Appendix D: LCC Evaluation Survey – Planning Committees

Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review

Planning Committee Survey

Committee Name: Curriculum and Academic Standards

Date: May 16, 2023

Members Present: Tom Downing, Chad Lewis, Alison Somerville, Colleen Baker, Melinda Duerksen, Fran Oberg, KC Mesloh, Thomas Robb, Monteil Ackley, Kelly Kissane, Jennifer Lawler, Buck Bauer, Makenzie Freedman

Members Absent: NA

Planning Section

When answering these questions consider the "planning process" the process used to create the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan; including but not limited to the work of planning committees (Academic Planning, Student Services Planning, Institutional Effectiveness Planning, Institutional Technology Planning, Facility Planning, Human Resource Planning etc.) as well as the recommendations from IPR and NIPRs and analysis of student learning and administrative unit outcome results.

1. Describe the committee's major accomplishment during this year.
   We approved new courses – including the Forestry CA and AS, approved the revitalized Gunsmithing courses and programs, the RN courses and degree and were proactive in getting curriculum through for IPRs; communication with faculty improved regarding timelines. Additionally, discussions were held regarding and representative texts, GESLO/ISLOs and were sent onto Senate. Discussions were also held on regular and substantive education. The committee functioned well with a hybrid setting meeting

2. Please share your recommendations to improve committee efficiency and effectiveness

There were some identified recommendations including, having trainings with faculty to limit curriculum returning for revisions, and improving communications on what is required for changes. Also, it was mentioned the committee could work to ensure representatives are present if items are on the agenda; if unable to make it set up a meeting with Co-chair or send someone in their place. There was also the suggestion to streamline the process of updating Course Outlines – such as coming up with a template with standard language and what is needed, which could help to make it more accessible. Another idea suggested moving SLO mapping changes like corrections, as long as not altering SLOs on the COR, be moved to subcommittee action.

3. Please describe any additional resources (e.g., human, research data, additional information) the committee needs to perform its assigned tasks?
   Some ideas for additional information could be reminding people the Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee it is a two year commitment, as well as improving new member training for retention

The committee could also hold potential training for members during meetings as an agenda item, i.e. the writing of Narratives.

Governance Section

Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements related to your service on the committee overall (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree)

- The committee mandate and charge are clearly understood by committee members Agree
- Meeting agendas were available to members at the start of each committee meeting Strongly Agree
- Draft minutes of prior meetings were available to members at the start of each committee meeting for approval Strongly Agree
- The length of the meetings was adequate to perform the work of the committee Strongly Agree
- Meetings were held at the regularly scheduled time Strongly Agree
- The committee started on time (within 5 minutes of expected start time). Strongly Agree
- The committee ended on time (within 5 minutes of expected end time). Agree
- The chair (co-chair) operated the committee effectively Strongly Agree
- Members contribute ideas freely Strongly Agree
- All ideas are treated with respect, whether others agree with them Strongly Agree
- There are sufficient opportunities to provide input into committee recommendations Strongly Agree

Please rate the following aspects of the committee's work (Very Good to Very Poor)

- Quality of communication within the committee Very Good
- Quality of information flow from the committee to constituency groups Good
- Quality of information flow from constituency groups to the committee Good
- Quality of communication by the committee with the campus community as a whole Good
- Access to information needed for discussion Very Good
- Appropriateness of meeting dates and times Very Good
- Effectiveness of meeting location Very Good
- Access to other resources needed for the committee to work effectively Good