

Consultation Council/Strategic Planning Committee Minutes
May 17, 2011

Present

Terry Bartley (management)	Noelle Eckley (Div Chair -faculty)
Shelly Baxter (management)	Dr. Doug Houston (President)
Sandy Beckwith (Lead Counselor – faculty)	Phil Horner (classified)
David Burris (Exec Director-HR)	Jeff Lang (classified)
Carie Camacho (Div Chair -faculty)	Logan Merchant (Chair/IT Planning)
Kayleigh Carabajal (Exec Director-IR)	Carol Montgomery (classified)
Dave Clausen (Exec Director –Fiscal Services)	Sue Mouck (Accreditation Liaison -faculty)
Marshel Couso (management)	Cary Templeton (Dean of Student Services)
	Brian Wolf (Div Chair –faculty)

Absent

Cheryl Aschenbach (AS-faculty)	Monica Cochran (Public Relations)
Dr. Irving Berkowitz (Dean of Instruction)	Eric Rulofson (Chair/ Facilities Planning)
	ASB Representative

Guest

Tami Wattenburg (classified)

With a quorum present, the meeting began at 9:35 am.

Strategic Planning:

1. Prioritized Budget Requests from Administrative Areas (Information) and 2011-2012 Tentative Budget (Information)

Dave Clausen provided handouts with budget information. The budget information from the state did not significantly change in the May rewrite. There is the expectation that the state may have a budget by mid-June.

2. Human Resource NIPR (Information)

David Burris presented the Human Resource NIPR, which was accepted by Cabinet on May 12, 2011. A question was raised as to the participation in the preparation of the program review. Mr. Burris identified that he was the primary author with utilizing information derived from a survey and assistance from Cabinet. The lack of involvement by the Human Resource Planning Committee was questioned. The difference between the evaluation of a specific area or department through the program review process and the shared governance participation in developing institutional plans partial based on the evaluation process was articulated. **By consensus, Consultation Council forwarded the document to the Governing Board and accepted the document for consideration in future planning efforts.** Several individuals had either not received the attachment with the email or not had an opportunity to review the document and declined to participate in consensus.

3. Draft 2011-2016 Facilities Master Plan (Consultation)

The draft 2011 -2016 Facilities Master Plan was provided as an attachment to the agenda. The incorporation of the annual action plans from the various master plans into the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan is occurring from the draft documents due to time constraint at year's end. The Facilities Planning Committee is meeting tomorrow to finalize the FMP.

4. Draft 2011-2016 Institutional Technology Master Plan (Consultation)

Logan Merchant distributed copies of the draft 2011-2016 Institutional Technology Master Plan, which is also undergoing final review.

5. 2011-2016 Student Services Master Plan (Consultation)

Cary Templeton identified that the 2011-2016 Student Services Master Plan distributed with the agenda had been adopted by the Student Services Planning Committee.

6. 2011-2016 Human Resources Master Plan (Consultation)

David Burris identified that the 2011-2016 Human Resources Master Plan had similarly been adopted y the Human Resource Planning Committee.

The recommendations from the various master plans along with the recommendations along with recommendations from the previously received Educational Master Plan will be incorporated into the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan for consideration at the next meeting.

Consultation Council:

- 1. Consultation Council Annual Evaluation of the Shared Governance and Planning Structure and Procedures (Governance)**
By consensus, Consultation Council adopted the evaluation form developed at the last meeting and forwarded the document to itself for consideration with other evaluation forms at the next meeting. (Form attached)
- 2. Accreditation Annual Report (Information)**
Sue Mouck provided the committee with a draft copy of the accreditation annual report to be submitted to the Accrediting Commission prior to June 1, 2011. There were no questions.
- 3. Request Academic Senate to establish a Joint Consultation Council/Academic Senate Subcommittee to Develop Revised Draft Institutional Planning and Budget Development Process Handbook for 2012-2013 (Governance) if needed**
Sue Mouck advised the group that as a component of our planning and budget development process for each of the last three years, the Academic Senate has formulated a subcommittee comprised of Consultation She advised the group that the Academic Senate president has already placed the item on the next senate agenda for consideration. She further advised the group the each group Consultation Council and the Academic Senate generally appointed three representative and that the subcommittee generally met in June to complete their work. Sandy Beckwith volunteered, as did Dave Clausen and Sue Mouck. . By consensus, Consultation Council appointed Sandy Beckwith, Dave Clausen and Sue Mouck to meet with the Academic Senate representatives should the evaluation process this year justify such a meeting.
- 4. Consultation Council Summer Meeting Schedule (Consultation)**
Sue Mouck reminded the committee that generally Consultation Council has established a reduced summer meeting schedule with meetings scheduled to precede meetings of the Governing Board. Individuals indicated a need to check their calendars for availability. Tentatively the meeting schedule agreed to included:
 - Tuesday, June 7 – 9:30 am in CD-119
 - Tuesday, June 28 – 9:30 am in CD-119
 - Tuesday, July 26 – 1:30 pm in CD-119
- 5. Personnel Update (Information) – Administration**
No update.

Other:

Dr. Houston announced for those who had not yet seen his email from last night, that he has accepted the position of Chancellor at Yuba Community College District. He indicated that, he will miss the relationships that he has established at the college and in the community. He is working diligently with Tom Henry and the Governing Board to find an interim replacement by June. Dr. Houston plans to be on campus the week before and attend the June board meeting, but will be on vacation for most of June.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 am

Future Agendas:

- 1. Initial Review of June 14, 2011 Governing Board Agenda (Information) –May 24, 2011 - Dr. Houston**
- 2. Adoption of Board Policies – Chapter 7 (Consultation) –May 24, 2011 - David Burris**
- 3. Adoption of the 2012-2016 CIMP (Consultation) – May 24, 2011 - Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal**
- 4. Acceptance of Final Quarterly Update on Progress on Annual Action Plans 2010-2011 (Information)- May 24, 2011- Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal**
- 5. Plan for Work Study Allocation for 2011-2012 (Information)– May 24, 2011- Cary Templeton**
- 6. Presentation of Status on KPI's (Information) - June 2011- Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal**

**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 [redacted] with, Irving Berkowitz, David Burris, Doug Houston Phil Horner, Jeff Lang, Logan [redacted], Carol Montgomery, Sue Mouck, Eric Rulofson, Cary Templeton

Members Absent: Shelly Baxter, Carie Camacho, [redacted] 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 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 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 reach a goal. 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.
2. What did not work in the planning process used during 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?
The planning process guidelines need to be consistently followed. Rumors and negative reports on the discussion 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.
3. 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.

4. 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.
5. Does your committee feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is valued?
"YES"
6. Does your committee feel additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work?
The 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.
7. 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

1. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?
"YES"
2. 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.
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.
The increase use of subcommittees was suggested.
4. 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.
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 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.

6. 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