2012-13 PIEAC Committee Evaluation Survey

1. Please identify your position with the college:

		Response Percent	Response Count
Full-time Faculty		**38.1%**	**8**
Part-time Faculty		9.5%	2
Classified Staff		14.3%	3
Administration		**38.1%**	**8**
Student		0.0%	0
		answered question	**21**
		skipped question	**0**

2. How long have you served continuously on this committee?

		Response Percent	Response Count
1st year (New members)		**47.6%**	**10**
2 years		28.6%	6
3 years		4.8%	1
4 – 5 years		9.5%	2
More than 5 years		9.5%	2
		answered question	**21**
		skipped question	**0**

3. Do you expect to serve on this committee again next year?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	**71.4%**	**15**
No	4.8%	1
Unsure	23.8%	5
	answered question	**21**
	skipped question	**0**

4. On how many other Coastline committees did you serve on this year?

	Response Percent	Response Count
1 committee	9.5%	2
2 committees	9.5%	2
3 committees	28.6%	6
4 committees	9.5%	2
More than 5 committees	**42.9%**	**9**
	answered question	**21**
	skipped question	**0**

5. Please rate how often the committee’s processes, interactions, and outcomes during 2012-13 reflected each of the following characteristics:

	Almost always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Rating Count
COLLABORATIVE: Sharing, inclusive, open to input, respectful of diverse opinions, characterized by meaningful dialogue	**47.6% (10)**	28.6% (6)	23.8% (5)	0.0% (0)	21
TRANSPARENT: Open, easy to understand, clearly defined, characterized by effective and meaningful communication with the College community	33.3% (7)	**42.9% (9)**	23.8% (5)	0.0% (0)	21
EVIDENCE-BASED: Reliant upon relevant, accurate, complete, timely qualitative and/or quantitative information; not based solely on assertion, speculation, or anecdote	33.3% (7)	**38.1% (8)**	23.8% (5)	4.8% (1)	21
EFFECTIVE: Working properly and productively toward the committee's intended results	19.0% (4)	38.1% (8)	**42.9% (9)**	0.0% (0)	21
EFFICIENT: Performing well with the least waste of time and effort; characterized by serving the committee's specified purposes in the best possible manner	14.3% (3)	23.8% (5)	**47.6% (10)**	14.3% (3)	21
				answered question	**21**
				skipped question	**0**

6. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements related to your service on the committee overall:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Rating Count
I feel comfortable contributing ideas	**47.6% (10)**	38.1% (8)	14.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	21
My ideas are treated with respect, whether or not others agree with them	**47.6% (10)**	**47.6% (10)**	0.0% (0)	4.8% (1)	21
I have had sufficient opportunities to provide input into committee recommendations	**50.0% (10)**	**50.0% (10)**	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	20
				answered question	**21**
				skipped question	**0**

7. Please rate the following aspects of the committee's work:

	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Rating Count
Quality of communication within the committee	33.3% (7)	**57.1% (12)**	9.5% (2)	0.0% (0)	21
Quality of information flow from the committee to constituency groups	9.5% (2)	**71.4% (15)**	19.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	21
Quality of information flow from constituency groups to the committee	14.3% (3)	**61.9% (13)**	23.8% (5)	0.0% (0)	21
Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a whole	0.0% (0)	**66.7% (14)**	23.8% (5)	9.5% (2)	21
Access to information needed for deliberations	10.0% (2)	**65.0% (13)**	25.0% (5)	0.0% (0)	20
Appropriateness of meeting space	33.3% (7)	**57.1% (12)**	9.5% (2)	0.0% (0)	21
Access to other resources needed for the committee to work effectively	14.3% (3)	**61.9% (13)**	23.8% (5)	0.0% (0)	21
				answered question	**21**
				skipped question	**0**

8. Rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Rating Count
The mandate and charge of the committee was clearly understood by committee members.	28.6% (6)	**42.9% (9)**	28.6% (6)	0.0% (0)	21
Meetings were held at the regularly scheduled time.	47.6% (10)	**52.4% (11)**	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
Meeting agendas were available to members at the start of each committee meeting.	33.3% (7)	**66.7% (14)**	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	21
Draft minutes of prior meetings were available to members at the start of each committee meeting for approval.	19.0% (4)	**52.4% (11)**	23.8% (5)	4.8% (1)	21
The committee started on time (within 5 minutes of expected start time).	42.9% (9)	**52.4% (11)**	4.8% (1)	0.0% (0)	21
The committee ended on time (within 5 minutes of expected end time).	5.0% (1)	25.0% (5)	**50.0% (10)**	20.0% (4)	20
The length of the meetings was adequate to perform the work of the committee.	14.3% (3)	**57.1% (12)**	19.0% (4)	9.5% (2)	21
The chair (co-chair) operated the committee effectively.	35.0% (7)	**45.0% (9)**	20.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	20
				answered question	**21**
				skipped question	**0**

9. Please enter this committee's most significant accomplishment this year.

	Response Count
	8
answered question	**8**
skipped question	**13**

10. Please enter the improvement most needed by this committee.

	Response Count
	12
answered question	**12**
skipped question	**9**

Q9. Please enter this committee's most significant accomplishment this year.		
1	Reorganization of planning process.	May 17, 2013 3:33 PM
2	Prioritization of requests from Annual Program Reviews	May 15, 2013 12:17 PM
3	Approved a Master Plan and budget.	May 13, 2013 2:49 PM
4	The documentation of the Planning Cycle handbook is a great start.	May 13, 2013 8:49 AM
5	Some planning occurred and some institutional goals were adequately tracked. I think the most significant thing this year was coming to grips with how complex and challenging planning for institutional effectiveness is. As a result of re-writing the process, I think the committee discovered that there were some appropriate and useful practices from the past that need to be reinstated.	May 10, 2013 4:12 PM
6	Getting documents relevant to accreditation written, vetted, evaluated in an efficient manner.	May 10, 2013 3:48 PM
7	Organized and finalized "documents"--the plan to plan. Now we need to actually plan and carry out the plan.	May 10, 2013 3:15 PM
8	Prioritization	May 10, 2013 1:16 PM

Q10. Please enter the improvement most needed by this committee.		
1	Evaluation of Wing needs and their prioritization.	May 17, 2013 3:33 PM
2	Time management and specific timelines need to improve. Be inclusive across all constituency groups.	May 15, 2013 4:55 PM
3	Interacting efficiently with Program Review	May 15, 2013 12:17 PM
4	We need to schedule the wing requests sooner in the spring and to make prioritization sooner. We also need plenty of time to prioritize the requests (2 days is not enough!). This year, the schedule was set back because of accreditation; let's hope that next year we will be back on schedule.	May 15, 2013 12:13 PM
5	Committee's procedures for decision making need to be designed, as they once were, with respect for the wing leaders' expertise and their ability to prioritize the needs of their respective wings. When wing leaders' priorities are presented early on, the committee then has the opportunity to discuss relevance to the Master Plan and allow the wing leaders to defend their priorities. This is the kind of collegial decision-making process long-term members are accustomed to.	May 13, 2013 2:49 PM
6	The committee needs work groups to get specifics developed and agreed upon. The committee needs to be more specific as to what is going to be done at each phase of planning.	May 13, 2013 8:49 AM
7	Communicate more clearly the general budgeting parameters and require prioritization of requests.	May 12, 2013 5:07 PM
8	This committee needs to review why meetings lasted so long, change the format of the agenda and not always include wing updates if there are other agenda items that are pressing and stick to the mandate of the committee. The process for funding is way too cumbersome and requires to much of wing leaders and those that have to provide details. There is a flawed system in how priorities are determined. There is too much wasted time spent on this when there is no money available, especially for long-term planning.	May 12, 2013 12:02 PM
9	We're working on it! We evaluated the committee performance and found lots of room for improvement. We are revisiting the timelines and calendars associated with planning and budgeting.	May 10, 2013 4:12 PM
10	The committee meetigns need to flow better. Sometimes, too much time is spent on certain items and pushes agenda items back.	May 10, 2013 3:48 PM
11	There is too much work that needs to be completed by this committee than ever got addressed. This past year it mainly "planned to plan." A strong leader other than the VP needs to chair it--someone with time to organize and plan for the committee meetings. //There also needs to be staff assigned to the committee so minutes can be better organized. //Also, no-one ever got assigned to implement the individual strategic plans, ie., who would carry out the strategic plans, how they would be acheived. //I don't think this evaluation tool evaluates whether PIEAC met its objectives. The goal of the committee should be stated, and respondents should be asked whether they think the committee met that goal.	May 10, 2013 3:15 PM
12	Communication of goals to the college	May 10, 2013 1:16 PM