<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 1:** It was clear what items should be requested through the PBC request form.
**Question 2:** The budget request form provided enough information for rating each request.
**Question 3:** A handbook or guide would be helpful in understanding the process and procedures.
**Question 4:** The rating rubric was helpful in the final rating of items.
**Question 5:** Training on the process was provided to members early in the Academic year.
**Question 6:** Training for using the PBC request form was available.
**Question 7:** The PBC process was clear to me.
**Question 8:** The overall PBC process was efficient.
Comments:

Question 1

- I was unclear of what can and cannot be requested through PBC. I notice that some items like markers and software were requested while other larger request came in. I think it would be nice to determine a cutoff amount or combine supply purchases into one.
- A sheet spelling out the exact requirements of requests for OE, OO,...,CM should be provided. If a particular range of money that is being requested should also be included. It would be helpful to include where requests with budgets out of this range should be sent. This will ensure that all requests are valid.
- I think units or divisions should screen proposals and submit there top 3 proposals.

Question 2

- The form did not give any hard data to look at. I think knowing how the request may impact the college and students would be important. How does the request fulfill the mission and vision of our college? Sometimes there are differences in between the AA or GLO and the vision of our college. If our vision is to become a top ranked community college than we may need to invest monies into reaching those goals which may be outside the AA and GLO. ie. Facility and Faculty improvements, Technology upgrades, etc.
- It would be more helpful if responses in the Alignment with Strategic Plan portion of the form included more than mere codes such as AC 5.4 - the coding is useless unless the evaluator has a listing of exactly what the codes mean. Very helpful if the alignment was clearly addressed in the Documentation portion of the form - articulates HOW the request fulfills-addresses the item in Alignment with Strategic Plan.
- The form was okay, however proposals lacked adequate justification.
- The rating was actually done based on the rubric. Is the question whether the information provided on the form was sufficient to make a decision on the rubric or whether the information on the form is sufficient to rate each request?

Question 3

- This would be helpful in understanding the process as there are no real clear guidelines in the process. A lot has been deferred to Doug.
- A thorough understanding of the process and procedures should result in better responses on the requests forms. Everyone will be able to work together with the same understanding...no more OJT and being clueless as you sit through the first several meetings.
- A simple set of directions would be sufficient to help faculty complete the budget form which was discussed at the meetings so DC's were informed and should have been able to answer questions. Otherwise, the process and guidelines are already established and were discussed at a meeting this year. All documents are already on the web, albeit in several places and some need to be updated - but changes are not major ones that affect the process. One thing that could be added is a link to the UH budget process http://www.hawaii.edu/budget/pdfs/UH%20Funding%20Overview%20-%20Rev%202002-17-10.pdf
Committee members should have a basic orientation of the process at the beginning of each fiscal year (as new people join each year), but after that they need to take responsibility for reading, coming to meetings and asking questions at the meeting if they do not understand.

Question 4

- It provided a basis for my ratings which was needed. What might be helpful is that we might want to identify which account would the request come from. I would rate items that need to go into a PCR differently than items that come from our college.
- The rating rubric standardizes ranking decisions by the evaluators and lessens personal biases. The rubric will also aid the authors of PBC request forms write more meaningful responses knowing what is being scrutinized in the ranking process.
- I think I could rate it without the rubric just as objectively.

Question 5

- No training was provided. It might be useful to place new members with old members together into smaller groups to allow open discussions and questions as large group can be intimidating to new members.
- I'm not sure if anyone knew what the process was at the start of the AY.
- Training was provided at the beginning of each of the PBC sessions.

Question 6

- No workshop or training was provided on how to complete the PBC form. An online form or database may help organize the information.
- At the start of the AY, there was much confusion regarding the use of the PBS Request form. Modifying the request form was discussed at the last meeting of the previous AND still being discussed at the start of the past AY!
- Training was given and training was available for those who requested it.
- The form was not worked on early by the committee to give enough advance preparation time for people submitting requests for department reports, hence some confusion. However, the form itself was discussed at the meetings so people should have been aware of the elements on the new form.

Question 7

- At first the PBC process was unclear but as we moved through I got a sense of what was happening.
- All I knew was that the requests will be reviewed and we would rank them.
- Yes, it is already documented.
Question 8

- I think overall the process could be created more efficiently. Smaller groups may be more beneficial instead of a large group.
- It took the whole AY to rank the requests for money that was to be spent in that AY. The ranking and awarding of funds needs to be done much earlier in the AY - or we'll have to plan two years in advance in order to receive money.
- Why are you only asking about efficiency and not effectiveness?
- I think the process could be streamlined.
- It's been a learning process to be sure, but works overall. Meetings should be scheduled for twice a month to allow for orientation/training of members, discussion on any improvements to be made, time for PLANNING issues and assessment of the process. Dissemination of funds should definitely be done earlier in the year so spending deadlines can be met without putting a strain on so many people or needing to carry over funds to the next year.

Question 9

- I am sure we will develop overtime.
- Dispense with the oral presentation of each PBC request - people can read. Allow for discussion and Q/A, if needed, before committee members rank the requests.
- Ranking can be done in a meeting with clickers following the discussion and Q/A period.
- Everyone needs to be familiar with rubric and use it to make their rankings. This can be done before they come to the meeting when the clickers are used to input the rankings.
- The Handbook should be made available before DCs begin writing out the PBC requests, and it should clearly define the criteria for each type of request. It should include the proper department/office to send requests that do not meet the PBC request criteria. For example, if a request is for supplies, then it should be sent to ....or if a request is for equipment under $$$, then the request should be sent to ----- instead of the PBC.
- Please continue to send out minutes of the PBC meetings soon after our meetings much like this AY (thanks Ivy!)
- The completion of the PBC request process early in the AY means that the money can be awarded and the services implemented within the AY.
- What we do is fine should we be addressing other issues? We are setting up new programs w/o thought of where they will be physically housed or the budget that is necessary. Neither have we addressed the infrastructure needed to support the growth of the college, e.g., a web master to free an administrator from APT work.