



**GOVERNING BOARD MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING, GOVERNING BOARD
PALOMAR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
GOVERNING BOARD ROOM
COLLEGE CAMPUS
SAN MARCOS, CALIFORNIA
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2003, 6:00 P.M.**

A. CALL TO ORDER

Darrell L. McMullen, President, called the regular meeting of the Palomar Community College District Governing Board to order at 6:00 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

TRUSTEES PRESENT:

DARRELL L. McMULLEN, M.B.A., PRESIDENT
RALPH G. JENSEN, B.A., VICE PRESIDENT
MICHELE T. NELSON, PH.D., SECRETARY
NANCY C. CHADWICK, M.S.W., M.P.A., TRUSTEE
MARK R. EVILSIZER, M.A., TRUSTEE
LEO MELENA, A.A., STUDENT TRUSTEE (arrived at 7:40 p.m. from a meeting in Irvine where he was representing the College)

EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATORS PRESENT:

Dr. Sherrill L. Amador, Superintendent/President
Diane Lutz, Assistant Superintendent/Vice President, Instruction
Joseph Madrigal, Assistant Superintendent/Vice President, Student Services
Dr. Jack Miyamoto, Assistant Superintendent/Vice President, Human Resource Services
Jerry Patton, Assistant Superintendent/Vice President, Finance and Administrative Services

BB. CLOSED SESSION

The Board went into Closed Session at 6:00 p.m., to discuss:

1. Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release, pursuant to Government Code 54957.6.
2. Conference regarding negotiations with CCE/AFT, pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6.
3. Conference regarding negotiations with PFF/AFT, pursuant to Government Code 54957.6.
4. Conference regarding discussion with Other Unrepresented Employees, pursuant to Government Code 54957.6.

BBB. RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION - There was no reportable action.

STAFF PRESENT:

Jenny Akins, Vice President, Confidential and Supervisory Team; Supervisor, Purchasing Services

Barbara Baldrige, Executive Assistant to Superintendent/Governing Board

Chris Barkley, President, Faculty Senate; Associate Professor, English

Mary Ann Drinan, Co-President, PFF; Associate Professor/Chair, Economics, History, and Political Science

Suzanne Gavin, Vice President, Administrative Association; Director, EOP&S

Maria Miller, President, The Faculty; Professor/Counselor

GUESTS:

Shannon Lienhart, Associate Professor, Mathematics

Jennifer Turpin, former employee

Others present are listed on the sign-in sheets.

QUORUM ESTABLISHED

Following the pledge of allegiance to the flag, Mr. McMullen declared a quorum present, and the meeting proceeded with the order of business.

A TAPED RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THIS MEETING IS ON FILE IN THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE FOR THIRTY DAYS OR UNTIL THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE GOVERNING BOARD, WHICHEVER IS LONGER.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MSC Chadwick, Nelson

The Governing Board hereby approves the Minutes of the Special Meeting of February 8, 2003.

The Governing Board hereby approves the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of February 11, 2003.

Shannon Lienhart stated that the comments from Jonnye Popick and Dr. Dan Finkenthal on pages 24 and 25 are summarized in one line. She did not feel that those lines correctly summarize the tone or the substance of either of the speakers at the last Board meeting. She requested that the minutes be changed in order to reflect accurately the tone and the substance of those speakers.

Ms. Chadwick accepted an amendment to fully describe the testimony. Mr. Evilsizer seconded the amendment. Dr. Finkenthal will be asked to prepare a summary of his comments for insertion into the minutes.

The Vote was unanimous.

D. CALL FOR REMOVAL OF ITEMS FROM OR CHANGES TO AGENDA – There were none.

E. REPORT OF THE GOVERNING BOARD PRESIDENT

Mr. McMullen reported that in a report made by Patrick Perry, Vice Chancellor, at the state-wide CEOCCC meeting, he stated that "Never before in the system history of community colleges have we had both elements, which is an increase in student fees and a budget cuts proposed concurrently in this magnitude." Basically, Mr. Perry's presentation pointed out that it will not be good. We are not the only community college that is affected by it. The numbers are telling us that we are not only going to take the hit, but we are actually going to get a disproportionate hit.

Mr. McMullen noted that the San Diego and Imperial County Community College Association is meeting next Monday in San Diego. Dr. Amador and Mr. McMullen will attend and have invited the leaders of both unions to join them. It would be good for the entire campus community to be in this advocacy together because all are affected. Through SDICCCA, we will be pointing out that the lower-funded districts, such as Palomar, are taking a disproportionate hit. Mr. McMullen encouraged group leaders to attend.

Mr. McMullen thanked Mike Ellis for his construction notification. In addition to budget cuts and all the things that follow with that, we're going to have a lot of disruption in parking lots, roadways, and construction zones. This will all lead up to our new science building. We are excited about it, but we also must live with the problems that will come along with it. Mike and his staff will do everything they can to make it as least intrusive as possible. It will take all of us to keep our eye on the ball; and that is the completion of the science building.

F. REPORTS OF THE GOVERNING BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Evilsizer reported that he attended the student rally on February 12. The students did a very good job in turning out for the rally and signing petitions regarding their concern over the state budget cuts and how it impacted them. They had set up awnings, which were needed that day because of the rain. Despite that, students took the time to come by and share stories with him about how some of these cuts might impact them and adversely affect their lives. He stated that it was very good to hear directly from students who are affected by those cuts.

Mr. Evilsizer and Ms. Chadwick visited Camp Pendleton and Fallbrook Palomar College sites. He feels that we have some terrific resources in the community. At Camp Pendleton, there are tremendous labs with new computer equipment that seemed to be under-utilized the day they visited. Mr. Evilsizer hopes we get the word out to faculty that's looking to utilize resources that maybe, in the future, we might schedule or encourage students to take some classes at Camp Pendleton. With the deployment, a lot of Marines have left the base. That certainly creates a capacity that we didn't have before.

Mr. Evilsizer stated that at the Fallbrook facility, they learned that ESL classes were in very high demand this semester, and there is a waiting list of over 100 students wanting to take them there, but we didn't have the space available to accommodate them.

The Budget Committee met this evening in Jerry Patton's office at 4:30. The main thing that came out of that is that we don't have numbers from the legislature or Governor yet with regards to the current cuts. We feel that the 2003-04 cuts are going to be a worse cut. The committee agreed that Mr. Patton's office would identify some key areas that might require some funding, areas that would be important to sustain at a certain level. We would look into tapping our reserve funds to help alleviate some of the stresses that the budget cuts would bring. Various councils and groups on campus will look at those things and identify some priorities where we might be able to use some reserve funds to help through the budget crunch.

Ms. Chadwick reported that she has been spending a lot of time doing site visits to our educational centers and has visited six of them thus far. She thanked Norma Bean for showing her the Camp Pendleton and Fallbrook centers, managed by Janet Hoffman; Mt. Carmel, Ramona, and Poway, managed by Tom Medel. She will be at Pauma this week and at Borrego Springs next week. Ms. Chadwick stated that this is a very informative and valuable experience for her because one of the most important things is to be informed as we get to the educational facilities master plan. She is feeling very comfortable about what she has learned about the educational centers and what she is hearing from people in the community about what we do. She assured the group that "we are loved, and we are admired and respected."

Ms. Chadwick reported that she, Dr. Nelson, Dr. Amador, and Jerry Patton will be meeting with the Mayor of Poway and City Manager on issues related to the educational and facilities master plan. She is looking forward to that because Poway is a very sensitive area. She looks forward to dealing with the current situation rather than the legacy of what has occurred in the past.

Mr. Jensen reported that, as a member of the Budget Committee, he feels Jerry Patton deserves a lot of support and respect from us.

G. REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT/PRESIDENT

1. Report of Vice President for Instruction

Diane Lutz reported that this Friday is the 2003 San Diego Diversity Summit at the University of San Diego. One of our adjunct faculty members, Arcela Nuñez-Alvarez, is on a panel discussing gender relations and family dynamics.

2. Report of Vice President for Student Services

Joe Madrigal reported that the men's and women's basketball teams have accomplished another milestone. Both teams have tied for co-championships of the conference. The men's team will play Cuesta College Friday night at 7:30 in the Dome. The women's team will play at Riverside Community College on Friday. It is very unusual that both Palomar and Southwestern tie for co-champions in the men's and women's.

3. Report of Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services

Jerry Patton presented a report on FY 02-03 Mid-Year Budget Adjustments. (Exhibit G-3) He also gave an overview of additional budget cuts that will be necessary for FY 03-04.

4. Report of Vice President for Human Resource Services – There was no report.

Dr. Amador reported that we are ready for accreditation. The team arrives on Tuesday, March 4, at 8 a.m.

She thanked the Board members for making themselves available at the times the team had requested. She also thanked Kelley Hudson MacIsaac and Lori Waite for all their work in terms of arranging the accreditation and Diane Lutz for the leadership and for serving as the liaison officer.

At the next Board meeting, members will receive a draft of the educational portion of our educational and facilities master plan. This is mainly the academic departments, as well as the services and administrative functions, looking at our projections which Michelle Barton did on modeling of the growth within each area, as well as the facilities that the faculty and staff feel that they need in the next 20 years. Mark Vernoy and his group have been putting the draft together. The drafts are out to the various staff members that are affected, and they are in the process of reviewing and revising them so that you will

have a draft. This is one piece of the big picture. We will give it to you in parts because it is quite involved.

**Resumption of
REGULAR AGENDA**

I. ACTION ON ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no items removed from the Consent Calendar.

J. REPORTS FROM COLLEGE GROUPS

Mr. McMullen noted that this is where reports are to be made. If there are any editorialized opinions, he asked that they be delivered under the agenda portion, "Comments from Other Individuals and Groups."

1. INFORMATION

Report of the Faculty Senate

Chris Barkley gave the following report: "The Senate has met only once since the last Board meeting and we spent ¾ of our time discussing the confidentiality of administrator evaluations and the methods used to determine the graphs as part of those evaluations.

"The Senate did pass a motion directing me to set up a meeting to deliver Dr. Amador's evaluation to her today so that I could give copies of that evaluation to the Board members tonight to give you a chance to read through the evaluation before a group of faculty meets with you in closed session at the next Board meeting. So let me do that at this moment. This was a little bit awkward because, unfortunately, Dr. Amador really didn't have time for us to actually sit down and talk about the evaluation today. Her schedule was very, very full. So the Senate was kind of rushing this a little bit. Normally, the process is that we deliver the evaluations and have a chance to talk to the person whose evaluation it is before we deliver them to the next person. But, what we have done instead, is we've agreed to meet with Dr. Amador before the next Board meeting to be able to go over the evaluation with her. So we will have gone through the correct process before we actually sit down and talk to you. What we're doing at this point is, we are giving this to you so that you have a chance to read it before we actually meet with you next Board meeting."

Mr. McMullen: "You said before the next meeting you would give her the courtesy of adequate time to meet with her so she can Don't wait 13 days."

Ms. Barkley: "Yes. If we need more than the one hour that we have scheduled at this point or if we're not able to meet during that time because it is at the time period that the accreditation team will be here, we will set up another time to be able to do that. We definitely want to make sure that we go through the process the way we've always gone through it in the past.

"Meanwhile we have asked our Personnel Standards and Practices Committee to make recommendations about whether statistical analysis or a sign-in sheet about confidentiality would be appropriate to include as we do future evaluations. At this point, this is sitting with committee, and they are to report back to us next week.

“We did pass one item for the Curriculum Committee that had inadvertently gone to you before the Curriculum Committee or the Senate had had a chance to see it. It was part of that large 80-page curriculum agenda that you ended up getting. Obviously, if we had not passed that item, I would be asking you to accept the recommendation of the Senate on an Academic Matter and rescind your approval. However, luckily, we did pass that item. You’ve already passed it, so we’re in good shape. I know you trust that all curriculum items have gone through the correct procedure and we will try to make sure that in the future that they do go through the correct procedure.”

Ms. Chadwick: “I’m assuming that Dr. Amador has agreed to this process even though it’s constrictive. And I also am assuming that, based upon what you’ve just reported, if there is a constraint in trying to move these process provisions that we can extend this. In other words, we wouldn’t push it so that we would put anyone in a situation where they would be uncomfortable. Is that correct?”

Ms. Barkley: “Well, the answer to your question is no. We didn’t have a chance to get an agreement; and, again, this was because there was no time in her schedule for us to actually sit down when I handed them over. She basically had to accept them in passing. There were three of us from the Senate that were there to try to meet with her. And yes, we will make sure that we go through the correct process. We are not gonna try to rush it, but we are going to try to meet with you at closed session at the next Board meeting if we can possibly do that. We’ve made that request, and I’m sure that . . . we’ve got two weeks. I think we can find an hour or more than an hour, if we need more than an hour, between now and then to sit down and meet.

Dr. Nelson: “It’s unclear to me why it had to happen this week if there was no time to review this with her.”

Ms. Barkley: “This was at the request of the Senate that I speed this process up. It was already planned for the meeting that we normally have tomorrow. I think I’m reading the Senate at this point. The Senate didn’t actually tell me that this was their rationale. But I think the reason was they wanted to make sure that you had time to read these ahead of time so that when we come in and talk to you in closed session, if we simply just handed it to you, you’d be seeing it cold.”

Dr. Nelson: “No, I agree. It’s just unclear to me why it had to happen these two weeks. We’re meeting every two weeks now.”

Ms. Barkley: “The Senate had actually wanted me to try to meet with you tonight in closed session. Actually, we had wanted the group of faculty that would be meeting with you in closed session tonight. I think they didn’t understand the process that we usually go through. And part of my constraint was that some of the administrators that I had to see had been out of town. Normally, what I do is that I see the Deans first, and I give them their evaluations, give them enough time to absorb them, give me feedback if they would like to have me pass that feedback on to the Vice Presidents. Then I go to the Vice President level, give them the Deans evaluations and also their own evaluations. Then, when they’ve had a chance to absorb those, then I take the Vice Presidents’ evaluations to the President, give the President her evaluation. When she’s had a chance to absorb that, then I take her evaluation to you. And so, it’s a many-step process. And I began it the day after the Senate ended up taking a look at these evaluations. I saw three of the Deans, but then I wasn’t able to see the fourth because she was out of town part of the time. And we had a holiday in there; we had a four-day weekend in there.”

Dr. Nelson: “So all the other people have had this step-by-step process but Dr. Amador has not.”

Ms. Barkley: "She is still getting the step-by-step process in that . . ."

Dr. Nelson: "We're getting this before she has seen it."

Ms. Barkley: "She has been given it today. I can't guarantee that she's had any time in her day to look at it."

Dr. Amador: "I haven't. I was told by Cheryl Ashour, my assistant, that the Senate called last night trying to get a meeting in. Because of my schedule, I tried to accommodate them at 11:30, but Jerry and Dale Wallenius were on a telephone conversation and we didn't get done until about five minutes to 12. It is still sitting on my desk. I have not had time. I had negotiations all afternoon."

Mr. McMullen: "Okay, we'll see how it goes. It seems like a real hard push."

Ms. Barkley: "We are trying to go through the process the way we normally do go through the process. I think there will be time for us to have a discussion with Dr. Amador before we actually have a discussion with you."

Dr. Amador: "Yes. In fact, I requested it today."

Ms. Barkley: "She did make that request, and it is set up for next week."

Mr. Evilsizer: "Before we leave this, just kind of painting an overview for us, Chris. This survey was completed last year in 2002."

Ms. Barkley: "Yes, I believe it was completed by the end of October of last year, and we would have given faculty about 2½ to 3 weeks to fill out those questionnaires."

Mr. Evilsizer: "So it went to all faculty?"

Ms. Barkley: "It went to all full-time faculty. It did not go to adjunct faculty."

Mr. Evilsizer: "Then, when were the survey results turned in and compiled?"

Ms. Barkley: "The Senate heard them two weeks ago at our meeting on the 14th, two weeks ago from last Monday was when the Senate heard, on the 10th I guess it must have been. The report . . . We have a Personnel Standards and Practices Committee and they . . . It's a huge task because the comments that come in, and this is from all of the Deans that aren't Interim Deans, the four Vice Presidents, and the Superintendent/President. And our Secretary types up all of the comments so that they can remain anonymous. Then the committee has to do the tallying of the responses, and that takes quite a bit of time. Actually, believe it or not, we're early. We actually did the evaluation early this year. We often don't even start it until the beginning of spring. But we didn't evaluate Dr. Amador the first year that she was here, and we wanted to start a little bit earlier this time. And we sometimes have not gotten any kind of response to give to the Board because it takes a long time for our committee to put together that result. And by the time we had gotten those reports ready, the contracts had already been offered to the various Vice Presidents, and we ended up not delivering them. So, you know, actually we are early, even though it doesn't seem like it this year."

Mr. Evilsizer: "So some 300 full-time faculty participated in this. What kind of a response rate did you receive back on that?"

Ms. Barkley: "You know, I would be more than happy to go over that when we do it in closed session. We intend to go over all of the statistics in terms of who turned in the numbers. It was a typical response. I can say that."

Mr. McMullen: "Am I to understand these surveys went out in October or they were all returned in October?"

Ms. Barkley: "Both. They went out in October, and we usually give people about three weeks to respond. I'm pretty sure that our due date was like the 28th of October. I will find out before I come to closed session exactly what the date was."

Mr. McMullen: "Yes, just trying to understand the timeline because we're talking four months. They've been somewhere, and they had to be delivered at noon today."

Ms. Barkley: "And, of course, we had the six-week break in there in which faculty are not around."

2. **INFORMATION**

Report of the Palomar Faculty Federation

Mary Ann Drinan gave the following report: "I have just a few brief remarks. At a CFT meeting this weekend, I spoke with several faculty leaders who described to me how their campuses were dealing with managing their budgets in this tough economic time. And what they described to me was a collaborative process, essentially, where faculty were working with classified and administration, using a problem-solving mode to deal with these issues and how budget adjustments will be made. And it appears that we really do not have anything comparable to that in place at this particular point in time. That is, faculty leadership and others have not had opportunities to be meaningfully involved in taking a look at what the future will bring and making plans for that. And so, I think that this collaborative model has a lot to recommend it, and I think really that it is the only responsible way for us to proceed."

Ms. Chadwick: "I'm wondering if the process here could be assessed in terms of its ability to be a collaborative model."

Mr. Patton: "The planning process that we have in motion is our planning councils. In those councils are representatives of all employee groups. We have chosen that model rather than sitting down with the leadership of each of the employee groups. We've allowed them to put people on the planning councils. Those recommendations will go forward to the Strategic Planning Council. All employee groups are represented there. All the leadership of the employee groups are represented there. Other than sitting down with the leadership of employee groups individually, we think the planning councils are collaborative."

Ms. Chadwick: "What I was hopeful is that perhaps we could not expect the answer tonight but have some ability to look at the model or process and see if there's some way if it's not possible and we meet the test of collaboration, that's fine. But we might want to review that to see how we can enhance the process. This should not be murky. It should not be fuzzy. We should be able to establish a level of collaboration that is a constructive, healthy model. And I'm just suggesting that maybe we might want to review the process to see if we can strengthen it."

Mr. McMullen: "I think there's a state-wide process which has been laid down so it won't be murky. Dr. Amador, would you please elaborate?"

Dr. Amador: "I think it goes back to we have a Strategic Planning Council. We spent two sessions on developing criteria. That was actually a consensus of where everyone agreed to that model except the PFF and the classified staff. So, what you're hearing is an exception to two groups that did not want to go with the criteria. At that time, they wanted to have meetings of just an individual leadership from each group. And it was the consensus of the group that that would probably not be the best because there's an old policy that you needed to declare an emergency, and we certainly weren't in an emergency mode at that point. The criteria, the cuts that came up have been through the Revenue Allocation Committee, which all the groups do sit on that committee. So it has been reviewed. I think there's a distinction between 02-03 cuts and 03-04 planning a budget. When you have an adopted budget, what we've done is deal with unexpended funds that were available; basically, what you saw is mainly positions which accounted for the largest amount. If that process still needs to be reviewed, all of those figures are out there. If some group at the Revenue Allocation Committee would like to change and make a suggestion of where something should be different than what has been out there and gone to that committee, as a second thought, that they see another area where that cut needs to be made, I don't have a problem with that, and I'm sure Jerry Patton doesn't have a problem with that. This is a plan; these cuts have not been made. This money has not all been taken, set aside, and put in one big account with \$307 million. These are proposed cuts. We don't know whether we need \$3.6 million; we don't know if we need \$4.3 million; and we don't know if we need \$2 million. Certainly, as we go through the information from the state of what we have to have, further things will be done. This is the first blush. I think it's very important that the Board is involved in it if there are priorities there that you would like to see cut someplace else. We only have a limited amount of money. Just because everybody doesn't agree doesn't mean that the process wasn't collaborative."

Mr. McMullen: "If I understand what you're saying, basically, these cuts are just more unfilled positions and unplanned use of budgeted monies this year. And we will go through the regular budgetary process for the 03-04 year, and that's going to get the complete review."

Dr. Amador: "That is right; and we've just started that process."

Dr. Nelson: "I heard that everybody had the opportunity to participate, they all had representation, all of the constituent groups on that committee. Not everyone agreed on how that should be done, but the process was adhered to. Everybody had an opportunity to discuss, but not everybody agreed. Okay."

Dr. Amador: "Strategic Planning Council had the budget criteria. We've given you a copy of that. That took us two different sessions to approve."

Ms. Drinan: "Just a point of clarification. There are five planning councils, and PFF has representation on one of those councils. On the budget committee, our representation was challenged just a few months ago, and we do have one individual that serves on that committee. But it was challenged and unclear as to whether we really did have representation. I forget the exact month, but it was in the fall."

Dr. Amador: "But they've been involved the whole time of the process that we knew there were budget cuts."

Mr. Patton: "I'm not sure about that. I'd like to talk to you more, Mary Ann, about who that was because I'm not aware of it. And we've had several meetings. We meet right after Strategic Planning Council. And to be honest, there's been several meetings when PFF has not shown up at those meetings. And so it's important, you know that this is a collaborative effort. But if they don't show up, there is no way that you can communicate. If I can just say one more thing about Strategic Planning Council. We have a lot of discussion that Dr. Amador is referring to. All but two people on that planning council after we discussed it felt it was appropriate that we continue the way we were going because when you look at a budget that has 87% in salaries and benefits, and if the magnitude of the cuts comes close to the Governor's recommendation is, you know where it's going. To have employee groups sit there and point out positions that they want to cut is extremely difficult. And some of the faculty and some of the classified on the Strategic Planning Council said after hearing that, 'we think the planning councils would be more appropriate, rather than employee groups having to say we're going to reduce this position, this position, and this position. Then you do get into difficulty. Every budget committee I've sat on when these reductions occur, it's not unusual for the employee group to look at other employee groups to get the cuts. We don't want to put employees in that kind of position of having to make those decisions, rather than going to a planning council like we've done now. So, all but two people out of that Strategic Planning Council which has 24 members concurred that it probably should go this direction we're going through the planning councils, rather than being employee groups against employee groups saying who gets reductions and who doesn't. We're trying to make it the least stressful but make it collaborative."

Ms. Chadwick: "I think your comments are well taken. I appreciate them. Thank you. My suggestion was that the very thing that we're kind of into already here be done in a formalized, perhaps not so formal, but some process way to look at how we can strengthen it. And I'm a little concerned that there are employees that are only in one area and not the others. But this is something that would be part of the review process, and I'm hopeful that that can occur."

Ms. Barkley: "I'd like to clarify a couple of things. First of all, there are faculty on all of the planning councils, so there are faculty representatives. There aren't necessarily PFF representatives. But I also need to clarify that the official position that the Senate took on the budget cut criteria was that we could not endorse it. We did not say that we were against it, but we saw some discrepancies between the proposed implementation of the budget cut criteria and the criteria themselves. So the motion that was actually passed at the Senate basically said that we can't endorse this but we expect that the administration will talk to the Faculty Senate on any issue that is academic and professional. Now, with that said, also the gist of the discussion at the Senate was that we believe the criteria were a very important way of going. It was the discrepancy between some of the planned . . . and part of the problem was like cutting classes and things like that that we did not think were ways of supporting students. So, nevertheless, those faculty members that were appointed by the Senate that were on Strategic Planning voted in favor of the budget cut criteria based on their interpretation of what the Senators were recommending. I was one of them. And so there was support from the faculty members that are on Strategic Planning Council for this. But the official Senate position was they couldn't endorse it the way it was stated and the way it was connected to the implementation procedures."

3. **INFORMATION**

Report of The Faculty

Maria Miller reported that March 5 will be the next scheduled meeting of The Faculty.

4. **INFORMATION**

Report of the **Administrative Association** – There was no report.

5. **INFORMATION**

Report of the **Confidential and Supervisory Team** – There was no report.

6. **INFORMATION**

Report of the **CCE/AFT** – There was no report.

7. **INFORMATION**

Report of the **Associated Student Government**

Leo Melena apologized for his tardiness as he was in Orange County doing an orientation for Phi Theta Kappa. Leo introduced Sally Serrin, ASG Senator, who reported that ASG held a rally on February 12. They had a lot of positive response from the students and faculty. They got approximately 2,000 signatures which they sent out to representatives and the Governor. They made those 2,000 people aware of what is happening and are hoping that they will tell others. The *Union Tribune*, KUSI, and Telemundo came out to cover the event. The award-winning *Telescope* also did a feature article on the event. They will continue the campaign with letters and e-mails. They are also contacting other colleges. On February 27, they plan to go to MiraCosta with other colleges to pool their resources and ideas to make their best effort on behalf of everyone.

Springfest is in full swing. Then voter registration follows. Elections for ASG are in April. Interested students should be encouraged to see Bruce Bishop.

K. COMMENTS FROM OTHER INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS

Jennifer Turpin addressed the Board on the subject of PeopleSoft.

Dr. Nelson responded: "I appreciate the fact that you came forward and spoke. For those of us that supported and voted for the funding, we understand truly that this infrastructure needs to be put in place, that it's essential, that there is no turning back. I thought the explanation – the presentation that we had – clearly stated that we are going to a vanilla product to make it universal, to do away with the kinds of things that had held us back. It took a lot of courage to come forward, and I appreciate it."

Dr. Finkenthal had requested to speak to the Board regarding student lay-offs but relinquished his time to Shannon Lienhart to speak on the same subject.

L. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – There was none.

M. NEW BUSINESS – There was none.

N. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

President

Secretary