

**[Before you Print – The document is 45 pages]**  
Consultation Council/Strategic Planning Committee Minutes  
June 13, 2012

Present

Cheryl Aschenbach (AS/Div Chair-faculty)  
Terry Bartley (management)  
Shelly Baxter (management)  
Sandy Beckwith (Lead Counselor – faculty)  
Kayleigh Carabajal (Dean of Academic Services)  
Dave Clausen (Dean of Admin Services)

Jeff Lang (classified)  
Sue Mouck (Accreditation Liaison -faculty)  
Marcus Murakami (ASB)  
Eric Rulofson (Chair/ Facilities Planning)  
Ross Stevenson (Div Chair -faculty)  
Cary Templeton (Dean of Student Services)  
Patrick Walton (classified)

Absent

Colleen Baker (Div Chair-faculty)  
Carie Camacho (Div Chair -faculty)

Carol Montgomery (classified)

Guests

Dr. Marlon Hall (Superintendent/President –elect)

Garret Taylor (faculty)

With a quorum present, the meeting began at 1:03 pm. Sue Mouck welcomed the new ASB representative, Marcus Murakami and Superintendent/President Elect Dr. Marlon Hall. Each of the individuals in attendance introduced themselves.

**1. Annual Evaluation of the Shared Governance and Planning Structure and Procedures (Governance)**

Sue Mouck shared the results of the evaluation of the governance and planning structure and procedures. She had added to the list of previously identified recommendations suggestions derived from the evaluation forms. Several modifications were made to clarify points. **The membership adopted by consensus the following list of recommendations for implementation in the next planning cycle.**

- 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. Modify non-instructional program review process to conform with modifications to instructional program review process
- d. Change the budget development process/forms to conform with the restructured program review process
- e. Establish an order for master plan development (EMP, SSMP, ITMP, FMP, HRMP)
- f. 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)
- g. Early identification and publication of the membership and meeting schedule for various committees in the fall (List of appointees provided to Human Resources)
- h. Automate the SLO assessment, program review and planning processes (electronic links)
- i. Maintain Consultation Council schedule and clearly communicate changes to the schedule
- j. Provide orientation/training for planning committees
- k. Articulate to the planning committees that they are responsible for more than reacting to the EMP; each is responsible for also inputting into the planning process based on individual areas of expertise.

- l. Attempt to make each master plan more complete (projects/plans sometimes not found in any plan)
- m. Need more comprehensive staffing plan to guide staffing decisions
- n. Make historical documents available
- o. “SMART” Meetings (projected agenda on screen)
- p. Parking lot for issues (memorialize and track issues)
- q. Contingency events planning and evaluation added to process
- r. Earlier distribution of agendas and materials (time for meaningful review)
- s. Institutional support for planning/governance process (clerical support)

Whenever appropriate the recommendations will be incorporated into the revised Planning and Budget Development Handbook.

**2. Administrative Procedures forwarded from Academic Senate (Information)**

Cheryl Aschenbach presented the administrative procedures **AP 4230 – Grading and Academic Record Symbols, AP 4231 – Grade Changes, AP 4255 – Disqualification and Dismissal** and one proposed revised board policy, **BP 4250 – Probation, Disqualification and Readmission**. She gave credit to Sandy Jonas for much of the work, which was ultimately adopted by the Academic Senate. One correction to the institutional researcher’s title was suggested. **With the suggested correction Consultation Council adopted AP 4230 – Grading and Academic Record Symbols, AP 4231 – Grade Changes, AP 4255 – Disqualification and Dismissal and forward the revised BP 4250 – Probation, Disqualification and Readmission to the Governing Board for their consideration.**

Sue Mouck indicated that two new standing items were being added to the agenda. Each agenda will provide an opportunity for an update from the Budget Advisory Team and an Accreditation Update.

**3. Budget Advisory Team Update**

Dave Clausen advised the group that the Budget Advisory Team (BAT) had met once. The initial meeting focused on overarching state budget issues impacting the college budget. Mr. Clausen repeated that the state budget situation seems to change daily. The most recent information impacting the budget is a little more positive. His primary focus is shifting from the budget to cash flow issues, which are looking “ugly”. Because these cash flow issues will impact the college beyond the date of approval of the final budget in September. BAT may continue to meet longer than originally intended.

**4. Accreditation Update (Information)**

Sue Mouck reminded the group, that the self- evaluation teams had been formulated last spring. Prior to the beginning of the fall semester, she intends to update the membership of all of the teams to reflect the removal of individual who have left the college and addition of individual who have joined the college. She indicated the intention to place as much of the documentation for writing the self-evaluation as well as and providing evidence is being placed on the college website. For example all currently approved student learning outcomes can be found on the website. As new evidence is identified or created, it needs to be added to the website. In response to a question concerning the lack of meetings for the standards during Spring 2012, Ms. Mouck indicated that the chairs for the standards have not yet been identified and the intention is to initiate scheduled meetings early in the fall semester.

**5. Personnel Update (Information) – Administration**

Dave Clausen indicated that the hiring of the Financial Aid Technician II and the Bookstore Manager are moving forward.

## Strategic Planning:

### 1. 2012-2013 Strategic Master Plan – Governing Board Planning Retreat July 24, 2012 (Consultation)

Sue Mouck provided a proposal containing four rewritten strategic goals based on the previous discussion by the Strategic Planning Committee and her thoughts. She also provided two possible areas of emphasis for the 2012-2013 academic year. She acknowledged the recommendation from the previous meeting that the strategic goals be indicated with bullets not numbers, but pointed out that our planning documents all reference objectives and strategies to appropriate strategic goals by number. She also indicated the need in our current planning structure to have broad strategic goals under which all college activities would fit. A wide-ranging dialogue with a diversity of perspectives resulted in the agreement to consider for further refinement at the next meeting the following four proposed strategic goal (all to be considered as equal priorities):

1. **Institutional Effectiveness:** Provide the governance, leadership, integrated planning and accountability structures, and processes to effectively support the learning environment, while ensuring responsible stewardship of public trust and resources.
2. **Learning Opportunities:** Provide an array of rigorous academic programs delivered via a variety of modalities that promote student learning and meet the needs of the local and global community.
3. **Resource Management:** Manage human, physical, technological and financial resources to sustain fiscal stability and to effectively support the learning environment.
4. **Student Success:** Provide a college environment that reaches-out-to and supports students, minimizes barriers, and increases opportunity and success through access and retention to enable student attainment of educational goals including completion of degrees and certificates, transfer, job placement and advancement, improvement of basic skills, and self development through lifelong learning.

After considerable discussion providing both pros and cons it was decided not to proceed with articulation of specific areas of focus for the next year. The absence of reference to diversity in the strategic plan was identified. The suggestion to include diversity within the value statement was presented. The value statement has been the same for more than five years. Replacement of the value summary statement with a diversity statement was suggested. Also suggested was adding diversity as the third bullet under Dignity/Respect. An opportunity to consider the college diversity statement to inform the discussion was requested. The college diversity statement will be provided with the next agenda. Shelly Baxter reminded the group that a lengthy process involving the entire campus was used to develop the value statement and suggested that it might be time to repeat that process. Sue Mouck pointed out that there was not sufficient time for such a process to occur before making recommendations to the Governing Board at the July 24, 2012 Retreat, but suggested that such an activity during Convocation could lead to changes for next year.

### Other:

1. Terry Bartley announced that the tentative budget was approved by the Governing Board on Tuesday and is in Datatel.
2. Eric Rulofson reminded the group that the first Public Sale of Surplus Equipment begins Saturday between nine and three. There are over 700 items remaining. Approximately 28% of the surplus has already been sold to local schools. The process is very simple. Submit a bid on any of the numbered items. The bidding process will continue for about a week. Ross Stevenson suggested that the assistance provided to local schools would make a great press release. Dr. Hall indicated that he would follow up on the Press Release.

3. Dave Clausen indicated that the experiment to keep the Cafeteria open during the summer has proved too expensive. Beginning next week available items will be limited to “Grab and Go”.

**Next Meetings: Wednesday, June 27, 2012 and Wednesday, July 11, 2012**

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm

**Future Agendas:**

1. **Review of July 10, 2012 Governing Board Agenda (Information) – June 27, 2012**
2. **2012 Fine Arts/Humanities (Information) - Cheryl Aschenbach**
3. **2011 Social Science IPR (Information) – Cheryl Aschenbach**
4. **2011 Gunsmithing IPR (Information) – Cheryl Aschenbach**
5. **2011 Journalism IPR (Information) – Cheryl Aschenbach**
6. **2012 Administration of Justice (Information) – September 2012– Cheryl Aschenbach**
7. **2009/11 Human Services IPR (Information) –October 2012– Cheryl Aschenbach**
8. **2012 Agriculture (Information) – Cheryl Aschenbach**
9. **2012 Business (Information) – Cheryl Aschenbach**
10. **2012 Enrollment Services (Information) –**
11. **2012 Research and Planning (Information) –**
12. **2012 Instructional Support Services –Library –**
13. **2012 Auxiliary Services – Bookstore/Book Rental/Loan Program – Dave Clausen**
14. **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 Constituent Group Survey

**Constituent Group:** *Classified*

**Date:** *June 1, 2012*

**Members Present:** *n/a - email*

**Members Absent:** *n/a - email*

### 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?
  - *Information is given at open forums*
  - *Classified are given the opportunity to give input*
  - *Classified input is given serious consideration when making changes/revisions*
  - *Some plans were changed as a result of our input*
  
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2011-2012 at Lassen College from the perspective of your constituent group?
  - *No oversight to ensure all plans are in compliance with various governmental codes that are applicable*
  - *Timelines for plan submissions need to be spread out so staff have a reasonable amount of time to review and respond*
  - *Some plans were not transparent and were enacted even though they were incomplete*
  - *There were components of plans/projects that were not discussed or to be found in any plan anywhere*
  - *Hiring and/or changes to staff are made, but are not reflected in the plans*
  - *Survey results and project outcomes are not always published*
  
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
  - *Post draft plans in a public display allowing for comment and better transparency*
  - *Follow the laws governing building modification and occupancy changes*
  - *Give an adequate amount of time to vet each plan including documents*
  - *Revise plans before making staffing changes or hiring new staff*
  
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 site where all historical documents, minutes and plans are housed that is open and available for staff and the general public to utilize*
  - *Have current governmental code books in the library*
  - *“Smart” conference/meeting rooms to utilize campus technology to streamline meetings, reduce copying costs, and aide in presentations*
  - *Maintain a “parking lot” of issues and concerns that are monitored and revisited on a regular basis*
  
5. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning?

- *There continues to be instances of inconsistencies between the planning process and budget development*
- *Reallocations do not seem to follow any plan*
- *Reorganizations may be used to circumvent the process*
- *The process is improving every year*

### Governance Section

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

- *Classified representatives on committees keep constituent group members informed*
- *Regular, noticed meetings*
- *Meetings are open*
- *Meeting minutes are disseminated quickly to campus community*
- *It works as well as it's allowed to and is effective as allowed*
- *Detailed reports are given at CSEA chapter meetings*

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

- *Schedule/allow more time to review plans by those directly affected*
- *Adjust meeting timelines to allow for comprehensive discussions when warranted*

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

- *Follow a timeline that allows for all groups to participate effectively*
- *Include "classified" and "management" in the Shared Governance Matrix*

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

- *Well, one thing I have heard is that plans are approved and then administration goes off on tangents and people are asking "where is it in the plan." This is especially true in staffing. Jobs suddenly appear with no pre-planning and often the descriptions are vague and not well written and there is no parity or equity.*
- *I don't think we have shared governance. If anything we have a consulting process, but we are not always included in that.*
- *Short-cuts are damaging to our integrity. Fiscal reporting of special projects are lacking, so evaluation of plans enacted can never really occur. For example – The true bottom line on the "big move" i.e. student services – trades – business – assessment – etc. was never published.*

## **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 to 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?

**Academic Affairs**

**Approved by Senate 5/8/12**

**Adopted by Consultation Council 6/13/12**

## **AP 4230 GRADING AND ACADEMIC RECORD SYMBOLS**

### **References:**

[Education Code Section 76224;](#)

[Title 5 Sections 55021, 55022, 55023, and 55024](#)

### **❖ From current Lassen College Policy 6400 titled Grading Policy**

When grades are given for any course of instruction taught in a community college district, the grade given to each student shall be the grade determined by the instructor of the course and the determination of the student's grade by the instructor, in the absence of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetence, shall be final.

If the presence of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetence is determined, the Dean of Academic Services in consultation with an additional faculty member with minimum qualifications in a discipline to which the course is assigned and oversight by members of the Academic Grievance Committee will use any or all of the following criteria, based on availability, to determine a grade assignment: course syllabus, time cards, test, quiz, exam scores, graded work, comprehensive exam or other appropriate data as determined by the committee. Once the committee has met, examined relevant documents and determines the appropriate change of grade, the Dean of Academic Services may recommend an official change of grade or may authorize removal of the grade from GPA calculation.

No grade of a student participating in a physical education class, however, may be adversely affected due to the fact that the student does not wear standardized physical education apparel where the failure to wear such apparel arises from circumstances beyond the control of the student.

The grade report made by the instructor to the Office of Admissions and Records shall be one of the following:

### **Evaluative Symbols**

A – Excellent - 4 grade points per unit

B - ~~Good~~ ~~Above Average~~ - 3 grade points per unit

C –Satisfactory - 2 grade points per unit

D - Passing, less than satisfactory - 1 grade point per unit

F – Failing - 0 grade point per unit

~~CR – Credit~~ **P – Pass** (at least satisfactory) - 0 grade point per unit

~~NC – Noncredit~~ **NP – No Pass** (less than satisfactory or failing) - 0 grade point per unit

FW – Failure to Withdraw

### **Non-Evaluative Symbols**

I - Incomplete - Does not affect grade point standing

W – Withdrawn al - Does not affect grade point standing

IP - In progress - Does not affect grade point standing

RD - Report Delayed - Does not affect grade point standing

**MW – Military withdrawal**

### **Explanation of Symbols**

#### **Satisfactory Grade**

For the course in question, a satisfactory grade for purposes of prerequisites means that the student's academic record has been annotated with the symbol A, B, C or ~~CR~~**P**.

#### **Incompletes**

Incomplete academic work for unforeseeable, emergency and justifiable reasons at the end of the term may result in an "I" symbol being entered in the student's record. The condition for the removal of the "I" shall be stated by the instructor in a written record. This record shall contain the conditions for the removal of the "I", the grade assigned in lieu of its removal, and the period of time allowed, as determined by the instructor, to make up the "I" grade. This record must be given to the student with a copy on file with the registrar until the "I" is made up or the time limit has passed.

Notification of conditions and timelines may be made one of four ways:

1. The instructor meets with the student, communicates the conditions and timelines, records the information on the Incomplete Form, and has the student sign for verification of notification.
2. The instructor sends the student conditions and timelines via email. The student's return email verifies notification and should be attached to the Incomplete Form.
3. The instructor informs the student of conditions and timelines via phone. The instructor documents all conditions and timelines as well as a record of the phone call on the Incomplete Form.
4. The instructor is unable to inform the student of conditions and timelines through any of the above methods. The Office of Admissions and Records will send a copy of the Incomplete Form to the student with a signature receipt required. If no signature receipt is returned to Lassen College or if the conditions are refused, the Office of Admissions and Records will immediately record the grade indicated on the form to be assigned if the conditions are not met.

A final grade shall be assigned when the work stipulated has been completed, evaluated and a change of grade form has been submitted by the instructor of record;



when the time limit for completing the work has passed; or when a student cannot be notified of conditions necessary to complete the “I” grade.

The “I” may be made up no later than one year, or less as determined by the instructor, following the end of the term in which it was assigned.

The “I” symbol shall not be used in calculating units attempted nor for grade points. A student may petition to the Dean of Student Services and the Chief Instructional Officer for a time extension due to unusual circumstances.

### **Withdrawal**

Withdrawal from a class or classes shall be authorized through the last day of the fourteenth week of instruction (or 75% of a term, whichever is less). Students may withdraw from a class or classes in extenuating circumstances after the last day of the thirteenth week (or 75% of a term, whichever is less) upon petition of the student or his/her representative, and after consultation with the instructor(s) or appropriate faculty to the Chief Instructional Officer. Extenuating circumstances are verified cases of accidents, illnesses or other circumstances beyond the control of the student. No notation (“W” or other) shall be made on the academic record of a student who withdraws up to and including the day before census (or 20% of a term, which ever is less).

Withdrawal between the census date or end of first 20% of a class (or such time as established by the district) and the last day of the thirteenth week of instruction (or 75% of a term, whichever is less) shall be authorized after informing the appropriate faculty.

Withdrawal after the end of the thirteenth week of instruction (or 75% of a term, whichever is less) when the district has authorized such withdrawal in extenuating circumstances, after consultation with appropriate faculty, shall be recorded as a “FW”.

For purposes of withdrawal policies, the term “appropriate faculty” means the instructor of each course in question or, in the event the instructor cannot be contacted, the department chair or equivalent faculty officer.

The “W” shall not be used in calculating grade point averages, but excessive “W”s (as defined in Title V, Section 55754 and 55756) shall be used as factors in probation and dismissal. Criteria for withdrawal procedures shall be published in the college catalog.

### **In Progress**

The “IP” symbol shall be used only following the grade point averages. If a student enrolled in an “open-entry, open-exit” course is assigned an “IP” at the end of an attendance period and does not enroll in that course during the subsequent attendance period, the appropriate faculty will assign an evaluative symbol (grade) to be recorded on the student’s permanent record of the course.

### **Report Delayed**

The “RD” symbol may be assigned by the registrar only. It is to be used when there is a delay in reporting the grade of a student due to circumstances beyond the control of the student. It is a temporary notation to be replaced by a permanent symbol as soon as possible. “RD” shall not be used in calculating grade point averages.

### **Military Withdrawal**

Military Withdrawal occurs when a student who is a member of an active or reserve United States military service receives orders compelling a withdrawal from courses. Upon verification of such orders, a withdrawal symbol may be assigned at any time after the period established by the governing board during which no notation is made for withdrawals. The withdrawal symbol so assigned may be a “W” or, if necessary to distinguish military withdrawals, may be a “MW”. Military withdrawals shall not be counted in progress probation and dismissal calculations. “W”s incurred during the period between January 1, 1990, and the effective date of this paragraph, which meet the definition of military withdrawals herein, shall not be counted in progress probation and dismissal calculations and may be changed to “MW”s.

Office of Primary Responsibility: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**NOTE:** The **red type** signifies **legally required** language recommended from the Community College League and legal counsel (Liebert Cassidy Whitmore). The language in **black ink** is current Lassen College Policy 6400 titled Grading Policy adopted on 9/20/76 and revised on 5/5/87 and 8/12/08 and Policy 6520 titled Assigning Grades in Special Circumstances adopted on 3/9/06 and revised on 8/12/08. The information in **blue type** is additional language to consider including in this procedure.

---

### **Date Approved:**

*(Replaces current Lassen College Policies  
6400 and 6520)*

**Academic Affairs**

**Approved by Senate 04/24/12**

**Adopted by Consultation Council 6/13/12**

## **AP 4231 GRADE CHANGES**

### **References:**

[Education Code Sections 76224 and 76232;](#)  
[Title 5 Section 55025](#)

### **Changing Grades**

The instructor of the course shall determine the grade to be awarded to each student.

The determination of the student's grade by the instructor is final in the absence of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetence. "Mistake" may include, but is not limited to, errors made by an instructor in calculating a student's grade and clerical errors. "Fraud" may include, but is not limited to, inaccurate recording or change of a grade by any person who gains access to grade records without authorization.

The removal or change of an incorrect grade from a student's record shall only be done pursuant to Education Code Section 76232 or by an alternative method that ensures that each student shall be afforded an objective and reasonable review of the requested grade change.

In cases where it may be necessary for another faculty member to substitute for the instructor to assign a grade (including completion of an "INC" grade) when the instructor is not available because he or she has left the employment of the district or fails to respond to repeated and extensive attempts to make contact, the Dean of Academic Services in consultation with an additional faculty member with minimum qualifications in a discipline to which the course is assigned and oversight by members of the Academic Grievance Committee will use any or all of the following criteria, based on availability, to determine a grade assignment: course syllabus, time cards, test, quiz, exam scores, graded work, comprehensive exam or other appropriate data as determined by the committee. Once the committee has met, examined relevant documents and determines the appropriate change of grade, the Dean of Academic Services will submit the official change of grade.

In cases where the District determines that it is possible that there may have been a mistake by the original instructor or in the case of fraud, bad faith, or incompetence, the

final recommendation concerning a change of grade or removal of the grade from GPA calculation will be made by the Dean of Academic Services using this same process.

In all cases, the student as well as the instructor who first awarded the grade will be given written notice of the change.

### **Security of Grade Records**

The District shall implement security measures for student records that assure no person may obtain access to student grade records without proper authorization. These measures shall be installed as part of any computerized grade data storage system.

The measures implemented by the District shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, password protection for all student grade databases, locking mechanisms for computer stations from which student grade data bases can be viewed, and strict limits on the number of persons who are authorized to change student grades.

Persons authorized to change grades shall be designated by the Director of Enrollment Services. No more than five District employees may be authorized to change student grades. Only regular full-time employees of the District may be authorized to change grades. Student workers shall not have access to grade records, and student workers may not change grades at any time.

Any person who discovers that grades have been changed by someone other than the persons authorized to do so shall notify the Chief Technology Officer. The Chief Technology Officer shall immediately take steps to lock the grade storage system entirely while an investigation is conducted.

If any student's grade record is found to have been changed without proper authorization, the District will notify:

- 1) the student;
- 2) the instructor who originally awarded the grade;
- 3) any educational institution to which the student has transferred;
- 4) the accreditation agency; and
- 5) appropriate local law enforcement authorities.

Whenever a grade is changed for any reason, corrected transcripts will be sent to any educational institution to which a student has transferred.

Any student or employee who is found to have gained access to grade recording systems without proper authorization, or who is found to have changed any grade without proper authority to do so, shall be subject to discipline in accordance with District policies and procedures.

Any person who is found to have gained access to grade recording systems without proper authorization, or who is found to have changed any grade without proper

authority to do so, shall be reported to the appropriate law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the college where the incident occurred.

**Note:** *The District may insert procedures related to processes for seeking grade changes, time limits, if any, and appeals to the Superintendent/President. Suggested procedures for doing so are contained in AP 5530 titled Student Grievance Procedures.*

Also see BP 3310 titled Records Retention and Destruction and BP/AP 5040 titled [Student Records](#)

Office of Primary Responsibility: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**NOTE:** *The **red type** signifies **legally required** language recommended from the Community College League and legal counsel (Liebert Cassidy Whitmore). The information in **blue type** is additional language to consider including in this procedure.*

---

**Date Approved:**

*(This is a new procedure recommended by the CC League and the League's legal counsel)*

**Academic Affairs**

**Approved by Academic Senate 5/22/12  
Adopted by Consultation Council 6/13/12**

## **AP 4255 DISQUALIFICATION AND DISMISSAL**

### **References:**

[Title 5 Sections 55033 and 55034](#)

***Note:** This procedure is **legally required**. Local practice may be inserted, but should address the minimum requirements in the following examples.*

### **Subject to Dismissal**

**Academic Dismissal:** A student who is on academic probation shall be subject to dismissal if the student's cumulative GPA is below 2.0 for three consecutive semesters, not including summer.

**Progress Dismissal:** A student who is on progress probation shall be subject to dismissal if the percentage of units in which the student has been enrolled for which entries of "W", "I" and "NP" and "NC" are recorded for three consecutive semesters reaches or exceeds 50%, not including summer.

### **Notification of Probation and Dismissal**

Lassen Community College shall make every reasonable effort to notify a student of academic probation or dismissal at or near the beginning of the semester in which it will take effect; but in any case, no later than the start of the fall (or spring) semester. Lassen Community College shall also make every reasonable effort to provide counseling and other support services to a student on probation to help the student overcome any academic difficulties.

### **Reinstatement**

Students who have been dismissed from Lassen Community College may appeal for readmission after one semesters' absence by seeing a counselor & filing a petition to the Chief Student Services Officer. If the petition is approved the student will be allowed to register, but will remain on probation and will have to petition each term (summer included) until their GPA reaches 2.0 or higher.

### **Right of Appeal**

Any student who is placed on probation or is dismissed may appeal in writing to the Chief Student Services Officer.

## Appeal Petition

The appeal petition may be printed online at [www.lassencollege.edu](http://www.lassencollege.edu) or obtained from Admissions and Records. (530) 251-8808 or (530) 251-8802 fax.

See attachments for student probation and dismissal handout and supporting documents.

Office of Primary Responsibility: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**NOTE:** The **red type** signifies **legally required** language recommended from the Community College League and legal counsel (Liebert Cassidy Whitmore). The information in **blue type** is additional language to consider including in this procedure.

---

### Date Approved:

*(This is a new procedure recommended by the CC League and the League's legal counsel)*



Lassen Community College  
**Probation/Dismissal Procedures**  
Per BP 4250 and AP 4255

### **Academic Progress**

Students at Lassen Community College are expected to select courses wisely. After preliminary adjustments in programs-usually completed within the first two weeks of a regular term-the student is expected to complete the courses chosen. At times, for a variety of reasons, students either do poorly in course work or withdraw from courses prior to completion. This policy has identified the point at which a student is felt to be operating below a satisfactory level.

### **Probation and Dismissal**

Failure to fulfill academic responsibility is considered to be a serious matter by the college. Accordingly, the following probation and suspension policies have been adopted pursuant to the Education Code and District Policy; a student can be placed on probation for two reasons:

- Unsatisfactory academic performance.
- Unsatisfactory progress in course work.

### **Standards for Probation**

A student who has enrolled for 12 or more semester units (during the fall/spring terms) at Lassen Community College is subject to the probation policy of the college:

**Academic Probation:** After the first semester in which a student shows a cumulative grade point average (GPA) below 2.0 for all units completed at Lassen Community College, the student shall be placed on "Academic Probation -1" status. After the second semester, a student who maintains less than a 2.0 cumulative GPA shall be placed on "Academic Probation-2" status.

**Progress Probation:** After the first semester (in which) a student shows grades of "W," "I," "NP" and "NC" in 50% or more of his/her cumulative units of enrollment, the student shall be placed on "Progress Probation-1." After the second semester a student who earns grades of "W," "I," "NP" and "NC" in 50% or more of his/her cumulative units of enrollment shall be placed on "Progress Probation-2" status.

### **Effects of Probation**

The probation status shall be placed on the student's transcript. First semester probationary students are strongly encouraged to see a counselor, but are not restricted from registering for the next semester. Second and successive semester, probationary-2 students must complete an Education Plan with a counselor in order to register in the subsequent term. Contact the Counseling Office, (530) 251-8842.

### **Removal from Probation**

Academic Probation: When the cumulative GPA of a student on academic probation becomes a 2.0 or higher he/she shall be removed from academic probation.



Progress Probation: When a student on progress probation receives grades of “W”, “I,” “NP” and “NC” in less than 50% of his/her cumulative units of enrollment at Lassen Community College, the student shall be removed from progress probation.

### **The following section is also in AP 4255 Disqualification and Dismissal**

#### **Subject to Dismissal**

Academic Dismissal: A student who is on academic probation shall be subject to dismissal if the student’s cumulative GPA is below 2.0 for three consecutive semesters, not including summer.

Progress Dismissal: A student who is on progress probation shall be subject to dismissal if the percentage of units in which the student has been enrolled for which entries of “W”, “I” and “NP” and “NC” are recorded for three consecutive semesters reaches or exceeds 50%, not including summer.

#### **Notification of Probation and Dismissal**

Lassen Community College shall make every reasonable effort to notify a student of academic probation or dismissal at or near the beginning of the semester in which it will take effect; but in any case, no later than the start of the fall (or spring) semester.

Lassen Community College shall also make every reasonable effort to provide counseling and other support services to a student on probation to help the student overcome any academic difficulties.

#### **Reinstatement**

Students who have been dismissed from Lassen Community College may appeal for readmission after one semesters’ absence by seeing a counselor & filing a petition to the Chief Student Services Officer. If the petition is approved the student will be allowed to register, but will remain on probation and will have to petition each term (summer included) until their GPA reaches 2.0 or higher.

#### **Right of Appeal**

Any student who is placed on probation or is dismissed may appeal in writing to the Chief Student Services Officer.

#### **Appeal Petition**

The appeal petition may be printed online at [www.lassencollege.edu](http://www.lassencollege.edu) or obtained from Admissions and Records. (530) 251-8808 or (530) 251-8802 fax.

## NOTICE OF PROGRESS PROBATION

Date

Dear Student:

This letter is to inform you that you have been placed on **probation for lack of satisfactory progress** at Lassen Community College. This is a result of receiving grades of “W”, “NC”, “NP” or “I” in 50% or more of **all units ever taken** at Lassen Community College as of the end of the Fall 2011. If the number of units not completed remains at 50% or more for at least three of your consecutively enrolled semesters, you will be subject to progress dismissal.

Minimum standards for probation and dismissal are mandated by Title 5, regulations for California Community Colleges. Lassen Community College’s policies for both academic and progress probation and dismissal can be found in the college catalog section entitled “Student Grades, Records and Academic Policies.”

Please meet with a counselor. The counselor will be able to advise you on how to improve your educational progress, avoid future dismissal and identify the steps you may take to ensure your success at Lassen Community College

Sincerely,

Admissions and Records

Enclosure

## NOTICE OF ACADEMIC PROBATION

Date

Dear Student:

This letter is to inform you that you have been placed on academic probation as a result of your Fall 2011 grade point average. This is a result of your **overall grade-point average** dropping below 2.0. Probation means that you are asked to carefully monitor your progress in your classes during the next semester and in future terms to make sure you can bring your grade-point average up to a 2.0 level or above. To get off probation your grade point average must equal or exceed 2.0.

Minimum standards for probation and dismissal are mandated by Title 5, regulations for California Community Colleges. Lassen Community College's policies for both academic and progress probation and dismissal can be found in the college catalog section entitled "Student Grades, Records and Academic Policies."

Please meet with a counselor. The counselor will be able to advise you on how to improve your educational progress and avoid future dismissal and identify the steps you may take to ensure your success at Lassen Community College.

Sincerely,

Admissions and Records

Enclosure

## NOTICE OF PROGRESS DISMISSAL

Date: April 23, 2012

Dear Student:

You have been **dismissed from attending Lassen Community College**. At the end of the Fall 2011 semester your units attempted for three consecutive terms with entries of “W”- withdrawal, “I” – incomplete, “NC” – no credit, or “NP”– no pass, are more than fifty percent (50%) of your total units attempted.

To re-enroll at Lassen Community College you must:

- ❑ Not attend for one regular semester
- ❑ Consult with a counselor to determine whether the reasons that led to your dismissal have been corrected sufficiently to enable improved performance.
- ❑ File an Appeal for reinstatement with the Chief Student Services Officer.

Lassen Community College’s policies for both Academic and Progress Probation and Dismissal can be found in the college catalog section entitled “Student Grades, Records and Academic Policies.”

Sincerely,

Cary Templeton

Dean of Student Services

## NOTICE OF PROGRESS DISMISSAL

Date: April 23, 2012

Dear Student:

You have been **dismissed from attending Lassen Community College**. At the end of the Fall 2011 semester your units attempted for three consecutive terms with entries of "W"- withdrawal, "I" – incomplete, "NC" – no credit, or "NP"– no pass, are more than fifty percent (50%) of your total units attempted.

To re-enroll at Lassen Community College you must:

- ❑ Not attend for one regular semester
- ❑ Consult with a counselor to determine whether the reasons that led to your dismissal have been corrected sufficiently to enable improved performance.
- ❑ File an Appeal for reinstatement with the Chief Student Services Officer.

Lassen Community College's policies for both Academic and Progress Probation and Dismissal can be found in the college catalog section entitled "Student Grades, Records and Academic Policies."

Sincerely,

Cary Templeton

Dean of Student Services

## Conditional Reinstatement

Date

Dear Student,

A review of your Fall 2011 grades indicates that you were scheduled to be dismissed from attending Lassen Community College for the Fall 2012 semester. However, after review of your Spring 2012 grades you are being automatically reinstated for the Fall 2012 term. This means that your dismissal status has been set aside so that you may enroll in the Fall 2012 semester. Congratulations on a successful Spring 2012 term.

**It is important for you see a counselor to review your records so that you can learn what you can do to improve your grades (course repetition, tutoring, planning, etc).** Counselors can also help you plan a schedule which will allow you to be successful. Minimum standards for probation and dismissal are mandated by Title V, regulations for California Community Colleges.

Lassen Community College policies for both Academic and Progress Probation and Dismissal can be found in the college catalog section entitled "Student Grades, Records and Academic Policies."

Sincerely,

Admissions and Records

Enclosures





Comments:

---

---

---

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Title:

---

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Student Notification Date:

---

Original copy to remain with Chief Student Services Officer  
White Copy – CSSO      Yellow Copy - A&R      Pink Copy - Student



# Legal Citation for AP 4255 Disqualification and Dismissal

## Title 5 Sections 55033 and 55034

5 CCR § 55033

Cal. Admin. Code tit. 5, § 55033

TITLE 5. EDUCATION  
DIVISION 6. CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES  
CHAPTER 6. CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION  
SUBCHAPTER 1. PROGRAMS, COURSES AND CLASSES  
ARTICLE 3. PROBATION AND DISMISSAL

§ 55033. Standards for Dismissal.

For purposes of this section, semesters or quarters shall be considered consecutive on the basis of the student's enrollment, so long as the break in the student's enrollment does not exceed one full primary term.

(a) A student who is on academic probation shall be subject to dismissal if the student earned a cumulative grade point average of less than 1.75 in all units attempted in each of 3 consecutive semesters (5 consecutive quarters) which were graded on the basis of the grading system described in section 55023.

(b) A student who has been placed on progress probation shall be subject to dismissal if the percentage of units in which the student has been enrolled for which entries of "W," "I," "NP" and "NC" (as defined in section 55023 and 55030) are recorded in at least 3 consecutive semesters (5 consecutive quarters) reaches or exceeds fifty percent (50%) in accordance with section 55031.

(c) The governing board of a district shall adopt and publish procedures and conditions for dismissal and appeal of dismissal and request for reinstatement. Such procedures and conditions may establish standards not lower than the standards specified in subdivisions (a) and (b) of this section. Specifically:

(1) A district may establish, as the minimum cumulative grade point average for dismissal purposes, a grade point average greater than 1.75; or

(2) A district may establish, as the minimum percentage of units of "W," "I," "NP" and "NC," a percentage less than fifty percent (50%), or

(3) A district may establish, as a minimum number of consecutive semesters or quarters, a number fewer than 3 consecutive semesters or 5 consecutive quarters.

(d) The district board shall adopt rules setting forth the circumstances that shall warrant exceptions to the standards for dismissal herein set forth.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 66700 and 70901, Education Code. Reference: Sections 70901, 70902 and 76000, Education Code.

5 CCR § 55034  
Cal. Admin. Code tit. 5, § 55034

TITLE 5. EDUCATION  
DIVISION 6. CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES  
CHAPTER 6. CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION  
SUBCHAPTER 1. PROGRAMS, COURSES AND CLASSES  
ARTICLE 3. PROBATION AND DISMISSAL

§ 55034. Notification of Probation and Dismissal.

Each community college shall make reasonable efforts to notify a student subject to academic probation or dismissal at or near the beginning of the semester or quarter in which it will take effect but, in any case, no later than the start of the fall semester or quarter. Each community college shall also make a reasonable effort to provide counseling and other support services to a student on probation to help the student overcome any academic difficulties. Each community college shall make reasonable efforts to notify a student of removal from probation or reinstatement after dismissal within timelines established by the district. Probation and dismissal policies and procedures shall be published in the college catalog.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 66700 and 70901, Education Code. Reference: Sections 70901 and 70902, Education Code.

**Academic Affairs**

**Approved by Academic Senate 5/22/12**  
**Recommended for Adoption by Consultation Council**  
**6/13/12**

## **BP 4250 PROBATION, DISQUALIFICATION, AND READMISSION**

### **References:**

[Education Code Section 70902\(b\)\(3\);](#)  
[Title 5 Sections 55030-55034](#)

***Note:** The following standards are the minimum standards defined in Title 5. The Board may adopt more stringent standards as specified in Title 5 Sections 55030-55034 and if it has done so, board policy must reflect those standards.*

### **Academic Progress**

Students at Lassen Community College are expected to select courses wisely. After preliminary adjustments in programs-usually completed within the first two weeks of a regular term-the student is expected to complete the courses chosen. At times, for a variety of reasons, students either do poorly in course work or withdraw from courses prior to completion. This policy has identified the point at which a student is felt to be operating below a satisfactory level.

### **Probation and Dismissal**

Failure to fulfill academic responsibility is considered to be a serious matter by the college. Accordingly, the following probation and suspension policies have been adopted pursuant to the Education Code and District Policy; a student can be placed on probation for two reasons:

- Unsatisfactory academic performance.
- Unsatisfactory progress in course work.

### **Standards for Probation**

A student who has enrolled for 12 or more semester units (during the fall/spring terms) at Lassen Community College is subject to the probation policy of the college:

**Academic Probation:** After the first semester in which a student shows a cumulative grade point average (GPA) below 2.0 for all units completed at Lassen Community College, the student shall be placed on “Academic Probation -1” status. After the second semester, a student who maintains less than a 2.0 cumulative GPA shall be placed on “Academic Probation-2” status.

**Progress Probation:** After the first semester (in which) a student shows grades of “W,” “I,” “NP” and “NC” in 50% or more of his/her cumulative units of enrollment, the student shall be placed on “Progress Probation-1.” After the second semester a student who earns grades of “W,” “I,” “NP” and “NC” in 50% or more of his/her cumulative units of enrollment shall be placed on “Progress Probation-2” status.

### **Effects of Probation**

The probation status shall be placed on the student’s transcript. First semester probationary students are strongly encouraged to see a counselor, but are not restricted from registering for the next semester. Second and successive semester, probationary-2 students must complete an Education Plan with a counselor in order to register in the subsequent term. Contact the Counseling Office, (530) 251-8842.

### **Removal from Probation**

**Academic Probation:** When the cumulative GPA of a student on academic probation becomes a 2.0 or higher he/she shall be removed from academic probation.

**Progress Probation:** When a student on progress probation receives grades of “W”, “I,” “NP” and “NC” in less than 50% of his/her cumulative units of enrollment at Lassen Community College, the student shall be removed from progress probation.

### **The following section is also in AP 4255 Disqualification and Dismissal**

#### **Subject to Dismissal**

**Academic Dismissal:** A student who is on academic probation shall be subject to dismissal if the student’s cumulative GPA is below 2.0 for three consecutive semesters, not including summer.

**Progress Dismissal:** A student who is on progress probation shall be subject to dismissal if the percentage of units in which the student has been enrolled for which entries of “W”, “I” and “NP” and “NC” are recorded for three consecutive semesters reaches or exceeds 50%, not including summer.

#### **Notification of Probation and Dismissal**

Lassen Community College shall make every reasonable effort to notify a student of academic probation or dismissal at or near the beginning of the semester in which it will take effect; but in any case, no later than the start of the fall (or spring) semester.

Lassen Community College shall also make every reasonable effort to provide counseling and other support services to a student on probation to help the student overcome any academic difficulties.

#### **Reinstatement**

Students who have been dismissed from Lassen Community College may appeal for readmission after one semesters’ absence by seeing a counselor & filing a petition to the Chief Student Services Officer. If the petition is approved the student will be allowed to register, but will remain on probation and will have to petition each term (summer included) until their GPA reaches 2.0 or higher.

## Right of Appeal

Any student who is placed on probation or is dismissed may appeal in writing to the Chief Student Services Officer.

## Appeal Petition

The appeal petition may be printed online at [www.lassencollege.edu](http://www.lassencollege.edu) or obtained from Admissions and Records. (530) 251-8808 or (530) 251-8802 fax.

Office of Primary Responsibility: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**NOTE:** The **red type** signifies **legally required** language (except where otherwise noted) recommended from the Community College League and legal counsel (Liebert Cassidy Whitmore). The language in **black ink** is current Lassen College Policy 5350 titled Academic Dismissal adopted on 9/20/76 and revised on 3/17/87, 11/10/98, and 6/27/06 and Policy 5340 titled Academic Grade Point and Probation adopted on 9/20/76 and revised on 3/17/87, 11/10/98, and 6/27/06. The information in **blue type** is additional language to consider including.

---

## Date Adopted:

*(This is a new policy recommended by the CC League and the League's legal counsel)*