The first meeting of the Palomar College Strategic Planning Council was held on Tuesday, April 2, 2002, at 2 p.m., in SU-18.

The meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m. by Dr. Sherrill L. Amador.

Roll Call
Members Present: Amador, Barkley, Barton, Bishop, Cater, Davis, Dimmick, Dolan, Drinan, Eberhart, Galli, Garlow, Gilson, Hoffmann, Jackson, Lutz, Madrigal, Patton, Smith,

Members Absent: Carson, Melena, Millet, Miyamoto, Weimer

A. INTRODUCTIONS

Dr. Amador congratulated the group for being on the Strategic Planning Council and welcomed them to the first meeting of this new group. Members were asked to introduce themselves and give a statement as to why they were appointed to the group and what they hoped to contribute and gain from the group or what they hoped the Council would achieve. After each person spoke, Dr. Amador noted that it is very exciting that this Council was put together as part of the Strategic Planning Task Force, a five-month project that culminated in many good things, one of which is our vision, “Learning for Success.” We will keep that vision in front of us as that is what we are about. When you are part of a group like this, you have a responsibility to take new information and do something with it. We must model the behavior that we are hoping the institution will follow as we put plans together and ensure that they are completed.

The Strategic Planning Council will involve hard work. It won’t be a group where the members just “show up.” Members will be on smaller sub-groups assembling things from time to time. When homework is assigned, it is very important that it be done. In a work group, it is imperative that each member carry his/her weight and be prepared. In turn, Dr. Amador will be prepared and provide the information that the Council members need. We will be arriving at the answers to questions together as we go along. We may need more information on how we are doing things. In June and at the end of each year, we will assess where we are in working together as a group and what we can do to improve. We also need to evaluate the success we are having in terms of the criteria for the plan itself. This group will put the first Strategic Plan together and finalize it. This is the work that the group needs to complete within the next two months.

The communication link back to the representative groups by the Council members is most important. The worst thing that can happen would be that everything stays within the Council. The whole point is that the Council members are out talking to other people, especially with those they represent. Dr. Amador will send out official notices, but the informal and formal communication from the Council members is also very important. Dr. Amador encouraged the members to feel free to participate during the Council meetings. All members are equal and each person’s thoughts and perspectives count. Everyone should feel comfortable in offering their comments and suggestions. Getting the best out of each person will make the group do its best work.

B. STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL

a. Structure/Role/Function

Dr. Amador distributed copies and discussed the Strategic Planning Council’s structure, including role, products, meeting schedule, chair, and members, as it was approved by the President’s Advisory Council on March 19, 2002. (Exhibit B-a) By combining the responsibilities of the President’s Advisory Committee, which was the governance piece, and the Educational Master Planning Committee, which had the planning function, the Strategic Planning Council was created. When the Council makes recommendations involving policies, they will go to the Board. Most of the time will be spent on planning and ascertaining that people are doing what they are
supposed to be doing in terms of implementing the plan. The Council will be considered the governance body of the College, and everything will feed into this group.

b. Membership Terms

Some Council members are appointed because of their function or position and others represent constituent groups. Dr. Amador suggested that constituent groups consider staggering the terms of their representatives so that there would be continuity from year to year.

Chris Barkley reported that the Faculty Senate’s appointees are for the following terms: Two years: Judy Cater and Judy Dolan; One year: Nancy Galli and Bob Gilson; Chris Barkley will be President for one more year; Chris Barkley would then become the Past President and the Senate would then appoint at least one other person for a two-year term to replace the two persons who had one-year terms.

Mollie Smith reported that the President of the Administrative Association serves for two years and then would serve as Past President.

c. Planning Council Structures and Relationship to SPC

Each of the Vice Presidents will have a planning council for his/her area that will feed into the Strategic Planning Council. Each of them had drafted a structure of his/her council for review by SPC. (Exhibits B-c) Several suggestions for revisions were made. The revisions will be incorporated and the structures will be placed on the Governance Structure Group Request form and forwarded to SPC members by the end of the week. Members were asked to share them with their constituencies and be prepared to bring any further suggestions or recommendations to the next SPC meeting. We would like to finalize the structures by the May 7 SPC meeting.

It was noted that we spend an inordinate amount of time on technology and that we do not have the best model at this time. We have hired a planning group, National Council of Educational Management Systems, a nonprofit group, to help us examine and improve the structure and management of our technology. The group will be on campus the week of April 29. It is proposed to eventually have a person responsible for all campus technology and a separate council for technology that will report to SPC.

We do not want a budget committee to set the priorities for us. SPC will look at what comes up from the other councils, will set priorities, and then will decide where the money will come from. We now have an institutional focus to our planning.

C. 2002-03 BUDGET CUT ISSUES

Dr. Amador reported that the Governor’s January budget has indicated cuts totaling approximately $990,000 to Matriculation, CalWORKs, TTIP, and Staff Development. In order to comply with the law, we had to give March 15 notices of the intention not to reemploy several academic employees. Legally, we must make decisions by May 15.

Since the last Board meeting, a plan has been devised to save the positions of the four counselors. The plan is based on the following priorities: (1) to have the least impact on students, (2) to do the least harm to the District’s future, and (3) to understand that it is the responsibility of the Board, President, and Vice Presidents to have a balanced budget. We won’t know the final budget figures until August or September.

We are not going to be able to reinstate the position of director of matriculation. Those responsibilities will be assumed by management in Student Services. The former director of matriculation will be assigned as a counselor, which will improve our counselor to student ratio.
We are also not going to be able to reinstate the positions of CalWORKs manager and counselor. We are still working through the classified support for that area.

Staff development has different issues, and we will try to restore those funds as best we can by using the money from faculty positions who are planning to retire later this year and not filled due to time constraints of the selection process.

A lot of TTIP money has been used for training and equipment. We will attempt to continue the training, but we may not be able to purchase much equipment next year.

It was noted that estimated COLA figures are dropping on a weekly basis. We were told at one point that it would be 2.19%. Latest figures appear to be between 1.65% and 1.75%. There is also a possibility that they may take some of the growth money away.

D. **EMPLOYEE SURVEY RESULTS**

It was reported that 1,401 requests for participation in the employee survey went out and 464 persons completed the survey, which is a 33% return. There were 57 administrators, 163 classified employees, 170 faculty, 7 other, and 67 declined or failed to state. They had about 70 requests for paper-based surveys. All information is kept confidential, so they are not going back to identify part-time, full-time, or classification of employees.

The highest-ranked item was 4.22 and the lowest was 1.76. Items that scored 3.5 and above should be considered high priority. Under the first category, Professional and Organizational Development, there were 24 items that were 3.47 and above. The highest one was “create a more timely process for approval of new and replacement positions.” Others were “provide ongoing training for new and current staff,” “follow through on recommendations made in committees and provide feedback on recommendations,” and “identify ways to remove competitiveness and promote inclusiveness, participation, and collaboration for all groups.” Under Teaching and Learning, there were only 4 items that scored 3.43 or above. Under Resource Management, 22 items scored 3.47 or above. Under Student Success, there were 30 items that scored 3.47 or above. Under Facilities, there were 43 items that scored 3.47 or above. Our next step is to organize a small writing group of five or six people to put these into manageable objectives, which become the Strategic Plan. From that, we will go into the annual implementation plan, which takes off the highest priorities in each of the areas. These will be our priorities for the first year.

At the next meeting, Michelle Barton will be working on criteria for evaluation, and we will start looking at some of the quantitative criteria to evaluate what we are doing.

E. **REPORTS OF CONSTITUENCIES**

1. **Faculty Senate**

Chris Barkley reported that the Senate asked that its concern be brought to this group about the logo and the fact that the Art Department seems to have been left out of any solicitation of suggestions for a logo. They are concerned about the logo that the Strategic Planning Task Force has chosen. She understands that the committee working on the logo has not finalized everything and wonders if it is possible to include the Art Department people at this point. Dr. Amador responded that there were people from the Art Department on the Strategic Planning Task Force. The committee researched the Art Department’s concerns about the legality of it, and we have checked with a logo attorney who has indicated that we are all right. To go back and revisit the subject again just because one department did not feel satisfied does not make sense. Someone from the Art Department is serving on the committee that is working on the graphics standards.
2. **CCE/AFT**

   Mike Dimmick reported that Classified Staff Development Day was held last week and was very successful.

3. **Administrative Association**

   Mollie Smith reported that the Administrative Association is having two workshops this semester. Bruce Bishop presented the first one on Parliamentary Procedure on March 21. Dr. Amador will give a workshop on Leadership on May 8.

   The Supervisors and Confidential Employees in the Administrative Association are going to engage in some dialogue with Dr. Amador and Dr. Miyamoto about the possibility of breaking away from the Administrative Association and forming their own employee group. There will be an open forum held to discuss the matter.

4. **Associated Student Government**

   Bruce Bishop reported that he had taken seven students to Washington, D.C., last week for a leadership and advocacy conference at the Capitol. They worked for months prior to the conference to make appointments with legislators and their aides and received valuable experiences during those meetings. Bruce indicated that he was incredibly proud of the students and their efforts.

5. **PFF/AFT**

   Mary Ann Drinan reported that the PFF had participated in the state convention of the CFT a few weeks ago. Many of them had an opportunity to put in a few good words when the Governor and others showed up. There was a good deal of lobbying done. The PFF is informally involved with an organization in San Diego County, The Faculty Coalition for Public Higher Education, which is a group that has representatives from all community colleges and publicly funded universities in San Diego. That group is involved in lobbying the Governor and the legislature with regard to the budget.

F. **ADELANTE CONFERENCE**

   Joe Madrigal announced that Palomar will be co-sponsoring the Adelante Conference on Saturday, April 6. They are expecting approximately 1,000 young people from junior high and high schools to be on our campus. They will be attending workshops and seminars on leadership training, financial aid, preparing for college, study skills, etc. We are very proud to be involved in this event.

G. **ADJOURNMENT**

   There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.