



STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

April 6, 2004

The regular meeting of the Palomar College Strategic Planning Council was held on Tuesday, April 6, 2004, in SU-18. The meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m. by Dr. Sherrill L. Amador.

Roll Call

Members Present: Amador, Barton, Bishop, Cater, Cuaron, Dolan, Dowd, Eberhart, Frady, Jay, Kelber, Madrigal, McCluskey, Owens, Patton, Roach, Soto, Spear, Versaci, Wallenius

Members Absent: Dimmick, Giese, Halttunen, Miyamoto, Snyder

Guests Present: Jenny Akins (for JoAnne Giese), Barbara Baldrige, Sue Doran (for Mike Dimmick)

A. Minutes

MSC Roach, Cater

The minutes of the meeting of March 2, 2004, were approved.

B. Action Items/Second Reading

1. Proposed BP 6310 – Risk Management

MSC Spear, Dowd to approve BP 6310 and forward to the Governing Board for approval. **Exhibit B-1**

2. Proposed BP 6810 – Illness/Injury Prevention

MSC Spear, Dowd to approve BP 6810 and forward to the Governing Board for approval. **Exhibit B-2**

3. Proposed BP 5030.6 – Fee Exemption for International Students

MSC Spear, Dowd to approve BP 5030.6 and forward to the Governing Board for approval. **Exhibit B-3**

4. Student Learning Outcomes Task Force Report and Recommendations

The back-up materials for this item had been sent to the SPC members via e-mail on March 5. Student learning outcomes was one of the items the Accrediting Commission had asked us to address. Brief discussion ensued. Steve Spear noted that student learning outcomes is a faculty matter. The faculty takes very seriously the role that the faculty and the Senate play in this. The Senate has recommended a change in the reporting relationships of the Learning Outcomes Council and Coordinating Committee. Mr. Spear will send the Senate's recommendation to Ms. Baldrige so that it may be included as an amendment on the governance structure form on the agenda for the next meeting. There is concern that everyone should recognize that academic and professional matters are the purview of the Senate. Dr. Amador stated that we must trust the faculty on the council to do what is right for this institution in terms of learning outcomes. Administrative support will be here because all of us are responsible for the accreditation of the institution. This item will be brought back to the May 4 meeting for action. **Exhibit B-4**

C. First Reading**1. Recommended Changes to BP 111 and Attendant Procedures**

Steve Spear presented proposed revisions to BP 111 – Dealing with Threats or Acts of Violence and its accompanying procedures. **Exhibit C-1** Mr. Spear has not removed any language from BP 111 but has added language dealing with abusive conduct. He took the language from AB 1582, a proposed Assembly bill. Current laws dealing with “harassment” in the workplace apply only to people who belong to a protected “class,” such as ethnicity, disabled, veterans, etc. However, studies have shown that approximately 2/3 of workplace harassment is “status-blind.” Dr. Spear stated that some of this status-blind harassment has occurred at Palomar College. He also stated that abusive conduct at Palomar College sabotages work performance, negatively affects morale, damages the educational environment, affects victims’ psychological and/or physical health, and creates increased health costs to the District. Dr. Spear asked that each of the constituent group leaders take this back to their members for discussion and approval.

Rocco Versaci noted that AB 1582 died in committee. One of the problems was that small businesses opposed it because it opens the door for an employee to claim they have been abused, which then makes the employer responsible for conducting investigations. He would be in favor of simplifying the language or perhaps inserting the words “hate speech.” Dr. Versaci stated his concern that a policy like this could make the District vulnerable for employees who don’t like the way they are talked to or perceive something as being abusive, opening up the floodgates for a lot of costs we do not need to bear.

Dr. Amador reported that she has had the District counsel review this matter, and what Dr. Versaci stated is absolutely true. One of the reasons the bill has died is because of the liability abusive behavior puts on any organization. However, we certainly need to look at ways to address the issue appropriately. It is going to take not only something legally, but it also involves the way we all behave. Some of the behavior lately has not been good. As a result, people feel more free. We must all be responsible for our own behavior to make sure that the positive behavior we exhibit is reflected in the way our students behave and the way we behave among peers, etc. This is a cultural as well as a legal issue. We need to have some discussion on the appropriate way to address this matter, whether it be revision to the Board policy, a code of ethics, a professional standards committee, or sometimes the unions take on the responsibility. It is a very complicated legal thing, yet all of us are trying to do the right thing so that we don’t have the unacceptable behavior that makes people feel uncomfortable and harassed.

Sue Doran stated that when you have others to corroborate the situation, letters, and e-mails, all of which are absolute proof that abusive conduct has occurred, there is nothing in place at Palomar College that allows it to be taken care of. The person can be spoken to, but it doesn’t mean they have to stop.

Jason Roach asked if this matter has been addressed for student relations with faculty and staff or between students. Bruce Bishop reported that there is language in the Code of Conduct that is similar to that which Dr. Spear is proposing and what is in the proposed legislation. He stated that we should hold staff to at least as high a standard of behavior and responsibility as we do students. There is no code of conduct for faculty or staff, with the exception of the language in BP 111.

Bonnie Dowd noted that BP 111 is in place, but apparently is not being followed. She also noted that when she has called people accountable for their actions, she has been accused of harassing them. She is concerned about having something in place that could be used as a way of finding a way to get rid of her because she speaks her opinion. She asked that before we go forward with a change in this policy, we think of all the ramifications. The Senate is putting forward constitutional changes to the faculty that would include a philosophy statement about a code of conduct for faculty, an ethical procedure by which when there are situations, rather than there being a public airing and a public display of both sides of the issue, it would be done through an investigative process. That is being done this week on other issues that have come forward. She stated that each of the groups need to look carefully at this issue.

It was agreed to bring this item back for more discussion at the May 4 meeting.

2. Recommended Procedure 6536 – Equipment Replacement

Jerry Patton and Ken Jay presented a new procedure for equipment replacement. **Exhibit C-2** It was suggested that the second sentence should read, “Technology equipment will be eligible for replacement on a three- (3) year cycle . . .” Following discussion, it was agreed to bring this item back for action at the May 4 meeting.

3. Technology Master Plan Task Force Membership Clarification

Steve Spear requested that the membership of this task force be clarified by indicating that the seven faculty representatives be indicated “Seven Faculty Divisional Representatives (in addition to Co-Chair) – Appointed by the Faculty Senate.” There was consensus that this change be made.

D. Discussion/Information Items

1. Calendar Items for Budget Priorities

In the unlikely event that extra funding is received, we should have our prioritized lists of needs ready. There is also a possibility that we will experience cuts, so each area should be looking for places these could be made. We need to use our planning process and bring forth proposals to SPC. We will start the discussions at the May 4 meeting. An SPC meeting will need to be held on May 18. Mr. Patton and Dr. Amador answered questions from SPC members as to why some Divisions did not make their share of cuts in 2003.

Dr. Amador stated that increases for this year will not be entertained in the areas that failed to make their cuts last year. There are things that we must do as an institution, and they will not be easy. The mobs in the audience at Board meetings indicating that they didn't want to cut people put us in this situation. Now we are in a situation where we are going to be very close to our 3% reserves. Regardless of the scenario, we still have the problem of spending more than we are taking in. Dr. Amador stated that we run a very inefficient operation in instruction compared to other districts. Because of that, we must expend more money. Becky McCluskey stated that CCE agrees with this evaluation of the situation. It is better that SPC deal with the problem than to have the mob action.

Ken Jay stated that if SPC, as a group, agrees on a course of action and it doesn't get accomplished, the credibility of our process comes into question. Who will take it seriously the next time? It becomes mob rule – whatever you can muscle.

Dr. Amador stated that Mr. Patton received from SPC and the four Vice Presidents a list of where the cuts were going to be made. We all trusted that. In fact, some even cut more than they were supposed to cut. It wasn't until after the adopted budget that we learned what had occurred. Some areas did what they were supposed to do, and others did not. Mr. Patton will make a presentation to the Governing Board at its next meeting on the state of the budget this year and the deficit that is expected for next year because this is a progressive problem that just keeps getting worse.

It was noted that we are in a hiring freeze and are asking everyone to purchase only what they absolutely need. Hopefully, our ending balance will be greater than anticipated. The only positions that are being filled are those with categorical funding and one we need to fill because of matched funding.

Barbara Kelber asked for clarification on the mob action and what exactly happened. Dr. Amador responded that instruction did not make their cuts. They failed to make \$650,000 in cuts. That included ADAs, efficiency within instruction of how it is run, and what is known as “administrative support costs,” not administration. Administrative support and reassigned time for instruction are very expensive at Palomar compared to all of our benchmark colleges. Dr. Kelber asked if the classified staff would have preferred to have those positions cut last year. Would they have preferred the faculty not try to help them? Tricia Frady stated, “That's not the perception here. Our concern is that all the planning councils came up with a plan. Each division was to take a hit. Not all of them followed through. Now are we going to go back to the table and each division is going to take the hit again. So certain divisions are going to lose multiple classified staff, instead of each taking their own hit. That is our concern. We don't want to lose any classified staff. Don't misunderstand us, we want help from everybody. There

was a plan – we wanted it followed.” It was noted that the ADAs were championed by the faculty, but there were numerous other classified positions in other divisions that didn’t have that support.

Dr. Amador stated that we still have the dilemma of not having cut \$945,000 last year and what that does for next year. The concern of the groups that did take the cuts being asked to make additional cuts is not going to be well accepted. We are going to have to deal with it.

Dr. Kelber asked if Dr. Amador has hopes that when the faculty contract is settled, we will be more efficient. Dr. Amador responded that she has hopes, but she is only on one side of the table. Most of the inefficiencies are still in there at this point. Bonnie Dowd pointed out that many of these inefficiencies go back to 1946. Dr. Dowd has an accounting background and has served on the Revenue Allocation Committee almost every year since she has been here. The matrix moves, but no one knows where the revenue is coming from because there isn’t a stream that ensures increased revenue. Her salary has not gone up during the past six years, but all her expenses have. That is exactly what is happening with the District. Our inefficiencies have peoples names attached to them. How do we become efficient and not eliminate people? We all want to hold on to positions in our areas because we think we can’t work any other way. It is very hard to think out of the box, but we need to figure it out because at some point, we’re going to have to pay.

2. 2003-04 AIP Final Evaluation

The 2003-04 Annual Implementation Plan Final Evaluation will be discussed at the May 18 meeting. Those responsible for input were asked to provide that information to Barbara Baldrige by May 11.

3. Annual Governance Evaluations

Dr. Amador noted that last year, an evaluation of Strategic Planning Council was done. As a result of that process, when we discussed the outcomes, we decided that we should have training. We were in agreement that SPC would go through an evaluation, as well as the VP’s councils this year. Michelle Barton explained last year’s evaluation of SPC. Evaluation forms for all councils for this year will be sent out on April 12. Participants will be asked to complete and return them within two weeks. On May 4 or 18, the results of the SPC self-evaluation will be brought back to SPC. The results of each of the planning council’s self-evaluations will be discussed with them. Bonnie Dowd commented that the training sessions held last year were most beneficial to those who serve on the councils.

E. Reports of Planning Councils

1. Administrative Services Planning Council

Jerry Patton reported that at the ASPC meeting the budget was discussed. Directors will submit their requests at the next meeting, which will then be forwarded to SPC. At RAC last week, it was agreed that the employees need to help formulate solutions; we don’t want to have someone else tell us what to do.

2. Human Resource Services Planning Council – There was no report.

3. Instructional Planning Council

Berta Cuaron reported that the IPC had met on March 24 and worked on setting priorities for next year. They are working on faculty positions for 2005-06.

4. Student Services Planning Council

Joe Madrigal reported that the SSPC had met on March 24, but because there was not a quorum, they only discussed the fee payment policy, which will be coming through the process. They also discussed strategies for bringing their budget requests forward for 2004-05. Mr. Madrigal will be reviewing the budget cut process with the SSPC members next week.

F. Reports of Constituencies

1. Administrative Association – There was no report.

2. Associated Student Government

Amador Soto thanked everyone for their help on Spring Fest. Tomorrow's ASG meeting will involve amendments for their constitution.

3. Confidential/Supervisory Team

Jenny Akins reported that CAST echoes the concern of CCE and the Administrative Association regarding the budget.

4. CCE./AFT – There was no report.

5. Faculty Senate

Steve Spear reported that the Faculty Appreciation Tea will be held on May 6. The Senate passed a draft of the instructional hire form. They passed the Student Learning Outcomes Task Force structure request. The Senate is making some constitutional structural changes, which will be coming out soon. They are also in the process of conducting elections and appointments for various things. New Senators' election will begin later this week. New TERB board members will begin a little after that. They are looking for a new Professional Development Coordinator because Judy Eberhart is retiring. They have completed the administrators' evaluations and are making appointments to discuss them with the individuals.

6. PPF/AFT – There was no report.

G. Pending Items – There were none.

H. Other Items

1. April 20 Meeting Canceled – Next Meeting May 4

Dr. Amador reminded the group that the April 20 meeting has been canceled. The next meeting will be May 4.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.