

[Before you Print – This document is 21 pages long]
Consultation Council/Strategic Planning Committee Minutes
May 17, 2012

Present

Cheryl Aschenbach (AS/Div Chair-faculty)
Colleen Baker (Div Chair-faculty)
Terry Bartley (management)
Shelly Baxter (management)
Sandy Beckwith (Lead Counselor – faculty)

Kayleigh Carabajal (Dean of Academic Services)
Jeff Lang (classified)
Carol Montgomery (classified)
Sue Mouck (Accreditation Liaison -faculty)
Eric Rulofson (Chair/ Facilities Planning)

Absent

Jennifer Bird (classified)
Carie Camacho (Div Chair -faculty)
Dave Clausen (Dean of Admin Services)
Katelyn Johnston (ASB)

Logan Merchant (Chair/IT Planning)
Ross Stevenson (Div Chair -faculty) – class conflict
Bill Studt (Interim President)
Cary Templeton (Dean of Student Services)

Guests

None

With a quorum present, the meeting began at 1:05 pm.

Consultation Council:

1. Annual Evaluation of the Planning and Governance Process (Consultation)

Sue Mouck asked the committee to identify points contained within the evaluations relating to either modification of structure or process that should be considered for next year. Jeff Lang articulated the concern that the Facilities Planning Committee did not understand their role in the process as a result of comments requesting less direction from the other master planning committees and more autonomy. The resulting discussion articulated that the process is continually being improved. The late arrival of master plans has necessitated that committees act without guidance in the past. Now that the master plans are arriving in a more timely manner, the committees are needing to adjust. It was agreed that although the various master plans should align and support the Educational Master Plan, each individual master plan is developed within the context of specific area of emphasis and should include initiatives arriving directly out of that area of emphasis (i.e. facilities or technology). Jeff Lang suggested that all plans, such as the bookstore remodel last year, should have detailed visual plans made available to the public in forums or some other venue to allow for wider review and input. He further suggested that planning for remodels completed on campus should be reviewed by all appropriate outside agencies in order to assure that the remodel meets expected standards. The group suggested that the Facilities Planning Committee was the proper place to express these concerns and Eric Rulofson assured Mr. Lang that as his supervisor he would assure him to opportunity to attend the next meeting. Points articulated for consideration in modification of the structure or process next year included:

- a. Inclusion of the Dean of Academic Services or designee on the Student Services Planning Committee or in some other way improve communication between the Academic Planning and Student Services Planning Committees
- b. Update the program review process to more clearly align with the adopted planning structure (the revision of the instructional program review process in under way by the Academic Senate)
- c. Change the budget development process/forms to conform with the restructured program review process
- d. Establish an order for master plan development (EMP, SSMP, ITMP, FMP, HRMP)
- e. Establish and adhere to rigid timelines for the acceptance of the various master plans (November – EMP; December SSMP; January – IPRMP; February- FMP; March – HRMP)

with an opportunity for reconsideration of master plans modified as a result of other plans in April prior to compiling the plan into the CIMP in May)

- f. Early identification and publication of the membership and meeting schedule for various committees in the fall (List of appointees provided to Human Resources)

Further consideration will be given at the next meeting of Consultation Council

2. Personnel Update (Information) – Administration

In the absence of Mr. Studt, Sue Mouck provided an update from Human Resources on the current vacant positions being filled. The current open positions are: Superintendent/President, Head Men's Wrestling Coach, Director of Nursing & Allied Health, Nursing Instructor, Bookstore Operations Technician, Administrative Assistant II I in Academic Services, and Financial Aid Technician II. All other positions are on hold. The group was reminded that in the current economic environment the financial picture is very fluid and changes hiring decisions are to be expected. The shortfall for next year is looking to be approximately one million dollars.

Strategic Planning:

1. 2012-2017 Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan (Consultation)

Sue Mouck presented the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan and informed the group that she took responsibility for the combining of the five previously accepted documents into the integrated plan. Jeff Lang questioned the lack of reference to training of classified employees in the Educational Master Plan. Ms. Mouck identified that the EMP was focused on instruction and even though there are classified employees supporting instruction, the majority worked in other areas. She indicated that the purpose of the Human Resource Plan was to expand and broaden the strategies identified in the other master plans, one of the reasons that adherence to the timeline for the various master plans was so crucial. She expressed the opinion that the time for evaluation of the content of the plans was at the time of acceptance and that at this point the committee was being asked to evaluate the integration of the plans rather than the individual content items. The group provided two "typo" corrections. **Consultation Council accepted the 2012-2017 Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan by consensus.**

2. 2011-2013 Action Plan Evaluation Matrix – Final Status May 2012 (Information)

The 2011-2013 Annual Planning Progress Evaluation Matrix was present. The committee was reminded that this planning matrix was adopted several years ago to track the institutional progress on planning agenda items. The progress is reviewed three times a year, May being the final review. The Matrix is present to the Governing Board as an indication of the institutional progress. **The group indicated that the Matrix was an informative document and should be provided separately in some flagged manner to the campus to encourage more individuals to become aware of the progress that has been made.**

3. 2012 Automotive Technology Instructional Program Review (Information)

Cheryl Aschenbach identified for the group that the Automotive Technology IPR did not contain the normal curriculum review. The reason being that the IPR proposed a complete redesign of the program. The program review was prepared by a part-time instructor and the division chair, who had not had sufficient time to propose the needed curriculum changes. Jeff Lang expressed appreciation of the historical perspective provided and indicated that a similar historical record would be very helpful in the case of terminated programs such as the Construction Technology Program. **Consultation Council accepted the 2011 Automotive Technology Instructional Program Review by consensus.**

4. 2012-2013 Strategic Master Plan – Governing Board Planning Retreat July 24, 2012 (Consultation)

Sue Mouck introduced the topic by reminding the committee of their role in recommending changes to the Strategic Plan (Mission Statement, Vision Statement, Value and Strategic Goals) to the Governing Board who initiate the annual planning cycle at their Planning Retreat in July. The

Strategic Planning Committee made recommendations for modification of the mission statement, which were subsequently adopted last year. In light of the institution being engaged in our self-evaluation for accreditation, the subcommittee for Standard I dealing with the Mission had met on Tuesday. The individuals in attendance at that meeting felt that the mission statement in its current form met the requirements of the standard however, it was suggested that the statement is rather static and possibly could be made more dynamic through modification to the existing language. Kayleigh Carabajal indicated that Sue Mouck had indicated to her that the primary focus of the institution is on student learning and institutional effectiveness articulated in the accreditation standards. The individuals at the accreditation subcommittee meeting did not see institutional effectiveness as being appropriate to the mission statement, but indicated that perhaps the phrase “student learning” could be considered. Shelly Baxter indicated that she saw the dynamic forward looking statement as being the vision not the mission, Sue Mouck identified that her review of the strategic plan had led her to wonder if the strategic goals were too philosophical. She saw goals as being more attainable. She suggested that consideration be given to modifying the strategic goals to combine or replace some or if the strategic goals are kept as written perhaps adding one or more areas within the goals of institutional focus for each year. It would appear that this year the institutional focus was on adding technology and from the previously adopted plan the one of the foci for next year will be professional development. Sandy Beckwith indicated the need to address all of the strategic goals each year, while Colleen Baker found the current list overwhelming and favored a narrower shorter list. Kayleigh Carabajal identified the need for areas of emphases within the strategic goals to assist in decisions. Eric Rulofson articulated that the strategic goals were more like guidelines, which provided the guidance for the development of strategies within the planning documents. There was support for keeping the existing strategic goals as well as support for reducing the number. It was identified that for next year a major focus will be maintaining fiscal stability while retaining services to students. Dr. Carabajal indicated that she had identified three primary areas of emphasis for next year: professional development, fiscal stability and student completion. Shelly Baxter asked if an Environmental Scan was being planned to contribute data to the discussion. Dr. Carabajal indicated that she has no plans to do an Environmental Scan (which cost \$12,000 last time) she did not think that anything new would be shown. The counties that Lassen College serves are economically depressed. Dr. Carabajal indicated that the college is engaged in an Economic Impact Study, with the information becoming available soon. Ms. Baxter suggested that the Strengths/Weakness; Challenges/Opportunities Exercise conducted during the development of the existing strategic goals would be helpful. Dr. Carabajal agreed that the results today would be different than several years ago. It was agreed that the discussion on both the mission statement and strategic goals would continue at the next meeting.

Other:

1. Terry Bartley reminded members that the printing of documents for Consultation Council is charged to the area making the request. There is no budget for printing documents.
2. Cheryl Aschenbach reminded members of the first Student Showcase occurring this year and asked for support through communication to students or fundraisers for the awards. In answer to a question she responded that there would be People’s Choice Awards in each area.
3. Cheryl Aschenbach also announced that there will be a Grand Opening of the as of yet un-named Faculty Training Center on Wednesday, May 23. Please stop by to check out the new center.
4. Carol Montgomery announced the CSEA/Brian Wolf Picnic to be held next Wednesday, May 23 between 11:30 and 1:00. Everyone is invited.

Next Meetings: May 24 2012 & Wednesday, May 30, 2012

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm

Future Agendas:

1. **Establish the Budget Process Revision Committee – May 24, 2012 – Cheryl Aschenbach**
2. **Emergency Preparedness Handbook (Consultation) -May 24, 2012 –Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal**
3. **Review of June 12, 2012 Governing Board Agenda (Information) – May 30, 2012**
4. **2011 Social Science IPR (Information) – Cheryl Aschenbach**

5. **2011 Gunsmithing IPR (Information) – Cheryl Aschenbach**
6. **2011 Journalism IPR (Information) – Cheryl Aschenbach**
7. **2012 Administration of Justice (Information) – September 2012– Cheryl Aschenbach**
8. **2009/11 Human Services IPR (Information) –October 2012– Cheryl Aschenbach**
9. **2012 Agriculture (Information) – Cheryl Aschenbach**
10. **2012 Business (Information) – Cheryl Aschenbach**
11. **2012 Fine Arts/Humanities (Information) – Cheryl Aschenbach**
12. **2012 Enrollment Services (Information) –**
13. **2012 Research and Planning (Information) – Kayleigh Carabajal**
14. **2012 Instructional Support Services –Library -- Kayleigh Carabajal**
15. **2012 Auxiliary Services – Bookstore/Book Rental/Loan Program – Dave Clausen**
16. **2012 Student Life (including Residential Life) (Information) –**

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

Constituent Group: Academic Senate representing Faculty

Date: May 8, 2012

Members Present: Cheryl Aschenbach, Carrie Nyman, Nancy Beterbide, Michael Giampaoli, Richard Swanson

Members Absent: Lisa Gardiner

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, Human Resource Plan) as well as the recommendations from program review and student learning outcome assessments.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

Some programs (for example, art) had institutional action and budget allocation taken based on planning recommendations in IPRs.

Technology has been added to classrooms as a result of the ITMP and Com-Pact.

Consideration of LCC’s Strategic Plan has resulted in initiatives to celebrate student success (Annual Student Art Show, Inaugural Student Showcase).

Faculty were given an opportunity to stay informed of planning through regular posting of email minutes and communications updating progress of planning process.

The recognition of the need to hire additional full-time faculty based on data in IPRs and EMP.

2. What didn’t work in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

Some contingency events were taken care of without consideration of impact on instruction (gym floor).

This event in particular was not well communicated to explore the impact on faculty and students until planned an in motion.

Some of the planning process was delayed – HRMP approval is late, but approval is pending.

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

The Academic Senate, recognizing the need to better integrate program reviews and planning, is revising the IPR process to better connect the processes and make the transfer of information from IPRs to planning committees easier and less personnel dependent. Recommendations from revised IPR template will feed directly into impacted master plans.

Cabinet should consider revising the NIPR template to mirror the revised format of the IPR.

Entire planning process (SLO assessments, IPRs, NIPRs, and master plans) all need to be moved to an electronic format (database?) that automatically links information into other plans.

Revisions to budget allocation process suggested by IPR template revisions need to be incorporated institutionally into the Budget Development Handbook.

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

Electronic database or other program to collect and track all planning process documents.

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

Technology was funded, some equipment was funded, and some personnel were hired (ENG faculty) during 11-12 based on previous IPR recommendations.

Governance Section

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

Tighter coordination between Academic Senate and its subcommittees (Curriculum and Minimum Qualifications) has gone more smoothly. Elimination of MQ committee by Academic Senate worked well. Faculty flex committee was more productive as a result of appointment of an Flex Committee chair. The Academic Senate appreciates that the administration acknowledges and respects the Senate's areas of primacy. LCFA interactions with administration have also been more amicable. Generally, interactions between faculty leadership and administration have improved are appreciated.

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

*HR Planning/Flex committee as a whole needs to begin meeting early in the year and coordinate staff development activities more actively.
There wasn't as much communication from Consultation Council when meetings were cancelled or rescheduled.
Regular CC meetings are encouraged.*

3. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution? *No.*

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

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

Committee Name: Academic Planning

Date: April 30, 2012

Members Present:

Dr. Carabajal, Colleen Baker, Ross Stevenson, Cheryl Aschenbach

Members Absent:

Carie Camacho

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, Human Resource Plan) as well as the recommendations from program review and student learning outcome assessments.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

The Education Master Plan informed all other plans much better this year; goals and strategies were clearer and input into other plans was more clearly indicated. Quality of EMP was improved and completion was timely.

2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

Although all plans are expected to be submitted and approved by completion of 2011-2012 academic year, it was difficult to completely vet and engage in dialog about individual plans given current timelines.

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

*Consider a staggered submission of plans (progressive dates) to allow for greater review and dialogue during the process. Recommended order: EMP, ITMP, FMP, SSMP, HRMP (with staffing plan)
Allow for more time between completion of final plan and submission of CIMP to the Board to allow for more dialogue and vetting campus-wide.*

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

The data and resources provided to the Academic Master Planning committee were sufficient to produce the EMP.

5. Does your committee feel your committee's contribution to the planning process is valued?

Yes. General responses and inclusion in other plans upholds value of EMP.

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

We are unable to say. The budget development process has not been completed.

Governance Section

1. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?
Yes. We produced the EMP as charged.

2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?

A stellar and clearly communicated Educational Master Plan with updated format.

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

No changes necessary or recommended.

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

No recommendations.

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 members participated as was appropriate and necessary.

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

Maintain a regular schedule of weekly Consultation Council meetings that allows for attendance by all identified members.

Consider ways for campus personnel to stay informed about planning, budgeting, governance and campus initiatives. Explore methods to increase dialog about materials and campus documents produced by committees and provided via email or LCC website.

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

Recognize that each planning committee is responsible for more than reacting to the EMP; each is responsible for also inputting into the planning process based on individual areas of expertise.

Develop a schedule of planning committee meetings at the beginning of the year so all groups can assign or adjust membership based on availability.

Conduct training within each planning committee regarding expectations of participation, level of expertise for content area of committee, and deliverables.

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

Constituent Group: Administration

Date: May 1, 2012

Members Present: Dave Clausen, Kayleigh Carabajal, Bill Studt, Cary Templeton

Members Absent: None

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, Human Resource Plan) as well as the recommendations from program review and student learning outcome assessments.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

The Educational Master Plan drove the other master planning documents. The ComPACT was completed.

2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

The ComPACT developed outside the normal budget development process last year to deal with the financial crisis was not as beneficial as expected. Recommend returning to the established process.

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

Publish a schedule for planning committee meetings early in order to attract more student participation. Conduct orientation/training sessions with each of the planning teams early in the fall to explain process and timeline to new members. Consistently use the agreed upon format.

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

Identify data and resources needed prior to beginning the planning process.

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

The budget development process is late, but many external reasons impacted the timeline. The lateness is in response to taking appropriate notice of the planning process.

Governance Section

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

Because the governance process has matured and previous issues have been resolved, there has been less dialogue than in previous two years.

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

The adjustments to the meeting schedule to honor other obligations and workload, resulted in missed opportunities for dialog. Recommend adhering to the meeting schedule next year.

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

Suggest the development of a budget advisory team to assist the administration in dealing with the fiscal situation arising for next year.

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

The governance process is maturing as seen by the institution's ability to modify the process to meet changing situations. The impact of the changes on outcomes has been evaluated and adjustments made.

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

Constituent Group: Associated Student Body

Date: May 15, 2012

Members Present: Katelyn Johnston, president and Angela Alfaro, vice-president

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 too the work of planning committees (Institutional Technology Plan, Facility Master Plan, Student Services Plan, Educational Master Plan, Human Resource Plan) as well as the recommendations from program review and student learning outcome assessments.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

Organizing meeting times after representative had been determined

2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

There was not enough notice of meetings.

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

Decide the times and dates of meetings earlier and notify all interested parties.

4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to effectively participate in the planning process? *None*

5. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning? *Yes*

Governance Section

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

Consultation Council is a great place for collaboration and shared governance.

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

Decide the times and dates of meetings earlier and notify all interested parties.

3. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution? *None*

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

Earlier notification would be appreciated.

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

Committee Name: Consultation Council/Strategic Planning

Date: May 3, 2012

Members Present: Cheryl Aschenbach, Colleen Baker, Terry Bartley, Shelly Baxter, Sandy Beckwith, Dave Clausen, Kayleigh Carabajal, Jeff Lang, Carol Montgomery, Sue Mouck, Eric Rulofson, Ross Stevenson, Bill Studt, Cary Templeton

Members Absent: ASB Representative, Jennifer Bird, Carie Camacho, Logan Merchant

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, Human Resource Plan) as well as the recommendations from program review and student learning outcome assessments.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

The initial part of the planning timeline was adhered to better this year than in previous years. The Educational Master Plan was accepted early and informed the other master plan better than in any previous year. The open forums continue to be a good source of information for the campus. The membership of Strategic Planning exhibited more confidence in the process this year. Collegial dialog occurred even with difficult topics.

2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

Not all of the master plans arrived on schedule, which has delayed the completion of the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan. There was inadequate discussion including a clear understanding of cost concerning several major facilities projects (i.e. moving the bookstore to the cafeteria) prior to the prioritization of the work last year resulting in unexpected expenses. Better communication of funding sources for major projects (i.e. insurance claims) was suggested, perhaps a “What’s happening at Lassen College?”

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

The committee suggested the addition planning and evaluation of contingency events to the process. The committee suggested that Consultation Council should go back to a regular meeting schedule too many meetings were cancelled. The order of acceptance of master plans was proposed with more rigid timelines. Suggestion is Educational Master Plan (EMP), Student Services Master Plan (SSMP), Institutional Technology Plan (ITMP), Facilities Master Plan (FMP) and Human resource Master Plan (HRMP).

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

The agenda needs to be distributed earlier to provide sufficient time for review. Clerical support for planning committees is needed. More robust cost/benefit information provided before prioritization and

recommendations are made. Promote the shared governance and planning process to new administrators. Encourage consistent participation by constituent representatives.

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

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

The process is late this year making it difficult to determine if budget development took appropriate notice of institutional planning. Contingency items should be incorporated into the process in the future.

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?

The committee accepted the EMP, SSMP, ITMP, and FMP. The draft CIIMP is in production. The committee adopted numerous administrative procedures and forwarded numerous board policy recommendations to the Governing Board. The Committee accepted and forwarded instructional and non-instructional program reviews to the Governing Board.

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

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

Continue to encourage student participation.

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.

Too many meetings were cancelled during the course of the year. There was low participation at some meetings, but broad constituent group representation at all meetings.

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

*Many individuals are overwhelmed with the volume of minutes, suggestion that important topics of interest in the minutes be flagged in the email title.
Student Interviews*

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

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

Committee Name: Facilities Planning Committee

Date: 5-3-12

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?
 - *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*
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2010-2011 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?
 - *The committee felt administrative pressure to respond specifically to the other plans e.g. CIMP, ITMP, & EMP limiting member input into the FMP.*
3. What changes would your committee recommend in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - *The FPC would benefit from greater autonomy in the creation of the FMP.*
4. 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.*
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 FPC feels additional planning committees are not necessary.*
7. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning?
 - *Yes*

Governance Section

8. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?
 - *Yes*
9. Identify results (products) of committee activities?
 - *The timely revision of the Facilities Master Plan*
 - *The annual review of the District's space inventory*
 - *Continued promoting and supporting increased 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*

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

- *No changes required.*

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

- *Yes*

12. 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 the majority the scheduled meetings.*

13. 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

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

Constituent Group: Management group

Date: 4/27/12

Members Present: Denise Stevenson, Robin Padgett, Bobbie Theesfeld, Beau Beaujon, Terry Bartley, (Shelly Baxter called in)

Members Absent: Eric Rulofson, Matt Levine, Julie Johnston, Vickie Ramsey, Susie Hart, Fran Oberg

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, Human Resource Plan) as well as the recommendations from program review and student learning outcome assessments.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

Keeping Targeted Tasks moving forward, Re-evaluating and not being afraid to delete tasks if they have become obsolete, over all the process is working very well

2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?

Staff feel they are getting busier and communication is not always available. Suggestions included have subject lines in emails that catch your attention. Learning how to look thru the board doc documents to see the files you can open to gain more information. Use of the everyone email may not be best for all subjects.

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

Our focus on priorities have improved, staff would like to see a staff lounge of some type that would allow for informal sharing of ideas to break up the isolation some offices have. Staff learning and resource center would also be helpful

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

Most wish they were not so over committed and had more time.

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

The process works but the uncertainty of State Budgets creates issues on how to plan.

Governance Section

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

Noel Levitz Survey/Survey Monkey these help with knowledge and ability to share. The committees that were formed with a background on accreditation was very helpful.

2. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Shared

Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?

Continue on communication especially with meeting as a group to go over topics that effect the campus

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

Various minutes on the LCC everyone can be overwhelming. Some find it hard to determine which minutes they should be reading and which minutes really do not pertain to them.

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

NIPR templates and or sharing other NIPR examples would be helpful for those who have never completed one before or someone to help get one started. A go to person would be helpful to give an example of how to write an SLO and then evaluate it.

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

Committee Name: Student Services Planning Committee

Date: 5-14-12

Members Present: Shelly Baxter, Janna Sandhal, Karen Clancy, Tom Rogers, Cary Templeton,

Members Absent: Dr. Carabajal, Ross Brosius, Sandy Beckwith, Sara Michels, Tena Rulofson, Andrew Faircloth

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, Human Resource Plan) as well as the recommendations from program review and student learning outcome assessments.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

Student Services Planning Orientation

2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your planning committee?

Committee would like a regular schedule of meetings (three meetings per semester)

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

None

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

Committee recommends that someone with knowledge in student services and understanding of key data elements be hired to head student services.

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

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

- *The Committee recognizes that this is an unusual budget year, however the District should more closely follow its budget development process.*

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?

*Development of the Student Services Plan
Review of NIPRs and SLO assessments*

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

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

Change committee make up to include the Chief Instructional Officer or their designee from the Academic Planning Committee to assure connection and communication between student and academic services. Add the Chief Student Service officer or designee from student services to the Academic Planning Committee to assure connection and communication between student and academic services when the Academic Planning Committee discusses enrollment changes or future enrollment plans.

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.

Every group participated at least 50%

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

See question four for our answer to how to improve communication between the Student Services Planning Committee and the Academic Planning Committee.

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

2011 Automotive Technology Instructional Program Review Executive Summary and Prioritized Recommendations

The Automotive Program has been a successful vocational program at Lassen College in the past, offering courses to students during both the day and evening hours with two full-time (FT) faculty members and a few part-time (adjunct) faculty members as needed. Program enrollment had declined as the senior faculty member retired in 2000 and the remaining FT faculty member retired in 2007. Since the fall 2007 semester, a limited offering of existing Program courses has been scheduled using a small pool of adjunct faculty members. That condition remains today and is the basis for the limited course offerings scheduled for the fall 2012 semester.

For the 2006/2007 academic year, the VP/Dean of Instruction, Dr. Steven Sylvester, recommended that the retired FT Program instructor position not be replaced for the fall 2007 semester as a budget consideration, that a complete curriculum review be undertaken with the assistance of a renewed advisory committee, and that the results of that review would be a condition for filling the vacate faculty position for the spring 2008 semester. Dr. Sylvester left the College after the spring 2007 semester without establishing the “renewed advisory committee.”

The subsequent VP/Dean of Instruction, Dr. Irving Berkowitz, arrived at the College in August, 2007. During his tenure, the newly selected Vocational/Technical Division Chair prepared and submitted an Instructional Program Review (IPR) in February, 2008. That IPR included eleven (11) nominees for the “renewed advisory committee” and an agenda for the first committee meeting that would address the conditions established by Dr. Sylvester and sustained by Dr. Berkowitz. During his tenure, Dr. Berkowitz did not convene the Board approved advisory committee, which subsequently sunset without renewed Board approval.

As the new Dean of Academic Services (formally the VP/Dean of Instruction position), Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal, submitted to the Board new advisory committee nominees and established a temporary, stipend position so that one of the adjunct faculty members could prepare this IPR and undertake a “full curriculum review.”

As a result of the Dean’s actions, the adjunct faculty member has prepared this IPR, has conducted a complete curriculum review incorporating advisory committee recommendations and is preparing revised course outlines and certificates for submission to the Curriculum Committee.

The new advisory committee has made two, very important recommendations thus far:

1. Complete the hiring process to hire a FT faculty member for the program, and
2. Incorporate NATEF standards and ASE certifications into existing curriculum, including the revisions to course outlines and realignment of College certificates with ASE certifications.

At this writing,

1. With regard to the hiring process for the FT faculty member,
 - a. The revised job description has been completed and approved,
 - b. The public advertisement of the open position has been placed on hold, and
 - c. No timeline has been established for release of that hold.
2. Revised course outlines and certificate pathways are scheduled for submittal to the Curriculum Committee at the May 15th meeting.

Prioritized Recommendations

Group 1 – Time Sensitive Recommendations Based on Advisory Committee Input

1. **Section 2.a Recommendation #1** – The administration must complete the hiring process for the FT faculty position in Automotive. This position should be filled not later than July 1st to provide the new instructor

with the time necessary to review and align course objectives, prepare requests for new equipment and create a schedule of classes with one FT and at least one adjunct faculty member.

The same recommendation was also presented in different variations in Sections, 2.b Recommendation #1, Section 2.c Recommendation #1 and Section 5.a.1.

2. **Section 2.b Recommendation #2** – With the revision to the course outlines, existing certificates will be revised, or new certificates created, to align course objectives with NATEF standards and ASE guidelines, during the spring 2012 semester.

This same recommendation was also presented in different variation in Sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.b.2, 2.d.1, 3.1, 4.1 and Section 4.1.

Group 2 – Recommendations Based on Advisory Committee, Faculty and Student Survey Input

3. Section 7 Recommendation #1 – Through general fund allotments and grant funding (VTEA), the new curriculum must be funded so that the equipment and shop conditions will meet NATEF standards.
4. Section 6 Recommendation #1 – New equipment must be purchased to properly train students to repair modern automobiles and to qualify to be a NATEF certified training facility.
5. Section 4 Recommendation #1 – Update curriculum, tools and equipment to meet students' needs and to comply with NATEF standards
6. Section 2b Recommendations #3 – No immediate recommendation for the AS degree is included. The plan will have the new FT instructor file an IPR addendum on this matter.
7. Section 1 Recommendations # 5 -- #10 – The Program faculty should undertake the following tasks and prepare recommendations for Advisory Committee:
 - 5) Evaluate the labor market survey information to determine relevant application to the local student population and industry.
 - 6) Evaluate the two-fold mission of the Automotive Program to determine whether both a transfer and a vocational course of study should be simultaneously pursued.
 - 7) Inspect Program equipment relative to equipment currency and course application and make appropriate recommendations.
 - 8) Inspect Program facilities for capacity to facilitate NATEF and ASE shop certifications.
 - 9) Discuss participation of Program students in Work Experience courses and/or other relevant learning experiences and make appropriate recommendations.
 - 10) Discuss and present a proposal as to whether the addition of diesel and agriculture mechanics curriculum to the automotive curriculum would be beneficial to students and employers.
8. Section 4 Recommendation #2 – Provide a/c for classroom and swamp coolers/fans for the shop area.