and see where we can save dollars, then bring those ideas to DTC for some consensus about combining some requests, and finding more ways to save costs.

**Web site to access all program reviews online**

□ **HYPERLINK "http://progreviews.sbcc.net" □ <http://progreviews.sbcc.net> □**

**You will be prompted for a login.**

**For username type in**

**sbcc\pipeline username**

**for password use your password for your pipeline account**

5. Discussion of planning agendas identified in the institutional self study.
  - a. Superintendent/President Serban reported that once the planning agendas identified in the Self Study are taken to the Board Study Session on May 14<sup>th</sup> and once the Self Study is approved at the May Board meeting, that is final. She stated that if anybody has a doubt as to whether they can achieve the planning agendas included in the Self study, to communicate to her by April 27. Once it is in there, we have to do it. Executive Vice President Friedlander stated that the Educational Master Plan will be worked on this summer and will bring it to CPC in the Fall.
6. Board Policy on Program Review – Superintendent/President Serban distributed the draft of Board Policy 4170 for discussion asking if any CPC Member had concerns with it. She stated that it needs to go to the May 14<sup>th</sup> study session and then approved the same week the board approves the entire Self–Study. Academic Senate Member Garey asked for a flow chart of how recommendations go to the Board Policies/Administrative Policies Committee (BPAP) and what happens from there. Executive VP Friedlander mentioned that in Dean’s Council there was discussion of a flow process for curriculum tracking and perhaps we could have the same process for BPAP.
7. Framework for evaluating institutional governance and committee structure – draft survey (Attached) – Superintendent/President Serban spoke about the following Objectives from the College Plan 2008-11.

Objective 5.1 In 2008-09, develop a framework for regular evaluation and improvement of institutional shared governance and decision-making structures and processes and conduct the evaluation.).

Objective 5.2 In 2009-10, develop and implement a plan that responds to the evaluation of each constituency group's effectiveness in the shared governance process (College Plan 2008-11).

Superintendent/President Serban reported that although we did not conduct the evaluation (5.1) in 08-09, we do have a draft survey attached to today’s agenda. She requested that the CPC members look at this and bring ideas and suggestions to the table as to how it can be approached.

8. Results of the Workplace Environment Assessment (handout)
  - a. Superintendent/President Serban requested that CPC Members read the results of the Workplace Environment Assessment for the next meeting.
9. Academic Senate Member Garey announced that the Drama Music will open the bids a week from Friday.
10. Accreditation forums: April 10 and April 17

**Meeting was adjourned.**

**Next meeting: Next meeting: Tuesday, April 14, 2009 3:00-4:30pm A218C**

**Santa Barbara City College  
College Planning Council  
Tuesday, April 21, 2009  
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm  
A218C  
Minutes**

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, O. Arellano, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, S. Ehrlich, J. Friedlander, T. Garey, M. Guillen, J. Meyer, C. Ramirez, J. Sullivan

GUESTS: M. Lin (for C. Avendano), K. O'Connor, L. Starke

ABSENT: C. Avendano, S. Knotts, S. Broderick, K. Molloy

**Call to Order**

Superintendent/President Dr. Serban called the meeting to order.

1. Approval of the minutes of the April 14, 2009 CPC meeting.

**M/S/C [Guillen/Bishop] to approve the April 14, 2009 CPC meeting minutes, everyone in favor.**

**Information Items**

2. SBCC nominated for the United Way Outstanding Division Award
  - a. Superintendent/President Serban announced that SBCC was nominated for the United Way Outstanding Education Division Award and recognized VP Bishop for the work he did on the College's United Way campaign. The results will be announced at the May 5<sup>th</sup> Award Banquet organized annually by the United Way.

**Discussion Items**

CSEA President Auchincloss asked what happened with SoMA yesterday. Superintendent/President Serban said nothing has happened yet. The Agenda for the May 8, 2009, Public Works Board Meeting Agenda needs to be put out 10 days in advance, not twenty days in advance. We do not know yet what is happening.

3. Assumptions for the tentative budget for 2009-10.
  - a. VP Sullivan reviewed the handout of the draft of the 09/10 Budget Assumptions for the Tentative Budget. These assumptions do not reflect the results of the May 19<sup>th</sup> 2009 elections. The tentative budget will be presented and discussed at the May

5<sup>th</sup> CPC Meeting. The Board will only pass a tentative budget in June. In September a revised version of the budget – the adopted budget – will be brought forward, as it is the case every year. He stated that we can operate on this tentative budget.

- b. Superintendent/President Serban handed out two copies of Exhibit C – the 09 Apportionment Report. She pointed out how quickly things changed from the February 24<sup>th</sup> report to the March 27<sup>th</sup> report. In those 32 days the revision made was significant. February's allowable Growth Rate for SBCC was 2.55% equaling \$1,740,041. On March 27 was decreased to 2.24% equaling \$1.5 million, a loss of \$200 thousand dollars of revenue for this fiscal year. This report is important because it determines the rest of the money that we will receive this year, and it is the key report that the State Chancellor's Office uses to build the 09-10 budget for each district. She reported that the good news is that Continuing Education's FTES is much better than expected in January. A discussion ensued regarding paying back FTES. Superintendent/President Serban discussed more details from the Exhibit C and stated that the State will have another Exhibit C in June, after the analysis of the FTES districts reported in their P2 apportionment reports which were due on April 20, in which the State may decrease our growth money further, as they see the money that comes from the property taxes, and as they see how much everybody else reported. The Annual Report is due July 15<sup>th</sup> and the Chancellor's office takes about 6 weeks to two months to analyze the FTES information reported by districts. SBCC's Summer enrollments are high on the first day of registration. The discussion continued with strategies about how to deal with this situation of much less growth money, such as possible class cancelations, hybrid classes and classroom sharing.

#### 4. Development of the Educational Master Plan.

- a. Draft by October 2009, finalized by December 15, 2009.
  - i. Superintendent/President Serban reminded CPC members that we are aiming for a draft of the Education Master Plan by October and final plan by December. She provided links to four examples of other college's Education Master Plans (see below). For our May 5 CPC Meeting, she would like Executive VP Friedlander, Academic Senate President Alarcon, VP of Business Services Sullivan and VP Arellano to look at the examples and come with some proposed table of contents or outline for May 5<sup>th</sup>.
- b. Structure
  - i. Examples from other colleges

1. Modesto Junior College  
<http://www.mjc.edu/news/educationmasterplan.html>
  2. Palomar College  
<http://www.palomar.edu/masterplan/>
  3. Foothill-DeAnza  
<http://fhdafiles.fhda.edu/downloads/homefhda/DistEMP.pdf>
  4. Las Positas College  
<http://www.laspositascollege.edu/about/MasterPlanFinal.pdf>
5. Framework for evaluating institutional governance and committee structure – draft survey (attached, also provided on April 7 and April 14).
- a. Discussion of a proposed structure and timeline was postponed to the next CPC Meeting.

Objective 5.1- In 2008-09, develop a framework for regular evaluation and improvement of institutional shared governance and decision-making structures and processes and conduct the evaluation (College Plan 2008-11).

Objective 5.2 - In 2009-10, develop and implement a plan that responds to the evaluation of each constituency group's effectiveness in the shared governance process (College Plan 2008-11).

6. Discussion of the results of the Workplace Environment Assessment (attached, handout also provided on April 7 and April 14) This will be discussed at the next meeting.
7. Discussion of Draft #5 of the Self study posted at <http://www.sbccc.edu/accreditation/index.php?sec=2862>
  - a. Discussion: Superintendent/President Serban thanked everyone for their participation and presentations in the two Accreditation Forums. She posted Draft 5 on the Accreditation web page on April 13. She is working on the “almost-final-edits” with Campus Diversity Director Rodriguez-Kiino. She suggested that everyone read the Standard(s) that applies to their Department. All employees should read Standard IIIA because that standard refers to the various aspects of employment and human resources. Different standards apply to different areas and depending on where one works at the college one may be interested in reading that Standard, e.g. IT read IIC and IIIC; Faculty – IIA; Students IIA and IIB.
  - b. Endorsements on May 5<sup>th</sup> - CSEA President Auchincloss asked if supervisors should give their staff time to read the self-study because the CSEA Consultation Group feels they need to have time to read it before they endorse it. Superintendent/President Serban pointed out that they should read at the minimum IIIA. She also clarified that endorsement means endorsement of the entire process. Information about the Self-Study was made available to the entire campus, Accreditation Forums were held and there were many opportunities to get



engaged, to read the drafts that were posted to the SBCC website and to make suggestions. She pointed out that compared to our last accreditation, the involvement and awareness of the college's accreditation process has increased by 2000% which is what was intended.

- c. Academic Senate P&R representative Meyer asked the President how she felt about our Self-Study so far. Superintendent/President Serban reported that it is a comprehensive and very solid and well written self-study. We are in good shape and on-schedule.

8. Discussion of program reviews resource requests.

a. Resource requests identified in faculty-led program reviews.

- i. Executive VP Friedlander presented the top priority Resource Requests for Instructional Departments and Faculty-Led Student Services. This list was first reviewed by the Academic Senate Planning and Resources Committee (P&R). P&R Representative Meyer reported that the final outcome from the P&R Committee was that they would go with the overall rankings given by the Deans and the Departments' Overall Ranking. Executive VP Friedlander discussed the priority requests up to page 15 one by one. Superintendent/President Serban suggested that everyone read through the rest of this, page 15 – 28 and bring comments and questions for discussion to the next meeting. Also for the next meeting, we are going to compile every Departments' Resource Request lists into one list to look at the overall picture.

- b. Student Senator Lin reported that the Student Senate has talked about three lighting situations that could be a problem and solved easily. The first situation that there is no lighting between the EBS Building, the PE building and the Bookstore. Students make u turns in the cross-walk between these buildings which is dangerous because they do not have full vision in the evening of people crossing. Some suggestions for solutions were that a sign be put up: No U turn and then allowing the cars to go into the driveway to the bookstore so they can make their U-Turn there. The second situation was that there was no emergency lighting in some of the classrooms that needs to be put in. Thirdly, the wi-fi system times out after 10 – 15 minutes of inactivity and is very frustrating when taking a test. VP Bishop said he could have staff change the default or have a sign that warns the students.

- c. Academic Senate Garey stated that it would be helpful to see the breakdown by general division of instruction and business service and by one time and on-going for different categories. He wants to see an overview. Superintendent/President Serban said this will be done for the May 5<sup>th</sup> CPC Meeting. .

9. Items to be covered at the May 5 and May 19 CPC meetings.

- a. The tentative budget will be presented and discussed at the May 5<sup>th</sup> CPC Meeting.
- b. The Educational Master Plan - Proposed table of contents or outline for May 5<sup>th</sup>
- c. Discussion of a proposed structure and timeline for the "Evaluation of the Institutional Governance and Decision Making Structure and Processes".
- d. Resource Requests for Instructional Departments and Faculty-Led Student Services - comments and questions for discussion.
- e. Compile all departments Resource Requests - breakdown by general division of instruction and business service and by one time and on-going and for different categories.
- f. Look at Fund 41.
- g. Self Study endorsement

As meeting was about to be adjourned Superintendent/President Serban saw that she had a call from Sacramento on her cell phone and answered it on the spot. It was Fred Harris, Assistant Vice Chancellor at the State Chancellor's Office with news that the SoMA preliminary plans will be allowed to move forward for approval. Everyone applauded and congratulated Superintendent/President Serban as well as all those who assisted her in obtaining this very positive outcome for a difficult situation.

**Meeting adjourned.**

**Next meeting:** Tuesday, May 5, 2009 3:00-4:30pm A218C

**BP 4170 PROGRAM REVIEW**

***Reference: Education Code Section 78016; Accreditation Standard I.B; BP2510***

Santa Barbara City College requires systematic review of all instructional, [faculty-led](#) student services, and operational programs and units for the purpose of evaluating and improving effectiveness and integration with the institution's planning and budgeting processes. The Superintendent/President, in consultation with the appropriate shared governance groups as stipulated in Board Policy 2510, ensures that procedures are developed and implemented for conducting instructional, faculty-led student services, and operational unit program reviews.

**BP 2410 BOARD POLICY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE**

*Reference: Education Code Section 70902; Accreditation Standard IV.B.1.b & e; BP 2510*

The Board may adopt such policies as are authorized by law or determined by the Board to be necessary for the efficient operation of the District. Board policies are statements of intent by the Board on a specific issue within its subject matter jurisdiction.

The policies have been written to be consistent with provisions of law, but do not encompass all laws relating to [eDistrict](#) activities.

Policies of the Board may be adopted, revised, added to or amended at any regular Board meeting by a majority vote. Proposed changes or additions shall be introduced not less than one regular meeting or Educational Policies Committee or Study Session of the Board prior to the meeting at which action is recommended.

Administrative procedures are statements of method to be used in implementing Board Policy. Administrative procedures are to be issued and revised by the Superintendent/President, in consultation with the appropriate shared governance groups as stipulated in Board Policy 2510. Such administrative procedures shall be consistent with the intent of Board Policy.

The Superintendent/President shall provide each member of the Board with any revisions since the last time they were reviewed. The Board reserves the right to direct revisions of the administrative procedures should they, in the Board's judgment, be inconsistent with the Board's own policies.

Board policies and administrative procedures shall be electronically available to District employees through the District website as maintained by the [Human Resources and Legal Affairs Department](#)Office of the Superintendent/President.

# Evaluation of the Institutional Governance and Decision Making Structure and Processes DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION April 7, 2009

The College Plan 2008-11 includes two objectives aimed at establishing a regular evaluation and improvement of institutional shared governance and decision-making structures and processes, conduct the evaluation and using the results to make changes as needed. The results of this survey will help the College to achieve these two objectives,

Please complete this survey reflecting on your experience while participating in the institutional governance committees. Melanie Rogers will distribute, collect and then tabulate and summarize the results. Responses will remain confidential and anonymous. **Please complete only one survey even if you serve on more than one committee.** Thank you.

Direct questions to Melanie Rogers.

**Please make your marks as follows:**

Like this:  Not like this:

1. Today's Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Participant Profile

2. What is your position in the college?

Position       Administration       Dept. Chair       Faculty       Staff       Student

Hours       Full time       Part time

Primary Campus       Main       Schott       Wake

3. How many different institutional governance committees have you served on in during the 2008-09 academic year?

1       2       3       4       5 or more

4. Check each committee you served on during the 2008-09 Academic year?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> College Planning Council      | <input type="radio"/> Student Senate         |
| <input type="radio"/> District Technology Committee | <input type="radio"/> Planning and Resources |
| <input type="radio"/> Academic Senate               | <input type="radio"/> Curriculum             |
| <input type="radio"/> Instructional Technology      |  |
| <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify)        |  |

6. Did you receive an orientation on how the governance system functions when you started serving on a committee?

Yes       No       Don't recall       Did not require an orientation

If no, what would you recommend?

7. Did you receive adequate or specialized training to make decisions when you started serving on a committee?

- Yes       No       Don't recall       Did not require special training

If no, what would you recommend?

8. What training would you like to receive or would recommend for a new member?

- Budgeting                                       Conflict Resolution                                       Consensus Decision Making  
 How to chair a meeting                       Leadership     Meeting Management  
 Parliamentary Procedures                       Other (Comment below)

Comment:

9. Check the committee you are evaluating today.

- College Planning Council                                       Student Senate  
 District Technology Committee                                       Planning and Resources  
 Academic Senate     Curriculum  
 Instructional Technology  
 Other (please specify)

10. How often do (did) you attend committee meetings?

- Occasionally (approx. half the meetings or fewer)                                       All the time (missed two meetings at most)  
 Regularly (more than half the meetings)     Perfect Attendance

11. Consider your experience on the Committee selected above. For each statement below please mark: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

<u>Task</u>	<u>Statement</u>	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
1.	Agendas, minutes and ancillary materials were provided electronically prior to the committee meetings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.	In general, the objectives of each committee meeting were clear and understood.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.	The discussions usually followed the agenda.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.	Committees completed the agenda in an efficient and timely manner.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5.	Action items and parties responsible were clearly articulated.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- |  |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 6. Action items were assigned and completed in a timely fashion.     | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7. Standardized procedures were identified and followed.             | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8. Committee chair or co-chairs were effective in managing meetings. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Information Adequacy**

- |  |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 9. The committee members had appropriate information to make informed decisions. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 10. Discussion and decisions were data driven and supported by sound evidence.   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Participation**

- |   |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 11. All constituent groups had an opportunity to participate on College committees. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 12. All members attended regularly.   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 13. All members were encouraged to be actively involved.                            | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 14. All members participated in the discussion and decision making process.         | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 15. Decisions were made by consensus.   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Statement**

**SA      A      N      D      SD**

**Professional Conduct & Respectful Dialogue**

- |  |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 16. Different opinions and values were respected.            | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 17. Committee members were always respectful of all members. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Overall**

- |  |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 18. Participation in the committee was important and valuable to the college.                | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 19. The committee charge was understood and the members worked toward fulfilling the charge. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 20. Committees have means to evaluate the effectiveness of its decisions and actions.        | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 21. Meetings were positive and constructive.   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 22. Committees acted in accordance with Title 5 Participatory Governance guidelines.         | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 23. Overall, I am satisfied with the Committee's   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

performance.

24. I was an effective participant.

**25. Please use the space below to provide any written comments about the institutional governance and committee structure in general and any specific committees. Include general comments, specific observations regarding positive or negative occurrences, suggestions for improvement. Use the other side as needed. Thank you.**