



STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL AGENDA

Date: November 2, 2004
Starting Time: 2:00 p.m.
Ending Time: 4:00 p.m.
Place: SU-18

CHAIR: Richard Jones

MEMBERS: Akins, Barton, Bishop, Charas, Cuaron, Dimmick, Dowd, Frady, Gordon, Halttunen, Ivey, Jay, Kelber, Kovrig, Madrigal, McCluskey, Miyamoto, Newmyer, Owens, Snow, Snyder, Townsend-Merino, Versaci, Waite

RECORDER: Ashour

	Attachments	Time
A. <u>MINUTES</u>		2 min
1. Approve Minutes of October 19, 2004		
B. <u>ACTION ITEMS/SECOND READING</u>		10 min
1. Administrative Services Planning Council Recommendation	ExhibitB1	
C. <u>ACTION ITEMS/FIRST READING</u>		20 min
1. Writing Team for Accreditation Progress Report		
D. <u>DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ITEMS</u>		30 min
1. FTES Analysis	Exhibit D1	
2. Institutional Review	Exhibit D2	
E. <u>REPORTS OF PLANNING COUNCILS</u>		15 min.
1. Administrative Services Planning Council – Joe Newmyer		
2. Human Resource Services Planning Council – Jack Miyamoto		
3. Instructional Planning Council – Berta Cuaron		
4. Student Services Planning Council – Joe Madrigal		
F. <u>REPORTS OF CONSTITUENCIES</u>		10 min.
1. Administrative Association – Ken Jay		
2. Associated Student Government – Paul Charas/Neil Kovrig		
3. Confidential/Supervisory Team – Jenny Akins		
4. CCE/AFT – Becky McCluskey		
5. Faculty Senate – Katie Merino		
6. PFF/AFT – Rocco Versaci/Julie Ivey		
G. <u>PENDING ITEMS</u>		
1. Library Rename		
H. <u>OTHER ITEMS</u>		



**STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
November 2, 2004**

A regular meeting of the Palomar College Strategic Planning Council was held on Tuesday, November 2, 2004, in SU-18. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Dr. Richard Jones.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Jenny Akins, Michelle Barton, Bruce Bishop, Berta Cuaron, Sue Doran, Bonnie Dowd, Patricia Frady, Sherry Gordon, Julie Ivey, Ken Jay, Richard Jones, Barbara Kelber, Becky McCluskey, Jack Miyamoto, Joe Newmyer, Wilma Owens, Susan Snow, Katie Townsend-Merino, Rocco Versaci
Members Absent: Paul Charas, Mike Dimmick, Lynda Halttunen, Neill Kovrig, Joe Madrigal
Recorder: Cheryl Ashour
Guests: Herman Lee for Joe Madrigal

A. MINUTES

1. Approve the Minutes of October 19, 2004

MSC to approve the Minutes of October 19, 2004 as revised

B. ACTION ITEMS/SECOND READING

1. Administrative Services Planning Council Recommendation

Mike Ellis explained that three separate firms have submitted proposals to install a cell tower on Palomar College property. **(Exhibit B1)** Each company would pay a \$20,000 upfront fee and \$2,000 a month thereafter. One of the sites is 150 feet away from a home. Concern was expressed about making sure that the district be a "good neighbor" so Mr. Ellis was asked to send a letter to neighbors prior to installation. The Governing Board will be notified that a letter will be going out before the letter is sent.

MSC (Bishop/Jay) to approve installation of the three cell towers with the understanding that the College will work with the vendor to send a letter, approved by the Governing Board, to neighboring homeowners notifying them of the installation and providing an opportunity for feedback. (1 day)

Discussion ensued on the issue of where the money generated from the cell towers will go – to the Facilities department or the general fund. Everyone agreed that Facilities is under funded and needs additional funding to run effectively. Some felt the money should go to the general fund and let Fiscal Stability Task Force resolve the under funding issue as part of the planning process. Others felt that Facilities should receive the money until the under funding issue is resolved. It was reported that planning process was followed when Administrative Services Planning Council approved the cell tower recommendation prior to bringing it to SPC. It was pointed out that at least eight other departments generate their own funds. Most are instructional departments and they are allowed to keep the funds for their operation rather than going to the general fund.

MS (Gordon/Owens) to give Facilities the upfront fee of \$20,000 for each cell tower with the ongoing \$2,000 per month revenue for each tower to go to the general fund.

MSC (Bishop/Dowd) to amend the motion to allow Facilities to receive the monthly payments for the first year, in addition to the upfront money. (11 aye, 6 nay)

AMENDED MSC (Bishop/Dowd) to give Facilities the upfront fee of \$20,000 for each cell tower in addition to the ongoing monthly money for the first year only and let Fiscal Stability Task Force resolve the under funding issue as part of the planning process as to how funds should be dealt with in the future. (11 aye, 6 nay)

C. ACTION ITEMS/FIRST READING

1. Writing Team or Accreditation Progress Report

Dr. Jones stated that based upon the recommendations by the Accrediting Commission, the following departments should be part of the writing team: Human Resource Services, Faculty Senate President, one additional faculty member, Faculty Co-Chair from the Learning Outcomes Council, President of the CCE, Director of Research, Vice President of Instruction (who is our official accreditation liaison), and the Vice President of Administrative Services, and the President.

Berta Cuaron distributed a letter from the Accrediting Commission outlining the six subjects that need to be addressed by April 1, 2005. Tremendous work has already been done on many of these areas. It is now time for the writing team to meet and write a draft. Once the individuals are identified who will participate on the writing team, a meeting day and time will be decided. It was decided that recommendations will be brought to the next SPC meeting (November 16).

D. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ITEMS

1. FTES Analysis

Herman Lee distributed and discussed a FTES analysis as of October 5, 2004. He discussed the ending balance for FY 03-04 and compared it to the projected FY 04-05. (Exhibit D1)

2. Institutional Review

Sara Thompson distributed and discussed the 2003-2004 annual report from the Institutional Review Committee (IRC). The planning councils were going to develop questions to be included in institutional review, or emphasize things they wish institutional review to focus on. The IRC is still lacking the questions from the councils. She stated it appears that many people do not understand how institutional review is used. IRC needs feedback on how planning councils are using the information. She requested that she be invited to the planning councils to talk about institutional review. Because of time constraints Dr. Jones requested that Ms. Thompson come back to the next meeting to discuss institutional review further. (Exhibit D2)

E. REPORTS OF PLANNING COUNCILS

1. Administrative Services Planning Council - No report

2. Human Resource Services Planning Council - No report

3. Instructional Planning Council - No report

4. Student Services Planning Council

Herman Lee reported that John Woods did a presentation on the Palomar Mentor's Program. The program has been granted \$5,000 from Matriculation and Transfer Advisory Council. Bruce Bishop did a presentation on the Food Services Advisory Committee. The Committee meetings are held on the third Wednesday of each month at 2:00 p.m. Everyone is invited to attend. They will be addressing the long lines in the cafeteria. Mr. Bishop also did a presentation on the Bookstore Advisory Committee. They meet the third Monday of each month at 2:00 p.m. Mr. Bishop urges faculty participation, especially input regarding ordering textbooks.

Barbara Kelber stated she heard in a Faculty Senate report that, as a cost saving measure, no food will be available between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. Mr. Lee responded that concerns should be expressed to the Food Services Advisory Committee. Ms. Kelber stated she is on record that she has concerns about this change because of the effect it would have on our evening students. Dr. Jones requested that Mr. Madrigal find out if Java City is included in the closure.

F. REPORTS OF CONSTITUENCIES

1. **Administrative Association** - No report
2. **Associated Student Government** - No report
3. **Confidential/Supervisory Team** - No report
4. **CCE/AFT** - No report
5. **Faculty Senate** - No report
6. **PFF/AFT** - No report

G. PENDING ITEMS

1. Library Rename

H. ADJOURNMENT

There being no remaining items, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

ASPC Recommendation to SPC

First Reading/Approval of Concept

On March 11, 2004 the Administrative Services Planning Council voted to authorize Mike Ellis to begin negotiations with three cellular phone services proposing to install cellular antennas/ towers in the Facilities Department compound. Additionally the Council agreed that the Facilities Department is entitled to receive the income generated from the site rentals to be used to facilities improvement projects.

Mike reported at the September 23, 2004 ASPC meeting that the two cell services (Nextel and Cingular) requesting to install sites in the Facilities area are offering \$2,000 a month and \$20,000 up front. (These amounts are actually a little higher than the standard.). The third service, Verizon, has not yet agreed on the price.

The Contracts and Fiscal Departments have reviewed the preliminary agreements. There will be a final review of the agreements by counsel before forwarding to the Governing Board for final approval.

Ex B.I.b.

Ashour, Cheryl

From: Ellis, Mike
t: Wednesday, October 27, 2004 3:51 PM
to: Hudson Macisaac, Kelley; Ashour, Cheryl
Subject: RE: Cell Towers

Cheryl,

The information on the cellular antennas is as follows:

Site Number	Company	Nearest House	Nearest Sidewalk
1	Cingular	150 feet	200 feet
2	Nextel	650 feet	adjacent to Parking Lot 9
			100 ft to sidewalk
3	Verizon	350 feet	250 feet

Please let me know if you have any other questions. Thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: Hudson Macisaac, Kelley
Sent: Wednesday, October 27, 2004 2:34 PM
To: Ellis, Mike
Subject: Cell Towers

Mike,

Cheryl Ashour called to let us know that the cell tower issue will be on the SPC agenda for a second reading. The information that the council would like is:

How far away are the towers from the nearest house? How far away are they from student paths? I told her you would probably be at that meeting?

The next meeting is November 2nd at 2pm in SU-18.

Kelley

Kelley Hudson MacIsaac
Manager, Facilities Planning/ EH&S
Palomar Community College
kmacisaac@palomar.edu
760 744 1150 x2772

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1			9/29/2004		10/5/2004	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5
2			FY03-04		FY04-05	FY04-05	FY04-05	FY04-05	FY04-05	FY04-05
			Amend Ann		Projection	-1.00%	-2.00%	-3.00%	-4.00%	-5.00%
4	WSCH		13,205.71		13,263.37					
5	DSCH		954.00		997.13					
6	IS & Wk Exp		613.00		622.73					
7	Actual									
8	Credit PA		499.36		487.00					
9	Noncredit PA		1,453.46		1,453.46					
10	Summer 2002									
11	Credit									
12	Noncredit									
13	Summer 2003									
14	Credit		1,632.73							
15	Noncredit		309.07							
16	Summer 2004									
17	Credit				1,755.53					
18	Noncredit				331.21					
19	TOTALS									
20	Credit		16,904.80		17,125.76	16,735.75	16,566.70	16,397.66	16,228.61	16,059.56
21	wildfire adj		3.55							
22	f-factor		82.81		40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00
23	Concurrent PE		(11.26)							
24	TOTAL Credit		16,979.90		17,165.76	16,775.75	16,606.70	16,437.66	16,268.61	16,099.56
25	Noncredit		1,762.53						-	-
26	wildfire adj		35.72							
27	TOTAL Noncredit		1,798.25		1,798.25	1,798.25	1,798.25	1,798.25	1,798.25	1,798.25
28	Grand Total		18,778.15		18,964.01	18,574.00	18,404.95	18,235.91	18,066.86	17,897.81
29										
30										
31	CAP ANALYSIS & VARIANCES									
32										
33					GROWTH RATE					
34	Growth Rate		0.00%		4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%		
35	Deficit Factor		0.00%		84.64%	84.64%	84.64%	84.64%		
36	New Rate		2.73%		3.39%	3.39%	3.39%	3.39%		
37										
38					CREDIT FTES					
39	Credit CAP**		17,166.98		17,554.74	17,554.74	17,554.74	17,554.74	17,554.74	17,554.74
40	Line 23 above		16,979.90		17,165.76	16,775.75	16,606.70	16,437.66	16,268.61	16,099.56
41	Over/(Under)		(187.08)		(388.98)	(778.99)	(948.04)	(1,117.09)	(1,286.13)	(1,455.18)
42										
43					NON-CREDIT FTES					
44	Noncredit CAP**		1,647.99		1,859.13	1,859.13	1,859.13	1,859.13		
45	Line 26 above		1,798.25		1,798.25	1,798.25	1,798.25	1,798.25		
46	Over/(Under)		114.54		(60.88)	(60.88)	(60.88)	(60.88)		
47										
48										
49										

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1			9/29/2004		11/2/2004	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
2			FY03-04		FY04-05	FY04-05	FY04-05	FY04-05
3			Amend Ann		Projection	-1.00%	-2.00%	-3.00%
4	WSCH		13,205.71		13,325.03			
5	DSCH		954.00		1,003.24			
6	IS & Wk Exp		613.00		622.73			
7	Actual							
8	Credit PH		499.36		487.00			
9	Noncredit PH		1,453.46		1,453.46			
10	Summer 2002							
11	Credit							
12	Noncredit PH							
13	Summer 2003							
14	Credit		1,632.73					
15	Noncredit PH		309.07					
16	Summer 2004							
17	Credit				1,755.53			
18	Noncredit PH				331.21			
19	TOTALS							
20	Credit		16,904.80		17,193.53	16,735.75	16,566.70	16,397.66
21	wildfire adj		3.55					
22	f-factor		82.81		40.00	40.00	40.00	40.00
23	Concurrent PE		(11.26)					
24	TOTAL Credit		16,979.90		17,233.53	16,775.75	16,606.70	16,437.66
25	Noncredit		1,762.53					
26	wildfire adj		35.72					
27	TOTAL Noncredit		1,798.25		1,798.25	1,798.25	1,798.25	1,798.25
28	Grand Total		18,778.15		19,031.78	18,574.00	18,404.95	18,235.91
29								
30								
31	CAP ANALYSIS & VARIANCES							
32								
33					GROWTH RATE			
34	Growth Rate		0.00%		4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%
35	Deficit Factor		0.00%		84.64%	84.64%	84.64%	84.64%
36	New Rate		2.73%		3.39%	3.39%	3.39%	3.39%
37								
38					CREDIT FTES			
39	Credit CAP**		17,166.98		17,554.74	17,554.74	17,554.74	17,554.74
40	Line 23 above		16,979.90		17,233.53	16,775.75	16,606.70	16,437.66
41	Over/(Under)		(187.08)		(321.21)	(778.99)	(948.04)	(1,117.09)
42								
43					NON-CREDIT FTES			
44	Noncredit CAP**		1,647.99		1,859.13	1,859.13	1,859.13	1,859.13
45	Line 26 above		1,798.25		1,798.25	1,798.25	1,798.25	1,798.25
46	Over/(Under)		114.54		(60.88)	(60.88)	(60.88)	(60.88)

To: Strategic Planning Council
 From: Institutional Review Committee
 Date: May 12, 2004
 Subject: 2003-2004 Annual Report

The institutional review process has been completed for this year. The Committee again applauds the faculty, staff, and administration for the exceptional work they do on behalf of our students. A tremendous amount of effort was again spent in the institutional review process. All participants in this process deserve recognition for their efforts.

Summary of Committee Activities

1. Revision of the role of institutional review in the governance structure

The role of the committee and its place in the governance structure were changed by the Strategic Planning Council at its meeting of December 2, 2003. The new role of the committee is to develop the models, methodology, and processes by which all programs and services at Palomar College are reviewed on an annual basis to evaluate their efficiency, effectiveness, and alignment with the Strategic Plan, Educational and Facilities Master Plan and those institution-wide plans to be developed in the future. The committee develops specific criteria and procedures by which individual programs, functions, and services are evaluated. It works with the appropriate staff to develop criteria, gather data, and coordinate reviews for the Planning Councils.

The committee now is responsible for two products: training pertinent to institutional review and procedures, criteria, and tools relating to the evaluation of all District functions and activities. The committee reports to the Strategic Planning Council for role, process, and annual update. It reports to the planning councils for its products.

The membership was changed to¹:

- Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services (or designee)
- Vice President for Human Resources (or designee)
- Vice President for Instruction (or designee)
- Vice President for Student Services (or designee)
- Seven Faculty Members representing divisions, library, or student services, appointed by the Faculty Senate
- Two Classified Unit Employees appointed by CCE/AFT
- One Administrative Association Member appointed by Administrative Association
- One Confidential and Supervisory Team Member appointed by CAST
- Director of Institutional Research and Planning (or designee)
- One Student appointed by ASG
- Faculty Co-Chair of the Curriculum Committee

¹ http://www.palomar.edu/strategicplanning/Governance_Structure_Book.pdf

2. Revision of the institutional review process

This is the first year the review featured the simplified, expertise-based institutional review process. The new process is vastly simpler, is expertise-based, and data receives greater attention than in previous reviews. It is linked to the strategic planning process, includes all constituencies at all stages of the review process, and incorporates review of all college operations. The process also has clear accountability for addressing review recommendations.

Planning Council. The revised process begins with the planning councils. Each council develops questions it would like to add to the review and adopts standards for evaluation of the questions.

Department. At the department level, the department chair, manager, or director is responsible for coordinating the annual review and writing the self-study. The review and self-study are to be developed with the participation of department faculty, staff, and (when appropriate) students.

The process of institutional review is designed to be an opportunity for the department to collectively self-evaluate their effectiveness and progress towards previously set goals. It should be an opportunity to think about ways the department can improve and re-evaluate their direction and objectives. The department will use standards agreed upon by the Planning Council to analyze, review, and summarize department/program goals and progress in the areas of: institutional effectiveness; program needs and status; and student learning outcomes assessment, planning, and implementation.

The department chairperson is responsible for writing a two- to three-page document summarizing the results of the program review and progress in student learning outcomes assessment, planning, and implementation. This document is forwarded to the dean or administrative program director and an electronic copy is sent to the Institutional Review Committee to be posted online.

Division or Administrative Program. The dean or administrative program director is responsible for conducting the annual review of the self-study documents and preparing an executive summary. The review and summary are to be developed with the participation of the department chairs/directors, a classified staff representative, and a representative from another area/division.

The area summary (executive summaries) of completed departmental program reviews should summarize departmental reviews, analyze and evaluate progress in the areas of: institutional effectiveness; program needs and status; and student learning outcomes assessment planning and implementation. The summary should also evaluate progress against institutional and program effectiveness standards established by the planning councils. Finally the summary should make appropriate recommendations for each program.

The dean or administrative program director is responsible for writing the summary document of the area's review. The executive summary is forwarded to the planning council and an electronic copy is sent to the Institutional Review Committee to be posted online. Department chairs/directors are responsible for communicating the outcome and recommendations back to their departments.

Planning Council. The vice president is responsible for working with their planning council to establish additional institutional effectiveness standards for institutional review and to incorporate the results of institutional review into the strategic planning process. Deans and administrative program directors are responsible for communicating the outcome and results back to their departments and for assuring that review recommendations are followed-up.

Strategic Planning Council. The Superintendent/President works with the Strategic Planning Council to incorporate the institutional review recommendations into the college strategic planning process. The vice presidents are responsible for communicating SPC actions related to institutional review to their areas and for following up on recommendations.

3. 2003-04 Annual Review

Institutional Review Committee worked with the Office of Institutional Research and Planning to develop a standardized data set². The data set included quantitative data from fall 2002 for each instructional program and instructional department. The data set also included financial data from FY 2003-04 for all college departments.

A total of 117 institutional review self-studies were submitted in 2003-2004 and have been posted on the committee's SharePoint website, <http://sharepoint.palomar.edu/ir/>.

Feedback was solicited from the College community at the committee's April 2004 meeting.

Process Recommendations to improve institutional review:

- Clarify how institutional review data will be and is being used by councils
- Include the standard load report for the first day of fall intersession in the quantitative data provided to departments and programs.
- Clarify the relationship between institutional review and the planning, budgeting, and student learning outcomes processes.
- Retain the brevity of the process
- Planning councils need to develop one or two questions to focus the review next year.
- Suggested IRC Process Timeline:

² The data set included fall 2002 enrollment, WSCH, FTES, FTEF (contract, hourly, and overload), WSCH/FTEF, student retention rate, and student success rate, all taken from the CCFS-320 Apportionment Attendance Report. Financial data was provided on the hourly budgets (sum of 230010 and 240010 budget pools) and discretionary accounts (sum of 400010, 500010, and 600010 budget pools). Financial data are from the PeopleSoft Budget Lookup query for FY 2003-04.

Date	Item	Responsible Person
September 21	SPC establishes annual implementation plan	Chairperson SPC
September 21	Planning Councils establish division's annual program review guidelines	Chairperson Planning Council
September 22	Questions due back to the IRC	Chairperson Planning Councils
September 23	Mail Review Packet to Departments	IRC
October 4	Programs complete reviews	Department Chairperson
October 13	Divisions and Directors complete reviews and develop executive summaries with recommendations	Division Dean or Program Director
November 15	Planning Councils complete reviews and develop executive summaries with recommendations	Chairperson Planning Council
December 7	SPC completes reviews, makes recommendations and forwards any resource issues to Revenue Allocation Committee	Chairperson SPC
February 1	Review recommendations returned to departments	Chairperson SPC
February 1	Revenue Allocation Committee acts on SPC recommendations	Chairperson RAC
February 22	Notifications of resource allocations made to departments	Chairperson RAC
March 2	Departments submit budget documents including altered resource allocations	Department Chairperson

- Given that the goal of this process is to improve programs and services to students, councils should develop self-study questions that focus on an area of importance to focus institutional attention and to encourage improvement.
- Continue to collect data that can be used in the future to identify trends in programs and services.

2003-2004 Committee Membership

Member	Representing
Tom Plotts	Administrative Association
Vacant	CCE/AFT
Chris Hall	CCE/AFT
Lisa Cecere	Faculty
Deborah Dozier	Faculty
Bruce Gan	Faculty
Beth Lowe (Co-chair)	Faculty
Lori Waite	Faculty
Vacant	Faculty
Vacant	Faculty
Ken Jay	VP Finance and Administrative Services
Nancy Horio	VP Human Resource Services
Mike Rourke (Co-Chair)	VP Instruction
Jayne Conway	VP Student Services
Jasper Sabile	ASG
Diane Cummins	CAST
Michelle Barton	Director Institutional Research and Planning
Vacant	Curriculum Committee Faculty Co-chair

