

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 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?

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?