Contract Education 2016 NIPR

LASSEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Terri Armstrong, VP of Academic Services

Accepted by Cabinet: December 6, 2016 Accepted by Consultation Council: January 18, 2017 Accepted by Governing Board: (insert date)

CONTENTS

SECTION 1: INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PLANNING	. 3
I. PROGRAM OVERVIEW AND OBJECTIVES	. 3
DESCRIPTION/EVALUATION:	. 3
Planning Agenda:	. 4
II Administrative Unit and/or Student Learning Outcomes Assessment	. 4
Student Learning Outcome Assessment	. 4
DESCRIPTION/EVALUATION:	. 4
Planning Agenda:	. 5
III. EQUIPMENT	. 5
DESCRIPTION/EVALUATION:	. 5
Planning Agenda:	. 5
IV. OUTSIDE COMPLIANCE ISSUES (IF APPROPRIATE FOR PROGRAM)	. 5
DESCRIPTION:	. 5
EVALUATION:	. 5
Planning Agenda:	. 5
VI. PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS	. 5
A. PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION BY PROGRAM STAFF	. 5
B. PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCLUSION IN THE PLANNING PROCESS	. 5
PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCLUSION IN INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS MASTER PLAN	6
PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATION FOR INCLUSION IN STUDENT SERVICES MASTER PLAN	6
PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCLUSION IN EDUCATIONAL MASTER PLAN	6
SECTION TWO: HUMAN RESOURCE PLANNING	6
I. PROGRAM STAFFING	6
DESCRIPTION/EVALUATION:	6
Planning Agenda:	7
II. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	7
DESCRIPTION/EVALUATION:	7
Planning Agenda:	7
III. Administrative Unit and/or Student Learning Outcome Assessments	7
DESCRIPTION/EVALUATION:	7
Planning Agenda:	7
IV. PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATION	. 7
PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION BY PROGRAM STAFF	. 8
PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCLUSION IN THE PLANNING PROCESS	. 8
PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCLUSION IN HUMAN RECOURSE MASTER PLAN	. 8
SECTION THREE: FACILITIES PLANNING	. 8
I. FACILITIES	. 8
DESCRIPTION/EVALUATION:	. 8
Planning Agenda:	9
II. PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS	9

PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION BY PROGRAM STAFF	9
PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCLUSION IN THE PLANNING PROCESS	9
PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCLUSION IN THE FACILITIES MASTER PLAN	9
SECTION FOUR: TECHNOLOGY PLANNING	9
I. INSTITUTIONAL TECHNOLOGY	9
DESCRIPTION/EVALUATION:	9
Planning Agenda:	9
II. PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS	9
PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION BY PROGRAM STAFF	. 10
PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATION FOR INCLUSION IN THE PLANNING PROCESS	. 10
PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUSION IN INSTITUTIONAL TECHNOLOGY MASTER PLAN	. 10
Attachment C	
LASSEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE MASTER PLAN OVERVIEW	. 11

Contract Education 2016 NIPR

SECTION 1: INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PLANNING

I. Program Overview and Objectives

In an era of budget constraints and tightening expectations regarding apportionment-supported credit coursework, creating a robust Contract Education Program offered a viable mechanism for the college to assume an entrepreneurial role and progress toward a vision of self-sustainability. This expanded role aided the College in fully achieving its purpose and potential while simultaneously being responsive to the educational needs of the community. The last Contract Education Program NIPR was written in 2011. The financial picture is different now.

LCC is currently being self-sustainable by primarily focusing on apportionmentsupported credit coursework. The only contracts currently in use are the Fire Science contracts which are being reported in the Fire Science IPR, and the FIELD contracts. FIELD represents the Farmworker Institute of Education & Leadership Development. Their mission is to promote economic and social prosperity in rural communities for Latinos, Working people, and their families. They provide basic education and skills upgrade training to immigrants, farm workers, and low-skilled workers in rural communities to give them the confidence to realize their dreams.

Description/Evaluation:

- a. Describe and evaluate the program objectives against the LCC strategic plan, specifically the mission statement and strategic goals [available online or in the current catalog].
- b. Evaluate any changes in the program since last review. Include summary of Annual Updates completed since last review.

Contract Education with FIELD aligns with the Lassen Community College mission statement in that we are providing courses which build intellectual growth and economic potential in our outreach areas.

Since the last 2011 Contract Education Program NIPR was written the State of California has improved its financial stability and the college is currently funded primarily with apportionment based on the credit and non-credit coursework. The only contract currently being used to generate FTEs is the FIELD Contract. There are a few Fire Science contracts generating FTEs, but they are being reported in the Fire Science IPR. As the FTEs from credit stabilize we will decrease the need

for the FIELD contract. There is a cost associated with the FIELD FTEs and there is not with the apportionment from the credit coursework.

FIELD courses offered since 2010.

	2010-11			2011-12			2012-13			2013-14			2014-15							
Course	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>
ENGL 150		1	1	2		1	1	2			1	1		7	24	31		1	8	9
ENGL 155				-				-				-			6	6				-
FS 60A	11	17	20	37	11	16	18	34	9	5	18	23	11	18	18	36	11	17	19	36
Grand Tot	11	18	21	39	11	17	19	36	9	5	19	24	11	25	48	73	11	18	27	45

Instructional Service Agreements - Number of Sections

Enrollments produced from the FIELD contracts.

	2010-11			2011-12			2012-13			2013-14				2014-15						
Course	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>
ENGL 150		19	31	50		22	11	33			24	24		162	478	640		11	349	360
ENGL 155				-				-				-			67	67				-
FS 60A	419	583	690	1,273	470	625	710	1,335	301	199	761	960	307	533	707	1,240	374	586	635	1,221
Grand Total	419	602	721	1,323	470	647	721	1,368	301	199	785	984	307	695	1,252	1,947	374	597	984	1,581

FTEs generated from FIELD contracts.

	2010-11			2011-12			2012-13			2013-14				2014-15						
Course	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>	Sumr	Fall	Sprg	<u>Total</u>
ENGL 150		-	4.0	4.0		2.1	-	2.1			3.5	3.5		18.3	40.1	58.4		-	36.8	36.8
ENGL 155				-				-				-			4.9	4.9				-
FS 60A	39.6	53.4	63.1	116.5	43.0	57.3	63.9	121.2	27.6	17.8	69.8	87.6	27.2	48.7	64.8	113.5	34.4	53.6	58.2	111.7
Grand Total	39.6	53.4	67.1	120.5	43.0	59.4	63.9	123.3	27.6	17.8	73.3	91.1	27.2	67.1	109.8	176.9	34.4	53.6	95.0	148.6

The 2013-2014 year were the highest in courses, enrollment, and FTEs. Again, these FTEs do not equate to the same dollars that a credit course FTE generates.

Planning Agenda:

• Work towards the elimination of FIELD contracts.

II Administrative Unit and/or Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Student Learning Outcome Assessment

AUO and SLO assessment is important to maintain and improve institutional effectiveness and provide an effective learning experience for LCC students. Departments are expected to measure AUO and/or SLO annually; these records are maintained in WEAVE and are available for review at any time.

Description/Evaluation:

1. Identify and evaluate Administrative Unit and/or Student Learning Outcomes including the relationship to strategic goals for AUOs and institutional student learning outcomes for SLOs utilizing information from WEAVE.

There are no AUOs or SLOs for Contract Education. Being that all of the contracts deal with specific programs and are acknowledged in their respective IPRs, I recommend that this NIPR be eliminated.

Planning Agenda:

- Sunset the Contract Education NIPR.
- If there continue to be FIELD courses they can be included in the EMP.

III. Equipment

Description/Evaluation:

No equipment is needed for Contract Education.

Planning Agenda:

N/A

IV. Outside Compliance Issues (if appropriate for program)

Description:

If appropriate, describe the role of outside compliance issues on the program.

The FIELD contract is difficult to maintain. Sometimes the faculty are not hired until right before the classes are scheduled to begin, making it difficult to get them Minimally Qualified (MQ'd). Many of the FIELD administrators change regularly, again making consistency in the program difficult.

Evaluation:

Assess changes in compliance or identification of compliance-related needs and the impact on the program.

We want to continue to become less reliant on the FIELD contracts.

Planning Agenda:

• Increase the apportionment funded FTEs and decrease the FIELD FTEs.

VI. Prioritized Recommendations

A. Prioritized Recommendations for Implementation by Program Staff

List all recommendations made in Section One that do not require institutional action (ie. curriculum development) in order of program priority.

None

B. Prioritized Recommendations for Inclusion in the Planning Process

- Grow apportionment funded FTEs.
- Eliminate the NIPR & include the FIELD courses in the EMP.

Template: 8th Edition – NIPR Handbook Spec

Prioritized Recommendations for Inclusion in Institutional Effectiveness Master Plan

Strategic Goal	Planning Agenda Item	Implementation Time Frame	Estimated Cost (implementation & ongoing)	Expected Outcome
				Individual programs will
				report on any contracts
	Eliminate this NIPR			being done in their area.

Prioritized Recommendation for Inclusion in Student Services Master Plan

Strategic Goal	Planning Agenda Item	Implementation Time Frame	Estimated Cost (implementation & ongoing)	Expected Outcome
	None			

Prioritized Recommendations for Inclusion in Educational Master Plan

Strategic Goal	Planning Agenda Item	Implementation Time Frame	Estimated Cost (implementation & ongoing)	Expected Outcome
	Grow credit coursework FTEs	2017-2018		1700 FTE
	Eliminate this NIPR and include			More complete picture of
	the FIELD courses in the EMP	2021	\$0	all academic FTEs.

Section Two: Human Resource Planning

I. Program Staffing

Description/Evaluation:

1. List the current staffing for the program include: managers, faculty positions, and classified staff.

There are typically two instructors each semester.

2. This section provides an opportunity for analysis and justification of projected staffing needs to support the program. Work-study student needs may be included.

FIELD takes care of this.

Planning Agenda:

List recommendations and necessary actions necessitated by the above evaluation. Complete Institutional Effectiveness Planning and Human Resources Planning Forms as appropriate for any recommendations requiring institutional action.

None

II. Professional Development

Description/Evaluation:

1. Describe the professional development and professional activities of the program staff relevant to program improvements that has occurred during the period under review. (workshops, conferences, staff development, work experiences, etc.)

None

Planning Agenda:

List recommendations and necessary actions necessitated by the above evaluation. Complete Institutional Effectiveness Planning and Human Resources Planning Forms as appropriate for any recommendations requiring institutional action.

N/A

III. Administrative Unit and/or Student Learning Outcome Assessments

Description/Evaluation:

1. Describe any results from assessment of administrative units and/or student learning outcomes that affect human resource planning

N/A

Planning Agenda:

List recommendations and necessary actions necessitated by the above evaluation. Complete Institutional Effectiveness Planning and Human Resources Planning Forms as appropriate for any recommendations requiring institutional action.

N/A

IV. Prioritized Recommendation

Template: 8th Edition – NIPR Handbook Spec

Contract Education 2016 NIPR

Prioritized Recommendations for Implementation by Program Staff N/A

Prioritized Recommendations for Inclusion in the Planning Process

None

Prioritized Recommendations for Inclusion in Human Recourse Master Plan

Strategic Goal	Planning Agenda Item	Implementation Time Frame	Estimated Cost (implementation & ongoing)	Expected Outcome
	None			

Section Three: Facilities Planning

I. Facilities

Description/Evaluation:

1. Describe and evaluate the Lassen Community College facilities available to the program.

None

2. Describe and evaluate additional facilities utilized off-campus by the program (attach any relevant rental agreements)

Tipton, CA and Greenfield, CA.

3. Describe any facilities needs identified by assessments of administrative unit and/or student learning outcomes

None

4. Justify any proposed modifications or additions to existing facilities that would better serve the program planned for the next five years.

None

Planning Agenda:

List recommendations and necessary actions necessitated by the above evaluation. Complete Institutional Effectiveness, Facilities Planning, and Technology Planning Forms as appropriate for any recommendations requiring institutional action.

N/A

II. Prioritized Recommendations

Prioritized Recommendations for Implementation by Program Staff

List all recommendations made in Section Three that do not require institutional action (ie. curriculum development) in order of program priority.

• N/A

Prioritized Recommendations for Inclusion in the Planning Process

• N/A

Prioritized Recommendations for Inclusion in the Facilities Master Plan

Strategic Goal	Planning Agenda Item	Implementation Time Frame	Estimated Cost (implementation & ongoing)	Expected Outcome
	None			

Section Four: Technology Planning

I. Institutional Technology

Description/Evaluation:

1. Describe and evaluate technology and technology support provided for instruction and instructional support.

N/A

2. Describe any technology and technology support needs identified by assessment of administrative unit and/or student learning outcomes.

N/A

Planning Agenda:

No technology needed.

II. Prioritized Recommendations

Template: 8th Edition – NIPR Handbook Spec

Contract Education 2016 NIPR

Prioritized Recommendations for Implementation by Program Staff

N/A

Prioritized Recommendation for Inclusion in the Planning Process None

Prioritized Recommendations Inclusion in Institutional Technology Master Plan

Strategic Goal	Planning Agenda Item	Implementation Time Frame	Estimated Cost (implementation & ongoing)	Expected Outcome
	None			

Attachment C

Lassen Community College Master Plan Overview

Six master plans comprise the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan. Recommendations from program reviews will be input into the selected master plans as determined by faculty in the prioritized recommendation spreadsheets. To better understand which master plan might be most appropriate for each program recommendation, a summary/objective of each plan is included below. More information can be found in the Shared Governance and Consultation Council Handbook and the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan.

Institutional Effectiveness Master Plan (IEMP): the IEMP addresses college needs not addressed in other plans. These needs include research, governance, outcome assessment, and administrative operations.

Educational Master Plan (EMP): The EMP addresses the instructional planning needs of the college.

Student Services Master Plan (SSMP): The SSMP highlights the services needed to maximize the student experience through a variety of key student support services.

Institutional Technology Master Plan (ITMP): The ITMP addresses the technology needs of the campus.

Facilities Master Plan (FMP): The FMP addresses the physical infrastructure, facility, and maintenance needs of the campus.

Human Resources Master Plan (HRMP): The HRMP identifies and manages the administrative functions of recruitment, selection, evaluation, and professional development needs of the College to ensure a fully-staffed and highly functioning team of employees.