

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

Committee Name: Academic Planning Committee

Date: 05.07.08

SUMMARY

Faculty Responses: 2

Classified Employee Responses: 1

Classified Administrator Response: 0

Educational Administrator Response: 0

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, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
I think the biggest success of the process was that we actually met three times and managed to approve the various documents we had to within the tight timelines. At one meeting, we actually discussed the future of the committee, as to who would continue the work, how would it be funded, assuring that what had been started was carried forward.

We finally saw info from IPRs moved into the appropriate planning documents, potentially adding validity to the IPR process in the eyes of the faculty since the IPR information no longer exists in a vacuum.

2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
On this specific committee, I didn't feel we ever got into substantive issues. It was mostly about meeting a particular timeline and approving documents to go forward. I realize the time constraints caused much of this. We did discuss who would carry on the leadership of our committee's activities once this school year ends, but no recommendations were forthcoming.

Widespread involvement and buy-in from all faculty, staff and management; many people are still unclear about how the planning processes work.

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

For me, personally, actually seeing all these committees tie together into a process that actually has concrete outcomes i.e. budgeting being tied to IPR and EMP, etc. I have been around long enough to see these processes come and go with no real changes. I hope it will be different this time.

Continue to educate people about the processes. Streamline the information coming from different departments, etc and being integrated into the various chapters of the Institutional Planning document.

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

I don't feel informed enough to answer that. I am looking at reviewing the charge of this committee in the shared governance document to see if it is relevant to what we think we should be doing.

Data...applicable, reliable and inclusive data so that planning recommendations are data-driven from the IPR process onward.

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

I was not involved in this phase.

Somewhat, if the various branches (I, A, P, SS) each paid attention to planning when figuring their priorities. The Instructional branch did, guided by Division Chairs, but it seemed that other branches may not have based on discussions within the final steps of the prioritizing process.

6. Was your committee's contribution to the planning process necessary?

I believe that some of the tasks we did perform, such as approving the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan was necessary to advance that document forward.

YES

7. Was your committee's contribution to the planning process valued?

I assume it was important to the process.

By those involved, YES. By the Instructional Office, YES. By the rest of campus, No, I don't believe so.

8. Are additional planning committees necessary for the process to work?
Absolutely not. I think we have too many committees now with overlapping charges.

No!

Governance Section

1. Did the committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?
I am not aware that this committee existed last year as the Academic Planning Committee.

No, the charge needs to be revised. SLO Coordination should be a separate committee.
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?
Reviewed and approved the Academic Master Plan (Section II of the Institutional Master Plan)

Academic Planning Document, Chapter 2 of the IMP
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.
I need to review the charge in order to determine if it should be modified.

See #1
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?
Since it is an academic planning committee, it was dominated by faculty and I didn't feel the classified members were considered as important, but that is probably the nature of that committee.

For the most part, yes. Chairs may be a logical choice for coordinating Academic Planning but Chairs already serve on a number of committees and are spread thin. So, perhaps faculty representation from each Division with at least one Division being represented by a Chair (to facilitate communication to/from Division Chairs).
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.
Due to logistical issues (one classified member relied on a phone link to Alturas to participate in the meeting) we only had one classified on site. Most faculty and management members showed up. Overall, I thought our group did well and did have over 50% of constituencies at each meeting.

Identify any individual or constituent group representation not in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings.
All assigned attended regularly

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

I don't know. I think people are overwhelmed by all the committees and not clear about what each one is doing. Minutes are often sent out late and in batches which are not conducive to people reading them. I would hope the communication becomes more timely and streamlined and charges of the committees become more specific to allow for a clear understanding of tasks each committee should be performing.

Communication standard needs to be two-way: from the faculty/staff to planning committees and then again from planning committees to faculty/staff in order to stay informed and receive input as plans are revised or reprioritized

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

No response from any Committee member.

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

Committee Name: Academic Senate (Faculty)

Date: May 12, 2008

Members Present: Cheryl Aschenbach, Betsy Elam, Carrie Nyman, Richard Swanson

Members Absent: Rosanna Brown, Ross Brosius

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, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
*All constituent groups were involved and valued.
Process was flexible in its firs application.
Instructional program reviews were finally incorporated into planning and budgeting process.*
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
*Timeline – start earlier
Clarification of sequence and steps could be improved*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
*More timely notice of deadlines and requisition requests
Remove appeals process from budget development process*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?
*Timely research data
Acquisition and implementation of training materials*
5. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional

planning?

Yes, instructional program review recommendations were incorporated into budget development.

Are additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work? *No*

Governance Section

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

The voice of the senate has been recognized and valued more than it has been previously.

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

Encourage representatives to truly represent their constituent groups and improve communication to and from the groups.

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

Combine and consolidate committees

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

Perhaps complete budget and planning by beginning of April so that evaluation can occur in April rather than May.

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

Committee Name: Accreditation Steering Committee

Date: April 24, 2008

**Members Present: Phil Horner, Bob Brower, Carrie Nyman,
Shelly Baxter, Sue Mouck, Carie Camacho,**

**Members Absent: Doug Houston, Garrett Taylor, Steven
Sylvester, Stephanie Stuart, Reina Branum, Chris Alberico,
Katherine Granfield, Christian Younger, Abel Ramoz, Rocky
Deal, Tom Holybee**

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, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
The planning recommendations from the accreditation self-study were more focused which will make planning for their accomplishment easier due to flexibility.

This committee has been effective in identifying the issues that need to be addressed for accreditation.

The organizational structure has been successful in orchestrating the work flow.

2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
The process and the resulting plan didn't satisfy the accreditation standards. We are on the right road, but haven't arrived yet according to Dr. Beno
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?

Improve the publication of all meeting – perhaps on the website.

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

More research data and the time to figure out “what we need” in the time that it is needed – acknowledging that the process is new

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

Consultation Council needs to communicate the process and the results when the process is complete. “Sell the process” Remind people that good things are happening.

6. Are there any additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work?

No

Governance Section

1. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee’s charge?

Yes

2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?

October 15, 2007 Progress Report

October 29, 2007 Visit

2008 Application for Reaffirmation of Accreditation

March Self-Study Validation Visit

Dr. Beno’s visit

2007-2008 Accreditation Annual Report

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

None

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

Continue to encourage broad participation – administrative participation is extremely important.

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.

Broad based participation

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

Publishing the minutes in a broader way

Encourage personal responsibility

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

Committees should have handbooks or other media to help train new members

Mentoring for new employees about governance

Training about participation and roles in the planning and governance processes of all groups (Board, Administration, Management/Confidential, Classified, Students)

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

Committee Name: Consultation Council

Date: May 8, 2008

Members Present: Ross Brosius, Ross Stevenson, Carie Camacho, Shelly Baxter, Garrett Taylor, Cary Templeton, Sue Mouck, Cecelia, Frohrib, Mark Nareau, Stephen Sylvester, Doug Houston

Members Absent: Carol Montgomery, Cheryl Aschenbach, Sandy Beckwith, Abel Ramoz

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, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
*The Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan was discussed broadly and openly several times.
All constituent group representatives had multiple opportunities to provide input.
The education of the campus community on the planning process went well.*
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
*Certain members of the group tend to forget that they represent a constituency-not their personal agenda.
The criteria for the prioritization of budget requests needs to be developed and communicated early in the planning process before individuals develop their budget enhancement requests.*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
Consolidate committees as appropriate, combine planning and governance.

*Remove the wording relating to an appeal process from the Open Forums held after the initial prioritization of budget requests.
Initiate steps of the budget development process earlier
Include categorical program budget managers in the budget development process early in order to adjust the process to meet special categorical needs (timing) and facilitate the inclusion of all budgets into a single process.*

4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to effectively participate in the planning process?
Timely provision of research data
5. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning? *Yes*
Establish the link between planning and budget development early in the process, set criteria for budget prioritization early through planning process
6. Are there any additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work? *No*

Governance Section

1. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? *Yes*
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?
*Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation Process Handbook
Spreadsheet of Prioritized Budget Enhancement Requests
Institutional Planning and Budget Development Process Handbook
Governing Board agendas
Open Forums
Meeting Minutes
Proposed policies, plans, and proposals came through this committee.*
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.
Consolidation of strategic planning and consultation council or consolidation of strategic planning and budget development process
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed? *Yes*
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.
The constituent groups representation on this committee was consistent and well balanced. All groups participated more than fifty percent of the meetings.

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

Recommend that appointments by constituent groups to committees be considered in light of improving effective communication.

Provide opportunities for committee reports (possibly during flex days)

Minutes on website

Minutes to all users via e-mail (currently done)

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

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

**Committee Name: Curriculum/Academic Standards
Committee**

Date: May 6, 2008

Members Present: Cheryl Aschenbach, Tina Bishop, Lisa Gardiner, Sue Mouck, Carrie Nyman, Robert Schofield, Stephen Sylvester

Members Absent: Betsy Elam, KC Mesloh, Abel Ramoz, Maria Valko

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, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
Not applicable
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
Not applicable
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
Not applicable
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to effectively participate in the planning process?
Not applicable
5. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning?

Not applicable

6. Are there any additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work?

Not applicable

Governance Section

1. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? *Yes*
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?
See the Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee Action Log and Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee Meeting Minutes
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.
 - a. *Consider folding the Student Learning Outcome Review Committee into the Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee as an adhoc subcommittee instead of the existing standing committee and include the responsibilities of the subcommittee under the responsibilities of the Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee*
 - b. *Consider folding the responsibilities for Student Learning Outcome Coordination into the responsibilities of the Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee, the fit is better than the existing combination of the Student Learning Outcome Coordination and Academic Planning*
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed? *Yes*
Recommend that the Administrative Assistant II – Counseling be considered as the second classified appointee to the Curriculum/Academic Standards Committee by the classified unit
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 individuals and constituent groups participated at more that fifty percent of the meetings.
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
Post minutes and action log on the college website for up to three years.

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

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

Committee Name: Facilities Planning Committee

Date: April 30, 2008

Members Present: Shelly Baxter, Nancy Lounsbury, Eric Rulofson, Patrick Clancy, Ross Stevenson, John Mulcahy, Cary Templeton

Members Absent: Katherine Granfield, Dave Trussel, Christian Younger, Dr. Sylvester,

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, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

9. *What worked in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?*

- *meetings were well attended*
- *maintained 1 hour meetings*
- *information flowed well to and from campus*
- *dissemination of minutes, agendas*
- *lively discussions often reaching consensus.*

10. *What didn't work in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?*

- *Committee did not have institutional priorities early in the planning process. As a result FPC planned using what they thought the priorities would be.*
- *We are not clear how the site plan will be adopted and prioritized during this process.*

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

- *All elements need to adhere to the IPR and NIPR processes.*
- *We would like to receive the facility requests from the planning process (IPR and NIPR) each year. At the end of the year we would like to put out a status report.*

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

**Nothing other than the requests asked for above*

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

**No real interaction between the FPC and budget process*

14. Was your committee's contribution to the planning process necessary?

**Yes, the FPC approval of the Scheduled Maintenance 5 year plan and recommendation was funded.*

15. Was your committee's contribution to the planning process valued?

**Unknown*

16. Are additional planning committees necessary for the process to work? **No*

Governance Section

7. Did the committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? **Yes*

8. Identify results (products) of committee activities?

**Creation of the Facilities Master Plan which included projects requiring funds which were allotted.*

**Completed the disaster risk assessment*

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?

**Yes – no changes needed*

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.

**Student involvement was low during the first part of the 07-08 year. Things are better now.*

**The committee obtained a quorum at every scheduled meeting*

**The committee recommends that the words "any individual" be removed from this form.*

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

**Communication seems very good as it is*

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

**No*

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

Committee Name: Institutional Technology Planning

Date: 4/23/2008

Members Present: Terry Bartley (M), Katherine Granfield (M), Ethan Keiley (C), Kam Vento (F)

Members Absent: Ross Brosius (F), Rosanna Brown (F), Ron Evans (M), Garrett Taylor (A), Orrin Winton (S), [vacant (C)]

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, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
Committees met, did work, produced plans; programs performed reviews. Of ITPC: meetings timely and orderly; close tie-in between ITPC Plan and IT NIPR.
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
Late start. Accreditation focus rather than campus focus.
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
Timeline. Fuzzy goal for planning: is it current-year budget process and prioritization, or long-term strategy?
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?
Committee was fairly self-sufficient, has created its own working groups and progress tracking. Need more IT staff; committee coordination with operational unit resources is unclear.
5. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning?

Yes. Requests were tied to planning premises/program review; first time that justifications have been required. An open process.

6. Was your committee's contribution to the planning process necessary?

Yes. Campuswide process; program reviews plus planning. IT committee helps supplement limited IT resources.

7. Was your committee's contribution to the planning process valued?

Yes. We support campuswide services.

8. Are additional planning committees necessary for the process to work?

No, no more standing planning committees, please. However, task forces convened by committees to do specific work would be useful, to support an action phase.

Governance Section

1. Did the committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? *Yes*

2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?

Tech Plan for Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan, including prioritized projects. Ongoing goal actions tracking. Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) draft in progress. Issues discussions.

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

No changes to charge, but more discussion of user needs and support capabilities is desired.

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

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.

See attached. No constituent group was unrepresented at more than 50% of meetings (though sole Administrator was not always able to attend full meetings).

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

Provide minutes of all committees in a unified and digested form, such as incorporating into existing weekly Lassen Lowdown newsletter. Individuals don't have time to read and grasp individual emailed minutes.

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

Keep working.

Recommend dissolving the Educational Technology Subcommittee as a standing committee. The subcommittee never formally met, the instructional interest is now strongly and capably represented in the committee as a whole, and the college doesn't need more obligatory committees. Instructional projects can be addressed as needed by ad hoc working groups rather than a standing subcommittee.

We are looking for ways to mobilize the committee and its members' knowledge and interests to achieve quick cheap wins that support operational productivity (communications, workflow), in addition to producing formal policy and planning that supports the formal governance process. More ad hoc working/interest groups; a Quick List of small projects or research topics; a Quick List of brief training topics/neat tricks, perhaps shared in lunchtime sessions (Innovation/Productivity Corner)?

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

Committee Name: Management/Classified Group

Date: April 28, 2008

**Members Present: Shelly Baxter, Karen Dolan, Robin Padgett,
Matt Levine,**

**Members Absent: Eric Rulofson, Tena Rulofson, Yvonne
Deering, Katherine Granfield, Mary Blevins, Vicki Ramsey,
Marshel Couso, Steve Avila, Terry Bartley,**

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, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
*We could use another cycle before a true assessment can be completed.
People are participating more effectively in the planning and governance processes*
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
*We need to more effectively communicate what is going on in the different committees. Minutes are nice but a summary from the people on the committees would be better.
The budget process needed more time and more consensus*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
*We need professional training on effective meetings.
Processes need to be more refined and in writing
We suggest that meetings could be more effective with a project management model*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?

We need an HR director in board. Some committees need direction on personnel issues.

Could a receptacle for statistical data or other information be created for all to use, instead of everyone looking for their own information

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

We believe the budget development process used the mission appropriately but there wasn't enough time to fully use the planning process results.

The timeline didn't work well

6. Are additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work?

No, we have everything we need to do things well.

Governance Section

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

Everyone appears to be functioning in their appropriate roles.

The flow chart flows well now

We feel we now have a true role in the governance process which we didn't feel we had before.

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

We still need another year to evaluate. It appears things are working better now.

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 planning or governance?

No

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

**Committee Name: Minimum Qualifications/Equivalency
Committee**

Date: April 29, 2008

Members Present:

Michael Giampaoli, Mark Nareau, Sue Mouck

Members: Absent

Noelle Eckley, Dr. Sylvester

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, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
The production of handbooks with written procedures minimized the impact of personalities on the process.
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
Delays in scheduled activities prevented the institution from following its own timeline during the planning process.
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
Reduction in the number of planning committees would improve effectiveness.
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to effectively participate in the planning process?
Timely provision of information would improve the process.

5. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning? *No comment*
6. Are there any additional planning committees necessary in order for the process to work? *No*

Governance Section

1. Did your committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? *Yes*
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?
Verification of Faculty to Meet Minimum Qualifications in Discipline of Instruction Resource Handbook
Equivalency Review Forms in Applicant Files
Equivalency Lists for Academic Senate and Governing Board
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.
The committee recommends that the Academic Senate consider making the Minimum Qualifications/Equivalency Committee an adhoc committee of the Academic Senate instead of a standing subcommittee. The committee met only once during the 2007-2008 academic year to consider equivalencies. The number of equivalencies being considered has significantly declined in recent years. The senate as a whole or a portion of the senate meeting with subject area faculty when equivalencies need to be determined could accomplish the responsibilities of the committee. The senate might consider continuing to include the Dean of Instructional Services (currently a member of the MQ/Equiv Committee) in equivalency determination meetings.
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?
Yes, see above recommendation
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 at least fifty percent of the time.
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
Reducing the number of standing committees on campus would improve communication.

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

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

Committee Name: STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Date:05/05/08

Members Present: completed by chair, Sandy Beckwith

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, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College? Staff Development committee decided to roll the minimal funds received to next year in order to have enough money to do trainings on campus for a greater number of people. *We will be meeting with a consultant in mid May, 2008 to design our plan for next year and the following years, tying in the staff development plan to the strategic plan.*
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
In process, see #1
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks? *LCC receives the minimum allocation from the state in Staff Development. We have requested budget augmentation for next year but it was not prioritized at a level that it will be funded. As the budget improves additional funding will allow us to provide training for a greater number of faculty and staff.*
5. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning? *Yes, see above*

6. Was your committee's contribution to the planning process necessary?
See #1

7. Was your committee's contribution to the planning process valued?
See #1

8. Are additional planning committees necessary for the process to work?

Governance Section

1. Did the committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? *Yes*
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities? *Started a long range plan for staff development. Continued with on campus flex day activities*
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed? *Yes*
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 constituent groups had representation at meetings where decisions were made*
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?

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

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

Committee Name: Strategic Planning Committee

Date: May 6, 2008

Members Present: Katherine Granfield, Shelly Baxter, Phil Horner, Toni Poulsen, Cary Templeton, Sandy Beckwith, Garrett Taylor, Dr. Sylvester

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, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
*Created a Master Plan which included mission and goals
Committees met and work was accomplished – pretty good participation*
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
 - a. *Changed the process in the middle of the year*
 - b. *The role of the Strategic Planning Committee often changes and evolves causing a lack of permanency*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - a. *Additional training for SWOT analysis, general strategic planning processes, development of mission and vision*
 - b. *Define roles of players(committees)*
 - c. *Getting outside input could be beneficial to the process*
 - d. *Committee's should assign tasks to all members to be more efficient*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?

- a. *Training*
 - b. *Research*
 - c. *Networking*
5. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning?
 - a. *No – it looked at the seven strategic goals, there was a disconnect in getting the information about educational initiatives to the budget managers*
 - b. *Yes – it acknowledged the plan and asked people to tie their enhancement request to the plans*
 6. Was your committee's contribution to the planning process necessary?
 - a. *Yes – We produced seven goals which are being used as a base for planning*
 - b. *No – We didn't feel as if we had a central role because inconsistency and unclear direction made us feel less relevant*
 7. Was your committee's contribution to the planning process valued?
 - a. *We felt that early on the campus community was valuing the work being done by the committee*
 - b. *Our contribution was not in a deliverable format*
 8. Are additional planning committees necessary for the process to work?
 - a. *Note made of the need for emergency planning*

Governance Section

1. Did the committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?
 - a. *Partially*
 - b. *We need to set reasonable goals and assess the specific outcomes*
 - c. *We need to use more measurable goals*
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?
 - *Minimal*
 - *CIMP Strategic Planning Section Update*
 - *Uniform planning format*
 - *Assessment Tools*
 - *ASB Survey*
 - *Contracted for an Environmental Scan*
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.
 - *Stop changing the charge*
 - *Evaluate the Strategic Goals*
 - *This committee should oversee the budget*

- *Make our strategic planning more uniform to the rest of the state*
 - *Ask appropriate questions to assess whether we are spending \$\$ effectively*
 -
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?
 - *Yes – but needs better attendance*
 - *Training needed – Committee requests that members be appointed for more than one year in order to take advantage of training and technical assistance that is needed for members of this committee*
 - *We need to have committee members assigned to complete tasks*
 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.
 - *Some student representation – less than 50%*
 - *We need a bigger connection with the Board either through our Board Retreats, the President or more Board representative participation*
 - *Constituent Groups have been well represented*
 6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
 - *Summary or minutes send out sooner*
 - *Bi Annual Reports?*

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

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

Committee Name: Student Services and Enrollment Planning

Date: May 7, 2008

Members Present: Shelly Baxter, Cary Templeton, Chris Alberico, Karen Dolan, Janna Sandahl, Dr. Sylvester, Jennifer Bird, Matt Levine, Robin Padgett

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, etc) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs.

1. What worked in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
Matriculation Audit
2. What didn't work in the planning process used during 2007-2008 at Lassen College?
*A number of issues could/should have come to this committee and didn't
We primarily focused
Change academic leaders to division chairs*
3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
*Confirm the process
We need to update policies and procedures/changes in Title V and Ed Code/training
on existing policies and procedures*
4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?
Formal Student Survey

5. Did the Budget Development Process take appropriate notice of institutional planning?
Yes – The requests met strategic goals and were prioritized using institutional criteria
6. Was your committee's contribution to the planning process necessary?
Yes
7. Was your committee's contribution to the planning process valued?
Yes – some plans were plan and have been used and references in the CIMP
No – work in process
8. Are additional planning committees necessary for the process to work?
No

Governance Section

1. Did the committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?
2. Identify results (products) of committee activities?
Matriculation Audit that is impacting the matriculation plan
Started a student services plan
3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge.
4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?
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.
Some administration, councilors did not attend 50%,
6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?
Post minutes on the website

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