

Dr. Marlon Hall Dr. Tammy Robinson **Patrick Walton**

Jeff Lang Carol Montgomery Kim Clain **Jonathan Herring**

Cheryl Aschenbach Sue Mouck Robert Schofield **Alison Somerville Ross Stevenson**

Dave Corley (ITP) Vickie Ramsey (HRMP) Greg Collins (FMP) Aeron Zentner (OIE)

Those present indicated in **bold**. Guests: None

Minutes for May 15, 2014 3:00 pm in CD-119

- 1. Approval of Consultation Council minutes for May 1, 2014 (Consultation) By consensus, Consultation Council approved the minutes for May 1, 2014.
- 2. Acceptance of AP 4104 Contract Education (Consultation) Ross Stevenson asked for clarification on what was meant by the "same protocols." Sue Mouck answered that the "same protocols" means the same procedures as for other courses as outlined in the curriculum handbook. By consensus, Consultation Council approved the AP 4104 – Contract Education.
- 3. Discussion of the results of the planning and governance evaluation (Consultation)

Sue Mouck informed the group that an updated combine evaluation form document was available. The evaluation this year includes forms from all planning and constituent groups. She further identified that this has not occurred in a number of years. Specifically, she thanked the students for their participation. She asked the group to identify the points from each area of the evaluation forms that needed to be captured in the minutes, specifically recommendations that needed to be considered by the Academic Senate for inclusion in the planning process.

Planning:

- a. "What works in the planning process at Lassen Community College?"
 - 1. The timeliness of the submittal of the various master plans.
- b. "What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen Community College? and "What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?"
 - 1. Aeron Zentner suggested that the planning process takes too long. He further suggested the formation of a committee comprised of all of the planning committee chairs, which would be responsible for the compiling of the master plans into the Comprehensive Institutional *Master Plan simultaneously with the development of the master plans.* He suggested that with the new program review process the master



plans could be develop at the same time instead of sequentially. Sue Mouck expressed the concern that the Academic Planning Committee needs to set the institutional direction based upon the program review recommendations rather than allowing each planning committee to operate directly on the program review recommendations. She also suggested that previously the development of all of the plans had not worked well which is why the timeline was developed although she allowed that the chairs of the planning committees had not been meeting regularly. She indicated that the suggestion was a major departure from the existing planning process and would require consideration and adoption by the Academic Senate.

2. Patrick Walton suggested that an alternate would be to speed up the process by allowing less time for each planning committee to develop their master plan. All of the master plans could be developed prior to the budget allocation process in February-March.

Ross Stevenson questioned the need for generating these plans. He suggested that there is a lot of brainpower dedicated to generating paperwork instead of working on recruiting and getting bodies into seats. Sue Mouck identified that integrated planning is an expectation of accreditation. Ross asked if the plans are just to satisfy ACCJC. Sue stated that integrated planning is intended to provide for a more effective institution not to meet ACCJC expectations. Tammy Robinson stated that the planning at Lassen College was much better integrated that at her previous institution and that she regularly used the planning documents in writing grants. Greg Collins informed the group that he had been impressed by the planning document on the website as he was considering the position at the college. He also indicated that the planning that had been done will make the physical plan needed much easier and faster to develop.

3. Jeff Lang suggested that the planning process needed to be more accessible to the community. He further suggested that open forums would be a means of involving the community and building political credibility.

Ross Stevenson asked about the meaning of "communication continues to be a challenge." Patrick Walton responded that the Student Services committee had been referring to the lack of communication between the planning chairs. Ross quoted from the Academic Senate evaluation form indicating that the "updates haven't always been as timely and



complete as necessary." Consistent and meaningful administrative updates were suggested. Dr. Hall responded to the question from Ross saying that the administration had expressed concern that many individuals do not get involved some will not even open emails to remain informed. Ross asked "What are communication channels?" Dr. Hall responded that email is one channel of communication. Ross questioned "Should not Consultation Council have been informed of the budget problems and layoff." He was informed that the next agenda includes a budget update. Ross stated that he knew of at least three layoffs and should not the administration communicated prior to terminating individuals. Tammy Robinson wanted to clarify that there have been no layoffs. Ross acknowledged the administrations authority to make decisions terminating employees, but stated that the administration had the obligation to keep the institution informed about such decisions and the rationale for making those decisions. He further stated that Consultation Council was the venue for communication between the administration and campus community on such issues.

- 4. Jonathan Herring requested that the governance and planning handbooks be provided to the students. He was informed that the handbooks are on the website, but handbooks can be provided to the students at the being of each academic year.
- 5. The classified group suggested that classified clerical support be used to provide minutes for governance and planning committee meetings. Jeff Lang reminded the group that a previous classified employee had provided clerical support for accreditation and educational planning. 6. Several groups recommended formation of a new Institutional Effective Planning Committee and one group suggested a committee comprised of planning committee chairs.

Governance:

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

Wide constituent group participation Better participation by students that over that last few years.

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

 Students are frequently unaware of meetings of committees, which do not meet regularly. Suggestion of a master calendar of meetings
- 4. Appointment of representatives to the subcommittee to update the Institutional Planning and Budget Development Process Handbook (Consultation)



Sue Mouck reminded the group of the standing process of forming a subcommittee of representatives from Consultation Council and the Academic Senate to incorporate recommended changes into the governance and planning handbooks. She informed the group that the Academic Senate had appointed Cheryl Aschenbach and Cory McClellan this year. By consensus, Consultation Council Aeron Zentner and Sue Mouck as it's representatives. Sue informed the group that the work of the subcommittee might take awhile because the Academic Senate must first consider some of the suggestions.

Strategic Planning

- 1. Acceptance and Recommendation to forward to the Governing Board the 2013-2014 Action Plan Evaluation Matrix (Consultation) *The review of the 2013-2014 Action Plan Evaluation Matrix was delayed until next week because the document was not attached to this week's agenda.*
- 2. 2013-2014 Institutional Key Performance Indicators and proposed 2014-2015 Institutional Key Performance Indicators (Information)

 Aeron Zentner presented the 2013-2014 Institutional Key Performance
 Indicators Annual Report. Aeron also presented the proposed 2014-2015 KPIs.

 Due to the length of the meeting discussion was delayed until the next meeting.
- 3. Institutional Set Standards (Consultation) Aeron Zentner presented the updated Institutional Set Standards. The standards previously developed were more goals than standards.
- 4. Presentation of 2014 Child Development IPR (Information) *The 2014 Child Development IPR adopted by the Academic Senate on May 13, 2014 was presented. It was suggested that a standardized cover page be adopted.*
- 5. Presentation of 2014 Administration of Justice/Correctional Science IPR (Information) *The 2014 AJ/CORS IPR adopted by the Academic Senate on May 13, 2014 was presented. The lack of any indication of the author of the IPR was noted.*
- 6. Presentation of the following 2014 NIPR Annual Updates (Information)
 The Admissions and Records, Financial Aid, Information Technology, Learning
 Center and Maintenance and Operations Annual NIPR Updates were presented.
 In response to a question, the process for non-instructional programs reviews
 where each is adopted by Cabinet then presented to Consultation Council and
 the Governing Board for acceptance. In the past program reviews have been
 returned to Cabinet in response to requests from program staff.



7. Discussion on the 2014-2015 Strategic Plan (Consultation) The administration emphasized how impressed the accreditation visiting team was with the Strategic Plan. By consensus, Consultation Council recommends to the Governing Board that no changes be made to the Strategic Plan for the 2014-2015 year.

Other:

- 1. Ross Stevenson questioned the plan Summer Meeting Schedule for Consultation Council. The Summer Schedule is on next week's agenda.
- 2. The meeting next week conflicts with the commencement practice. It was question whether the meeting time could be changed. The group agreed to a tentative meeting time of 1:00 pm next Tuesday.
- 3. Patrick Walton on behalf of David Clausen informed the group of a serious bedbug problem in the Dorm. The plan is to use money remaining in the dorm account to purchase new mattresses (130) for the amount of \$18,870. Greg Collins informed the group that the purchase of the mattresses is only the first step. Additional steps will be taken after the students leave for summer.

Future Meetings: Tuesday, May 20, 2014

Future Agendas:

- 1. Acceptance of the following 2014 NIPR Annual Updates (Information) Aeron Zentner
 - a. Admissions and Records
 - b. Assessment, Counseling, Student Success and Transfer
 - c. EOP&S/CARE
 - d. Independent Living Program
 - e. Kinship
 - f. Learning Center
 - g. Library
 - h. Student Life
- 2. Discussion of process for background checks for faculty and administrative positions (Consultation) Ross Stevenson
- 3. Acceptance of AP 3550- Drug Free Environment and Drug Prevention Program (Consultation) Vickie Ramsey
- 4. Presentation of 2013 Welding Technology IPR (Information) Cheryl Aschenbach
- 5. Presentation of 2013 Human Services IPR (Information) Cheryl
- 6. Presentation of 2014 Outreach NIPR (Information) Patrick Walton (May 22, 2014)
- 7. Discussion of the results of the planning and governance evaluation (Consultation) Cheryl Aschenbach (May 22, 2014)
- 8. Summer Meeting Schedule for Consultation Council (Consultation) Cheryl Aschenbach (May 22, 2014)



Proposed Lassen Community College District Procedure

CCLC No. 4104

Academic Affairs Senate Approved 5/13/14

AP 4104 CONTRACT EDUCATION

Reference:

Title 5 Section 55170

The District may contract for instructional classes to be offered at the request of public or private agencies or groups.

The District will develop, review, approve and evaluate courses offered through a contract using the same protocols as for all other classes whether credit, non-credit, or not-for-credit.

Definition:

Contract education is a formal relationship between a community college district and a public or private entity for the purposes of providing instruction or services or both.

The mission of Contract Education in the Lassen Community College District is to provide efficient, cost-effective customized training solutions, consultation, and necessary services to fit the productivity needs of employers throughout the District.

Contract education instruction typically consists of Not-For-Credit classes, but classes can be for credit or non-credit. Not-for-Credit refers to classes, including community service classes, that are offered without credit and which are not eligible for apportionment funding. Not-For-Credit classes are required to be fiscally self-supporting. Closed or open Credit and Non-Credit classes may also be offered through Contract Education. All District policy, negotiated working conditions, and pay rates apply to Credit and Non-Credit classes.

The power to contract is vested in the Office of Superintendent/President. The Board of Trustees has the authority to ratify any contracts that exceed terms granted to the Superintendent/President.



The authorization of contracts includes agreements, leases, applications, contracts claims and other documents and reports, including but not limited to: service agreements, insurance agreements, fiscal, budgetary, payroll and personnel documents, travel requests, contracts for purchase of apparatus, furniture, equipment, supplies and books, as well as contracts entered into as necessary to receive federal and state funds allocated to the District, all within the limits of fiscal ability and sound budgetary controls and subject to such policies as established by the Board.

The processes and procedures for developing and administering contract education and customized training programs shall, where appropriate, include the following:

Contract Feasibility Criteria

These basic criteria shall serve as a method to evaluate the District's involvement in any given contract. District and/or institution administrators shall review and approve contracts on the basis of these standards:

- The aims and objectives of the contract shall further the District and the institution's mission, mandates, and goals.
- The scope, objectives, and outcomes of the contract shall be feasible, measurable, and attainable.
- The District shall recover, from all revenue sources, an amount equal to or greater than the actual costs (including administrative costs) incurred in providing contracted services.

Guidelines

- Marketing and contracting with employers to meet training, education, and productivity needs shall be coordinated by the CIO.
- All contracts, with all appropriate attachments, shall be reviewed with the CFO for language, risk, and fiscal format. All contracts require the signature of the CIO, CFO, and CEO of the District.
- Pricing for all contracts should be sufficient to cover all costs for delivery and a return to the District. No District general funds shall be used to deliver contracted services for courses that receive no apportionment.
- Whenever Performance-Based Training needs can be met through an open enrollment Credit class, then that response is preferred. Requests for Credit or Non-Credit classes will be referred to the CIO. When Credit or Non-Credit class requests cannot be provided, the request shall be converted into a community service course.
- The Office of Academic Services or its designee will assist with and manage all budgets and intervene for performance regarding revenues and expenditures for all Contract Education contracted services and



California Community College Economic Development Program funded grants District-wide. The CIO or his or her designee is responsible for providing all administration and personnel necessary for delivery of the contract.

Office of Primary Responsibility: _	Academic Services
-------------------------------------	-------------------



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

Academic Senate (Faculty) April 29, 2014

Members Present: Cheryl Aschenbach, Lisa Gardiner, Michael Giampaoli, Carrie

Nyman

Guests Present: Cory McClellan, Jeff Owens, Ken Theobald Members Absent: Richard Swanson, Nancy Beterbide

Planning Section

- 1. What works in the planning process at Lassen Community College?

 There are opportunities for input and voices are respected. Consultation

 Council meetings are open to everyone, and visitors are welcomed and included.

 Faculty members have opportunities to participate through IPR completion

 and planning committee participation. Faculty's role in development and

 approval of the process is respected. Availability of minutes from planning

 committee meetings on the website has improved.
- 2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen Community College? Communication continues to be a challenge. People need to know what's happening within the planning process. Communication needs to be ongoing and not just conveyed through the planning documents. Consultation Council updates haven't always been as timely and complete as necessary.
- 3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - Utilize division meetings more effectively to promote communication and flow and information. Regularly hold division meetings.
 - Continue to increase the availability of committee minutes online.
 - Information about processes and governance should be conveyed to new employees through New Employee Orientation. If NEO happens now, be sure to include info. NEOs need to happen more often (at least once a semester). If NEOs aren't happening, they need to be regularly scheduled. NEOs could



include presentation input from various groups rather than all info being conveyed by HR staff.

- Make sure handbooks (budget development, shared governance) are available and distributed to new employees.
- 4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?
 - Recommendations from IPRs need to be combined and distributed to planning committees for consideration.
- 5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work?
 - Yes, an Institutional Effectiveness Master Planning Committee is necessary in order to create an IEMP and incorporate recommendations from areas not naturally feeding into existing master plans. Committee make-up should be consistent with existing master planning committees.

Governance Section

- 1. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?
 - There is wide representation on most campus committees as at least one constituent representative from each group attends most meetings.
 - Students have regularly participated on Curriculum/Academic Standards and Consultation Council committees.
- 2. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Share Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?

 Continue to encourage student participation on as many committees as possible.
- 3. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?

 None



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

Committee Name: Administration

Date: May 8, 2014

Members Present: Dr. Marlon Hall, Dave Clausen, Patrick Walton, Dr.

Tammy Robinson

Members Absent:

Planning Section

- 1. What works in the planning process at Lassen Community College?
 - a. The integration process works well as the committees work in a collegial manner across campus.
 - b. Transparency of the committee and meetings.
 - c. Meeting our timelines.
- 2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen Community College?
 - a. Poor communication channels
 - b. How information is disseminated across campus
 - c. We need more commitment, participation and feedback
- 3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?

Have all the Chairs from all planning committees sit in on a monthly Chair Meeting to discuss/share in collegiate planning, with the minutes from that group coming back to the different constituents. The committee would be called, The Institutional Effectiveness Committee.



4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?

None

5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work? *Yes*

Governance Section

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

Yes! We are moving forward.

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

No change

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

Adding the IE committee and the Committee Chair's committee



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

Committee Name: Associated Student Body

Date:4/25/14

Members Present: Elizabeth Fernandez, Taylor Munoz, Mike McDonald, Andrew Smiley, Jonathan Herring, Glenn Razzano, Matt Bates

Members Absent: Kirk Tibbets, Shyanne Dase,

Planning Section

1. What works in the planning process at Lassen Community College?

Ease of communication amongst committee members, and timely dissemination of pertinent data and documentation.

2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen Community College?

Not all constituency groups and committees reach out to ensure ASB is notified of all meetings.

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

More diversity in membership, across committees. Most committees have very similar membership.

4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?

Collect more student feedback in order to tailor to their needs.



5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work?

No.

Governance Section

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

Increased willingness of students, to fulfill our shared governance obligations. More inclination of school employees to help teach students their roles in shared governance.

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

No.

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

Modify the survey given to ASB so it is more relevant to our specific role.



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

Committee Name: Classified Employees

Date: May 8, 2014

Members Present: Carol Montgomery, K.C. Mesloh, Jeffrey Lang, Shawn Hubbard, Kim Clain, Heather DelCarlo, Cecelia Frohrib, Laura Greer, Diann Jackson, Sandra Jonas, Karen Clancy, Logan Merchant, Matt Montgomery, Eddie Sager, Elaine Theobald, Jennifer Tupper

Members Absent:

Planning Section

- 1. What works in the planning process at Lassen Community College?
 - The consistent reporting format used by every planning committee on campus makes it easier to update the master plans annually and to use the plans to provide current information on area needs and projects to other committees.
 - The Human Resources and Professional Development master plans were reported separately this year the goals and strategies are more focused now.
 - The technology installed in the classrooms has made it easier for the planning committees to share documents and other information during meetings.
 - Open Forum
 - Ability to give input
- 2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen Community College?
 - The process is currently a reactive versus a proactive.
 - Staff input is not always considered.
 - At times no clear reasoning is given for plans or changes



- 3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - Take into consideration the ideas and suggestions of the staff that is affected.
- 4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?
 - a. Paid classified clerical support
- 5. Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work?
 - Staff Development

Governance Section

- 6. What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process?
 - The Consultation Council does a good job of distributing agendas, minutes and related documents in a timely manner.
 - Regular meetings
 - Fair representation and participation from the different groups
- 7. Do you have any suggestions or comments to improve the function of the Share Governance and Collegial Consultation Process?
 - a. Can be too slow/drawn out of a process
- 8. Do you have any suggestions for modifying, adding, or deleting any components of the governance and/or organizational structures of the institution?



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

Management April 30, 2014

Members Present:

Robin Padgett, Fran Oberg, Bobbie Theesfeld, Denise Stevenson, Adam Runyan, David Corley, Francis Beaujon, Terry Bartley, Marley Morse, Vickie Ramsey, Lori Pearce

Members Absent: David Trussell, Julie Johnston, Dr. Aeron Zentner, Matt Levine, Greg Collins

Planning Section

What works in the planning process at Lassen Community College?

The shared governance-key members from each group having a say in the discussion of planning. Some groups are very active and give some a better view of the entire process and how it works

What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen Community College?

New employees can feel lost, an orientation on the expectations and value of participating in the planning process and how the process would work.

Orphan NIPR's such as Fiscal, Institutional Planning, Auxiliary services don't seem to fit into the master planning and may need another plan developed

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

Timelines defined with strategic goals in place and a road map on how to get there.

Everyone seems to have to touch the idea and this allows for road blocks to slow or impede progress.

What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) do you feel the planning committees need to perform their assigned tasks?



Good current quantitative data and comparative data to other areas. (other colleges or not)

Consortium solution based (not re-inventing the wheel)

Current semester data of what is happening in real time so as to correct actions or to intercede when necessary

Do you feel that additional planning committees are necessary in order for the process to work?

Adopt a place for orphan NIPR's

Governance Section

What is working well in the Shared Governance and Collegial Consultation process? All voices feel heard and valued. The open forums for the students was seen as very positive input. Surveys of students were also helpful.

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

Encourage student participation and recognize that their voice is valued

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

We use a universal values statement that leaves the governance (accreditation work) off the table when it comes to making a statement to move an agenda forward. Full participation from everyone is of value and can only cause serious harm to the campus and the mission of the college if withdrawn.



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

Academic Planning Committee April 29, 2013

Members Present: Cheryl Aschenbach, Colleen Baker, Carie Camacho, Sue Mouck, Fran Oberg, Alison Somerville, Ross Stevenson and Patrick Walton

Members Absent: Dave Trussell

Planning Section

What works in the planning process at Lassen College?

The planning process led with the Educational Master Plan.

Balanced participation by all members of Academic Planning Committee with mutual respect among members.

Implementation of last year's recommendations used in guiding this year's discussions and decisions.

What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?

The budget allocation process in the Strategic Planning Committee was handicapped by the lack of availability of revenue projections for next year. Lack of current recommendations for program review - should be corrected by change to process adopted by Academic Senate providing for annual updates Lack of specific budget request (dollar amounts) – should be corrected by revisions to process adopted by Academic Senate

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

Academic Senate adopted changes to process should improve effectiveness. Provide Strategic Planning with earlier revenue projection for the following years to improve the budget allocation process.

Include the evaluation process and timeline in the Institutional Planning and Budget Allocation handbook.

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



Provision of more responsive, timely research data to inform academic planning- should be corrected by hire of Director of Institutional Effectiveness

Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary?

Yes, committee provided direction to the planning process through the timely development of the EMP

Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued? Yes

Do you feel additional planning committees are necessary for the process to work? *No*

Governance Section

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

Identify results (products) of committee activities?

Educational Master Plan

Direction to enrollment management in the development of the class schedule by division chairs

Key Performance Indicators

Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. No

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

Recommend removing other planning committee chairs from the membership. The improved timing and sequence of the development of the Master Plans removed the need for improved communication, which was the reason for including the other chairs.

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 of the committee consistently participated.

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

Initiate a master calendar of meetings linked to committee agendas and minutes.



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

Consultation Council/Strategic Planning April 24, 2014

Members Present:

Administration: Dr. Hall, Patrick Walton, Dr. Robinson, Dave Clausen

Classified: Jeff Lang, Kim Clain, Carol Montgomery

Faculty: Cheryl Aschenbach, Sue Mouck, Ross Stevenson, Alison Somerville Management: Terry Bartley, Aeron Zentner, Greg Collins, Vickie Ramsey

Students: Jon Herring Guests: Lori Pearce

Members Absent:

Carie Camacho, Robert Schofield

Guests Present:

Cory McClellan

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 works in the planning process at Lassen Community College?
 - Timing worked very well this year.
 - The staggering of plans with specific due dates proved effective.
 - We met all due dates.
 - *Input from all constituent groups is included and respected.*
 - A forum was held this year after being missed last year, and it was helpful for sharing information and communicating about the planning and budgeting processes; participants could be made more aware of projects in progress.



- 2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen Community College?
 - Some areas (finance, accreditation, institutional effectiveness, governance, and research) don't integrate with the existing planning process; an absence of institutional areas makes follow through with planning and budgeting recommendations difficult.
 - IPRs/NIPRs don't usually address program reductions.
 - Budget prioritization of lower cost items is difficult and increases the number of items being prioritized.
 - Some items on the prioritization list appeared to be old items that were not reflective of more recent requests.
 - Administrative decisions were made and budget allocations made external to the planning and budgeting process (hiring additional positions, additional funding to positions).
 - Student involvement in the planning process is lacking, and it's difficult to capture student input and recommendations in combination with IPR/NIPR recommendations.
 - Concerns exist about accuracy of information in the prioritization process; "emergency" and "health and safety" in the case of additional purchasing or projects as well as prioritization should be well-defined.
- 3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - Include an additional master plan in the CIMP to capture institutional areas not included in the existing plans.
 - Include an administrative review or evaluation external to the program with each IPR/NIPR to incorporate comments relative to downsizing or reduction when not addressed in the program review. The Institutional Effectiveness Task Force may be interested in assisting with the review of program review to address this.
 - Prioritize lower cost items at the area level and include only a lump sum item in the prioritization process for each area.
 - Input prioritization requests directly from spreadsheets in annual updates and IPRs completed within the last year rather than including old information. Old information should not be carried forward. It will be critical for programs to have current IPRs and annual updates for programs to reprioritize requests or confirm requests.
 - Consider a quantitative rubric or score to initially prioritize budget items, then follow-up with qualitative discussion to determine final order.
 - Budget requests/priorities must have an estimated cost; it is difficult to prioritize items without knowing the potential cost for the items.



- Address the need to occasionally purchase items or hire people outside the planning process because of external grant needs. Perhaps better communicate updates of this manner through Consultation Council/Strategic Planning Committee.
- Consultation Council expects that all items needing additional funding, including new positions, be brought to CC for discussion or information (as appropriate) and, when necessary, reprioritization of general fund priorities.
- Consider addressing student input via student surveys or student forums while making sure that results are disseminated to planning groups.
- Track follow-up to budget prioritization process to record what has been funded and what the outcome is. Consider a bi-annual report presented at CC.
- Consider adjusting timelines for receipt of annual updates and program reviews in September so information is immediately input into the budget and planning processes.
- 4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?
 - Quantitative data is necessary along with qualitative data.
 - It needs to be determined who/what position is responsible for incorporating spreadsheets into budget prioritization as well as who is responsible for combining individual master plans into the CIMP.
- 5. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary? *YES*
- 6. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued? Yes. This committee has more voice than others because of the nature of everything funneling through this group, so there is a lot of opportunity for input and involvement.
- 7. Do you feel additional planning committees are necessary for the process to work?
 - Probably. If an institutional section of the master plan is determined necessary to capture areas not incorporated in other master plans, then a committee should be structured similar to existing master plan committees.

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? *CIMP, budget prioritization, BPs and APs, budget form, accreditation self-evaluation and abstract, minutes of all meetings posted to website.*
- 3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. *No suggestions.*
- 4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?

 None
- 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.

 Representation and participation was excellent over the course of the year.

 It should also be noted that our student rep, Jon Herring, was a regular participant.
- 6. How could communication between committees and others be improved with regards to governance?

 Continue to make efforts to disseminate information out to everyone. Be sure to include information at CC as a means of communicating with the campus. Continue with area updates regularly scheduled on the CC agenda including staffing discussions and decisions.



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

Committee Name: Facilities Planning Committee

Date: 5.7.14

Members Present: Francis Beaujon, Greg Collins, Shawn Hubbard, Aeron Zentner, Nancy Lounsbury, Dave Clausen.

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 works in the planning process at Lassen Community College?
 - d. The integration process works well as the committees work in a collegial manner across campus.
 - e. Transparency of the committee and meetings.
 - f. Meeting our timelines.
- 2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen Community College?
 - d. Poor communication channels
 - e. How information is disseminated across campus
 - f. We need more buy-in, participation and feedback
- 3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
 - a. Have all the Chairs from all planning committees sit in on a monthly Chair Meeting to discuss/share in collegiate planning, with the minutes from that group coming back to the different constituents. We could call the



committee- Comprehensive Institutional Effectiveness. The committee will most likely need admin support.

- 4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?
 - a. Good: as stands now, ok.
- 5. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary?
- 6. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued? *a. YES*
- 7. Do you feel additional planning committees are necessary for the process to work?
 - a. We would like to see Comprehensive Institutional Effectiveness, chairs from all planning committees meeting monthly and reporting back to their constituents.

Governance Section

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

Yes, and we are moving forward.

- 2. Identify results (products) of committee activities? *Facilities Master Plan*
- 3. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. No change
- 4. Was the committee membership appropriate to implement its charge? If not what changes are needed?

We feel that we need to have Institutional Effectiveness and Comptroller added to our committee.

5. Provide an analysis of the participation of the membership. Identify any individual or constituent group representation not in attendance more than fifty percent of the meetings.

All groups are represented and participate 50% or above.



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

There would be improved communication between constituents/committees with the Comprehensive Institutional Effectiveness with Chairs meeting, discussing and disseminating information (as stated above in planning section #3.).



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

Committee Name: Human Resource Planning Committee

Date: May 7, 2014

Members Present: Vickie Ramsey, Elaine Theobald, Colleen Baker, Lori Pearce, Dave Clausen, Aeron Zentner

Members Absent: Brenda Hoffman, Dan Anderson, Nancy Bengoa, Sandy Beckwith

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 works in the planning process at Lassen College?

- a. Meetings were collegial.
- b. Technology in the classrooms makes it easy to view information being discussed.
- c. We definitely have good plans.
- d. The template is really agreeable; uniform and easy to read.
- e. Separating the HR Master Plan and the Professional Development Plan was a good idea this year.
- f. Wide participation.

2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen College?

- a. The committees don't meet enough.
- b. Not really sure the results from the plan actually get implemented the way we want.
- c. Lack of connection between plan and implementation.



- 3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
- a. Meet more often and review the plan at those meetings.
- b. Use convocation to announce progress/implementations.
- c. Communicate better between chairs of all of the planning committees in order to cohesively develop one CIMP.
- d. Spring Convocation: present the CIMP.
- 4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks
- a. Need to share the load, not just one person doing everything.
- b. Note taker at the CIMP Chair Committee meetings should update document information.
- **5.** Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary? *Yes.*
- 6. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued? V_{OS}
- 7. Do you feel additional planning committees are necessary for the process to work?

Yes, with reservations!

- a. CIMP Chair Committee
- b. Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Governance Section

8. Did the committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?

Yes.

9. Identify results (products) of committee activities?

Human Resource Master Plan; Professional Development Master Plan; Proposed draft Flex Schedule for 2014-15; Employee Handbook draft.

10.Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. *Don't change the charge.*



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.

Everyone participated when meetings were scheduled. Would like to have more student involvement.

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

Having the plans and discussion of the plans during convocation. CIMP Chair Committee.

Include information on shared governance in the Employee Handbook as well as during New Employee Orientation.



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

Committee Name: Institutional Technology Planning Committee

Date: 5/2/14

Members Present: Dr. Tammy Robinson, Lori Collier, Jake Freitas, David Corley, Logan Merchant, Elaine Theobald (guest)

Members Absent: Dave Clausen, Michael Giampaoli, Jackson Ng, Julie Johnston

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 works in the planning process at Lassen Community College?
 - The sharing of ideas and needs
 - The staggered due dates of master plans
- 2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen Community College?
 - Better coordination of communication between planning committees
 - Service committees should do their plans last based on the needs outlined in other master plans
- 3. What changes would you make in the process to improve efficiency and effectiveness?



- Service committees should do their plans last based on the needs outlined in other master plans
- 4. What additional resources (human, research data, additional information, etc) does your committee need to perform your assigned tasks?
 - Budget information whenever possible
 - Needs outlined in other master plans
- 5. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary? *Yes*
- 6. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued? Yes
- 7. Do you feel additional planning committees are necessary for the process to work?
 No

Governance Section

- 8. Did the committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge? *Yes*
- 9. Identify results (products) of committee activities? *ITMP*
- 10. Provide suggestions to change or modify the committee charge. None
- 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.

 Mary Hasselwander is officially named part of the committee, but never attended.



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

We need better communication between committee chairs to share information about projects, etc.



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

Committee Name: Student Services Planning Committee

Date: April 29, 2014

Members Present: Patrick Walton, Adam Runyan, Tom Rogers, Heather Del Carlo, Noelle Eckley (by way of email in advance)

Members Absent: Jacob Williams, Denise Stevenson, Cecelia Frohrib, Barbara Baston

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 works in the planning process at Lassen Community College?

All constituent groups are included in the process and all areas of campus are able to give relevant input.

The timing is being closely followed so that the planning/budget/student needs/recommendations are taken into account for decision making, increasing chances for improved student success and attainment of LCC goals.

2. What doesn't work in the planning process at Lassen Community College?

We often have meetings to plan but more often than not nothing comes to fruition from these plans.



The planning process is lengthy and it is difficult to make change quickly.

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

Make sure that all planning meetings have an agenda in advance and that members can review all necessary documents prior to the meeting.

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

Ensure that all NIPR/IPR recommendations have costs associated with those recommendations to better allow the committee to prioritize with necessary financial information.

Quantitative data that is associated with the hiring of new positions would be helpful.

5. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is necessary?

Yes

6. Do you feel your contribution to the planning process is valued?

Yes

7. Do you feel additional planning committees are necessary for the process to work?

We need a sixth planning committee for "Institutional Effectiveness." It would include areas not currently under any of the master plans such as the Business Office, Institutional Effectiveness, Academic Senate, Accreditation and perhaps others.

Governance Section



8. Did the committee perform during the preceding year as identified in the committee's charge?

Yes

9. Identify results (products) of committee activities?

The SSMP

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

No changes are necessary.

To include Student Success and Equity

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

Committee membership needs to be changed and add a student representative. The committee voted and agreed to add a student representative for next year.

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.

Jacob Williams (faculty) was not in attendance more than 50% of the time. All other committee members were present more than 50% of the time.

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

The chairs of the planning committees need to have a meeting(s) to make sure that the plans are working in conjunction and no one is in a silo. This way as recommendations come out of a particular plan we understand the changes that might need to occur in other plans.