

Spring 2026 Governance Survey

Summary Report

The Spring 2026 Governance survey was administered to gather feedback from Pasadena City College governance committee members about their experiences participating in shared governance during the academic year. The respondents for this survey were participants on College Council and the subcommittees of College Council. The survey asked respondents to reflect on committee operations, access to information, use of evidence, collegiality, communication with constituent groups, alignment with the college's strategic plan, student centered decision-making, and opportunities for improvement.

Executive Summary

Sixty-two individuals responded to the survey, 50% participation rate. Overall, the results indicate generally positive perceptions of the governance process, with most respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that committees operated effectively, discussions were collegial, information was available to support decision-making, and members were able to participate meaningfully in shared governance. Open-ended comments provided additional context and identified opportunities to strengthen committee effectiveness, communication, strategic alignment, and follow-through.

Survey responses suggest that governance committee members generally had a positive experience with shared governance at PCC during the 2025–2026 academic year. Most respondents reported strong attendance, with 70.31% indicating they attended more than 75% of meetings or never missed a meeting. Respondents also reported favorable perceptions of committee functioning. More than 90% agreed or strongly agreed that agendas and minutes were accessible in a timely manner, committee charges were shared and understood, members received adequate information, discussions were supported by evidence, and differing opinions were respected.

The strongest area of agreement was collegiality. A combined 95.24% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that discussions were collegial and that differing opinions were respected. Similarly, 95.16% agreed or strongly agreed that committees met on a regular basis, and 93.66% agreed or strongly agreed that their committee played an effective role in participatory governance at PCC. In addition, 85.71% of respondents indicated that they feel they can effectively participate in shared governance.

Areas with somewhat lower, though still generally positive, ratings point to opportunities for improvement. The item regarding regular communication with constituent groups had 90.33% agreement, but fewer respondents selected “strongly agree” compared with other items. The item regarding regular discussions of diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice had the lowest overall agreement, with 83.87% agreeing or strongly agreeing and 16.13% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. The student-centered decision-making item also showed room for continued attention, with 88.89% agreeing or strongly agreeing.

Open-ended comments highlighted several recurring themes. Respondents expressed interest in stronger alignment between committee work and collegewide strategic goals, clearer guidance and training for committee chairs and members, more consistent meeting schedules, improved communication between representatives and constituent groups, and more meaningful follow-through on committee recommendations. Some comments also raised concerns that committees may at times become overly process-oriented or function primarily as review bodies rather than spaces for substantive discussion and action. Other suggestions included strengthening program review support, addressing accessibility, improving outcomes assessment processes, discussing the impact of grants, and ensuring that diversity, inclusion, and social justice remain visible in committee agendas.

Key Findings

Finding	Summary
Strongest agreement	95.24% agreed or strongly agreed that discussions were collegial and differing opinions were respected.
Regular meetings	95.16% agreed or strongly agreed that their committee(s) met on a regular basis throughout the academic year.
Effective role in governance	93.66% agreed or strongly agreed that their committee(s) played an effective role in participatory governance at PCC.
Effective participation	85.71% answered Yes when asked whether they can effectively participate in shared governance at PCC.
Primary opportunity area	83.87% agreed or strongly agreed that committee(s) had regular discussions on improving diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice; this was the lowest agreement level among the eleven governance practice items.

Participation and Attendance

Attendance response	Percent
I attended fewer than 50% of the meetings	3.12%
I attended between half and 75% of meetings	18.75%
I attended more than 75% of the meetings	50.00%
I never missed a meeting	20.31%
Other	7.81%

Perceived Ability to Participate

Response	Percent
Yes	85.71%
No	14.29%

Committee Experience

The table below summarizes the items around committee experience using the combined percentage of respondents who selected Agree or Strongly agree. Items are listed in survey order.

Item	Agree or strongly agree	Disagree or strongly disagree
Agendas and minutes were accessible in a timely manner prior to meetings.	93.65%	6.35%
Committee mission or charge was shared, understood, and used to guide work.	92.06%	7.94%
Members received adequate information to make informed recommendations and decisions.	95.16%	4.84%
Discussions were informed and supported by sound evidence.	95.24%	4.76%
Discussions were collegial and differing opinions were respected.	95.24%	4.76%
Members regularly communicated with the constituent group they represent regarding key items.	90.32%	9.68%
Committees played an effective role in participatory governance at PCC.	93.65%	6.35%
Committees contributed to the achievement of the college's strategic plan.	91.94%	8.06%
Committees made student-centered decisions.	88.89%	11.11%
Committees met on a regular basis throughout the academic year.	95.16%	4.84%
Committees had regular discussions on improving diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice.	83.87%	16.13%

Strengths and Opportunity Areas

Item	Agree or strongly agree	Disagree or strongly disagree
Discussions were informed and supported by sound evidence.	95.24%	4.76%
Discussions were collegial and differing opinions were respected.	95.24%	4.76%
Members received adequate information to make informed recommendations and decisions.	95.16%	4.84%
Committees met on a regular basis throughout the academic year.	95.16%	4.84%
Agendas and minutes were accessible in a timely manner prior to meetings.	93.65%	6.35%
Committees played an effective role in participatory governance at PCC.	93.65%	6.35%
Committee mission or charge was shared, understood, and used to guide work.	92.06%	7.94%
Committees contributed to the achievement of the college's strategic plan.	91.94%	8.06%

Item	Agree or strongly agree	Disagree or strongly disagree
Members regularly communicated with the constituent group they represent regarding key items.	90.32%	9.68%
Committees made student-centered decisions.	88.89%	11.11%
Committees had regular discussions on improving diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice.	83.87%	16.13%

Themes from Open-Ended Responses

Theme	Description
Strategic alignment	Respondents suggested that committee goals and agenda items could be more explicitly connected to collegewide strategic goals and priorities.
Chair guidance and committee training	Several comments asked for clearer guidance for committee chairs and training or pathways that help members understand expectations, program review, evidence use, and committee responsibilities.
Communication loops and follow-through	Comments emphasized the need for representatives to communicate back to constituent groups and for committees to see how recommendations move forward after discussion.
Substantive decision-making	Some respondents expressed concern that committees can become overly procedural or process-oriented, limiting substantive discussion and action.
Meeting consistency and time	A few comments referenced cancelled, rescheduled, or insufficiently frequent meetings and noted the difficulty of completing committee work within limited time.
Program review and outcomes assessment	Respondents identified program review, PSLO data collection, non-instructional outcomes, and examples of effective reviews as topics for future work.
Accessibility, DEI, and student-centeredness	Comments identified accessibility, DEI/social justice agenda items, and student-centered scheduling or resource decisions as areas that should remain visible in governance discussions.

Suggested Next Steps

- Review committee charges and annual goals to identify where each committee connects to the college strategic plan.
- Provide a brief annual orientation for committee chairs and members, including agenda-setting, evidence use, Brown Act expectations where applicable, and communication back to constituent groups.
- Create a simple mechanism for tracking committee recommendations, referrals, and outcomes so members can see what happened after discussion.
- Encourage committees to identify one or two action-oriented priorities for the year, rather than relying only on standing informational items.

- Consider whether DEI, accessibility, and student-centered decision-making should be explicit recurring prompts in committee agendas or annual self-evaluation.

Q1: Attendance Comments

1. 35%
2. I have missed two meetings
3. I had teaching conflict, not able to attend.
4. FSC=100%; BRAC=>75% (Missed One)
5. I attended most of the meetings

Topics Respondents Wish Committees Had Discussed

1. I would be interested on focusing attention towards college-wide strategic goals. I know we have business that needs to be conducted like approval of policies. Some committees do this better than others depending on the leadership and that makes me wonder what kind of guidance the chairs of committees have.
2. I have been in too many committees where we meet regularly and nothing ever really gets accomplished. Most of the time its because the committee comes to a decision to actually improve processes on campus and the overall student experience. Every time we hit a wall when things have to be "approved" by the faculty. The faculty union steps in and everything stops. No improvements are made and we end up dealing with the same issues over and over. I wish the administration would grow a pair and start making decisions that actually improve the student experience rather than appease the faculty constantly.
3. Ethics of Committee Chairs for Hiring Committees and Hiring practice
4. The issue this year was that College Council did not always meet.
5. As part of the Outcome Standing Committee, I wish there were more discussion around how other colleges manage PSLO data collection. I view the work of this committee as heading in a problematic direction when it comes to PSLO data collection.
6. Improving programs' ability to produce meaningful program reviews Create a "pathway." Provide targeted training that can be mapped to see how important elements of producing program reviews (data collection, data analysis, understanding how to come up with benchmarks with accompanying logical rationales) are first introduced, then practiced, and finally reinforced during the years leading up to each program's Program Review submittal date.
7. Reviewing program review Accessibility
8. I would like to discuss the impacts that federal and state grants have on campus.
9. Professional development for faculty and curriculum redesign.

10. I've been able to contribute to my committee by submitting my program reviews but because of my teaching schedule, I was not able to attend meetings.

11. We just need more time, but I feel I can't ask the committee members to spend more time because they are all so busy during the semester and there isn't usually any funding for summer or winter meetings. I'm pursuing that, though.

12. Question: Members were given adequate information to make informed recommendations and decisions. Answer: For BRAC Yes! and For FSC the information is presented last minute without enough time to review the Meeting Packet. Question: My committee(s) met on a regular basis throughout the academic year. Answer: For BRAC the answer is Yes! For both BRAC & FSC there were cancelled meetings and rescheduled meetings. Both of these Committees have a meeting that is scheduled on the Fourth Thursday of the month. In the Fall, that means that there are two meetings. One each in September and October. Thanksgiving is the fourth Thursday in November. In the Spring there are three meetings. One each in March, April and May. of the Five meetings on the Fourth Thursday, two were cancelled or changed at the last minute days before the meeting. BRAC rescheduled. FSC did not reschedule. I feel that there should be more respect for these five meeting dates. Regularly scheduled meetings should be held. I would make the suggestion that a "Regularly Scheduled Meeting" on the third Thursday in November that is established at the first meeting in September.

Suggested Committee Goals or Agenda Items for the Next Academic Year

1. This may not be feasible or may depend on the committee, but if we can focus all committees on a strategic goal so we're all working on rowing in the same direction. Perhaps it's retention, completion, closing a particular equity gap, resource allocation. But that all the committees that have anything to do with that goal are working to come up with strategies to address the desired outcome. This would take strategic coordination.

2. I have advice for the administration! Listen to the people on these committees!

3. One goal should be the ethics of chairs who chair hiring committees. Constituents have noticed that higher management have placed themselves in committees as chairs in hiring committees to give their friends--a leg up in the process and in some instances have hired their friends. In many situations, staff have recused themselves, but they have found that Human Resources has done nothing to put a stop to these unethical practices. Perhaps an audit needs to take place as we're sure Accreditation teams would not look kindly on this kind of behavior especially from highly paid officials of the college.

4. The committee should regularly meet. Their charge of reviewing AP/BPs are good. They should invite committees to share what is going on.

5. We do have a rather clear path forward when it comes to establishing outcomes for non-academic units on campus. More discussion is needed about PSLO data collection for academic units, especially in identifying if the right data is being collected.

6. Mock program review (recorded? presented live at Flex Day?) We create three review amalgamations: one is exemplary, another is acceptable, and the last is developing. Everyone is invited to view/attend but make viewing/attendance mandatory/strongly recommended to those areas who have never submitted a review or have consistently received Developing as feedback on their submissions.
7. It appears most committees are merely rubber stamping the process. Real discussion and thoughtful decision making is not happening at the committee level. I find that some representatives are not reporting to the committee information that will help with decisions.
8. While my committee's goals are worthy, and while the committee works in good faith and with the best intentions to further those goals, my experience is that the process is made sclerotic and much less effective than it might be by an overgrowth of administrative procedure that functions pervasively to shift the committee's actual effort away from the core function we are supposed to perform and onto an infinite regression of emphasis on procedural compliance. In effect, we spend an incredible amount of time discussing and evaluating procedural nuances, and in effect end up focusing on and enforcing compliance with our own process rather than actually focusing on increasing the effectiveness of the entities we are tasked to improve. We require that they self-report, but we do not seek or develop additional information sources beyond that self-reporting. Providing that self-reporting, in the specific form in which we require it, furthermore requires substantial time from the entities we are supervising, which in turn diverts them from performing their core functions. I am sure that some trickle of improvement might result, however, overall this process takes a lot of time for us, a lot of time for the entities reporting to us, and ends up focusing more on evaluating their adherence to our process than on concrete improvement in their actual core functions. I am being deliberately vague partly because in my experience this is a serious problem that affects not only the committee I serve on, but every administrative aspect of PCC that I have so far encountered: worthy goals, good intentions, and diligent effort by committed people, diluted by cumbersome and ossified protocol.
9. Supporting the campus wide accessibility goals.
10. Not at the moment.
11. I do feel that Faculty tend to articulate their preferred goals by taking advantage of students inability to articulate their needs (students not fully understanding the system). For example, the highest demanded classes (by students) are difficult to access because faculty dictate when those classes are available (only during Faculty's preferred schedule). Faculty fight to maintain schedules that faculty prefer, not schedules that benefit students and student's availability. There is also a serious disconnect between faculty's expectations for the level of services that can be provided by facilities and the amount of money being invested in fixing/repairing the existing facilities and infrastructure.
12. I am hoping that my committee will be able to act as an advisory for the creation of the new CTL. Right now the work and expertise of this committee has not been utilized in decision making--has not even been acknowledged or consulted, generally. However, this is something we can work to change. Hopefully we will be able to do that starting this summer (with a funded retreat) and continuing into next year. We have been struggling to understand how we can get access to information and how we can meaningfully engage in decision making. We haven't known how to

find where the decision making discussions are actually happening and who is having them. Our AS leadership is committed to helping us shift this dynamic.

13. My committee(s) had regular discussions on improving diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice. Answer: Diversity, Inclusion and Social Justice are inherent in all actions. If discussions occur then they are met with respect and appropriate dialogue. I feel that during BRAC, data is referenced regularly. I feel that discussions regarding diversity, inclusion and social justice should be an agenda item for all FSC Meetings.

14. Outcomes Committee: should and will focus on working with campus wide non-instructional divisions and programs to standardize outcomes collection and assessment in 2026-27.