

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

Committee Name: Academic Senate

Date:

Members Present:

Members Absent:

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 used during 2009-2010 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

All planning committees produced plans that were incorporated into the CIMP.

2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2009-2010 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

First, given the absence of division chairs until March 8, 2010, representation of faculty and divisions, particularly in regards to decisions effecting day-to-day function of divisions, was non-existent. For the same reason, individual faculty did not have adequate input into the budget enhancement or reduction process. The only exception is the campus-wide survey, but these were individual based, not department or division-based. Because of the lack of division input into budget enhancement and reduction, many departments had current year budgets reduced, or available monies removed from accounts, based on decisions of the Dean of Instruction alone. No faculty input was solicited with regard to suggestions for reduction of budgets within programs, departments, and divisions.

Second, the budget planning timeline was not followed, nor was the process. Budget enhancement/reduction forms were never distributed to faculty regardless of timeline. At no time did the Dean of Instruction, in the absence of division chair assignments, discuss individual program or department budgets with program faculty.

Third, recommendations from IPRs and NIPRs need to be fully integrated into the planning process. Recommendations currently are included as an attachment to plans, but primarily at the insistence of division chairs for individual programs. The inclusion of recommendations needs to be automated to reduce manpower efforts, reduce oversight

of IPR/NIPR recommendations, and to ensure that recommendations are included in all relevant or necessary plans.

3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
Continue to employ division chairs to facilitate full participation of faculty and representation of program, department, and division interests for campus-wide and instructional decision making.
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?
Greater and more expedient access to data was important to the planning process this year; the faculty expects to see a continued capacity to produce and interpret data necessary for decision making. In order to accomplish this, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning may need additional assistance.
5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work? *No. But, the people assigned to committees need to take the responsibility seriously and realize that each person represents faculty. The facilitation of communication between all faculty and the individual committees by the appointed representatives is critical to informing and empowering all faculty.*

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
Constituent Group Survey**

Committee Name: Administration

Date: May 4, 2010

Members Present: David Burris, Kayleigh Carabajal, Dave Clausen, Monica Cochran, Dr. Doug Houston, Sue Mouck, Cary Templeton

Members Absent: Dr. Irving 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 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 used during 2009-2010 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?
 - a. *Budget development process worked well despite the late start*
 - b. *Great dialogue, listening forums*
 - c. *Policy and administrative procedures review process has gone well*
 - d. *Master planning committees felt engaged in the process*
 - e. *Consultation Council session to discuss and integrate strategies went well*

2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2009-2010 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?
 - a. *Insufficient time in the compressed timeline*
 - b. *Insufficient time to prioritize strategies (delete strategies)*
 - c. *Too many strategies to accomplish next year*
 - d. *Linkage between student learning assessment, program review and planning needs strengthening*
 - e. *Clarify relationship between master plans and externally mandated plans such as the Matriculation Plan, Student equity Plan, Staff Development Plan*

3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - a. *Clarification of role of Consultation Council and representative to Consultation Council along with training*
 - b. *Improve communication between master planning committee by addition of the chairs of other planning committee to the Academic Planning Committee*

- c. *Change timeline for the development of plans (Strategic Plan –Summer to early fall, Educational Master Plan early to mid-fall, other Master Plans mid to late fall) [Strategic Plan drives the EMP and the EMP drives the other master plans]*
 - d. *Process for Tracking of Implementation and Evaluation of Results of decisions*
 - e. *Regular Constituent and Governance group meetings*
 - f. *Improve representative communication*
 - g. *Guidelines for the maximum number of strategies*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?
 - a. *SMART Meeting Room*
 - b. *All documents provided in a repository on the website*
 5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work?
 - a. *Reorganization of the enrollment management function [audit by external expert to provide suggestions]*

Governance Section

1. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?
 - a. *Dialogue*
 - b. *Participation*
 - c. *First and second readings of policies and procedures*
 - d. *Sufficient time for input*
2. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?
 - a. *Training to clarify role of representatives and role of Council*
 - b. *Clarification of the results of consultation (identification of recommendations and resulting decisions)*
 - c. *Better outflow of information to Constituent Groups*
3. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?
 - a. *Restructure the Student Services Planning Committee as shared governance group*

Is there anything you would like to add to the evaluation of either planning or governance? *No*

**Lassen Community College Planning, Budgeting and
Governance Process Review 2010
Constituent Group Survey**

Committee Name: Classified

Date: May 13, 2010

Members Present: Jennifer Bird, Reina Branum, Karen Clancy, Brenda Cook, Cecelia Frohrib, Mary Hasselwander, Philip Horner, Diann Jackson, Sandra Jonas, Nancy Lounsbury, Logan Merchant, K.C. Mesloh, Carol Montgomery, Susan Murchison, Laurel Norman, Shelly Reinsel, Ray Richardson, Harvey Roberts, Bruce Sager, Janna Sandahl, Elaine Theobald

Members Absent: Gale Baraby, Mike Bartley, Denise Bosse, Janet Butcher, Kim Clain, Patrick Clancy, Wendy Donohue, D. C. Freeman, Dennis Groneman, Brenda Hoffman, Ken Honea, Rocky Kotaro, Jeff Lang, Wendy Langslet, Christina Madrid, Carla May, Motare Ngiratmab, Caryn Nobles, Esperanza Plasencia, Gail Pritchard, Stephney Stuart, Elwise Tangelbad, Tami Wattenburg, Theresa Woodbury, Norm Wilson, Caleb Lief

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 used during 2009-2010 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?
 - *Members of the classified constituent group were given the same opportunity to participate in the planning process as other groups.*
 - *Plans continue to be written, recorded, tracked, revised and disseminated with a paper trail.*
 - *The matrix developed by Dr. Carabajal was instrumental in helping the IT committee understand and see the direction they needed to take.*
 - *HR committee reported they achieved their goal of completing the Faculty Hand Book.*

2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2009-2010 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

- *Reorganiation(s). The planning has been planned by few and affects many. Plans that were not well thought out, unrealistic and had far reaching negative effects on staff and students.*
 - *Plans that resulted in understaffing of entire areas.*
 - *There seemed to be a decrease in participation/attendance of committee members.*
 - *There is a perception that there was a lack of Administrative attendance at SG committee meetings.*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - *Include/get input from staff that are affected as a part of the planning process.*
 - *Increase communication within and between departments, i.e. Departmental meetings and meetings with departments that affect each other.*
 - *Transparency from Cabinet.*
 4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?
 - *Utilize technology available to us on campus to streamline meetings and aid in presentations of agenda items with documents, i.e. power point presentations, white boards.*
 - *Paid classified clerical support.*
 5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work?
 - *No. Not at this time.*

Governance Section

1. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?
 - *Regular, noticed meetings*
 - *Meeting minutes are disseminated quickly (except HR) to campus community*
 - *It works as well as it's allowed too and is effective as allowed*
2. 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.*
 - *Include all constituent groups, i.e. Faculty, Management & Classified in the flow chart shown on page 9 of the Shared Governance & Collegial Consultation document.*
 - *The process seems to work as well as it's allowed.*
 - *It is affective as it is allowed.*

3. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?
 - *Include all constituent groups, i.e. Faculty, Management & Classified in the flow chart shown on page 9 of the Shared Governance & Collegial Consultation document.*

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

- *Be respectful of women and women's rights*

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

Committee Name: Consultation Council

Date: April 29, 2010

Members Present:

Cheryl Aschenbach (AS - faculty)	Dr. Doug Houston (President)
Terry Bartley (management)	Phil Horner (classified)
Sandy Beckwith (Div Chair -faculty)	Jeff Lang (classified)
David Burris (Exec Director-HR)	Alex McElrath (ASB)
Carie Camacho (Div Chair -faculty)	Sue Mouck (ALO-faculty)
Kayleigh Carabajal (Exec Director-IR)	Shelly Reinsel (classified -substitute)
Dave Clausen (Exec Director –Fiscal Services)	Cary Templeton (Dean of Student Services)
	Brian Wolf (Div Chair –faculty)

Members Absent:

Dr. Irving Berkowitz (Dean of Instruction)	Carol Montgomery (classified)
Monica Cochran (Public Relations)	Eric Rulofson (Chair/ Facilities Planning)
Marshel Couso (management)	

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 used during 2009-2010 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?
 - a. *Standardization of format for master plans improves the readability*
 - b. *Budget development process proceeded smoothly despite the need for budget reductions instead of budget enhancements*
 - c. *Improved provision of data for decisions*
 - d. *More participation in the decision-making process*
 - e. *Validation of planning process provided by removal of college from sanctions by ACCJC*
 - f. *Information Forums with focused topics*
 - g. *Consistent attendance by membership and frequent attendance by guests*

2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2009-2010 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

- a. *Frequent delay in due dates for budget and master plan development*
 - b. *Timely provision of data*
 - c. *Lack of adequate representative faculty participation prior to appointment of division chairs*
 - d. *Communication between planning and constituent groups should not rely so heavily on written minutes [responsibility of representatives to the groups that they represent]*
3. What changes would your committee recommend in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
- a. *Follow the established timelines for budget and planning*
 - b. *Establish and publish an Annual Consultation Council Calendar*
 - c. *Improve Meeting Management*
 - 1. *Clearly articulate recommendations made by the committee*
 - 2. *Provide Information Items in written format similar to Consent Agenda at board meeting [no discussion needed unless requested by membership]*
 - 3. *Provide Quarterly Written Reports [Foundation Report]*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?
- a. *Document Management System*
 - b. *Smart Meeting Room [wireless, screen, projector]*
 - c. *Laptops/iPads*
5. Does your committee feel additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work? *No*
6. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning?
Yes

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. *2010-2015 Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan*
 - b. *Tentative Budget with recommendations for budget reductions*
 - c. *Hosted Institutional Forums*
 - d. *Policy Recommendations*
 - e. *Administrative Procedure Recommendations*
 - f. *Resolution of Student Issues brought to the Council*
 - g. *Increase participation by students in Council*

3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.
 - a. *Modification of charge to include development of the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan*
 - b. *Modification of charge to include the oversight of evaluation of planning agenda*
 - c. *Change "Develop" to Recommend the Strategic Master Plan to Governing Board*

4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?
 - a. *Add to the membership the chairs of all planning Committees (Academic Planning, Student Services Planning, Facilities Planning, Institutional Technology Planning, Human Resource Planning) – planning committee chairs do not impact the quorum, which is determined by constituent group representation*
 - b. *Add the Lead Counselor as a faculty representative*

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.

Participation by all constituent groups has been exemplary this year. Representatives from at least four and generally all five constituent groups have been in attendance at every scheduled meeting.

6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
 - a. *Reaffirm the responsibility of each representative on the Council to provide communication back to his or her constituent group*
 - b. *Provide drafts of working document on the website*

Is there anything you would like to add to the evaluation of either planning or governance? *No*

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

Committee Name: Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee

Date: April 27, 2010

Members Present: Cheryl Aschenbach, Colleen Baker, Reina Branum, Betsy Elam, Lisa Gardiner, KC Mesloh, Sue Mouck, Robert Schofield, Garrett Taylor

Also Attending: Gail Pritchard

Members Absent: Dr. Berkowitz, Tina Bishop

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 used during 2009-2010 at Lassen College from the perspective of your committee?
*The curriculum committee utilized the recommendations from instructional program reviews to add/delete/modify courses, degrees and certificates.
Lack of Department Chairs created a roadblock in faculty receiving timely and accurate information.*
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2009-2010 at Lassen College from the perspective of your committee?
The lack of communication between the Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee and the Academic Planning Committee interferes with the effectiveness of both.
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
The possible solution would be to include representation from the Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee on the Academic Planning Committee.
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to effectively participate in the planning process.
 - a. *Additional surveys from campus-wide/student base.*
 - b. *Additional surveys from “Open Forum” discussions*
5. Are there any additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work? *No*

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?
Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee results are documented in the minutes and annual log
 - a. *Approved new courses to be forwarded to the Academic Senate, Governing Board and Chancellor's Office*
 - b. *Re-activated courses*
 - c. *Deleted courses*
 - d. *Modified degrees and certificates*
 - e. *Approved student learning outcomes for courses and degrees*
 - f. *Timely submission of general education courses for CSU and UC*
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.
The committee is one of the most efficient and effective on campus, no modifications needed.
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed? *The committee membership as assigned is appropriate.*
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.
Participation by all individuals and constituent groups was exemplary with the exception of the administration (instructional dean). The consistent absence of the instructional administrator resulted in the total lack of communication between academic planning and curriculum actions. The effectiveness of the Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee would be enhanced by the presence of the instructional dean, the reason for the inclusion of that individual as a voting member of the committee.
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
 - a. *At this time, committees send their minutes to the entire college campus through email. Although individuals are inundated with email communications, it does provide an opportunity for interested individuals to keep informed.*
 - b. *Mutual respect between all parties... Some individuals are feeling unappreciated.*
 - c. *Convocation – Each committee shares their updates/procedures*

Is there anything you would like to add to the evaluation of either planning or governance? *No*

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

Committee Name: Minimum Qualifications/Equivalency Committee

Date: April 30, 2010

Members Present: Nancy Bengoa-Beterbide, Sara Michels, Sue Mouck, Richard Swanson [Noelle Eckley participated prior to the meeting]

Members Absent: 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 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 used during 2009-2010 at Lassen College from the perspective of your committee? *NA (The Minimum Qualifications/Equivalency Committee as an operational subcommittee of the Academic Senate does not participate directly in the planning process.)*
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2009-2010 at Lassen College from the perspective of your committee? *NA*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness? *NA*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to effectively participate in the planning process. *NA*
5. Are there any additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work? *NA*

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?
 - a. *Lassen Community College Verification of Faculty to meet Minimum Qualifications in Discipline of Instruction Resource Handbook – January 2010*
 - b. *Reviewed and made recommendations to the Academic Senate on applicant and faculty equivalency requests*
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? *Yes Broad divisional representation of faculty on the committee is important.*
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. *The participation of the faculty appointees was consistent and reliable. The instructional dean did not participate in the committee operations. The absence of instructional dean participation gave the perception of administrative disinterest in the process to assure the qualifications of the faculty pool.*
11. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance? *Communication has worked well particularly with a senator serving on the committee.*

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