# Survey Results and Proposed Improvements – April 19, 2017

*Note: All items are open to modification, including those with no proposed changes*

| # | Survey Item | Avg 1-5; 5 is good | Proposal and Notes |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Level of communication (facilitator). | 4.5 | No proposed changes at this time. |
| 2 | Frequency of communication (facilitator). | 4.5 | No proposed changes at this time. |
| 3 | Level of communication (co-chairs). | 4.2 | No proposed changes at this time. |
| 4 | Frequency of communication (co-chairs). | 4.2 | No proposed changes at this time. |
| 5 | Use of website as communication tool. | 4.2 | No proposed changes at this time. |
| 6 | Frequency of CC Meetings. | 3.4 | Propose going to quarterly CAEECC mtgs for Year 2+ with ad hoc meetings if needed. |
| 7 | Length of meetings. | 3.6 | Propose a standing time of 9:30-4:30pm for Year 2+ to ensure sufficient time for discussion. |
| 8 | Utilization of subcommittees in initial 2 stages of BP process. | 2.1 | Subcommittee role, scope, and relationship are currently being discussed by CAEECC membership. |
| 9 | Utilization of subcommittees during BP chapter draft/draft BP review process. | 2.0 | Subcommittee role, scope, and relationship are currently being discussed by CAEECC membership. |
| 10 | Communication of subcommittees to larger CAEECC membership. | 2.1 | Subcommittee role, scope, and relationship are currently being discussed by CAEECC membership. |
| 11 | Mtg process rules (e.g., submit proposals for topics, CAEECC members speak first, etc.). | 3.7 | Mixed results, but unclear what needs to be modified. Suggest new facilitator evaluate. |

# Survey Results and Proposed Improvements – April 19, 2017

| # | Survey Item | Avg 1-5; 5 is good | Proposal and Notes |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Agenda development. | 3.5 | Proposal to:<br>a) have facilitator map needed items to resolve and ensure sufficient time to address issues in addition to other agenda items that are needed<br>b) have a discussion at each CAEECC or subcommittee meeting regarding agenda for the next meeting<br>c) conduct a survey regarding agenda items prior to each mtg<br>d) discuss with individual CAEECC members as needed, and<br>e) identify required PAs for topics. |
| 13 | Variation in session presenters. | 3.2 | Working on getting more volunteers to conduct sessions besides facilitator and co-chairs at CAEECC meetings. TBD at subcommittees. |
| 14 | Relevance of topics. | 3.7 | Proposal for agenda development is also intended to improve the relevance of topics. |
| 15 | Time to review documents prior to CC meetings. | 3.4 | Will post agenda and substantive meeting documents 7 calendar days prior to mtg with the expectation that CAEECC members fully prepare for the meetings to maximize efficient discussion. |
| 16 | Length of discussion time for topics. | 3.5 | Per 3/17 ad hoc discussion and survey results, agenda survey should also request length suggestions from CAEECC members. Include "additional discussion topics" in the event there is time left over. |

# Survey Results and Proposed Improvements – April 19, 2017

| # | Survey Item | Avg 1-5; 5 is good | Proposal and Notes |
|---|---|---|---|
| 17 | Adequacy of remote participation infrastructure, including webinar and teleconference tools. | 3.8 | No proposal at this time, but there were some moderate scores that warrants follow up with the new facilitator. |
| 18 | Conduciveness of meeting structure for speaking candidly in CC meetings. | 3.7 | Suggest facilitator explore opportunities for improvements on this item. |
| 20 | Adequacy of CAEECC.org as source of meeting documents, stakeholder feedback documents, and background information. | 4.5 | No proposed changes at this time. |
| 21 | Level of transparency in meeting preparation activities. | 3.7 | See above for agenda development. |
| 22 | Compliance of CAEECC process with charter document and CPUC guidance. | 3.8 | Suggest facilitator explore opportunities for improvements on this item, including updating the charter. |
| 23 | Accessibility and responsiveness of facilitation team between CC meetings. | 4.6 | No proposed changes at this time. |
| 24 | Impartiality of facilitation team. | 3.9 | Will address with new facilitator. |
| 25 | Accessibility and responsiveness of co-chairs between CC meetings. | 4.5 | No proposed changes at this time. |
| 26 | Fairness of CC co-chairs. | 4.3 | No proposed changes at this time. |
| 27 | Process for issue resolution. | 3.8 | Suggest facilitator explore opportunities to improve approaches to achieve resolution where feasible. |
| 28 | Ability to balance and prioritize member comments and topics. | 3.8 | Will address this with new facilitator. |
| 29 | Tracking comments and resolution. | n/a | Propose this to be a facilitator role to articulate a discrete ask and track its resolution. |

## Survey Results and Proposed Improvements – April 19, 2017

Margie Gardner/CEEIC:

- Survey results and proposed improvements
- Congratulations to facilitators and Co-Chairs – high ratings
- Purpose of survey was to take a check on how the process went during the first formal year of CAEECC; we want to use results to improve for year 2.
- Scores – best scores are related to facilitators and Co-Chairs
- Lots of 3s
- Items in 2s fell around subcommittees and one on agenda setting. Not clear the role or scope for subcommittees is working. We only did one thing with subcommittees – very limited role last year. We'd like to get more input on subcommittees, agenda development, and time to review documents. We always want more time to review documents. If there are suggestions on these issues, please provide.
- Read comments from slide regarding agenda development. For this meeting, Lara provided a survey for agenda items. Did that work? Do you want survey for agenda for each meeting?

Jenny Berg/BayREN: It is interesting that lowest score was for short time for document review. This was typically an issue for people who wanted to submit a proposal. I think people typically prepare for meetings shortly before they happen. I would suggest that anyone can suggest agenda items to Co-Chairs, instead of survey.

Lara Ettenson/NRDC: In the next iteration, we are hoping to talk to more people outside of the meetings. If we can shorten the time required to provide documents, it would allow for more dialogue to prep for meetings. I don't care about whether we have a survey or if people submit directly to me. The next facilitator can review the overall process and recommend changes.

Mike Campbell/ORA: The reason I scored one particular area low is that sometimes it felt like we were plowing through issues that needed a lot of time and sometimes we were spending time on things that I didn't need to address. I understand the challenges in setting agendas. I think it might work for the next facilitator to make a proposal or provide a

rough draft of agenda, and get feedback on draft agenda. I would have liked to spend more time on budgets and metrics – and nothing else.

Jenny Berg/BayREN: I completely agree with Mike about not having enough time to discuss important issues. There were really important issues where we did not have enough time to discuss. There was a lot of heavy discussion that was cut off – particularly during the meeting in Oakland where we discussed the procurement review group. As a group, we should be afforded the opportunity to discuss weighty issues.

Susan Davison/CalCERTS: When I think about the importance of coming to the meeting, I'd like to be surveyed on the agenda and asked to prioritize the issues. Issues could get prioritized just before the meeting based on survey results. You can get input in a different manner.

Lara Ettenson/NRDC: I'm brainstorming that we could have an agenda and a running list of issues so if we have extra time we can go to the list of issues that are not on the agenda.

Susan Davison/CalCERTS: Also note that priorities change over time.

Margie Gardner/CEEEIC: Averages also mask real concerns. Please speak up of there is something you are really unhappy about.

Lara Ettenson/NRDC: There were a few items with mixed results. I propose that the next facilitator deep dive into those issues.

Going forward with the agenda …Facilitator will develop a series of agenda item with running list of issues. We will be flexible and can re-prioritize. We can talk to people to identify issues and prioritize. Closer to the day of meeting, we can survey to prioritize agenda items. We will have a shorter list with longer time for issues to address during meeting.

We understand that people come to listen to particular issues.

Mike Campbell/ORA: I appreciate a survey for various topics for this meeting. There were a few things I am interested in and most of the rest I didn't care about. Did the survey make any changes for the meeting today?

Lara Ettenson/NRDC: Yes, the survey helped in shaping the final agenda.

# Survey Results and Proposed Improvements – April 19, 2017

Mike Campbell/ORA: Maybe you can use a survey to narrow-in conversations with people.

Lara Ettenson/NRDC: Some people asked for one consistent ED representative to be at every meeting. I talked to ED about that but this is a workload issue for them. They would like to have someone from ED at each meeting. We can work on prepping the ED rep before the meetings so they can address issues.

I also want to address input on people worrying they can't speak candidly in these meetings. Please come to us if you ever feel like you can't speak up.

Jenny Berg/BayREN: Maybe consider not requiring survey participants to not identify themselves.

Lara Ettenson/NRDC: I did that so I could follow up with people but I am keeping results confidential. I hope people can talk to me if they are uncomfortable with addressing issues in a meeting. [side comment: will be even easier to be candid with a facilitator]