



INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL Minutes

September 28, 2005

Members Present: Mark Bealo, Norma Bean, Richard Borden, Katheryn Garlow, Terry Gray, Karen Huffman, Terry Humphrey, Chantal Maher, Becky McClusky, Tina Riley, Pat Schwerdtfeger, Sara Thompson, Mark Vernoy

Members Absent: Wilma Owens

Guest: President Deegan

Recorder: Wendy Antes

Introductions of all members were made after the meeting was called to order.

I. **Approval of Minutes (September 14, 2005)**

Minutes were approved with 1 abstention.

II. **Faculty Position Priority Process** (handout)

The next joint meeting with SSPC will be held on September 29. The meeting will focus on the process of prioritizing positions. The 14 remaining positions will not be prioritized until the overall process can be renewed and revised and both committees agree on changes to prioritizing all positions.

Discussion from the Faculty Senate was to ask other colleges what their process was and maybe use those processes and practices as a model. Another recommendation from the Faculty Senate included forming a sub-committee, comprised entirely of faculty or faculty and deans, without non-instruction members to prioritize faculty positions.

The inclusion of classified staff was stated as being important because staff also work closely with students and are aware of student needs. The Faculty Senate also recommended there needs to be a balance between the IPC & SSPC councils, to ensure equal representation, in the prioritization process since one council is larger than the other.

It was suggested that data be used to consider all faculty positions, including counselors and librarians. A handout with student headcount at Census was presented as some initial data. IPC members would like it reaffirmed that it is IPC's role to recommend faculty priorities to SPC. SSPC should continue to submit input for priorities and particular needs. Separate consideration may need to be given for Counselors and Librarians, or voted on differently, possibly based on a percentage of all faculty positions. SSPC could work out a percentage for counseling positions when the faculty priorities list is established.

A point system was also suggested. This would assign a weighted value to data elements / criteria and may assist in the prioritization of positions and could include points for faculty resignations or retirements. All positions should be looked at objectively, no lobbying should be allowed, and the positions should be prioritized based on the good of the whole for the college and not emotionally based. The Faculty Senate suggested other values that could be used for consideration:

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Number of sites where courses are taught | WSCH/FTE |
| Number of classified staff | Health/safety issues |
| Full-time/part-time ratio | Retirement |
| Attrition | Diversity issues |
| Equipment/facilities certain programs require | Outreach aspects/articulation |
| Variability of the position | Outside accreditation |

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

September 28, 2005

Page 2

Job market outlook
Course demand

Income generation
Degree/certificate demand.

Discussion to continue at the next joint IPC / SSPC meeting on September 29.

III. **Strategic Plan 2009**

A PowerPoint presentation with handouts was presented to the council by Michelle Barton from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning and the Strategic Plan Coordination Workgroup.

[Strategic Plan 2009 Progress Report for Planning Councils](#)

IV. **Institutional Review**

Postponed for future meeting.

V. **Goals for 2005-2006**

The Council will develop goals, some of which will come from the Strategic Plan 2009, once adopted.

VI. **SPC Report**

A quick update on the North Center was discussed by President Deegan. Palomar College has completed its Due Diligence and has paid the non-refundable deposit of \$300,000 for the 82-acre location in Fallbrook. If the required Bond passes, that money will be used to purchase the land and to build approximately 150,000 square feet of initial classroom and office space to open the center. Additional facilities would be built with additional Bond or State funds. Bond funds would also be used to make significant facility improvements (repair, replace, renovate) on the San Marcos campus. Several bond scenarios were provided to the Council in regards to the likely amount of funding Palomar may receive. How much the total bond will actually be remains to be determined. The bond measure could be between \$400M and \$850M, and a survey to the voting community will help determine the amount that voters would be likely to support.

VII. **Other**

Invitation was extended to watch the math tutor on-line.
Reminder of the NCHEA grant deadline.

VIII. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:10, p.m.

Next meeting: October 19, 2005, 2:30-4:00, SU-18