



STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

February 3, 2004

The regular meeting of the Palomar College Strategic Planning Council was held on Tuesday, February 3, 2004, in SU-18. The meeting was called to order at 2:01 p.m. by Dr. Sherrill L. Amador.

Roll Call

Members Present: Amador, Barton, Bishop, Cater, Cuaron, Dowd, Drinan, Eberhart, Frady, Giese, Halttunen, Jay, Madrigal, McCluskey, Miyamoto, Owens, Patton, Soto, Spear, Wallenius

Members Absent: Dimmick, Key, Magana, Designee for Faculty Senate Past President

Guests Present: Barbara Baldrige, Sue Doran (for Dimmick)

A. Minutes

MSC Halttunen, Soto

The minutes of the meeting of December 2, 2003, were approved with the following corrections:

Page 1, two motions near the bottom of the page that were defeated should read, "MS Motion did not pass."

Page 3, F-5, second sentence should read, "They met yesterday with Marty Hitelman"

Dr. Amador asked that each of the constituent groups be certain that they have the appropriate number of representatives appointed to SPC.

B. Action Items/Second Reading – There were none.

C. First Reading – There were none.

D. Discussion/Information Items

1. Statewide Funding Formula - Community Colleges

Dr. Amador noted that each member of SPC had received a copy of the CCLC's "League Issues Brief" regarding the statewide funding formula for community colleges. (**Exhibit D-1**) She discussed the potential for a new funding formula contained in this document. Our existing formula for community colleges is so convoluted, misunderstood, and hard to calculate that it does not work from a practical standpoint. It is also very inequitable in that it is program-based funding. When it was created, it attempted to appease a variety of groups, not change anything, but call it something new. It became very evident through last year's budget negotiations that community colleges are not funded appropriately because of the interests of equalization, growth, and the issue of non-credit funding. Many feel that community colleges' adult education FTES should be funded at a higher level than high school adult education. Each of these three interests have gone to their legislators to attempt to get action. As a result, nothing has happened. Consequently, the statewide funding formula has been developed. It is a work in progress, and Exhibit D-1 indicates the status as of December, 2003. In January, the new Governor's budget came out with favorable indications for community colleges in his initial proposal for 2004-05. It has something for each of the three interest groups but not necessarily what each of those groups wanted. That could be a concern for us if we get into a fight outside of our system as to how the funding formula is going to work. As of last week, there was still hope of doing something with the new funding allocation and going along with what the Governor has proposed. Some of the people in the interest groups are already promoting their own issue. There is an attempt to bring the various groups

together, so that the system can come up with one proposal from our system. One of the major issues that goes across all three areas of interest is how to treat the census. The proposal gives a center an extra million dollars. The term "center" needs to be more clearly defined. It is the commitment of the CEO Board, whether we get funding or not, to try to resolve the issue of the formula. Once that is done, as money comes into the system, there will be a formula to distribute it.

Jerry Patton noted that Palomar College is 63rd out of the 72 districts in the state, in terms of funding. We are at \$3,592 per FTE. The highest college is over \$8,000. Dale Wallenius added that if we were brought up to the average by adding another \$180 per FTE, it would bring close to \$3 million each year to the College.

2a. Budget Update

Jerry Patton provided an update on the 2003-04 budget. So far, we have not had any mid-year reductions. We are awaiting property taxes and student fees. The last two years, we have not received backfill. CCLC is urging passage of Propositions 55-58 on the March 2 ballot.

The Governor's proposal for 2004-05 includes 3% growth. Our growth cap will be about 1.7%. It includes \$80 million equalization. One way of funding COLA of 1.84% would be to take \$20 million from equalization, leaving \$60 million. The difference would be made up from the general fund. There is also consolidation of categorical programs.

Dr. Amador added that it is proposed to increase enrollment fees again, probably to \$26 per unit so that students will be eligible for federal funds. Currently, we are not able to access those funds because our fees are so low. Students will be upset about the increase in fees; however, it may not be good strategy to protest it given the severe budget situation. Our fees per unit would still be much lower than the rest of the nation. The Governor has now put more money on the table for community colleges than for either of the other higher education systems. Although we are not pleased with an increase in fees, we probably should not spend our efforts fighting the Governor on this issue.

Mr. Patton noted that if the equalization drops from \$80 million to \$60 million, growth, COLA, and equalization would increase Palomar's budget by about \$3.8 million for 2004-05. However, if the propositions on the March 2 ballot fail, it would mean a 25% cut for all state agencies. A grass-roots effort similar to the one undertaken last year needs to take place. Mr. Patton also reported that lawsuits pending may have an effect on the budget.

Dr. Amador noted that there are four resolutions on the next Board agenda urging the electorate to vote for Propositions 55-58. Both 57 and 58 must pass in order for either of them to take effect.

2b. FY 04-05 Budget Development

Jerry Patton noted that if the bond passes, we will be OK for FY 2003-04. That makes the Governor's budget look very positive. There will be much discussion between March 2 and the May revise. As we look toward budget development, a calendar has been developed, which Mr. Patton distributed at this time. **(Exhibit D-2b)** This exhibit will be on the Administrative Services website. Mr. Patton briefly discussed the information. This afternoon the Revenue Allocation Committee will discuss asking the planning councils to submit additional requests above and beyond the continuation or roll-over budget. In light of the potential cutback that may occur, it is expected that these submissions will be frugal. It is suggested that not more than three of the highest priorities each planning council be submitted. Later on, when the realities of the 2004-05 budget are known, we could come back and revisit any additional requests.

Mr. Patton also distributed copies of a Budget Development Work Flow Chart, indicating the process for submitting proposed budgets. Dr. Amador noted that most of the work of prioritizing will be done by the planning councils before submitting them to SPC.

3. Community College Survey of Student Engagement

Michelle Barton noted that our strategic plan evaluation includes a measure of student feedback for a means of collecting student information. Specifically, the plan calls for administering the Community College Survey of Student Engagement. In our AIP this year, there is an objective to develop and implement programs and services to increase persistence, completion, and transfer. In following up on those two items, we discussed administering the CCSSE. It is a national survey designed around research outcomes, retention, completion and persistence, the factors that affect retention, and whether or not students complete their goals. This survey is not the same as the one given a few years ago that was prepared for our accreditation visit. We need to administer it now so that the planning councils may use the information gleaned from it in developing their programs for persistence and retention.

A random sample of 40 to 50 sections will be selected this spring. The faculty members of those sections will be contacted, asking them for permission and a date to administer the survey. A representative from the research office will administer the survey, which will require 20 to 30 minutes of class time. It is proposed that the survey be administered the end of March and beginning of April. A memo will be sent in the next couple of weeks notifying the entire campus community of the survey. The results will probably be available some time in June.

Dr. Amador noted that this survey will give us our much-needed baseline. This will be something that the Student Learning Outcomes group will want to discuss.

4. Governance Structure Document

Dr. Amador distributed copies of the newly revised Governance Structure document and noted that a flow chart had been included. **(Exhibit D-4)** There are still some committees that are awaiting the faculty contract. The Computer Coordinating Committee is awaiting input from the Technology Task Force. Additional hard copies are available in the President's Office. The document will also be placed on the web site.

6. Student Learning Outcomes Task Force

Dr. Amador provided an update on this task force. They started meeting in mid-October and had about four meetings where they attempted to define what they were talking about. The task force has developed objectives to accomplish before it is finished. They revisited the Principles of Assessment document that was distributed several years ago and are considering distributing it again. Staff Development activities on the issue have been set up for March. The biggest chore they have is to make a recommendation for a permanent structure of how the assessment of student learning outcomes will be done at the institutional level. Most of the work will be done in the individual faculty member's classroom; but there are program and institutional levels. More importantly, there is the evidence piece, which is the measurement of how do we know and how to make changes, that needs to be developed. The task force is looking at how to structure the committee, which needs to be approved by this group so that they can actually start the work. A smaller work group will meet during the next two weeks to prepare some initial drafts. Then, they will go back to the task force. Hopefully, by the end of March, SPC will see the first draft, which will then go out to all the various constituent groups. A governance structure request form will be forwarded to SPC.

E. Reports of Planning Councils

1. Administrative Services Planning Council

Jerry Patton reported that the ASPC met on January 22. They discussed the budget and the Equipment Replacement Task Force, which Ken Jay has chaired. They are proposing some Board policy changes having to do with risk management, injury and illness prevention programs, and the smoking policy. They discussed institutional review and integrating it into their action plans.

2. Human Resource Services Planning Council

Jack Miyamoto reported that the HRSPC met on January 27. They finalized the classified evaluation process and the changes recommended through accreditation. In the spring, mandatory workshops will be held for supervisors. Workshops for classified employees will also be held to explain the process and what their supervisors should do. They reviewed the HRS budget draft for 2004-05 and will continue that process until the time comes when they need to approve it. They discussed institutional review and how it relates to District goals. They continued their discussion regarding recruitment and hiring of more diversified faculty. The next meeting will be February 10.

3. Instructional Planning Council

Berta Cuaron reported that the IPC met on January 28. They had a brief presentation from Calvin One-Deer Gavin on the Hispanic Serving Institution designation. The possibility of moving forward with a Title 5 proposal for this next year was discussed and supported by the group. They also had a presentation by Pat Schwerdtfeger on the NCHEA grant, working on the first-year student success rate in collaboration with CSUSM and MiraCosta. They concluded their discussion on establishing baseline data for ADA parity and workload measures. They applied the scores to the measures they were working with and everything fell into place, with the exception of a couple of program areas. They are looking at bringing some recommendations for minor changes to the form used for faculty position priorities. They mapped out the next couple of months with institutional review, establishing their priorities for budget and planning, and their AIP status report.

4. Student Services Planning Council

Joe Madrigal reported that the SSPC met on January 28. They also had a presentation by Calvin One-Deer Gavin. He is moving forward with a presentation that will be taken to the Faculty Senate later this month, trying to get faculty support for the grant under Title 5. The proposal must have faculty buy-in, instructional support, as well as institutional support. If it is successful, we will move ahead and write a planning grant. We will then have an opportunity to gather in groups, college wide, and decide where our priorities are in line with our strategic planning process. Mr. Gavin is to be commended for his efforts in this area. SSPC also discussed credit/non-credit procedural issues and fee exemption for international students. They presented for second reading and approval their institutional review documents and the executive summary prepared by Mr. Madrigal. Those documents will be forwarded to SPC.

Dr. Amador stated that it is her understanding that reports will not come to SPC. Interested parties can look at them on the web site. SPC's connection with the Institutional Review Committee was to check processes and progress and to ensure that training was occurring. The purpose for institutional review for an area was to go to the planning council and use that input for plans, action plans, change of direction, and those kinds of things. SPC wants to be assured that the planning councils are using institutional review information to make their action plans. There are reorganization proposals being discussed involving staff, which will stay within the parameters of the budget. Decisions will be made at the planning council and the information reported to SPC.

F. Reports of Constituencies

1. Administrative Association – No report.

2. Associated Student Government

Amador Soto reported that ASG held its first meeting of the spring semester on January 28 and will meet again tomorrow. They are beginning to plan the spring break festivities. They have one new member and will be recruiting additional members.

3. Confidential/Supervisory Team – No report.

4. CCE/AFT

Becky McCluskey thanked Dr. Amador for taking the Classified Staff Development Day request to the Vice Presidents' meeting and for its approval. It will be held on the afternoon of March 17.

5. Faculty Senate

Steve Spear reported that the Senate started work yesterday on a draft copyright policy and procedure. When it is completed, it will be brought forward to SPC. The faculty members of the Presidential Search Committee will be named by Monday, February 9.

6. PFF/AFT

Mary Millet reported that PFF had an executive board meeting last week. They are having a member meeting on February 27. They had department rep training on January 23. Department reps act as liaisons between the faculty and the elected officers. The next negotiating session will be held this Friday.

G. Pending Items – There were none.

H. Other Items

1. Annual Implementation Plan – February Updates

The February updates of the AIP will be due next week and will be brought to SPC at the February 17 meeting.

2. Curriculum Committee – Student Member

Bruce Bishop asked if his request to have the student member of the Curriculum Committee be a voting member of that committee had been approved by the Faculty Senate. Steve Spear reported that it has been approved. The appropriate correction will be made in the Governance Structure document.

I. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.