



STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

February 17, 2004

The regular meeting of the Palomar College Strategic Planning Council was held on Tuesday, February 17, 2004, in SU-18. The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m. by Dr. Sherrill L. Amador.

Roll Call

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

Members Absent: Barton, Cuaron, Dimmick, Drinan, Magana, Millet, Patton, Two Representatives from Faculty Senate

Guests Present: Cheryl Ashour, Norma Bean (for Administrative Association), Sue Doran (for Dimmick)

A. Minutes

MSC Dowd, Bishop

The minutes of the meeting of February 3, 2004, were approved.

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

C. First Reading

1. Proposed New Policies

a. BP 6310 – Risk Management

Proposed New Policy:

BP 6310

Risk Management

The Board is committed to the establishment of a risk management program that is consistent with all legal requirements for community colleges. The primary concern of such a program shall be the safety and health of students, faculty, staff, and the public and the protection of District property and assets. In order to ensure that the District is conducting its operations as safely and efficiently as possible, the Board authorizes the Superintendent/President or designee to develop and maintain a risk management program that includes identification, prevention, mitigation, and assumption or transfer of risks through appropriate agreements, purchase of insurance, pooling with other agencies or other risk financing practices. The ultimate goal shall be successful implementation of safety and loss prevention/control practices and the maintenance of adequate insurance programs. An annual report on the program shall be presented to the Board.

The Superintendent/President may delegate to a staff member the authority to administer and adjust claims up to \$10,000 with the advice and concurrence of the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services. The Board shall approve settlements in excess of \$10,000. These limits notwithstanding, the Board will accept settlements made by an insurance carrier in the name of the District under terms of applicable insurance policies.

Government Code Sections 935 et seq.

Ken Jay discussed the policy. He stated that the new policy recognizes the importance of risk management and implements an annual report to the Board on risk management issues, which we have not done in the past. It would delegate a designee on campus to settle claims up to \$10,000, which would expedite any process of a small-value claim and it would save on attorney's fees. The type of claim that would fall under this policy would be Palomar property that is damaged or destroyed; for instance, a broken door or stolen computer. If someone else's property or a person is injured or damaged, then the claim falls under a liability deductible. There is not a current Board policy on risk management. Government code regulations state there should be a policy. The policy protects the Board and the person working in the position of risk manager.

The College has different deductibles for different things. Property damage is \$10,000; for liability, it is \$25,000. We have a reserve of \$100,000 in the budget that the College uses to pay claims that are deductible. However, it is not likely that we would have more than four claims a year.

An administrative employee from Ken Jay's office will probably be delegated the responsibility to administer the claims. Specific names were not given because the title could change in the future and we would then have to revise the policy. A yearly report of the number of claims settled will be given to the Board.

The policy will be brought back for action on April 6, 2004.

b. BP 6810 – Illness/Injury Prevention

Proposed New Policy:

BP 6810

Illness/Injury Prevention

Pursuant to the Labor Code and California General Industry Orders, the Board of Trustees recognizes the necessity of an injury/illness prevention program. No employee shall be required to work under unsafe or hazardous conditions or to perform tasks that endanger their health or safety. The District shall make every reasonable effort to ensure that working conditions and equipment are maintained in compliance with federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

The Board expects all employees to use safe work practices and to report and correct any unsafe conditions that may occur. The Superintendent/President shall name a manager to serve as the safety officer for the District. The safety officer shall be responsible for maintaining implementation procedures for this policy in accordance with federal, state, and local laws. These procedures shall include the development of safe and healthy work practices through education, training, and enforcement.

Labor Code Section 6401.7; Cal-OSHA Safety Orders Section 3203

This is a policy regarding safety which is derived from a major objective from our strategic planning process. It addresses some issues regarding illness and injury prevention.

The policy will be brought back for action on April 6, 2004.

c. BP 6820 – Smoking; Delete BP 105 – Smoking

State law, AB 846, has recently changed the minimum smoking distance from a state building to 20 feet. A fact sheet describing AB 846 was distributed (Exhibit C-1c). This policy complies with the law. A task force is also investigating establishing designated areas where smoking would be allowed. There are areas where smoking is not permitted at all.

MSC Cater/Owens to move the item to action

MSC Madrigal/Giese to approve the adoption of BP 6820 and the deletion of BP 105 and forward this item to the Governing Board as follows:

Proposed New Policy:**BP 6820****Smoking**

There shall be no smoking permitted in buildings or within 20 feet of buildings at Palomar College or in areas designated as "No Smoking" by the College.

Government Code Section 7596-7598

Current Board Policy to be deleted:**BP 105****Smoking (86-11842, 95-17640)**

There shall be no smoking permitted in buildings or within 7.5 feet of buildings at Palomar College. GB 6-30-87, Rev. 6-11-96

2. Proposed New Policy BP 5030.6 – Fee Exemption for International Students**Proposed New Policy:****BP 5030.6****Fee Exemption for International Students**

Palomar College shall charge a nonresident capital outlay fee and an application processing fee to citizens and residents of a foreign country per Education Code 76141 and 76142. A student who demonstrates economic hardship is exempt from the capital outlay fee and the application processing fee. The exemption is authorized, on a per semester basis, when a student meets the eligibility criteria for benefits under the Aid to Families of Dependent Children program, the Supplemental Income/State Supplementary Program, or a general assistance program.

Herman Lee described the policy. He stated the policy is a direct response to direction by Ralph Black, legal counsel for the California Community Colleges, that we did not have a policy in accordance with minimum conditions. Mr. Black requested a Board-adopted policy which defines economic hardship. Mr. Lee does not anticipate many international students making a waiver request under the condition of economic hardship because to be eligible for the programs, you have to be a U.S. citizen and a state resident, and international students do not qualify in either category.

The policy will be brought back for action on April 6, 2004.

D. Discussion/Information Items1. Annual Implementation Plan – February Progress Reports

Dr. Amador reviewed progress for each goal through February, 2004. Discussion ensued. Regarding Objective 4, No. 1, Bonnie Dowd requested that the form used by faculty regarding student athlete grades be revised from a letter-grade response to include a dialogue box if the instructor is not able to give an evaluative grade at this point. A revision was made on page 9 to delete the name of Erin Messersmith and replace it with her title.

2. Credit/No Credit Form

Herman Lee stated the Credit/No Credit form was changed to eliminate the instructor's signature. He emphasized this change is a procedural change, not a policy change. The credit/no credit procedure currently in place was developed in the 1970s. Bruce Bishop recently spoke to Mr. Lee about the procedure, saying that Title 5 states that a student must only notify the instructor and does not need to request permission. Mr. Bishop gave an example of an instructor who did not allow a student to change from a grade to credit/no credit simply because he did not like the student. After this incident, Mr. Bishop researched Title 5 and the Ed. Code and found language that clearly states the decision belongs to the student. In the past, the only reason we originally asked for a signature was to advise the instructor the student had made the request. It has grown from that point to be interpreted as the instructor has the right to say no. He believes it is not a reasonable interpretation of Title 5. He stated that the English Department's requirement that no student can take English 100 for credit/no credit is also not adhering to Title 5 regulations.

Mr. Lee spoke of the difficulty students have getting instructor signatures, especially those in distance learning and evening students. Mr. Lee brought the recommendation to Student Services Planning Council to remove the instructor's permission from the form. During discussion at SSSPC, a question was asked regarding the point that origination of the signature process had to do with faculty being involved in the process of advising students. In response, Mr. Lee stated the counseling and admissions staff will advise students that credit/no credit grading is not recommended for certain courses. It will be done at the time of the request and on the web page of the on-line application. Steve Spear stated that this issue is on the next Faculty Senate agenda as they did have a concern about the advising. He stated that with the precautions and the steps counseling and admissions will take, the concern will be addressed.

Mr. Lee will revise the form to reflect the change. The item will be brought back for discussion after the Faculty Senate discusses it at their meeting and requests it be on the agenda.

E. Reports of Planning Councils

1. Administrative Services Planning Council

Ken Jay reported that the ASPC met on February 12. They put the finishing touches on the Equipment Replacement Task Force policy. It will be coming to SPC for a first reading on March 4.

2. Human Resource Services Planning Council

Jack Miyamoto reported that the HRSPC met on February 10. He was unable to attend the meeting, but stated they reviewed the Human Resources Institutional Review document. They had questions about the Human Resources budget. The majority of the time was spent on brainstorming strategies for improving our diversity in faculty recruitment.

3. Instructional Planning Council

Wilma Owens reported that the IPC met on February 11. Most of the meeting was spent on reviewing each Division's Institutional Review. The thread running through all of those was that divisions, departments, and programs felt they had inadequate resources for equipment and supplies. While student population has grown, supply budgets have not. Everyone has been struggling trying to meet student needs. Extensive data was collected from the institutional review process that will be useful and will be a foundation to build on. They also reviewed the rationale form for faculty positions. During the last cycle, as the form was developed, it was found that some of the items were nebulous, and people were not sure how to respond. A group of people met to improve the form. It will go to the Faculty Senate for review. Student Services discussed the form at their planning council and provided the Instruction office with input. Previously, IPC had heard a presentation about the Hispanic Serving Institution grant. There were a lot of questions about whether or not we are applying for a grant or whether we were applying for a grant to plan for a grant. Those questions are getting answered and will be discussed in depth at the next meeting. The College's needs will be analyzed and listed so that we will be positioned to quickly respond to incoming grant requests. When applications come out, we will already have a need identified and can match that need with the grant when the resources are available. At the next meeting, they will begin to develop priorities for the budget.

4. Student Services Planning Council

Joe Madrigal reported that the SSSPC met on February 18. They discussed a proposed reorganization in Bruce Bishop's area because of a recent resignation of a classified position in charge of processing all of the PIC cards. Upon review of the present job description for the position, it was noted that there is a discrepancy between past and present requirements. The position is being updated to reflect the actual duties performed in the position. No additional dollars will be involved. Mr. Bishop is working with Human Resource Services to make sure a job description is developed that reflects what is needed. They also discussed the rationale form for faculty positions. They recommended to the Instruction Office that when requesting full-time counselors, the counselor to student ratio for the position be listed. The recommendation was accepted by the Instruction Office and will be incorporated in their revisions. SSSPC received a request for reactivation of a counseling services supervisor position. It is felt there is a

need to provide classified staff supervision. The proposal was tabled pending further discussion by the Counseling department and will be brought back to the planning council for further review.

F. Reports of Constituencies

1. Administrative Association

Norma Bean reported that a general membership meeting will be held on February 25. Today at Executive Council, Trustee Evilsizer requested to meet with them to learn about the Administration Association.

2. Associated Student Government

Amador Soto reported that ASG held a meeting last week in Escondido. They now have a new Senator, Sara Hugo. They discussed Spring Fest. At the next meeting they will discuss the men's bathrooms in the SU building, the Arboretum maintenance, and decorating the Student Union.

3. Confidential/Supervisory Team – No report.

4. CCE/AFT – No report

5. Faculty Senate

Steve Spear reported that the Senate named faculty members to the presidential search committee. They also passed a course discontinuance policy. The draft instructional hiring forms are coming to the Senate for information.

6. PPF/AFT – No report

G. Pending Items - There were none.

H. Other Items - There were none.

I. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.