

**Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process  
Review  
Evaluation Survey Results –  
Planning Committees, Constituent Groups and Individual  
Responses**

**Academic Planning Committee  
April 29, 2013**

Members Present: *Cheryl Aschenbach, Colleen Baker, Carie Camacho, Sue Mouck, Fran Oberg, Alison Somerville, Ross Stevenson and Patrick Walton*

Members Absent: None

Planning Section

When answering these questions consider the “planning process” the process used to create the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan; including but not limited to the work of planning committees (Educational Master Plan, Student Services Master Plan, Institutional Technology Master Plan, Facility Master Plan, Human Resource Master Plan etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*The planning process led with the Educational Master Plan.  
Balanced participation by all members of Academic Planning Committee with mutual respect among members.  
Implementation of last year’s recommendations used in guiding this year’s discussions and decisions.*
  
2. What doesn’t work in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*The budget allocation process in the Strategic Planning Committee was handicapped by the lack of availability of revenue projections for next year.  
Lack of current recommendations for program review - should be corrected by change to process adopted by Academic Senate providing for annual updates  
Lack of specific budget request (dollar amounts) – should be corrected by revisions to process adopted by Academic Senate*
  
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?  
*Academic Senate adopted changes to process should improve effectiveness.  
Provide Strategic Planning with earlier revenue projection for the following years to improve the budget allocation process.  
Include the evaluation process and timeline in the Institutional Planning and Budget Allocation handbook.*

4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?  
*Provision of more responsive, timely research data to inform academic planning- should be corrected by hire of Director of Institutional Effectiveness*
5. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary?  
*Yes, committee provided direction to the planning process through the timely development of the EMP*
6. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued? *Yes*
7. Do you feel additional planning committees are necessary for the process to work? *No*

### Governance Section

1. Did the committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? *Yes*
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?  
*Educational Master Plan*  
*Direction to enrollment management in the development of the class schedule by division chairs*  
*Key Performance Indicators*
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. *No*
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?  
*Recommend removing other planning committee chairs from the membership. The improved timing and sequence of the development of the Master Plans removed the need for improved communication, which was the reason for including the other chairs.*
5. Provide an analysis of the participation of the membership. Identify any individual or constituent group representation not in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings.  
*All members of the committee consistently participated.*
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?  
*Initiate a master calendar of meetings linked to committee agendas and minutes.*

## Academic Senate (Faculty)

### April 23, 2013

Members Present: *Cheryl Aschenbach, Nancy Beterbide, Lisa Gardiner, Richard Swanson, Michael Giampaoli, Carrie Nyman*  
Members Absent: *None*

#### Planning Section

1. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?

*We have been following timelines and processes.*

*Budgeting process is better integrated with IPRs – requests are driven by IPR process and recommendations rather than a separate submission for budget enhancement.*

*When we follow the planning processes, no one can argue we aren't doing it.*

2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?

*Whether accurate or not, the perception that administration does not follow planning process and plans with regards to budget decisions and hiring jeopardizes support of and participation in existing processes and could have negative accreditation implications.*

*It is difficult to make budget recommendations without current budget information and status.*

3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?

*More research data to inform decision-making. Additionally, it would be helpful to have a researcher give interpretations of data for discussion within IPRs rather than just data. Training to complete standard college forms (travel requests & reimbursements, POs, annual updates, etc) as well as planning/program review documents.*

*More participation by administration in the planning process and more openness by administration to ideas expressed by constituent groups. New administrators need to understand our local processes.*

4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?

*Training, research data and interpretations*

5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work? *NO!*

#### Governance Section

1. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?

*All groups are more collegial and less adversarial than in the past as a result of participatory governance and participation in regular Consultation Council dialogue.*

*More information through meeting minutes is being communicated from planning committees.*

2. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Share Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?

*Have a shared repository of information rather than emailing documents. Make sure the information on the website is current. Use website better to promote ideas and meetings and to inform the campus community about governance-related dialogue.*

3. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?

*Have researcher provide analysis of data for easier inclusion into IPRs, NIPRs.*

*Continue to communicate/train on the IPR, NIPR and annual update processes.*

*Capture the evaluation process within process handbooks.*

*Administration should be reviewed/evaluated by constituent groups rather than acting and being evaluated in isolation. After all, student input is included within faculty evaluations. In the recent past, some administrators have asked for subordinate input to improve operations and performance.*

# Administration

## April 29, 2013

Members Present: *Dr. Marlon Hall, Dave Clausen, Sue Mouck, Patrick Walton*

Members Absent: None

### Planning Section

1. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*Consistent representation of all constituent groups except ASB*  
*Improved opportunities for communication*  
*Timeline for the development of master plans worked better, than in previous years.*  
*Improved tracking of progress on implementation of last years plan*  
*Shared responsibility for planning*  
*Visual depiction of integrated planning in flowchart*
2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*Lack of ownership for process and results by some individuals*  
*Need to continue improvement of communication.*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?  
*Planning committees need to continue to meet and refine drafts following Consultation Council acceptance of draft and prior to incorporation into CIMP*  
*Institutional Planning and Budget Development Handbook needs to be expanded to include the evaluation process (timeline/forms)*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?  
*Improved reliable research data needs to be provided to inform process (should occur next year with the hiring of the Director of Institutional Effectiveness)*
5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work? *No*

### Governance Section

1. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?  
*Broad based representation and participation*  
*Regular meeting schedule*
2. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Share Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?  
*Improve the timeliness of the responses from constituent groups*

*Provided orientation to the governance and planning process/structure at the beginning of each academic year*  
*Provided expectations for etiquette (conduct at meetings) during orientation*  
*Shift the focus of discussions away from operational issues towards institutional strategic issues such as student success*  
*Use projection technology to improve meetings*

3. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?  
*Add Director of Institutional Effectiveness to Consultation Council/Strategic Planning, Academic Planning, Student Services Planning and Institutional Technology Planning*

# Associated Student Body

## April 28, 2013

Members Present: *Angela Alfaro, Michael McDonald, Alisa Baraby, Robert Lopez, Jonathan Herring, Corrina Brown, Sydney Velasquez*

Members Absent: *Elizabeth Fernandez, Marcus Murikami, Shon Parker, Francisco, Michael, Jacqueline Douglas*

### Planning Section

1. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*LCC ASB has had little to no participation in the planning process, which makes this a difficult question to address.*
2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*A majority of ASB senators feel they have not been adequately given the opportunity to participate in the planning process at LCC as well as a general lack of communication.*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?  
*We feel there continues to be a lack of communication between the different constituency groups.*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?  
*Perhaps to facilitate better communication we could institute a mass text message contact system to stay abreast of committee meetings and other vital matters.*
5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work?  
*We feel perhaps improving existing planning committees would be more beneficial than creating new ones.*

### Governance Section

1. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?  
*The meetings are the most streamlined that we have witnessed.*
2. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Share Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?  
*No, it is one of the better examples of how a committee should work.*

2. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?  
*Perhaps an online calendar keeping the times and dates of the different constituency groups, committees, and ASB to be distributed to all interested parties.*



# Facilities Planning Committee

**Date:** 5-14-13

## Planning Section

When answering these questions consider the “planning process” the process used to create the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan; including but not limited too the work of planning committees (Institutional Technology Plan, Facility Master Plan, Student Services Plan, Educational Master Plan, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2012-2013 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?  
*Meetings were well attended with the exception of the student representatives.  
Meetings were kept to 1 hour  
Information flowed well to and from meetings  
Minutes and agendas were regularly disseminated  
Meeting discussions were lively and achieved consensus  
The committee received the other planning documents earlier which assisted in the development of the FMP.*
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2012-2013 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?  
*No comments received.*
3. What changes would your committee recommend in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?  
*No comments received.*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?  
*Clerical support for the FPC chair would be beneficial.*
5. Does your committee feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is valued? *Yes*
6. Does your committee feel additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work?  
*The FPC feels additional planning committees are not necessary.*
7. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning? *Yes*

## Governance Section

1. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? *Yes*
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?  
*The timely revision of the Facilities Master Plan*  
*The annual review of the District's space inventory*  
*Continued promoting and supporting increased District recycling*  
*The review and support of the District's Five Year Scheduled Maintenance Plan*  
*The review and support of the Humanities Modernization Initial Project Proposal*
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.  
*No changes required.*
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed? *Yes*
5. Provide an analysis of the participation of the membership. Identify any individual or constituent group representation not in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings.  
*The Students attended less than fifty percent of the scheduled meetings. The Administration, Faculty, Classified, and Management groups attended the majority the scheduled meetings.*
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?  
*The FPC feels the campus committee communication is working. The FPC believes its practice of disseminating all committee correspondence via the LCCD everyone e-mail list is also working well.*

# Institutional Technology Planning Committee

## 5/9/13

Members Present: *L. Collier, R. Padgett, E. Theobald, L. Merchant*

Members Absent: *D. Clausen, J. Johnston, M. Giampoali, J. Ng, M. Hasselwander*

### Planning Section

When answering these questions consider the “planning process” the process used to create the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan; including but not limited to the work of planning committees (Institutional Technology Plan, Facility Master Plan, Student Services Plan, Educational Master Plan, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*The process of each planning committee building their plan based on the draft plans of other committees as well as the IPRs and NIPRs of each program and department helps to focus each committee on the master plan  
Standardized format of plan tables makes ease of readability  
Involves cross-campus input and feedback*
2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*Need more inter committee communication to cross reference work to be completed  
Achievements of the goals in the plans are not acknowledged and applauded*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?  
*Committees setting and maintaining regular meetings each semester would allow more opportunity to review and update the current plan.  
Improve communications with the rest of campus, both for input and feedback.  
Hold an “All Committees” meeting during Convocation*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?  
*No additional resources are required*
5. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary? *Yes*
6. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued? *Yes*
7. Do you feel additional planning committees are necessary for the process to work? *No*

## Governance Section

1. Did the committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?  
*Despite limited meetings, the ITPC fulfilled its charge*
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?  
*Successfully update the Institutional Technology Master Plan by prioritizing new technology that was identified through the institutions planning process. The following goals were met;*
  - A) *Weave online has been implemented*
  - B) *Smart Classrooms have been established*
  - C) *Accademia has been implemented*
  - D) *New business lab has been established*
  - E) *College Facebook page has been updated*
  - F) *New webpage software has been implemented*
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.  
*Establish or update the regular meeting schedule by the first day of classes each semester.*  
*Evaluate NIPR's and IPR's Institutional Technology needs to be included in the Institutional Technology Master Plan (ITMP)*  
*Update Institutional Technology Master Plan (ITMP)*
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?  
*The Director of IT and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness should have seats on the committee*
5. Provide an analysis of the participation of the membership. Identify any individual or constituent group representation not in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings.  
*D. Clausen <50%*  
*J. NG <50%*  
*M. Giampaoli <50%*  
*ASB rep <50%*
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?  
*Sharing of meeting announcements and minutes is positive and should continue. Committees should announce completion of goals to other areas of the campus and community as appropriate*  
*"All Committees" meeting at Convocation with suggestion boxes available for each committee or planning group.*

# Human Resource Planning Committee

## May 9, 2013

Members Present: *Vickie Ramsey, Cindy Howe, Elaine Theobald, Nancy Bengoa, Sue Mouck, Carrie Nyman*

Members Absent: *Brenda Hoffman, Dan Anderson*

### Planning Section

When answering these questions consider the “planning process” the process used to create the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan; including but not limited too the work of planning committees (Institutional Technology Plan, Facility Master Plan, Student Services Plan, Educational Master Plan, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*We definitely have good plans.  
The template is really agreeable; uniform and easy to read.  
Wide participation.*
2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*The committees don't meet enough, if at all, and plans are thrown together at the last minute and not well thought out.  
Not really sure the results from the plan actually get implemented the way we want.  
Lack of connection between plan and implementation.*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?  
*Meet more often and review the plan at those meetings.  
Use convocation to announce progress/implementations.  
Communicate better.  
Spring Convocation add an update on the status of our planning committees.*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks  
*Need to share the load, not just one person doing everything.*
5. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary? *Yes.*
6. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued? *Yes.*
7. Do you feel additional planning committees are necessary for the process to work? *No.*

## Governance Section

1. Did the committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?  
*Yes, but we didn't meet enough early enough to adequately perform our charge.*
  
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?  
*Human Resource Master plan; Professional Development Plan; Proposed draft Flex Schedule for 2013-14.*
  
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.  
*Don't change the charge.*
  
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed? *Yes.*
  
5. Provide an analysis of the participation of the membership. Identify any individual or constituent group representation not in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings.  
*Everyone participated when meetings were scheduled. Would like to have more student involvement.*
  
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?  
*Having the plans and discussion of the plans during convocation.*

## **Management/Confidential Employees**

### **4/29/13**

Members Present: *Denise Stevenson, Bobbie Theesfeld, Matt Levine, Shelly Baxter, Dave Trussell, Robin Padgett, Terry Bartley*

Members Absent: *Vickie Ramsey, Fran Oberg, Julie Johnston, Tina Rulofson, Eric Rulofson, Francis Beaujon*

#### Planning Section

1. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*All have equal participation in all phases of the process. All are aware of the timelines and what the expectations are.*
2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*Process works but limited staff creates a more difficult ability to cover all the commitments.*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?  
*The hiring admin assistance to help with reporting process such as NIPR work. When typing is not the skill of the manager, it makes these processes harder to do.*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?  
*Same as above, also by supporting the upcoming hire of a researcher back on campus will be very helpful.*
5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work? *NO*

#### Governance Section

1. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?  
*Information is available and participation is welcome from all.*
2. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Share Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?  
*Our process is strong, we were able to have a seamless transition with the new hire of Dr. Hall, and the Governance process continued uninterrupted.*
3. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?

*The process seems to have matured with less change identified, expectations are being met.*



# Student Services Planning Committee

**Date: May 15, 2013**

Members Present: *Patrick Walton, Shelly Baxter, Karen Clancy, Diann Jackson, Noelle Eckley, Jacob Williams*

Members Absent: *ASB, Kam Vento, Thomas Rogers,*

## Planning Section

When answering these questions consider the “planning process” the process used to create the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan; including but not limited too the work of planning committees (Institutional Technology Plan, Facility Master Plan, Student Services Plan, Educational Master Plan, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What works in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*Being early in the planning process (immediately after the EMP<sup>1</sup>) was very helpful.*  
*Having the plans in sequence worked extremely well.*  
*The timeline for master plans and adherence too it worked well.*
2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?  
*All IPR's and NIPR's need to adhere timelines to give adequate information and time to formulate the Student Services Master Plan.*  
*Lack of representation from all constituent groups especially given our desire to have greater student input.*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?  
*Utilizing a calendaring mechanism (doodle) to schedule meetings for committees.*  
*Involving student services managers in the early planning process for the SSMP to gather important information for formulating the SSMP.*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?  
*Current and extensive data provided by a researcher.*  
*More clerical support to help compile the SSMP.*
5. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary? *Yes*
6. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued? *Yes*

7. Do you feel additional planning committees are necessary for the process to work? *No*

### Governance Section

1. Did the committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? *Yes*
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?  
*The creation of the Student Services Master Plan  
Staffing prioritization was included for the first time ever in the SSMP.*
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. *No*
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?  
*The committee make-up was appropriate from each constituent group.*
5. Provide an analysis of the participation of the membership. Identify any individual or constituent group representation not in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings.  
*ASB was never represented on the Student Services Master Plan  
Kam Vento (faculty) was never present for any planning committee meetings.  
All other members were present at least 50% of the time.*
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?  
*Initiate a master calendar of all planning and governance meetings.  
A designated webpage or portal that has links to all committee documents (agendas, minutes, research, etc...).*

**Lassen Community College Planning Process Review Individual Survey - Spring 2013**

**Q1. The planning process at Lassen College works and produces appropriate institutional plans.**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Strongly Agree	9.1%	2
Agree	54.5%	12
Neutral	22.7%	5
Disagree	13.6%	3
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
	answered question	22
	skipped question	0

**Q2. I receive information about institutional planning through a variety of ways (by receiving committee minutes, through committee membership, through my group's representatives on various committees, through open forums).**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Strongly Agree	13.6%	3
Agree	68.2%	15
Neutral	13.6%	3
Disagree	4.5%	1
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
	answered question	22
	skipped question	0

**Q3. The institution has too many plans.**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Strongly Agree	4.5%	1
Agree	9.1%	2
Neutral	59.1%	13
Disagree	18.2%	4
Strongly Disagree	9.1%	2
	answered question	22
	skipped question	0

**Q4. The institution plans in the correct areas.**

<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Strongly Agree	4.5%	1
Agree	45.5%	10
Neutral	27.3%	6
Disagree	18.2%	4
Strongly Disagree	4.5%	1
	answered question	22
	skipped question	0

**Q5. The process I follow to have my ideas heard (through open forums, through representatives, etc) is effective.**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	4.5%	1
Agree	50.0%	11
Neutral	40.9%	9
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	4.5%	1
	answered question	22
	skipped question	0

**Q6. The Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan is the appropriate vehicle for institutional planning.**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	13.6%	3
Agree	68.2%	15
Neutral	13.6%	3
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	4.5%	1
	answered question	22
	skipped question	0

**Q7. The institutional planning process is appropriately tied to the budget development process.**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly Agree	4.5%	1
Agree	45.5%	10
Neutral	31.8%	7
Disagree	13.6%	3
Strongly Disagree	4.5%	1
	answered question	22
	skipped question	0