1. At which site do you work? Please check all that apply.

- District Office (Dublin) 4
- District Office (Pleasanton) 0
- Chabot College 13
- Las Positas College 9

2. On which committee do you serve? Please check all that apply.

- District Planning and Budget Committee 10
- District Technology Coordination 7
- District Facilities Committee 10
3. Constituency group leaders are aware of the member appointment process.

Discussion:
- Sometimes as leadership changes, I don’t think new leaders are well informed.
- While the committee has frequently discussed the balance among the sites, when it comes to voting, the representatives tend to vote in blocks, which means if we disagree on an issue, we make no progress.
- Several members should be on the committee by default because their roles are integral on how technology works in the district. They shouldn't have to be appointed by senates and bargaining units.
- Some of the IPBM committee memberships are not current on websites.

4. Committee members are aware of the committee chair selection process.

Discussion:
- It seems most chair appointments often roll over from year to year.
5. **Committee members are aware of their term length and responsibilities.**
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**Comments:**
- I'm not sure they always are informed of this.
- It seems most chair appointments often roll over from year to year

6. **The membership allows for effective shared governance participation.**
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**Comments:**
- While the committee has frequently discussed the balance among the sites, when it comes to voting, the representatives tend to vote in blocks, which means if we disagree on an issue, we make no progress.
- Not sure what is being asked by "effective shared governance participation"
- District Tech Committee seems to see itself as gatekeeper for college technology proposals
7. The number of committee members is appropriate.
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Comments:
- PBC is very big, I understand why but it isn't always the best size to get things done or come to consensus. And the voices are dominated by the faculty.
- While the committee has frequently discussed the balance among the sites, when it comes to voting, the representatives tend to vote in blocks, which means if we disagree on an issue, we make no progress.
- While a large group, it is essential for broad dialogue, transparency, and consensus building.
- The membership is quite large. Does it really need so many members?

8. Committee members have the opportunity to provide input into agendas.

![Bar chart showing survey results for committee members providing input into agendas.]

Comments:
- Committee member input opportunities seem to be inconsistent; role of IPBM committees appear to be viewed differently between committees.
9. **Agendas are published in advance with time for review.**
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Comments:
- Committee material is often provided during the meeting or only viewed on screen. This does not allow for committee work and dialogue to be as effective as it could be.

10. **Committee meets regularly, as scheduled.**
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Comments:
- The conversations are elaborate and complicated, leads to spinning wheels at times. But tough conversations need direction and follow-through, not curtailment.
- Several meetings are canceled each year due to holidays and commencement.
11. Minutes are taken, widely publicized and easily accessible.

Comments:
- Some IPBM committee agendas and minutes are outdated.

12. The committee charter or charge is appropriate.

Comments:
- It is not clear to me where integrated "PLANNING" occurs. In my view, we have been and continue to not take active steps to manage our situation--specifically to dramatically increase retention or address our financial situation. The latter is complex, I realize, but I don't think we're actively managing for a good outcome.
- Opportunities for analyzing interpretation of committee charge and role may help empower all stakeholders.
13. **Committee sets goals at the beginning of the year.**

- **Strongly agree**: 5
- **Agree**: 11
- **Neutral**: 2
- **Disagree**: 2
- **Strongly disagree**: 0
- **Unsure or Not Applicable**: 0

Comments:
- I'm unsure as to how the committees set goals for the year in ways that are inclusive of college needs.

14. **Committee provides feedback on issues to the colleges and the District.**

- **Strongly agree**: 7
- **Agree**: 9
- **Neutral**: 3
- **Disagree**: 1
- **Strongly disagree**: 0
- **Unsure or Not Applicable**: 0

Comments:
- I'm not sure how effective this communication is.
- The feedback comes from the reps, not from the committee.
15. The committee provides an opportunity for meaningful dialogue and decision making.

- Strongly agree: 6
- Agree: 10
- Neutral: 3
- Disagree: 1
- Strongly disagree: 0
- Unsure or Not Applicable: 0

Comments:
- At times, the voices are mostly faculty, sometimes they have great input and other times they just repeat the same things which just draws the meeting out. Also, there is a certain amount of bullying that goes on from at least one faculty member.
- There has been significantly less participation in zoom-held meetings. I am hopeful that I return to face to face will help.
- Some challenges exist with recommendations to improve college operations in service to student equity and success.

16. Decisions and recommendations made by this committee consider college educational master plans and/or the district-wide strategic plan as appropriate.

- Strongly agree: 7
- Agree: 10
- Neutral: 2
- Disagree: 1
- Strongly disagree: 0
- Unsure or Not Applicable: 0

Comments:
- I'm not sure every member is aware of the master or strategic plans. Which we should review every year.
- I think we need to be more student-centered. e.g., we dropped students AGAIN this year for nonpayment despite a commitment not to do that again.
17. Committee identifies opportunities for college-to-college/district collaboration.
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Comments:
- Disparities between college amenities suggest lack of opportunity for college-to-college collaborations.

18. Decisions are data driven and based on evidence.
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Comments:
- I think most of the time this is true. Other times decisions are based on a perceived inequity.
- The problem isn't about the data. The problem is very different views of that data.
- More could be done here to improve this.
- Generally, data is presented to inform decisions, but sometimes decisions are made without full data analysis.
19. Committee operates with a districtwide perspective.

- Strongly agree: 6
- Agree: 8
- Neutral: 2
- Disagree: 3
- Strongly disagree: 1
- Unsure or Not Applicable: 0

Comments:
- I don't believe this is always true. It has been better lately. But if you look at votes you will see the sites all vote alike.
- I often think that we discuss things from that perspective but vote from a college perspective.
- Often times conversations and decision points that ought to be aired out at the college are instead being brought to be dealt at a district committee. Unproductive.
- Dialogue seems to be mostly grounded in committee members' positional perspectives.

20. Committee meets the milestones and goals it sets at the beginning of the year.

- Strongly agree: 5
- Agree: 8
- Neutral: 4
- Disagree: 2
- Strongly disagree: 0
- Unsure or Not Applicable: 1

Comments:
- This committee gets stuck a lot and it is frustrating.
- I am extremely disappointed that we have not adopted a new allocation model.
- No need to rush to the milestones but ensure quality with honest conversation and clear objectives.
21. Committee issues a year-end report to the Chancellor with lessons learned, accomplishments, and recommendations for future topics to address.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure or Not Applicable</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- I'm unsure about this one.
- If we did, I don't remember seeing it or discussing it.

22. Committee meeting reminders are emailed prior to meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure or Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: None
23. There is a clear flow of communication from chair to members and between members.

- Strongly agree: 7
- Agree: 10
- Neutral: 2
- Disagree: 1
- Strongly disagree: 0
- Unsure or Not Applicable: 0

Comments: None

24. Committee members report out to their constituency groups.

- Strongly agree: 6
- Agree: 7
- Neutral: 4
- Disagree: 1
- Strongly disagree: 0
- Unsure or Not Applicable: 2

Comments:
- I'm not sure how well this is going. I try to but sometimes meetings are difficult.
- I have no way of know if this happens at the other college, but it does happen at my college.
- I believe this to be the case, but am not sure that I can speak for all members.
- Varies.
25. There is a clear pathway for communication between the district committee and the applicable college committees.

Comments:
- I don't think these committees communicate well.

26. All decisions are documented and communicated.

Comments:
- This is unclear to me. PBC makes recommendations not decisions. I am not sure if those recommendations are communicated with all the sites (other than through the minutes), or whether the Chancellor actively communicates actions on those recommendations. This is a problem across the district and college in my view. The only way you would know about recommendations is to READ ALL THE COMMITTEE minutes, and no one has time for that. No effective "dash board" or summary seems to exist for either district or college committees. We make it hard to KNOW rather than easy.
- Not all decisions are documented in meeting minutes from past two years.
27. **Information and decisions are shared districtwide.**
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**Comments:**
- Chabot college does a good job of communicating meetings/agendas regarding our meeting, but LPC & the District don't. I believe the committee chair needs to send a district wide meeting invite.
- This is unclear to me. PBC makes recommendations not decisions. I am not sure if those recommendations are communicated with all the sites (other than through the minutes), or whether the Chancellor actively communicates actions on those recommendations. This is a problem across the district and college in my view. The only way you would know about recommendations is to READ ALL THE COMMITTEE minutes, and no one has time for that. No effective "dash board" or summary seems to exist for either district or college committees. We make it hard to KNOW rather than easy.
- I believe this to be the case, but am not sure that I can speak for all members.
28. Overall, college and district educational missions are the foundation of decisions made within the IPBM structure.

Comments:
- This is a complex question. The balancing act between being student-driven and a well-functioning organization is tricky, particularly in the environment we have been and continue to be in.
29. Overall, college educational master plans and/or the district-wide strategic plan are the foundation for recommendations made by IPBM committees, as applicable.

Comments:
- In spirit yes, but not explicitly. There is not "We are making decision A because of its alignment with strategic plan item X.9.c". The essence of alignment is always there, as we as professionals in the education sphere have generally aligned goals, we just do not explicitly state how particular decisions support specific aspects of the master plans. I do not think we really need to though, as that would likely just add superfluous work without any real benefits - it would just be ticking off boxes.
- This is a complex question. The balancing act between being student-driven and a well-functioning organization is tricky, particularly in the environment we have been and continue to be in.
30. Overall, the IPBM process is easy to understand.

Comments:
- This is both yes and no. If you are familiar with it, then somewhat yes. But if you are coming in cold, then not at all. This is true of a multi-step and complicated process, so this is a non-issue.
- I think what is documented and what is actually going on are not the same.
- No, I don't think it is always clear what the relationship between the process and what SLT decides without regard to input from the process.

31. Overall, the IPBM process provides an adequate forum for shared participation in the decision-making process.

Comments:
- I think it can with some changes.
- The process is ok, communication about various decisions is less clear.
32. **Budget decisions made through the IPBM process reflect student needs and intent to improve student learning and achievement.**
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**Comments:**
- In my view, this is one area we could improve in.
- More could be done for this to be true.

33. **Decisions made via the IPBM process are transparent and communicated broadly throughout the district.**
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**Comments:**
- Again, both yes and no. In general, most decisions are shared, but perhaps not understood, as background and familiarity are required to truly grasp many decisions. So shared? Yes. Communicated, which includes being understood by the receiving party - perhaps not so much, at least across all/most district constituents. Most people just want the bottom line of how it affects them, not all the details.
- I've made it clear, I am not sure that DECISIONS are communicated broadly or effectively (and those are not the same thing).
34. The IPBM process allows for autonomous decision making at the college level.

Comments:
- Somewhat or mostly agree.
- I'm not sure if it's the budgeting process or the IPBM structure that contributes to the decision making at the college level. I'm not sure what you are asking for in this question.
- It allows for it, and in many ways, autonomy is practiced. But, in other ways, district is king.
- College projects face autonomy challenges.

35. The IPBM process provides a clear path from recommendation to consideration in the decision-making cycle.

Comments:
- The process is clear. It is less clear where integrated strategic planning occurs. This is something that has been brought up multiple times in PBC meetings. It is NOT our charge (many feel), but no one is sure whose charge it is.
- We're still waiting for movement on the State Authorization issue from almost 3 years ago.