

Lassen Community College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review

Planning Committee Survey

Committee Name: Academic Planning Committee

Date: May 18, 2011

Members Present: Dr. Berkowitz, Carie Camacho, Brian Wolf, Sandy Beckwith, Noelle Eckley

Members Absent: Cary Templeton, Dr. Carabajal, Brian Gosney, ASB

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 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

Positive, collegial, started with broad, general ideas, which became more specific as plan progressed. Additional data provided critical in success for short term class scheduling

2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

Unknown budgets made it difficult to plan in some cases.

3. What changes would your committee recommend in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?

Data support – Don't have a framework to assess feasibility of current and future programs (i.e. what kind of data is needed to do long range process. Standing agenda items to monitor EMP

4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks? *Additional research data*

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?
No
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?
Change in program status (LVN, Graphic Design, Logistics)
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. *None*
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?
Yes, broad based
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 not made aware of meeting times.
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
Possible annual meeting with Student Services/Institutional Technology/ Facilities Planning Committees

Is there anything you would like to add to the evaluation of either planning or governance?

Lassen Community College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review

Constituent Group Survey

Constituent Group: Faculty (Academic Senate)

Date: May 12, 2011

Members Present: Cheryl Aschenbach, Lisa Gardiner, Richard Swanson, Nancy Beterbide, Michael Giampaoli

Additional Faculty Members Present: Sue Mouck, Tom Jeffries

Members Absent: Betsy Elam, Carrie Nyman, Robert Schofield

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.

8. What worked in the planning process used during 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

Planning influenced instructional priorities even in the face of cuts, faculty input and recommendations from IPRs were included in plans, IPR process has benefitted from the availability of more data compared to previous IPR cycles.

9. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

Planning timelines were not adhered to. Not all faculty IPR recommendations were evident in plans developed – vocational programs were not represented in plans. There is still room for improvement with data for IPRs – some faculty are not confident working with raw data, and there is a need for a greater diversity, quantity and consistency of data (student success and enrollment/FTE data by term is more beneficial to identify trends). LVN faculty have not been sufficiently involved with planning/decisions made for the program.

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

Follow timeline established in the Institutional Planning and Budget Development Handbook. Include IPR recommendations immediately in the next cycle of plans.

11. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to effectively participate in the planning process? *None.*
12. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work? *No!*
13. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning?
Yes, budget is tied to planning.

Governance Section

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

The Senate's legal role (10+1) is acknowledged and appreciated. The faculty has regular, structured opportunities to participate in consultation through the Senate

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

Increase faculty representation for governance on Consultation Council. The Senate President is the only faculty constituent group representative on CC. Once all planning chairs were included, most of whom are managers, the number of classified and management representatives outnumber faculty representation. Although faculty division chairs are members of CC, their selection by and service to administration limits their ability to solely represent the faculty. Division Chairs, by job description, are also planners and implementers of plans rather than representatives. The Senate plans to appoint a broad selection of faculty to fill the current faculty spots (3 DCs and Lead Counselor) on CC so as to create a stronger faculty constituent group representative voice for matters of consultation.

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

See explanation above.

Is there anything you would like to add to the evaluation of either planning or governance?

A strong link and communication between Senate and instructional administration is facilitated by the regular attendance of an instructional administrator at Senate meetings. Until Dr. Carabajal was appointed Dean of Academic Services, the link between Senate and instructional administration was lacking.

**Lassen Community College Planning, Budgeting and
Governance Process Review
Planning Committee Survey**

Committee Name: Consultation Council/Strategic Planning Committee

Date: May 10, 2011

Members Present: Cheryl Aschenbach, Terry Bartley, Sandy Beckwith, Irving Berkowitz, David Burris, Doug Houston Phil Horner, Jeff Lang, Logan Merchant, Carol Montgomery, Sue Mouck, Eric Rulofson, Cary Templeton

Members Absent: Shelly Baxter, Carie Camacho, Brain Wolf, Student Representative

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.

14. What worked in the planning process used during 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

The planning process worked well this year. The development of the COM.P.ACT help the committee to remain focused. The two-year planning horizon in the COM.P.ACT for budget prioritization worked better than one-year. Conducting open forums as part of the planning process in addition to the budget development process was an improvement. Communication between the Strategic Planning Committee and the various master planning committees worked better this year.

15. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

The planning process timelines need to be consistently followed. Rumors and negative reports on the discussions and consensus reached during meeting have had a negative impact on the process. The need for accurate and effective communication continues to be an issue.

16. What changes would your committee recommend in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?

Efforts to provide effective communication must continue and be improved, providing executive summaries along with entire documents was suggested. Individuals wanting the short version could read the executive summaries and those more interested in the background and details could read the longer version. Clear follow-up on the recommendations forwarded by the committee needs to occur. The utilization of technology during committee meetings was suggested.

17. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?
It was suggested that providing a clerical support pool for the various planning committees would improve efficiency.
18. Does your committee feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is valued?
"YES"
19. Does your committee feel additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work?
The consideration of a budget advisory committee, which would function as a subcommittee of the strategic planning committee to develop draft budget proposals (serve the role filled by Cabinet this year) was suggested to address some of the concerns about transparency raised about this year's budget development process.
20. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning?
"YES"
The integration between planning and budget development occurred better this year, due at least in part to the planning occurring prior to the budget development instead of at the same time as in previous years.

Governance Section

7. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?
"YES"
8. Identify results (products) of committee activities?
Committee activities are clearly published in the minutes, but include: prioritized list for one-time expenditure, Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan, COM.P.ACT strategies recommendations, recommendations on board policies, adoption of administrative procedures, and forwarded program reviews to governing board and planning committees. In addition the committee provided good examples of the consultative process and upheld the institutional values.
9. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.
The increase use of subcommittees was suggested.
10. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?
The large size of the committee was noted, but it was agreed that the consensus model has worked well and no changes were suggested.
11. 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 groups were represented at least fifty percent of the time. Informational meetings were held on the few occasions when a quorum was not in attendance. No meetings were cancelled for lack of participation.

12. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
The utilization of executive summaries was again suggested. Orientation/training for members of this and other committees on the consultative process should continue. Scheduled presentations of information from Consultation Council on constituent group and planning committee agendas.

Is there anything you would like to add to the evaluation of either planning or governance?
None

Lassen Community College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review

Planning Committee Survey

Committee Name: Facilities Planning Committee

Date: 5-18-11

Members Present: Kory Konkol, Patrick Clancy, Francis Beaujon, Eric Rulofson

Members: Dr. Berkowitz, Cary Templeton, Ross Stevenson, Ross Brosius (had a meeting conflict), and the Student Representative

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.

21. What worked in the planning process used during 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?
 - *Meetings were well attended with the exception of the Administration and 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*
 - *Participation by interests outside the FPC increased over last year. Several individuals attended FPC meetings and provided meaningful input.*
22. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?
 - *The committee received little input from the Administration and Student representatives.*
23. What changes would your committee recommend in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - *The FPC would benefit from receiving the EMP earlier in the planning process.*
24. 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.*

25. Does your committee feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is valued?
- *Yes, as an example the Consultation Council's COMPAC priorities were sent to the FPC committee for recommendations before implementation.*
26. Does your committee feel additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work?
- *The FPC feels additional planning committees are not necessary.*
27. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning?
- *In the past year the committee is not aware of any FPC recommendations that were given notice in the budget process.*

Governance Section

13. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?
- *Yes, additionally the FPC added clarifying language to the committee's charge.*
14. Identify results (products) of committee activities?
- *The revision of the Facilities Master Plan*
 - *The first annual review of the District's space inventory*
 - *Promoted and supported an increase in 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*
 - *Reviewed several District construction projects including the; Ag tack rooms and Gun Shop storage building proposals.*
15. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.
- *See attached revised and approved Facility Planning Committee charge.*
16. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?
- *Yes, the membership is appropriate to implement the FMP's charge.*
17. 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 Administration and Students attended less than fifty percent of the scheduled meetings. The Faculty, Classified, and Management groups attended 100% of the scheduled meetings.*
18. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
- *The FPC feels the campus committee communication is working. The FPC's believes its practice of disseminating all committee correspondence via the LCCD everyone e-mail list is also working well.*

Is there anything you would like to add to the evaluation of either planning or governance?

Facilities Planning

Open and uses voting by majority decision-making processes.
Meets on third Wednesday of odd months at 11:00 am in the Board Room

- Recommend construction and modification of District facilities, assets, properties, and the repurposing of assignable square footage.
- Recommend sequencing and priority of large District renovation and construction projects defined as projects required to be bid by the State of California Public Contract Code.
- Develop, review and adjust facilities planning documents
- Submit the Facilities Master Plan to the Consultation/Council/Strategic Planning Committee

ing:

- 2 administrators (Dean of Academic Services or designee and the Dean of Administrative Services or designee)
- 2 confidential/management representatives appointed by the management group including the Director of Facilities
- 2 faculty appointed by the Academic Senate
- 2 classified representatives appointed by CSEA (The FMP Committee recommends that one classified representative be from maintenance)
- 1 student representative appointed by ASB

Chair:

meeting in the fall semester.

- A quorum, consisting of one member from each of three of the five voting constituencies, shall be required to conduct business.
- Attendance, including voting may be facilitated by electronic communication.

Reporting: Reports to Executive Director of Human & Support Services Documents are forwarded to the Strategic Planning Committee.

Approved by the Facilities Planning Committee - February 21, 2007

Reviewed by the Facilities Planning Committee – May 2011

Lassen Community College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review

Planning Committee Survey

Committee Name: Human Resource Planning Committee

Date: May 12, 2011

Members Present: David Burris, Kam Vento, Sandi Jonas, Susie Hart

Members Absent: Dr. Berkowitz, Tami Wattenburg, Vickie Ramsey

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.

28. What worked in the planning process used during 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

Reviewed and approved the hiring procedures manual. Use of electronic communications for collaboration outside of meeting time.

29. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

Time constraints and difficulty in gathering a quorum

30. What changes would your committee recommend in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?

Structure improvement, Use of best practices

31. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks? *Time*

32. Does your committee feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is valued? *Yes*

33. Does your committee feel additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work?
No

34. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning?

N/A

Governance Section

19. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?

Flex Day activities
Supervisory training

20. Identify results (products) of committee activities?

Reviewed and forwarded hiring procedures manual
Implemented new-hire mentor program
Employee handbook template
Flex day activity through e-mail notification, calendar not established

21. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. *None*

22. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?

Yes

23. 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. *NA*

24. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?

Publish minutes
Central repository for minutes
Goal of linking all plans

Is there anything you would like to add to the evaluation of either planning or governance?

Lassen Community College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review

Planning Committee Survey

Committee Name: Student Services Planning Committee

Date: 5.9.11

Members Present: Cary Templeton, Tena Rulofson, Janna Sandahl, Jerry Thao

Members Absent: Glen Yonan, Jennifer Bird, Toni Gomez, Dr. Berkowitz

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.

35. What worked in the planning process used during 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

The orientation meeting for this committee and the full set of NIPR's accompanied by the student service managers explanation helped the committee come up to speed on the issues facing Student Services. The budget overview also helped the committee understand the massive budget cuts and their impact from the previous year. Meetings were noticed well and the electronic handouts prior to the meetings helped committee members prepare for the meetings.

36. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

Lack of commitment to come to the meetings by some groups made shared governance difficult.

37. What changes would your committee recommend in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?

Have set dates for the meetings announced at the beginning of the term.

38. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?

None

39. Does your committee feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is valued?
40. Does your committee feel additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work?
No
41. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning?
Yes

Governance Section

25. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?
Yes
26. Identify results (products) of committee activities?
Budget enhancements, Master Plan updated, SLO review from Student Services NIPR's, NIPR review and the development of a Student Services Committee manual with key documents.
27. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. *None*
28. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?
Yes when people show up. Good minutes also.
29. 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 student constituent group
Jennifer Bird, Glen Yonan, Dr. Berkowitz, Toni Gomez*
30. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
Professional Demeanor and decorum during meetings could have been better at consultation council. In this committee we had no incidences of poor demeanor or difficult decorum but in other governance meetings valuable time was wasted because of an occasional misunderstanding, outburst or difficult communication pattern.

Is there anything you would like to add to the evaluation of either planning or governance?