

Executive Summary of Feedback Results

2025FA Recommendations Survey

Reviewed by the Participatory Governance Task Force (PGTF)

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Question 1: "What are your thoughts about the current recommendations? (What stands out to you as most meaningful, helpful, or concerning?)"	4
Question 2: What changes, supports, or ideas would help make these recommendations more effective or easier to put into practice for your group?	5
Question 3: Anything else you'd like to add that wasn't asked here?	6
Conclusion	6

Introduction

On October 17, 2025, the Participatory Governance (PG) Task Force distributed a letter to all Committee Chairs announcing the completion of a year-long review of the college's governance structure under College Council. The letter outlined seven key recommendations designed to strengthen inclusion, accountability, and institutional effectiveness across San Bernardino Valley College's participatory governance system. These recommendations proposed the creation of new committees, including the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC), Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), Educational Policies and Procedures Committee (EPPC), and Facilities, Safety, and Technology Committee (FSTC), as well as the reaffirmation of the Accreditation Committee (AC). Additionally, the Task Force recommended that all governance committees adopt an annual timetable aligned with the academic calendar and implement a quad-chair leadership model to promote balanced representation and shared responsibility.

To gather feedback on these proposed changes, a survey was distributed to committee members through a dedicated link and QR code included in the letter. The survey was open from October 17 through October 30, 2025, allowing approximately two weeks for committee discussions and individual responses. A total of 11 participants submitted feedback during this period. The responses summarized in this report provide insight into committee members' perspectives on the proposed governance structure, the clarity and feasibility of the recommendations, and their overall impressions of the participatory governance process.

Question 1: "What are your thoughts about the current recommendations? (What stands out to you as most meaningful, helpful, or concerning?)"

A total of 11 participants provided feedback on the current recommendations, expressing a mix of appreciation, requests for clarification, and concerns about implementation. Several clear themes emerged across the responses.

The most frequent theme, noted by 6 respondents, was appreciation for the clarity, structure, and transparency of the proposed recommendations. Many commended the task force for its thoroughness, the handouts provided, and the effort to make governance processes more understandable to the wider campus community. Respondents especially valued the emphasis on transparency in decision-making and the inclusion of clear tasks and outcomes for each recommendation.

A second major theme, mentioned by 4 respondents, centered on the creation and clarification of new or restructured committees, such as the Planning and Resource Allocation Committee (PRAC) and the Educational Policies and Procedures Committee (EPPC). Feedback included requests for clearer distinctions between committee functions, particularly how program review and resource allocation will interact to prevent redundancy or confusion. Participants also asked for clarification on committee leadership roles (quad-chair structure, liaison assignments, and participation expectations).

Another recurring point, raised by 3 respondents, was concern about the potential separation of instructional and non-instructional program review processes. Some felt that dividing areas could undermine cross-campus collaboration and shared understanding developed through the ASPIRE model. These respondents emphasized the importance of maintaining a holistic review process that encourages transparency, dialogue, and shared accountability among all divisions.

Additionally, 3 respondents highlighted positive reactions to specific recommendations, such as reaffirming the Accreditation Committee's role, introducing attendance and engagement standards, and encouraging broader participation in campus initiatives beyond committee work. One respondent specifically noted "Governance Fatigue" and linked it to unclear committee roles and decision-making pathways, underscoring the need for structural clarity to sustain engagement.

Question 2: What changes, support, or ideas would help make these recommendations more effective or easier to put into practice for your group?

Responses to Question 2 reflect a range of thoughtful suggestions focused on improving committee structure, communication, and implementation processes across the college. While several respondents agreed with the proposed recommendations, many emphasized the need for clearer governance frameworks and manageable committee workloads.

The most frequently mentioned theme (4 comments) centered on committee structure and participation. Respondents expressed concern that committees are too numerous or too large, which leads to member fatigue and disengagement. Suggestions included consolidating committees, reducing overlapping functions, and allowing members to participate selectively based on expertise rather than serving on multiple standing groups. One respondent also proposed adding a student services co-chair to improve representation.

Another prominent theme (3 comments) focused on clarity and transparency in governance processes. Respondents requested clearer distinctions between Academic Senate and college-wide committees, better-defined expectations for committee members, and specific guidelines outlining management roles and boundaries within shared governance. There was also a call for explicit direction in the forthcoming Participatory Governance Handbook on how Program Review recommendations will inform institutional decisions such as hiring and budgeting.

A smaller set of comments (2 responses) offered targeted structural or procedural ideas, such as adopting annual timelines for committee evaluations, using cyclical review to assess effectiveness, and reconsidering leadership models (e.g., preferring co-chairs instead of quad chairs). These suggestions reflected a desire to strengthen accountability and efficiency.

Finally, 2 respondents stated that they were either unsure or felt the recommendations were already well-developed and did not require further modification.

Question 3: Anything else you'd like to add that wasn't asked here?

A total of nine responses were provided for this open-ended question. Most comments reflected appreciation and support for the work completed by the committee, with several expressing gratitude for the effort, transparency, and collaboration involved in developing the recommendations. Specifically, five respondents offered direct expressions of thanks or commendation for the committee's dedication and transparency.

In addition to the positive feedback, a smaller number of comments included requests for clarification on the next steps. Two respondents asked for more discussion or clearer information on how proposed changes would be implemented in practice and who would participate in the committees, particularly noting interest in whether non-instructional faculty (such as counselors) would be included.

One respondent highlighted openness to further discussion, signaling a willingness to engage in the ongoing process, while another shared a more personal reflection on working within institutional structures, acknowledging positive progress while encouraging continued improvement.

Conclusion

The survey feedback reflects strong support for the Participatory Governance Task Force's recommendations, with respondents appreciating the clarity, transparency, and structure of the proposed model. Several participants requested clearer distinctions between committees, leadership roles, and how program review and resource allocation will connect to institutional decisions. Concerns about committee workload and governance fatigue were also noted, along with suggestions for streamlining processes and refining leadership structures. The responses were positive and collaborative, emphasizing gratitude for the Task Force's work and a desire for continued communication as the recommendations move toward implementation.