

# **Lassen Community College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review**

## **Planning Committee Survey**

**Committee Name: Academic Planning Committee**

**Date: May 11, 2009**

**Members Present: Dr. Berkowitz, Cheryl Aschenbach, Tina Bishop, Carie Camacho, Ross Stevenson, Cary Templeton**

**Members Absent: Sandy Beckwith, Yvonne Deering**

### 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 worked in the planning process for 2009-2014 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

*We were able to identify and prioritize the academic needs of the college.*

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

*There were too many issues for the committee to deal with. Process is still in the development stage and still has bugs to workout. Need to integrate more data into decision-making.*

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

*The committee needs more data and more time.*

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

*The committee needs more data and more time.*

5. Do you feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is necessary?

*Unquestionably*

6. Do you feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is valued?

*At times*

7. Do you feel additional planning committees are necessary for the process to work?

*Absolutely not*

### Governance Section

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

*Yes, charge includes enrollment management and because of all the tasks the committee couldn't get to it.*

2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?

*Instructional staffing prioritized, CIMP objectives and evaluations*

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*

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 performed*

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

# Lassen Community College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Constituent Group Survey

**Committee Name: Academic Senate**

**Date: April 27, 2009**

## **Members Present:**

Cheryl Aschenbach, President  
Carrie Nyman, Vice President  
Richard Swanson, Secretary  
Nancy Beterbide  
Carie Camacho  
Lisa Gardiner  
Robert Schofield  
Richard Swanson

## **Members: Absent**

None

## **Planning Section**

1. What worked in the planning process for 2009-2014 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

*The Senate was able to participate in the planning process for both the Academic Calendar and Strategic Objectives*

2. What didn't work in the planning process at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

*Nothing noted*

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

*The Senate has just completed revisions to the IPR process, which will mesh well with existing planning and budgeting processes.*

4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to effectively participate in the planning process?

*In general, planning committees need accurate, reliable and available data to drive plans and decisions. Beyond that, one would need to serve on an individual planning committee to better evaluate necessary resources.*

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

## **Governance Section**

1. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?  
*Communication has improved, lines of collegial consultation are being better understood and implemented by faculty*

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

*Better educate and train on the process so that faculty can continue to develop an understanding and trust for how it works. Continue to develop campus awareness. Revisit issues addressed through shared governance, remind people how it works, and encourage people to work a problem through the process.*

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

*Continuing on #2, perhaps role-modeling or problem-solving potential problems being addressed through the consultation process at Convocation or other flex day activity.*

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

**Committee Name: Accreditation Steering Committee**

**Date: May 7, 2009**

**Members Present:**

Karen Clancy  
Doug Houston

Sue Mouck  
Denise Stevenson

**Members: Absent**

Shelly Baxter  
Irving Berkowitz  
Bob Brower  
David Burris  
Katherine Granfield

John Martin  
Toni Poulsen  
Stepheny Stuart  
Cary Templeton  
Chris Younger

Planning Section

6. What worked in the planning process for 2009-2014 at Lassen College from the perspective of your committee?  
*The planning process included issues related to addressing accreditation recommendation.*
7. What didn't work in the planning process at Lassen College from the perspective of your committee? *None*
8. What changes would your committee suggest to the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness? *None*
9. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to effectively participate in the planning process? *None*
10. Are there any additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work?  
*None*

Governance Section

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

5. Identify results (products) of committee activities?  
*Preparation of two follow-up reports, two updates to the follow-up reports, an annual accreditation report and preparation for two evaluation team visits.*
6. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.  
*It is suggested that the committee may have outlived its purpose. When the Accreditation Steering Committee was first formed in the Fall of 1996, the institution did not have a shared governance organizational structure. Since that time the organizational structure of the college has significantly changed. The Consultation Council/Strategic Planning Committee has replaced many of the coordinating/oversight functions of the Accreditation Steering Committee. It recognized that an accreditation coordinating function may be necessary prior to the writing of the self-study. With the college off of sanctions, the on-going steering committee may not be necessary.*
7. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed? *Yes*
8. 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 participation on this committee has waned this year. Particularly the faculty involvement, with the exception of the faculty chair has been significantly reduced.*
9. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?  
*Communication has significantly improved with the distribution of agendas and minutes from many committees on the "everyone distribution list."*  
*Suggestion to improve communication that the campus schedule four open forums: two at the beginning of each semester possibly during Convocation to set the direction of the semester and two at the end of the semester possibly during finals week to review and evaluate the semester. Forums should provide an opportunity for the free flow of information and serving food would encourage attendance.*

# Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Constituent Group Survey

**Committee Name: Administration**

**Date: May 5, 2009**

**Members Present:**

Irving Berkowitz  
David Burris  
Monica Cochran

Katherine Granfield  
Doug Houston  
Cary Templeton

**Members Absent: None**

**Others Present:**

Julie Johnston

Sue Mouck

Planning Section

1. What worked in the planning process for 2009-2014 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?
  - a. *Board Retreat with Strategic Planning Committee worked well to initiate the planning process this year.*
  - b. *Board adopted Strategic Goals adopted prior to the planning process and providing a guiding framework for the process.*
  - c. *Combination of the Consultation Council and Strategic Planning Committee worked well because the SPC became central to the process and functioned to coordinate the planning activities.*
  - d. *Achieved higher level of integration in the planning process and resulting plan this year.*
  - e. *Provided public scrutiny of planning document*
  - f. *Alternating Cabinet and Executive Cabinet worked to facilitate workflow.*
  - g. *Mini Retreats for administrators adopted this spring.*
  - h. *Convocation activity last fall provided an opportunity for all campus employees to engage in the planning process.*
  - i. *Documentation of the planning process.*
  
2. What didn't work in the planning process at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?
  - a. *Lack of regular updates to board and public on planning progress.*
  - b. *Academic Planning Committee experienced more top down than bottom up planning*

- c. *Need to engage greater number of individuals in the planning process particularly as it relates to their area.*
  - d. *Inadequate structure for communication to campus which groups (operational structure or constituent groups) to review (solicit input) on planning and governance (work product).*
  - e. *Program review integration is not clearly articulated in the process (clarification that program review is driving decisions).*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
- a. *Use agenda to clarify which groups (operational structure or constituent groups) are providing review.*
  - b. *Provide training for more effective communication.*
  - c. *Provide current versions of planning documents in an accessible electronic repository.*
  - d. *Further refine the three separate resource allocation (budget enhancement) lists: staffing, one-time expenditures, on-going non-staffing and ensure the development of a separated prioritized list is clearly articulated within the budget development document.*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?
- a. *Documents and databases need to be accessible online.*
  - b. *Key users need to be able to interact electronically.*
  - c. *Provision of "intranet" or similar vehicle.*
  - d. *Make available more external resource planning documents.*
5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work?
- a. *Institutional Research Advisory Committee*
  - b. *Distance Education Advisory Committee*
  - c. *Prison Education Committee*

*Tasks without a committee:*

- 1. *Safety*
- 2. *Web Standards and Priorities*

### Governance Section

1. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?
  1. *Good collegial dialog on a variety of issues.*
  2. *Measureable Results (EEO Plan, Emergency Procedures Manual)*
2. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?
  1. *Clarify items on Consultation Council agenda as falling into one of three groups:*
    - a. *Governance – recommendations to be developed by the body on policy and strategic planning*
      - i. *May require protracted discussions with multiple readings, time for information to be taken back to constituent groups for discussion*





# Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Constituent Group Survey

**Committee Name: Classified Employees (CSEA)**

**Date: May 14, 2009**

## **Members Present:**

KC Mesloh	Phil Horner
Bruce Sager	Elaine Theobald
Patrick Clancy	Karen Clancy
Ken Honea	Carol Montgomery
Jeff Lang	

## **Members Absent:**

### Planning Section

1. What worked in the planning process for 2009-2014 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

*The classified constituent group was given the same opportunity to participate in the planning process as other groups. Plans are written, recorded, tracked, revised and disseminated with a paper trail.*

2. What didn't work in the planning process at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

*Reorganization. The planning has been planned by few and affects many. It seems like we are allowed to participate when the administration need us and by the time it comes to us for input most decisions have already been made behind closed doors without our participation.*

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

*More communication between various committees. Increase communication within departments, ie. Departmental meetings. Plans should not be brought into shared governance process until all mandatory subjects of negotiations have been resolved. Sunshine plans, allow more participation in forming plan (Collegial Consultation).*

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

*Research data, historical numbers when making decisions, timely data.  
Classified clerical support.*

5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work?

*No, sufficient number of committees currently. Save the Safety/Emergency Preparedness Committee.*

#### Governance Section

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

*We are meeting regularly. We have a working knowledge of processes. Release time for staff to attend.*

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

*Invest more time and money to implement good sound practices.*

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

*Respect contracts, Ed. Code, and State Law.*

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

**Committee Name: Consultation Council/Strategic Planning Committee**

**Date: May 7, 2009**

**Members Present:**

Cheryl Aschenbach  
Terry Bartley  
David Burris  
Karen Dolan  
Phil Horner

Dr. Doug Houston  
Jeff Lang  
Sue Mouck  
Eric Rulofson  
Cary Templeton

**Members Absent:**

Sandy Beckwith  
Dr. Irving Berkowitz  
Shelly Baxter  
Carie Camacho

Katherine Granfield  
Carol Montgomery  
Abel Ramoz  
Ross Stevenson (class conflict)

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 worked in the planning process for 2009-2014 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?
  - a. *Good sharing of information*
  - b. *Combination of the Consultation Council and Strategic Planning Committee worked well – recommend keeping the structure for next year*

2. What didn't work in the planning process at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?
  - a. *The committee focused on too low a level of decision-making*
  - b. *The committee did not receive data in a timely fashion*
  - c. *Information needed earlier (specifically budget enhancement information needed prior to meeting determining priorities)*
  - d. *Institutional is still exhibiting a lack of trust, which needs to be built over time*
  - e. *Need the justification portion of the budget enhancement forms to be consistently completed to provide the committee with information for making informed decisions*
  - f. *The planning process took too long*
  - g. *Lack of a quorum*
  
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
  - a. *Identification of what items on the committee agenda need to be communicated to various groups (information for constituent groups, planning groups, other)*
  - b. *Clarification of the role of the members of the committee*
  - c. *Use of committee minutes as a mechanism to communicate with other groups*
  - d. *For important issues it might benefit the process to have the committee chair or college president make presentations to groups (planning committees or constituent groups)*
  
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?
  - a. *Time*
  - b. *Provision of data earlier*
  - c. *"Intranet" – electronic repository for documents*
  
5. Do you feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is necessary?  
*Yes*
  
6. Do you feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is valued?  
*Yes, at least by members of the committee. The process is still new and many on campus are still unaware of the committee's contributions.*
  
7. Do you feel additional planning committees are necessary for the process to work?  
*The college may need to consider some form of Institutional Research committee in the future.*

## 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?
  - a. *2009-2014 Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan*
  - b. *Institutional Planning and Budget Development Process Handbook*
  - c. *Shared Governance & Collegial Consultation Process Handbook*
  - d. *Proposed Acceptable Use Policy*
  - e. *Proposed Equal Employment Opportunity Plan*
  - f. *Interim Emergency Procedures Handbook*
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.  
*No suggested changes to charge*
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?  
*Broad across campus representation by constituent groups 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.  
*Attendance at the committee meeting was generally good. Only one meeting was cancelled for lack of a quorum. No constituent group missed more than fifty percent of the meetings.*
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
  - a. *Communication is working better – distribution of agendas and minutes by email is improving communication*
  - b. *Clarification of items on the agenda as falling into specific areas*
    1. *Governance – formal recommendation derived by consensus expected from the committee*
    2. *Consultation – less formal suggestions from committee providing guidance to assist in making decisions*
    3. *Information/Communication – flow of information sometimes about decisions already made*
  - c. *Structure periodic presentations by planning committees and program reviews (executive summaries) to improve communication*

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

**Committee Name: Curriculum/Academic Standards  
Committee**

**Date: May 5, 2009**

**Members Present:**

Ms. Cheryl Aschenbach, Vice Chair  
Ms. Elizabeth Elam  
Ms. Lisa Gardiner  
Ms. K.C. Mesloh  
Ms. Susan G. Mouck, Chair  
Mr. Robert Schofield  
Mr. Garrett Taylor

Ms. Gail D. Pritchard  
Curriculum Secretary/Technician

**Members: Absent**

Dr. Irving Berkowitz, Vice-President/Dean of Instructional Services  
Ms. Tina Bishop, Articulation Officer  
Ms. Reina Branum  
Ms. Carrie Nyman  
Ms. Tammy Younger/ASB Representative

**Planning Section**

1. What worked in the planning process for 2009-2014 at Lassen College from the perspective of your committee?  
*The Curriculum review component of the Instructional Program Review process leading into institutional planning worked well.*
2. What didn't work in the planning process at Lassen College from the perspective of your committee?  
*The committee with primary responsibility for the review and approval of curriculum and programs has not been included in the communication loop. The lack of communication of intent for the development or expansion of instructional programs has left the committee without adequate information to effectively participate in planning relating to curriculum and program development .*

3. What changes would your committee suggest to the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?  
*Regular attendance and participation by the Vice-President/Dean of Instructional Services would facilitate communication between the Academic Planning and Curriculum/Academic Standards committee in the area of program development.*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to effectively participate in the planning process?  
*Accurate, reliable and available data relevant to curriculum review and decision-making. (Example: To inactivate CHEM 1B or not?) See meeting minutes of March 17, 2009)*
5. Are there any additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work? *No*

### **Governance Section**

6. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? *Yes*
7. Identify results (products) of committee activities?  
*Action Log 2008 – 2009 and meeting minutes.*
8. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. *None*
9. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?
  1. *Meeting attendance of the Institutional Researcher, when needed by the committee for decision-making.*
  2. *Membership be assigned by academic year to facilitate the required stand alone training that is mandatory at the beginning of the Fall semester.*
10. 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.  
*Representatives of all constituent groups were in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings with the exception of the administration and the student representative of the associated student body.*
11. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?  
*Communication has improved: The Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee distributes agenda's and minutes to all campus. It is recommended that other committees; Academic Planning, Human Resources Planning, and Student Services Planning also distribute minutes.*



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

**Committee Name: Facilities Planning Committee**

**Date: May 6, 2009**

**Members Present:** Nancy Lounsbury, John Mulcahy, Patrick Clancy, Peggy Fulder, Eric Rulofson, Abel Ramoz

**Members Absent:** Irving Berkowitz, Cary Templeton, Michelle Baxter (excused)

## 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 worked in the planning process for 2009-2014 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

*\*Meetings were well attended except by Administrative Constituent, absent 75%*

*\*Maintained one hour meetings*

*\*Information flowed well to and from campus*

*\*Minutes and agendas disseminated regularly*

*\*Active, lively discussions mostly reaching consensus*

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

*\*Administration wanted to change our charge. Not clear on site plan prioritization process. Committee did not have institutional priorities early in the planning process, as a result FPC planned using what they thought priorities would be.*

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

*\*IPR and NIPR with facility requests need forwarded to the FPC.*

*\*Institutional priorities need forwarded to the FPC early in the yearly planning process.*

4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?  
\**Staff and budget to adequately address Environmental Stewardship on campus.*
5. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning? *Not structured to include the FPC in the budget process.*
6. Do you feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is necessary?  
\* *Yes. The 5-year plan was funded.*  
\* *Yes. Welding square footage expansion for production was supported by FPC pending funding.*
7. Do you feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is valued?  
\**Yes, now that we have a representative on the Strategic Planning Committee.*
8. 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 need to re-write charter as focus has been changed.*
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?  
\**Creation of the Facility Master Plan, which included projects requiring funds, which were allotted.*
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.  
\**Modify the charge to include a focus on Environmental Stewardship.*
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed? *Yes.*  
\**Consistent participation by administration constituent.*
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. \**Administrative group.*
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?  
\**Our committee's communication seems very good as it is. Sending minutes via email is timely and available to be read or researched.*

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

**Committee Name: Institutional Technology Planning Committee**

**Date: May 11, 2009**

**Members Present:** Bartley, Brown, Granfield, Levine, Merchant, Theobald, Vento; Giampaoli provided email input

**Members Absent:** Hubbard

## 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 worked in the planning process for 2009-2014 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?
  - a. Developing technology objectives based on Board-directed Strategic Goals, and providing these as input to the Strategic Plan.*
  - b. Receiving the Strategic Objectives and Strategies as assembled and elaborated by the Strategic Planning Committee, and using them as direction for specific action projects.*
  - c. Having the whole procedure working and available; we could see results and tell we were doing some good.*
  
2. What didn't work in the planning process at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?
  - a. Developing a distinct Technology Master Plan and vision. Our 'plan' is simply a subset of the Strategic Master Plan.*
  - b. Integrating IPR/NIPR recommendations into our planning or our actions; connecting us, the resource, with them, the needs.*
  - c. Achieving full integration with the work of sibling committees. 'We are in an eddy, need to be in the mainstream'*

3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
  - a. Articulate a subordinate plan purpose and template.*
  - b. Create a more useful format for publishing IPR/NIPR recommendations.*
  - c. There needs to be a more practical way to segregate recommendations by topic and channel them to the relevant committees; and, a clear process & timeline for committee review and digestion of these recommendations as input to planning and action. (This was the topic of an ITPC discussion in Spring 2009.)*
  - d. Circulate a form to faculty asking what technology is needed to improve teaching methods.*
  - e. Create more communication ('cross-pollination') between this and other planning committees; through cross-membership, or specially-appointed roving connectors/ambassadors?*
  
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?
  - a. IPR/NIPR data*
  - b. More communication/coordination with other planning committees*
  - c. Survey data from faculty or other campus constituencies*
  - d. A summary of the typical technology available at similarly sized campuses*
  
5. Do you feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is necessary? *Yes.*
  
6. Do you feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is valued? *Yes.*
  
7. Do you feel additional planning committees are necessary for the process to work?
 

*No. But focused working groups are important, such as the ad-hoc emergency preparedness group. And, the formation of these groups needs more formalization: constituent groups are uncomfortable with non-approved appointments. (This does not apply to creating a working subgroup within a committee.)*

### 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?

- a. Developed Objectives for Strategic Plan, Fall 2008*
- b. Created Datatel Access Authorization Form, Spring 2009*
- c. Created Workstation Standards, Spring 2009*
- d. Articulated a computer lab management process in collaboration with Academic Planning, Spring 2009*

3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.

*Suggest the committee's meeting schedule be trimmed to once monthly from twice monthly; this was our practice for Spring 2009 and seemed to be a good fit for amount and timeliness of committee work, set against competing work demands.*

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.

*All individuals and groups attended 50% or better, and attendance at each meeting was better than 50%.*

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

- a. Cross-membership in sibling planning committees to overcome functional silos (Technology, Facilities, Human Resources, Academic).*
- b. We need to all be working on the same thing. Select 1 or 2 goals for more focus for the year: what is our big push, common theme? As Accreditation visitors noted, we have too many plans, are working on too many things. The other objectives/strategies wouldn't go away, but we would guarantee unified effort behind select initiatives to be more effective. As an example, we seem to agree that distance education is a key to our growth and survival, but we don't seem to come together behind it so that it explodes.*

# **Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review Constituent Group Survey**

**Committee Name: Management/Confidential Employees**

**Date: May , 2009**

**Members Present:** Shelly Baxter Terry Bartley David Burris  
Yvonne Deering, Karen Dolan, Ron Evans, Susie Hart, Matt  
Levine, Vickie Ramsey, Eric Rulofson, Denise Stevenson

**Members Absent:** Robin Padgett, Marshel Couso, Monica  
Cochran, Julie Johnston

*The committee was asked if there were any areas from this survey that proved to be an issue and all agreed that the planning process was working for our group and that our input was heard and we were well represented. There were no other comments regarding our planning processes. Each had an opportunity to respond from the various committees that they were a part of.*

## Planning Section

1. What worked in the planning process for 2009-2014 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?
2. What didn't work in the planning process at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?
5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work?

## Governance Section

1. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?
2. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?
3. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?

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

**Committee Name: Minimum Qualification/Equivalency  
Committee**

**Date: May 5, 2009**

**Members Present:**

Noelle Eckley  
Sara Michels

Sue Mouck  
Richard Swanson

**Members: Absent**

Nancy Bengoa-Beterbide  
Dr. Irving Berkowitz

Planning Section

1. What worked in the planning process for 2009-2014 at Lassen College from the perspective of your committee? *Not applicable*
2. What didn't work in the planning process at Lassen College from the perspective of your committee? *Not applicable*
3. What changes would your committee suggest to the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness? *Not applicable*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to effectively participate in the planning process? *Not applicable*
5. Are there any additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work? *Not applicable*

Governance Section

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

*The committee performed all of its charge with the exception of the review of newly hired educational administrators for minimum qualifications. Only one of the newly hired educational administrators was reviewed.*

2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?

*Review of seventeen applicant files for equivalency*

3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.

*None*

4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? *Yes*  
If not what changes are needed? *None*

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 committee members were in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings with the exception of the Vice-President/Dean of Instructional Services. The attendance of the Director of Human Resources as a guest at one of the meetings was appreciated by the membership.*

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

*The board agenda item on equivalency provides a valuable tool in communication and transparency of the equivalency process.*

Additional Comments:

*The committee recommends that the minimum qualification and equivalency process be consistently followed subsequent to the completion of the committee's role. Any proposed changes to the process need to be brought to the attention of the Academic Senate.*