

STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL AGENDA

MEETING TYPE:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Staff	Date:	2/4/03
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Product/Project	Starting Time:	2 p.m.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Special	Ending Time:	4 p.m.
			Place:	SU-18

CHAIR: Sherrill Amador

MEMBERS: Barkley, Barton, Bedford, Bishop, Cater, Champine, Davis, Dimmick, Dolan, Drinan, Eberhart, Engleman, Fukunaga, Galli, Giese, Halttunen, Lutz, Madrigal, Melena, Miyamoto, Owens, Patton, Smith, Wallenius

RECORDER: Barbara Baldrige

GUESTS: Wilson

Order of Agenda Items	Desired Outcome	Resources Used	Time Allotted
A. <u>MINUTES – January 21, 2002</u>	Decision		2 min.
B. <u>ACTION ITEMS/SECOND READING</u>			
1. Budget Cut Criteria and Implementation Plan	Decision	Exhibit B-1	10 min.
C. <u>FIRST READING</u>			15 min.
<u>POLICIES RELATING TO GOVERNING BOARD:</u>			
1. BP 2010 – Board Membership (to replace BP 8.1)	Discussion	Handout	
2. BP 2015 – Student Member(s) (to replace BP 8.3, 8.31, 8.33, 8.34)	Discussion	Handout	
3. BP 2100 – Board Elections (to replace BP 9.1)	Discussion	Handout	
4. BP 2105 – Election of Student Members (to replace BP 8.32)	Discussion	Handout	
5. BP 2110 – Vacancies on the Board (to replace BP 10.0)	Discussion	Handout	
6. BP 2210 – Officers (to replace BP 12.1)	Discussion	Handout	
7. BP 2220 – Committees of the Board (to replace BP 12.14)	Discussion	Handout	
D. <u>DISCUSSION ITEMS</u>			
1. Instruction Reorganization (Lutz)	Discussion	Handout	15 min.
2. Update on District Structure for Educational Master Plan (M. Vernoy)	Information/Discussion		15 min.
E. <u>REPORTS OF PLANNING COUNCILS</u>			20 min.
1. Administrative Services Planning Council – Jerry Patton			
2. Human Resource Services Planning Council – Jack Miyamoto			
3. Instructional Planning Council – Diane Lutz			
4. Student Services Planning Council – Joe Madrigal			

F. REPORTS OF CONSTITUENCIES

20 min.

1. **Administrative Association** – Mollie Smith
2. **Associated Student Government** – Leo Melena
3. **Confidential/Supervisory Team** - Jo Anne Giese
4. **CCE/AFT** – Mike Dimmick
5. **Faculty Senate** - Chris Barkley
6. **PFF/AFT** – Mary Ann Drinan
7. **The Faculty**

G. PENDING ITEMS

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| 1. Proposed BP 1100 – The Palomar Community College District | Will be addressed on 2/18/03 |
| 2. Proposed BP 1200 – District Mission (to replace BP 1.1) | Will be addressed on 2/18/03 |
| 3. Committees with Administrative Association/CAST Representatives | Will be addressed on 2/18/03 |
| 4. Proposed Change – Revenue Allocation Committee | Will be addressed on 2/18/03 |
| 5. Proposed Change – Safety and Security Committee | Will be addressed on 2/18/03 |
| 6. Proposed Change – Facilities Planning Committee | Will be addressed on 2/18/03 |
| 7. Proposed Change – Bookstore Advisory Committee | Will be addressed on 2/18/03 |

H. OTHER ITEMS



**STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
February 4, 2003**

The regular meeting of the Palomar College Strategic Planning Council was held on Tuesday, February 4, 2003, in SU-18. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Dr. Sherrill L. Amador.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Amador, Barkley, Barton, Bishop, Cater, Champine, Davis, Dimmick, Drinan, Eberhart, Engleman, Fukunaga, Giese, Lutz, Melena, Owens, Patton, Smith, Millet (for Bedford)
Members Absent: Halttunen, Madrigal, Miyamoto, Wallenius, Bedford
Guests Present: Cheryl Ashour, Darla Wilson

A. MINUTES

MSC (Bishop/Melena) to approve the minutes of the meeting of January 21, 2003

Dr. Amador shared information she learned from the CCLC legislative conference this weekend concerning the budget. She spoke to assembly members who said there is movement toward the Senate's budget. However, no one seems to know what to do. There was talk of the structural problem of being tied with the K-12 system because of Prop. 98.

B. ACTION ITEMS/SECOND READING

MSC (Dowd/Bishop)

The Budget Cut Criteria and Implementation Plan document received a second reading. **(Exhibit B1)** Ms. Barkley related that the Faculty Senate had some concerns on some of the items and could not endorse it as it was. The Senate specifically did not like the wording about filling/replacing only necessary vacant positions. They believe all faculty are necessary. They also disagreed with the wording on enforcing minimum class size guidelines, believing it is in contradiction to minimum impact on student enrollment in classes and maintaining the diversity of the educational programs. The Senate discussed the item about limiting expenditures. They felt the vice presidents should not be spending so much time approving items that are \$5. They suggested that the document say only have Vice President approval over \$50. She read the following motion that was passed by the Faculty Senate:

The Faculty Senate acknowledges receipt of the Budget Criteria and Implementation Plan and expects that we will be consulted prior to any action that would impact academic and professional matters.

The Senate suggested that the faculty that are on SPC vote their own conscience. Ms. Barkley will vote in favor because she believes the concept of having criteria and using objective criteria is a very important point. The Senate did not propose an alternative plan.

Ms. Lutz responded to the question of expenditures and said that the Vice Presidents are not looking at specific expenditures but will be given a periodic report on purchases by their managers and directors.

Ms. Drinan expressed that she had severe objections to this plan in the part that deals with the issue of language because there are not adequate definitions of words such as "adequate student services" or "necessary." She thinks those criteria are important to have established. She also had a strong reservation about all of it because there are statements about classified staff and faculty or staff in general and believes those issues need to be addressed by their respective employee groups. She feels that a group like this is not empowered by law to deal with issues regarding collective bargaining. She questioned whether undesignated funds are included in the term "unrestricted general fund." Mr. Patton responded that they were.

Mr. Dimmick was concerned about the vagueness with some of the language. He believes it doesn't give specifics of what will actually take place. He questioned who will be making the decisions and who is designated to determine the necessary staff to maintain an area.

Dr. Amador reminded members that this issue was discussed at the last meeting where she said it is impossible to define "necessary" because it will be different for each department. They also talked about the process and said that the individual councils at the Vice President level will be looking at impacts and changes. SPC will not look at individual persons, names, or people but at positions because of the bumping issues. It is at this time that administration works with the appropriate groups and the collective bargaining units, so they are informed of personnel affected.

The process of getting input into the budget is a governance issue. Palomar has a council structure and criteria. It is talked about in SPC, as at the last meeting. We said we would talk about the overall impact. As some members wanted the big picture, in other words, what would be the total picture, councils' plans will be discussed at the same time so that everybody will get to see the same thing. It would be naïve to think that this is going to be a group process and everyone in SPC will sit here and decide out of which department who is going to be cut. That would be absolute anarchy. There will be input through the governance structure. Management has a responsibility to manage the budget ultimately. Dr. Amador will make a recommendation to the Board.

Mr. Dimmick responded that the Resource Allocation Plan was developed in which all constituent groups on this campus met and agreed on the language with regards to emergency situations. He stated that there is specific language that was agreed upon and is concerned that we are discounting what that language is and now starting a whole new process. Mr. Dimmick believes the College is presently in an emergency situation regarding the budget. He stated that the smaller group, consisting of the presidents and vice presidents of the employee groups and the President of the College, should be the ones to get together and make the decisions. Dr. Amador and Mr. Patton responded that we are not in an emergency situation now but are trying to plan our way through to decide what is necessary. A structure has been set up and passed in SPC and the College is following that structure. There presently is no plan regarding staff in individual departments. The employee groups will meet to discuss people at the point in the plan when the individual councils have made their recommendations regarding positions. This is February and decisions will need to be made by April. Mr. Dimmick responded that things are changing without anyone knowing about them, specifically in student services being reorganized and moving the transfer center to another location. However, it was pointed out that moving the department from one location to another did not affect anyone's employment.

Ms. Drinan favors the idea of declaring an emergency and looking at the constitution of that small group because she believes that cutting \$3 million from the budget is an emergency. She feels that we will have those individuals who are able to talk about a variety of issues together in one room. We have all representation in some ways here within this group and it is necessary to talk about various perspectives and spend more time than a group of this size can adequately do. Also, because that committee grew out of discussion among all people throughout the campus and was not something that was done in a week or two months but emerged after multiple discussions over a period of multiple months, it has that degree of support that probably is not present for other kinds of processes.

Mr. Patton responded that if decisions were made that way, it would only be natural that each group protect its own interests. The committee charged with making cuts only wants to look at it globally. If you ask for names or positions, those committees have always said it is not their job to do so. So the process we are going through where administratively we look at the overall impact and try and figure out how best we can provide the services for the College and make those recommendations at planning councils is a much more effective way than having employee groups decide, because it is going to be one group against the other where no group will agree to cut from their own.

Dr. Amador is open to any group who would like to approach her with an offer to make cuts or limit benefits as a unit. However, the only suggestions she has received have been cuts in someone else's department,

not theirs. Faculty Senate is the only group that has come forward to say how their area is going to contribute to the cut.

Ms Dowd supports where we are and is comfortable with the criteria. The processes are administrative. The “how” needs to be done in consultation with the planning groups. But the President and Vice Presidents are the ones who will be held accountable for any decisions made. Others are not equipped with access or information and are not the ones who will be accountable. Although she and other Faculty Senate members did not endorse the entire aspect of the criteria, they did recognize the necessity for it. She would like to use the criteria and trust the process.

Members voted to enact the plan, with the exception of Drinan, Dimmick, and Millet who were opposed.

Dr. Amador addressed the issue of rumors. She mentioned a few of them, such as all student hiring is frozen, all ADAs will lose their jobs, and 15 administrators are going to Hawaii for a conference, and said that none of them were true. It is not the role of this group to spread rumors but to stop them; and if you do not know the answer, get correct information.

C. ACTION ITEMS/FIRST READING

This item was removed from the agenda because it relates to the reorganization and operation of the Governing Board. It is not something that this group can determine.

D. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Dr. Vernoy gave an update on the district structure. **(Exhibit D1)** Master plans for all departments are being worked on. The Governing Board passed a motion to look at a new district structure to include a new campus and center in either the northern or southern part of the district. A draft of a summary of the educational plan has been written. It is located on the internet at www.palomar.edu/masterplan. The basis for most of the plans for departments and disciplines was done with the faculty groups or classified who talked to the consultant and indicated their needs and how their department would grow. The next meeting is set for Thursday, February 6 from 1-3 p.m. in the Governing Board room. Visitors are welcome if they want to hear about the district structure plan.

Ms. Lutz distributed handouts reflecting the reorganization of Instruction. A decision was made to not go ahead with a new divisional dean. Instead, the area was restructured. Workload was evenly distributed, some management positions were consolidated, some divisions were moved around and some management positions were eliminated. All changes will be effective July 1. The departments have agreed and are fully supportive of the changes.

E. REPORTS OF PLANNING COUNCILS

1. Administrative Services Planning Council

The meeting was cancelled in order to get recommendations to give to the council.

2. Human Resource Services Planning Council

The council spent time on the impacts of the budget cuts and how it affects student services. They discussed the process to hire an hourly, classified person and implementation of same.

3. Instructional Planning Council

Besides reorganization, they also discussed budget implications.

4. Student Services Planning Council – There was no report

F. REPORTS OF CONSTITUENCIES

1. Administrative Association

Mollie Smith reported that Maria Miller has offered to help anyone who wants to update their resume. Last Thursday, the Administrative Association met with Dr. Amador and Dr. Miyamoto. They were told that, as a precautionary measure, all administrators will receive a March 15 notice. Everyone will be notified by June 30 whether or not they will be working after July 1.

2. Associated Student Government

Leo Melena reported that students are continuing their efforts in response to the potential budget cuts. Over 1,000 letters have been sent to Sacramento, Mr. Wyland, and Mr. Morrow. He spoke personally to Mr. Wyland and while he was not positive, he was insightful on the way things worked. A press conference was held last Thursday which was published in the North County Times and Union-Tribune. ASG is co-sponsoring a book signing by Jan Bertocini Mitchell, the widow of a past student, Lt. James McNally, who gave his life in defense of our country. ASG is planning a retreat on campus to bring new members up to speed and talk about the objectives and mission of ASG.

3. Confidential/Supervisory Team – There was no report.**4. CCE/AFT**

Mr. Dimmick reported that he attended a conference in Sacramento last Tuesday on behalf of CTS. He met with the Governor's office and spoke to Senate members. The Assembly was in session but he did speak to their staff.

5. Faculty Senate

Chris Barkley reported that the Senate made several appointments to committees. The Agenda will continue to be sent out on paper; however, everything else will be electronic, including minutes. They will appoint the remaining openings for committee members as soon as possible.

6. PFF/AFT

Mary Millet reported that she also attended the CFT conference where some resolutions were passed. One of them required money, so she participated in a session that spoke of how we can accomplish things without asking for more money. There were some valuable things brought forward which faculty can use. She was encouraged to see so many forces at work to help alleviate problems regarding the budget crisis.

7. The Faculty

Chris Barkley reported that Nancy Galli has resigned as Faculty President, and they are in the process of electing a new President. If that person chooses not to sit on SPC, it will be requested that the Faculty report be taken off the agendas.

G. PENDING ITEMS

The pending items were briefly explained.

1. Proposed BP 1100 – The Palomar Community College District

No comments

2. Proposed BP 1200 – District Mission

No comments

3. Committees with Administrative Association/CAST Representatives

No comments

4. Proposed Change – Revenue Allocation Committee

The Faculty Senate felt that there was an inconsistency in the way in which it is presented and that the reporting relationship was not identified. They recognize that RAC is unique in that it doesn't report to SPC but thought it important to state that RAC advises SPC of revenue estimates, and reviews SPC priorities, and allocate funding to show that it works with SPC on those particular items. Faculty Senate would like representation on all governance committees. The Senate asked Ms. Barkley to generate a list of all the governance committees and find out what their representation is. It may be that the Senate will make a recommendation for seven faculty members. Dr. Amador requested it be put into writing and submitted to Mr. Patton.

5. Proposed Change – Safety and Security Committee

No comments

6. Proposed Change – Facilities Planning Committee.

The Faculty Senate may ask for seven representatives for committees. Dr. Amador brought up the fact that the Senate already has a problem filling the existing committees and questions if they discussed the logic of adding more in light of this. She would like the Senate to at least fill the committees they are presently on before discussing adding more. Dr. Amador is committed to have the faculty voice. When there is a committee waiting for the faculty voice it really holds them up.

7. Proposed Change – Bookstore Advisory Committee

No comments

H. OTHER ITEMS

It was mentioned that the Faculty Senate endorsed Ms. Barton's document from the last meeting, where she had requested members take it back to their constituencies.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Budget Cut Criteria and Implementation Plan
Unrestricted General Fund
Mid Year 2002-2003
Budget Year 2003-04

Criteria

- Assure the solvency and fiscal integrity of the District.
- Minimize impact on students enrolled in classes.
- Maintain adequate student services.
- Maintain the diversity of the educational programs.
- Minimize expenses for outreach.
- Maintain facilities and continue current facilities projects only to minimize future expensive costs.
- Meet State mandated requirements.
- Meet State growth goals.
- Maintain and support necessary staff.
- Maintain safety and health requirements for students and staff.
- Consider function and program needs using data and information before recommending cuts.
- Evaluate and eliminate redundancies in programs and services
- Other

Mid Year 2002-03 (January – June)

- Enforce consistently and strictly minimum class size guidelines.
- Fill/replace only necessary vacant positions.
- Use reorganization and attrition as much as possible to reduce staff (March 15/30 day notices) to achieve efficiencies.
- Limit expenditures in all budget accounts (vice president approval).
- Limit general fund equipment purchases to emergencies (vice president approval).
- Use designated lottery funds for instructional supply expenditures.
- Review board reserve policy of 5% of previous year's expenditure.
- Begin new projects only if they meet criteria identified above and will result in long term benefit that outweighs short term costs.
- Other

Budget Year 2003-04

- Enforce consistently and strictly minimum class size guidelines.
- Use reorganization and attrition as much as possible to reduce staff (March 15/30 day notices) to achieve efficiencies.
- Fill only those 2001-02 faculty positions approved and considered critical. Do not fill 14 faculty positions on 2003-04 priority list. Do not fill faculty vacancies created through retirements unless considered critical.
- Limit expenditures in all budget accounts (vice president approval).
- Limit general fund equipment purchases to emergencies (vice president approval).
- Use designated lottery funds for instructional supply expenditures.
- Begin new projects only if meets criteria above and will result in long term benefit that outweighs short term costs.
- Other

