Appendix D: LCC Evaluation Survey – Planning Committees

Lassen College Planning, Budgeting and Governance Process Review

Planning Committee Survey

Committee Name: Facilities Planning Committee

Date: May 4, 2023

Members Present: Carie Camacho, Dan Williams, Tom Rogers, Michael Blaschak, and Tiffany Montgomery.

Members Absent: Frank Avilla, Kory Konkol, and Carrie Nyman.

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.

Describe the committee's major accomplishments during this year: The major accomplishment this year for the FMP Committee was the completion of the Dorm Grant. It was a difficult ask since there was a time constraint but we were able to get it submitted.

1. **Please share your recommendations to improve committee efficiency and effectiveness.** No recommendations were provided. The committee thought efficiency and effectiveness were good.

2. **Please describe any additional resources (e.g., human, research data, and additional information) the committee needs to perform its assigned tasks.** The committee did not have a researcher or CBO for most of the year. These two positions are needed to have an effective committee.

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
    - **Strongly 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 the expected start time).
    - **Strongly Agree**
- The committee ended on time (within 5 minutes of the expected end time).
    - **Strongly 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
    - **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 – Need training for Board Docs for the campus as a whole.**
- Access to information needed for discussion
    - **Good**
- Appropriateness of meeting dates and times
    - **Good**
- Effectiveness of meeting location
    - **Very Good**
- Access to other resources needed for the committee to work effectively
    - **Good**