



## STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL AGENDA

Date: May 1, 2007  
Starting Time: 2:00 p.m.  
Ending Time: 3:45 p.m.  
Place: SU-18

**CHAIR:** Deegan

**MEMBERS:** Barton, Bishop, Colwell, Cuaron, Doran, Dowd, Eichelberger, Faulkner, Fernandez, Frady, Gowen, Halttunen, Hogan-Egkan, Ivey, Lienhart, Madrigal, McCluskey, Miller, O'Brien, Owens, Park, Plotts, Tortarolo

**RECORDER:** Ashour

	Attachments	Time
<b>A. <u>MINUTES</u></b>		5 min.
1. Approve Minutes of April 17, 2007		
<b>B. <u>ACTION ITEMS/SECOND READING</u></b>		30 min.
1. Chapters 1 & 2, Policies & Procedures	Exhibit B1	
2. Academic Calendar 2008-2009	Exhibit B2	
3. Staff Development & Training Governance Structure Form	Exhibit B3	
<b>C. <u>ACTION ITEMS/FIRST READING</u></b>		10 min.
1. Holiday Scheduled 2007-2008	Exhibit C1	
2. Winter Holiday Schedule 2007-2008; 2008-2009; and 2009-2010	Exhibit C2	
<b>D. <u>DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ITEMS</u></b>		15 min.
1. Grants Review Process	Exhibit D1	
2. Shared Governance Evaluation	Exhibit D2	
3. Annual Implementation Plan May Update		
4. Student Grade Dispute Procedure	Exhibit D4	
5. 75/25 Workgroup	Exhibit D5	
<b>E. <u>REPORTS OF PLANNING COUNCILS</u></b>		15 min.
1. Administrative Services Planning Council – Bonnie Ann Dowd		
2. Human Resource Services Planning Council – John Tortarolo		
3. Instructional Planning Council – Berta Cuaron		
4. Student Services Planning Council – Joe Madrigal		
<b>F. <u>REPORT FROM RAC</u></b>		10 min
<b>G. <u>REPORT FROM TRC</u></b>		
<b>H. <u>REPORTS OF CONSTITUENCIES</u></b>		15min.
1. Administrative Association – Tom Plotts		
2. Associated Student Government – Michelle Eichelberger		
3. Confidential/Supervisory Team – Chris Miller		
4. CCE/AFT – Becky McCluskey		
5. Faculty Senate – Brent Gowen		
6. PFF/AFT – Shannon Lienhart/Julie Ivey		
<b>I. <u>OTHER ITEMS</u></b>		



**STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL  
MEETING MINUTES  
May 1, 2007**

The regular meeting of the Palomar College Strategic Planning Council was held on Tuesday, May 1, 2007, in SU-18. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Robert Deegan.

**ROLL CALL**

Members Present: Barton, Bishop, Cuaron, Doran, Eichelberger, Faulkner, Fernandez, Gowen, Halttunen, Hogan-Egkan, Ivey, Lienhart, Madrigal, McCluskey, Miller, O'Brien, Owens, Park, Tortarolo  
Recorder: Cheryl Ashour  
Members Absent: Robert Deegan, Bonnie Ann Dowd, Tricia Frady, Tom Plotts

**A. MINUTES**

**1. Approve Minutes of April 17, 2007**

MSC (Gowen/Ivey) to approve the Minutes of April 17, 2007 with revisions

**B. ACTION ITEMS/SECOND READING**

**1. Chapter 2, Policies & Procedures (Exhibit B1)**

There were no revisions to Chapter 1. Changes made at the last meeting to Chapter 2 of the Policies & Procedures were reviewed.

MSC Gowen/O'Brien to approve Policies and Procedures, Chapters 1 and 2 as noted with corrections

**2. Academic Calendar 2008-2009 (Exhibit B2)**

It was requested that the Part Time Plenary dates of August 21, 2007, and January 15, 2008, be added to the calendar.

MSC Tortarolo/Halttunen to approve the Academic Calendar 2008-2009 as noted with correction.

**3. Staff Development & Training Governance Structure Form (Exhibit B3)**

There was no discussion.

MSC O'Brien/Owens to approve the Staff Development and Training Governance Structure Form.

**C. ACTION ITEMS/FIRST READING**

**1. Holiday Schedule 2007-2008 (Exhibit C1)**

MSC Tortarolo/Owens to move to second reading

There was no discussion.

MSC Gowen/Faulkner to approve the Holiday Schedule 2007-2008

**2. Winter Holiday Schedule 2007-2008; 2008-2009; and 2009-2010 (Exhibit C2)**

MSC Tortarolo/Gowen to move to second reading

There was no discussion.

MSC Gowen/Faulkner to approve the Holiday Schedule 2007-2008; 2008-2009; and 2009-2010

**D. DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ITEMS****1. Grants Review Process (Exhibit D1)**

One of the objectives of the Annual Implementation Plan was to develop and implement a process for submitting, approving, and managing grants. A Grants Review Workgroup was formed. They researched the grants process of other community colleges in California, as well as outside the state. They reviewed the processes in place at Palomar for managing and submitting grants.

Michelle Barton distributed and discussed the recommendations from the Grants Review Workgroup. The Workgroup identified five items that would be important for Palomar, if Palomar was to move forward in establishing or focusing on securing funds. Ms. Barton discussed three recommendations the Workgroup made to seek out and obtain grant funding that could be used to help support our students and their success.

**2. Shared Governance Evaluation (Exhibit D2)**

Michelle Barton discussed the results of the self-evaluation sent to the members of the Strategic Planning Council, as well as the other planning councils. The self evaluation is used to seek feedback and input on how we can make this process better, as well as celebrate some of the successes and strengths. Ms. Barton presented a summary of the overall governance evaluation.

It was requested that the survey be on-line in the future, instead of paper-based.

**3. Annual Implementation Plan May Update**

This item was tabled until September 4, 2007.

**4. Student Grade Dispute Procedure (Exhibit D4)**

Brent Gowen announced that the Academics Standards and Practice Committee of the Faculty Senate drew up a Student Grade Dispute policy and procedures. The Senate recognized the need for a student grade appeal procedure separate from the student grievance procedure.

He distributed and discussed the document. Mr. Gowen requested that SPC members email any responses to him. The policy and procedures will go to the Faculty Senate for approval.

**5. 75/25 Workgroup (Exhibit D5)**

Brent Gowen reported that the Faculty Senate and the PFF have invited the District to join them in a workgroup to come up with a plan for pursuing the goal of 75% full-time faculty and 25% part-time faculty. The workgroup will meet over the summer.

Shannon Lienhart distributed and discussed a report she put together, using data from the Chancellor's office, regarding faculty full-time equivalent and the 2006 Fiscal Data Abstract.

**E. REPORTS OF PLANNING COUNCILS****1. Administrative Services Planning Council – no report****2. Human Resource Services Planning Council**

John Tortarolo reported that HRSPC discussed the Human Resource Services 5-year staffing plan. They plan to review their Council's evaluation at their next meeting.

**3. Instructional Planning Council**

Berta Cuaron reported that IPC met last week. They approved three requests from departments looking to use the 75/25 monies which were previously set aside. An update on enrollment FTES for this academic year was given. Information on the budget received from RAC and the initial draft of institutional review were discussed. Ms. Cuaron distributed and discussed with IPC the research study on basic skills from the State System Office.

**4. Student Services Planning Council**

Joseph Madrigal reported that SSPC met April 25. They discussed the Campus Police Committee membership. They approved an additional faculty member and ASG representative. This will bring the number of faculty members from two to three, and the number of ASG representative from one to two. The committee will recommend to the Faculty Senate that the faculty member appointed to the Campus Police Committee be a counselor. The Campus Police Committee Governance Structure will come to SPC in the fall for approval. Bruce Bishop reported to SSPC that Aramark is in negotiations with the District for a new contract. The College policy on alcohol on campus was discussed.

**F. RESOURCE ALLOCATION COUNCIL – no report****G. REPORT FROM TECHNOLOGY RESOURCE COMMITTEE – no report****H. REPORTS OF CONSTITUENCIES****1. PFF/AFT**

Shannon Lienhart reported that PFF is still in negotiations with the District. She reported that PFF filed a grievance on the grade change issue. They are also concerned about a faculty investigation. Ms. Lienhart discussed Governing Board agenda procedure. She requested that SPC discuss at the next meeting that SPC be able to view and discuss Governing Board agenda items prior to the item appearing on the agenda. Ms. Cuaron will bring this request to President Deegan.

**2. Faculty Senate**

Brent Gowen reported that the Faculty Senate, at their next meeting, will review the institutional review forms. He mentioned that the Faculty Senate voted to make part time faculty members eligible to serve on committees. They are reviewing the committee list to make sure there would not be a conflict of interest if a part time faculty member were to serve on a given committee. They discussed accreditation and academic due process. Learning Outcomes Council will be discussing moving forward with an Honors Program.

**3. CCE/AFT**

Becky McCluskey stated that she agrees with PFF that there should be a discussion at SPC regarding Governing Board Agenda items being reviewed by SPC prior to the item being put on the agenda.

**4. Associated Student Government**

Michelle Eichelberger reported that ASG attended the Statewide Conference where Region 10 ratified their constitution. ASG elections are being held May 7-10. She thanked everyone who attended the Virginia Tech vigil. Ms. Eichelberger asked where in the governing process is the smoking policy. Mr. Madrigal responded that a proposal has been submitted by the Smoking Policy Workgroup to Facilities, asking them to recommend eight areas of the campus to be designated as non-smoking. The issue of signage and landscaping also needs to be addressed. However, before any action can be taken, SPC needs to review and approve the Workgroup's recommendation.

**5. Confidential/Supervisory Team**

Chris Miller reported that CAST is in the process of voting for their Employee of the Year. The CAST Annual Retreat is scheduled for June 28.

**6. Administrative Association – no report****I. OTHER**

Sue Doran announced that this is her last SPC meeting. She said it was a pleasure serving on the committee.

Molly Faulkner announced that the Faculty Dance Concert is May 11-13.

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

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

## **QUESTIONS REGARDING CHAPTER 2** **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

### **BP 2015**

- 2<sup>ND</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence. What defines a “resident”? It was suggested the sentence change to say “legal” resident.

**Action Taken:** After careful consideration, President Deegan is suggesting no changes.

- The Student Trustee has an advisory vote. Insert verbiage from last page regarding this into policy at the bottom with the other “privileges” mentioned.

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

### **BP 2105**

- Bruce Bishop said 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph not accurate. Mr. Bishop to provide verbiage.
- John Tortarolo suggested a policy if both President and VP ineligible. Mr. Bishop to provide verbiage

**Action Taken:** No recommendations submitted; no changes made.

### **BP 2210**

- There are questions regarding duties of the Vice President. First, the last 3 bullets say same as first bullet, but more specific.
- Should the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet say President at any Regular and/or Special meetings **in the absence of the President**.
- Should the last bullet say “other Governing Board **members** (meaning Palomar members) or “other Governing **Boards**” (meaning other Districts)

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

### **BP 2220**

- There was a question on paragraph 2 regarding quorum. Bruce Bishop is checking on the issue.

**Action Taken:** No recommendations submitted; no changes made.

### **BP 2315**

- It was suggested that the first sentence, second line say “applicable legal provisions **of the Brown Act** (delete including but not limited to)
- 2<sup>nd</sup> page, second paragraph there is a question about the meaning of “complaint”. Some believe the language is ambiguous. BP 2345 says anyone can speak in front of the Board and complain about a staff or faculty member. BP2315 talks about first going to the President and eventually to closed session. Should the first sentence of the 2<sup>nd</sup>

paragraph say “If any person requests an opportunity to present **formal** complaints to the Governing Board...” so that it is distinguished from just a common “complaint”

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

#### **BP 2330**

- Third paragraph talks about majority vote of all the membership of the Board. Is it the majority of **those voting**, or the majority **of all board members**, even if some aren't there? For instance, if only 3 members are present, do all 3 have to vote the same? In this case if the vote is 2-1 it would not pass because you need 3 to have a majority. Requests clarification.

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

#### **2340 BP & AP**

- The 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph in Policy that a written summary must be signed by the initiator is not in Procedures

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

#### **BP 2345**

- It was requested that the first sentence of paragraph under #1, say “Members wishing to present such items shall submit a written request **prior to the public comment section of the Agenda** to the Superintendent/President....”

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

#### **BP & AP 2365**

- It was requested that tapes be kept for 2 years instead of 30 days.

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

#### **AP 2410**

- Berta Cuaron suggests that in the third paragraph, numbers 3-6 be deleted. These councils report to SPC, who is the group that makes a recommendation. A recommendation does not come directly from these Councils.

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

#### **BP 2432**

- It was requested that the term “chief” be replaced with “Vice President” in the bulleted section to reflect Palomar’s “culture” of using Vice President instead of Chief.

**Action Taken:** After careful consideration, President Deegan is suggesting no changes because this conforms to the System Office.

**AP 2435**

- It was requested that it be made clear that after the evaluation of the Superintendent/President his/her evaluation will be placed in their personnel file.

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

**AP 2510**

- 2<sup>ND</sup> page, under "Recommendation Process", it is recommended the second sentence say "When consensus cannot be reached, a majority of **those voting** shall determine the recommendation.

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

- The definitions of Governance Structure are not correct. New definitions were approved last fall.

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

- Under the Open Access section on third page there was a question about the phrase "requesting and receiving permission" (third line). You don't need permission to speak. This sounds like the chair has the ability to deny permission to speak. It was suggested the second sentence say "In addition to representation afforded to individuals through constituencies, other individuals and groups will be heard in accordance to the Brown Act." Reword the section to reflect this.

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

**BP 2610**

- The second paragraph refers to the "the following timelines:" with no timeline information included.

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

**BP 2710**

- It was recommended adding "and designated employees" to the first sentence of the first paragraph.

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

**AP 2712**

- It was recommended that the words "Section 13" replace "the Appendix" in the Section 2 paragraph.

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

- It was noted that the footnote number is not accurately reflected (it should be small) in Sections 7 (A), (B), and (C). Good recommendation! All the footnotes in this procedure (including Sections 3 and 4) were formatted to be superscript.

**Action Taken:** Change was made

- It was suggested reference to a part-time member in Section 8(A) be deleted, as we do not have part-time members.

**Action Taken:** Part-time member language deleted

- SPC noted that in Sections 8.1(A) and 9(E) there was not a written form of \$360 included as in other sections.

- 

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

#### **BP 2715**

- In Item 10, it was recommended including the phrase “in accordance with the Brown Act” in place of “without the approval of the Board by majority vote.”

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

#### **BP 2725**

- It was noted that the paragraph uses the terms student member as well as student trustee. Since the term student member was referenced twice and appears to be consistent with the use of “Board member,” the single reference to “student trustee” will be revised to be:

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.

- It was noted that the last sentence in BP 2725 is identical to a sentence in BP 2730 titled Health Benefits. The phrase “except for the non-voting student member” was added to BP 2730 for consistency.

**Action Taken:** See changes in **blue** ink.



## SUMMER 2008

MAY 2008						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

JUNE 2008						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

JULY 2008						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

AUGUST 2008						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24/31	25	26	27	28	29	30

May 27-June 21      4-wk Session  
 June 23-Aug 4      6-wk Session  
 June 23-Aug 18      8-wk Session

## FALL SEMESTER MEETING DAYS

(number of days including finals)

M	T	W	TH	F	S
15	17	17	16	16	16

## SPRING SEMESTER MEETING DAYS

(number of days including finals)

M	T	W	TH	F	S
15	17	17	17	16	16

163 Instructional, 12 Total Professional Dev Days  
 (11 Professional Development Days plus  
 1 Plenary Day)

◆ Faculty Plenary

□ Semester Begins

○ Last Class/Final Exams

△ Spring Recess

■ Shaded Areas-Non-instructional Days

## FALL 2008

AUGUST 2008						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	◆ 22	23
24/31	□ 25	26	27	28	29	30

SEPTEMBER 2008						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

OCTOBER 2008						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

NOVEMBER 2008						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23/30	24	25	26	27	28	29

DECEMBER 2008						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	○ 15	○ 16	○ 17	○ 18	○ 19	○ 20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

Aug 22      Faculty Plenary  
 Aug 25      Fast Track 1 begins  
 Aug 25      Fall WKDY classes begin  
 Aug 30      Fall Saturday classes begin  
 Sept 1      Labor Day  
 Oct 20      Fast Track 1 ends  
 Oct 22      Fast Track 2 begins  
 Nov 10      Veterans' Day  
 Nov 27      Thanksgiving  
 Nov 28      Local Holiday  
 Dec 15-20      Last Class/Final Exams  
 Dec 20      Fast Track 2 ends  
 Dec 20      Fall semester ends  
 Jan 1      New Year's Day

## SPRING 2009

JANUARY 2009						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	□ 20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

FEBRUARY 2009						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28

MARCH 2009						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	△ 23	△ 24	△ 25	△ 26	△ 27	△ 28
△ 29	30	31				

APRIL 2009						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

MAY 2009						
SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	○ 16
○ 17	○ 18	○ 19	○ 20	○ 21	○ 22	23
24/31	25	26	27	28	29	30

Jan 19      Martin Luther King's Day  
 Jan 20      Spring semester begins  
 Jan 20      Fast Track 1 begins  
 Jan 24      Spring Sat classes begin  
 Feb 13      Lincoln's Day  
 Feb 16      Washington's Day  
 Mar 21      Fast Track 1 ends  
 Mar 23-29      Spring Recess  
 Mar 30      Fast Track 2 begins  
 May 16-22      Last Class/Final Exams  
 May 22      Fast Track 2 ends  
 May 22      Commencement  
 May 22      Spring semester ends  
 May 25      Memorial Day

**GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE GROUP REQUEST**

Ex C3

Request submitted by: John Tortarolo				Date: April 17, 2007			
<b>Proposed Name of Requested Group:</b> Staff Development and Training Committee							
<b>Council</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Committee</b>		<b>Subcommittee</b>		<b>Task Force</b>	
<b>Action Requested:</b>			<b>Add</b>	<b>Delete</b>		<b>Change</b>	
<b>Role, Products, Reporting Relationships:</b>  <b>Role:</b> <u>Identify and assess staff development and training needs, recommend funding and review outcomes.</u>  <b>Products:</b> <u>A Staff Development and Training Plan for the application and distribution of Staff Development &amp; Training funds.</u>  <b>Reporting Relationship:</b> Strategic Planning Council							
<b>Meeting Schedule:</b> <u>2nd Thursday of each month 10:30am-12:00pm or as needed.</u>							
<b>Chairs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vice President, Human Resource Services</li> <li>• Coordinator, Faculty Professional Development</li> </ul>							
<b>Members:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two representatives from the Professional Development Review Board</li> <li>• Two representatives from the Professional Growth Committee</li> <li>• One Senior Administrator from the Professional Development Review Board</li> <li>• One Administrative Association Member appointed by AA</li> <li>• One Confidential/Supervisory Team Member appointed by CAST</li> <li>• <u>One Classified employee appointed by CCE</u></li> </ul>							

**Deleted:** Jack Miyamoto

**Deleted:** September 2, 2003

**Deleted:** The Staff Development and Training Committee reports to the Strategic Planning Council and is responsible for making recommendations for annual staff development funding expenditures, administers periodical needs assessment surveys, and guides in the development of the three-year Human Resources Department Plan. The Committee guides staff development activities by establishing priorities, policies and procedures for allocations, and collecting information that can be used for ongoing and summary evaluation.

**Deleted:** Three-year Human Resources Development Plan

**Deleted:** ¶

**Deleted:** Twice yearly

**Formatted:** Font: 12 pt

**Formatted:** Bullets and Numbering

Reviewed by Strategic Planning Council:

Comments:

9/16/03	First Reading
10/7/03	COMMITTEE DECLARED INACTIVE AS OF 10/7/03
12/5/06	Reactivated

*Exhibit* \_\_\_\_\_



## *HOLIDAY SCHEDULE*

2007-2008

Board Approved \_\_\_\_\_

DATE HOLIDAY OBSERVED	HOLIDAY
Wednesday, July 4	Independence Day
Monday, September 3	Labor Day
Friday, November 9	Veterans' Day
Thursday, November 22	Thanksgiving Day
Friday, November 23	Local Holiday
Monday, December 24	Christmas Eve
Tuesday, December 25	Christmas Day
Wednesday, December 26	Admissions Day
Thursday, December 27	Added Board Holiday
Friday, December 28	Local Holiday
Monday, December 31	Local Holiday
Tuesday, January 1	New Year's Day
Monday, January 21	Martin Luther King, Jr. Day
Friday, February 15	Lincoln's Day
Monday, February 18	Washington's Day
Friday, March 28	Spring Holiday
Monday, May 26	Memorial Day

## WINTER HOLIDAYS SCHEDULE FOR 2007-2008; 2007-2008; AND 2009-2010

December/January 2007/2008

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
December 16	December 17	December 18	December 19	December 20	December 21	December 22
	Work day	Work day	Work day	Work day	Work day	
December 23	December 24	December 25	December 26	December 27	December 28	December 29
	Christmas Eve	Christmas Day	Admissions Day	Added Bd. Holiday	Local Holiday	
December 30	December 31	January 1	January 2	January 3	January 4	January 5
	Local Holiday	New Year's Day	Work day	Work day	Work day	

December/January 2008/2009

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
December 14	December 15	December 16	December 17	December 18	December 19	December 20
	Work day	Work day	Work day	Work day	Work day	
December 21	December 22	December 23	December 24	December 25	December 26	December 27
	Work day	Work day	Christmas Eve	Christmas Day	Admissions Day	
December 28	December 29	December 30	December 31	January 1	January 2	January 3
	Added Bd. Holiday	Local Holiday	Local Holiday	New Year's Day	Work day	

December/January 2009/2010

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
December 13	December 14	December 15	December 16	December 17	December 18	December 19
	Work day	Work day	Work day	Work day	Work day	
December 20	December 21	December 22	December 23	December 24	December 25	December 26
	Work day	Work day	Work day	Christmas Eve	Christmas Day	
December 27	December 28	December 29	December 30	December 31	January 1	January 2
	Admissions Day	Added Bd. Holiday	Local Holiday	Local Holiday	New Year's Day	

Board Approved:

**Report to SPC**  
**May 1, 2007**  
**Recommendations from Grants Workgroup**

**Overview**

The 2006-07 Annual Implementation Plan includes the following objective:

*“Develop and implement a process for submitting, approving and managing grants.”*

In November 2006, SPC tasked a small group to begin work on this objective. The workgroup included members from the faculty, classified staff and administration (see below for list of workgroup members). The workgroup reviewed the current processes in place at Palomar for developing, submitting, and managing grants. Also, it reviewed current practices at other community colleges. From these discussions the workgroup identified the following needs:

- 1) A clear institutional commitment to the establishment of a grants function.
- 2) A proposal submission and approval process.
- 3) A post-award (oversight) process to ensure compliance and completed deliverables.
- 4) Training and support for grant proposal development and activities.
- 5) A central repository for the college's grants proposals and awards.

The workgroup determined that while Palomar has been successful at obtaining grants, the college lacks a focused institutional grants identification, development, and submission process and grants oversight function. As a result, the college is not always prepared to seek out and obtain grant funding that could be used to help support our students and their success.

**Recommendations**

1. Establish a formal grants function and process at the college that includes the following activities:
  - a. Identifying of grant opportunities
  - b. Supporting Pre-Award activities including the writing of grants
  - c. Supporting Post-Award support activities including fiscal support and the set up and maintenance of a grants repository
  - d. Providing training and professional development related to the grants submission process
2. Establish a small grants steering committee that will accomplish the following activities:
  - a. Identifying grant strategies and objectives for Palomar
  - b. Monitoring grant activities
  - c. Approving large grant concepts and submissions
  - d. Providing updates to SPC and the college
3. Establish a grants office consisting of the following personnel:
  - a. Grants Development Specialist/Writer (1.0 FTE)
  - b. Budget/Fiscal technician (.45 FTE)

**Workgroup Membership**

Michelle Barton, Berta Cuaron, Robert Deegan, Brian Engleman, Tricia Frady, Lynda Halttunen, Ken Jay, Joe Madrigal, Calvin One-Deer Gavin, Pete Ordille, Frank Puchi, Anita Weems, Anna Woodcock, and Joan Decker

2006-07 Strategic Planning Council - Self Evaluation		
Questions/Comments	N	AVG
1. The role and responsibilities of the Strategic Planning Council (SPC) are clear and well understood.	11	4.1
<b>Comments:</b>		
The delineation of responsibilities between the SPC and Planning Councils is not always clear.		
Not sure what our function is		
There are roles not followed-decisions are made that should go to SPC that aren't. At times it seems to be just for show not for the shared governance.		
2. The SPC has operated effectively this year.	11	4.3
<b>Comments:</b>		
On issues that they were able to discuss, many times things appear to have been decided ahead of time.		
3. The SPC spends the appropriate amount of time discussing and acting upon issues and topics.	11	4.0
<b>Comments:</b>		
Some discussions become drawn-out.		
4. The Annual Implementation Plan and methods for evaluating our progress on accomplishing its tasks are clear and understood (i.e., tasks identified, plan, individuals/groups responsible for completing tasks, three progress reporting periods, final progress report).	11	4.0
<b>Comments:</b>		
The plan is clear the implementation is not		
5. The procedures used to guide the functioning of the SPC are effective (e.g., structure, conduct, and the organization of meetings).	11	4.4
<b>Comments:</b>		
Roberts rules!		
6. The structure of SPC allows for open and participatory communication between constituents.	11	4.2
<b>Comments:</b>		
It seems that reports are rushed and any comments that need discussion are overlooked		
7. I understand/understood my role and responsibilities as a member of SPC.	11	4.3
<b>Comments:</b>		
the faculty		
Not sure what our function is		
8. As a member of SPC, I am/was able to participate in the decision-making process of the college.	11	4.2
<b>Comments:</b>		
Yes please. Is that our function?		
To many issues not discussed and if they were-gave the impression that it didn't matter what a thought or idea was-it was decided & that wouldn't change		
9. As a member of SPC, I feel that I am/was able to devote the time necessary for participation on the council.	11	4.1
<b>Comments:</b>		
10a. Who do/did you share information with regarding the issues discussed and actions taken at SPC?		
<b>Comments:</b>		
Email & meeting to division faculty constituency.		
All managers in Counseling Services Division		
Deans, chairs and directors, other staff		
Administrative Association		
constituent group		
When appropriate I share with my dept/colleagues		
Student Services Planning Council		
Faculty Senate, Student Services Planning Council		
I report on SPC activities to the Faculty Senate.		
Our group (constituent group)		

10b. What methods do/did you use to share this information?		
<b>Comments:</b>		
email & meeting		
email, one-on-one discussion, meetings.		
weekly meetings		
formal meetings (VPI cabinet, division meetings), emails, informal meetings		
email		
oral & written		
Faculty meetings-casual conversation		
Regular verbal reports.		
a weekly report		
meetings, emails		
verbally in meetings		
11. What did SPC do well this year? Please give specific examples.		
<b>Comments:</b>		
AIP		
Reviewing Policies and procedures which needed to be done for several years.		
Budget Process, faculty priorities		
Fostering communication/discussion during meetings		
We kept up with the activity of all committees		
AIP		
I appreciate both the formality and informality of the forum		
12. How can SPC improve? Please give specific examples.		
<b>Comments:</b>		
Budget outline guidelines		
Clearly define its role.		
Integrate Institutional Review with Student Learning Outcomes		
Make decisions more timely		
re to time outlined on agenda		
Role clarification - SPC recommends to the supervisor/president, but is not an approving body.		
Clearer delineation of function/scope of SPC much clearer communication. I feel several suggestions for		
Make it truly shared-listen to others ideas, thoughts & concerns-truly listen-not for appearance but for real.		
13. Are you a current member of SPC? (Circle your response)		YES = 11 No = 0
14. How long have you been a member of SPC or how long were you a member of SPC? (Circle your response.)		
A. Less than one semester ( )		
B. One Semester (1)		
C. Two Semesters or More (10)		



2006-07 Strategic Planning Council - Governance		
Questions/Comments	N	AVG
1. The roles and responsibilities of the planning councils (Administrative Services, Human Resource Services, Instructional, and Student Services) are clearly defined and understood.	10	3.7
<b>Comments:</b>		
The deliniation of responsibilities between the SPC and Planning Councils is not always clear.		
Needs to be much clearer		
no comments		
There are mixed messages-we have shared gov. but Admin really makes all decisions		
2. The governance structure provides an opportunity for each campus constituency (students, faculty, classified staff, and administrative staff) to identify and articulate its views on institution-wide issues.	11	4.2
<b>Comments:</b>		
With time constraints I feel discussion is limited. Most things seem to be for information only.		
I've been there, and just given lip service (oh I hear you) but really not listened to.		
3. The process for proposing changes (e.g., changes to committee members, establishing a new committee) to the governance is clearly defined and understood.	11	4.0
<b>Comments:</b>		
Better than it was in the past but still needs more work		
It's getting better		
4. The process for presenting issues or matters for discussion within the governance structure is clearly defined and understood.	11	4.0
<b>Comments:</b>		
5. The planning councils spend the appropriate amount of time discussing and acting upon issues and topics.	9	3.7
<b>Comments:</b>		
I'd like to see a bit more time for reports & general discussion		
6. Overall, the planning councils have operated effectively this year.	10	3.9
<b>Comments:</b>		
Not being sure of the roles & responsibilities. I'm not sure (and I'm on all of em!)		
and more, give the appearance that no matter what-Admin will decide & that is final		
7. The governance structure allows for expression of ideas, input, and feedback at all levels of the institution (i.e., communication flows vertically up through the organization and horizontally across the organization).	11	3.7
<b>Comments:</b>		
I would say information flows but discussion & outcomes don't		
It allows for it, but many figure why do so because not fully listened to		
8. What are the strengths of the current governance structure? Please give specific examples.		
<b>Comments:</b>		
the leadership		
Strong leadership, strong membership (members are well-informed on issues).		
Wide participation		
Each group has representation and is able to participate in the decision making process.		
Openness of the councils to discuss issues.		
In theory this structure supports shared governance. In practice there is a lot of information sharing but very little shared decision making.		
In theory it is good, but not in reality.		
I attend SPC meetings but not the meetings of the other planning councils, so I don't feel qualified to comment on them.		
9. How can we improve the current governance structure? Please give specific examples.		
<b>Comments:</b>		
Set goal at first weeks		
Streamline AIP. Integrate Institutional Review with SLO's & budget		
Streamline decision making		
Follow process! Procedures established by district		
Better role definition - What is the Council role (recommendation) vs decision making. This is Really		
ortant.		
Discussion & implementation. Don't dismiss unpopular viewpoints.		
Listen to others and really take into acct what their concerns, thoughts & ideas are. Others do have valid		
thoughts & concerns ideas that could have benefited the college in the past		



## Overall Governance Evaluation

Thirty five council members completed the Governance Self-Evaluation form.

	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	% Agree / Strongly Agree	Average
Q1. I understand the roles responsibilities and relationships of planning councils.	34	2	3	2	18	9	79.4%	3.9
Q2. The governance structure provides an opportunity for each campus constituency to identify and articulate its views on	35	3	4	0	17	11	80.0%	3.8
Q3. The process for proposing changes to the governance structure is clearly defined and understood.	35	1	1	6	19	8	77.1%	3.9
Q4. The process for presenting issues or matters for discussion within the governance structure is clearly defined and understood.	34	2	2	5	18	7	73.5%	3.8
* Q5. The planning councils spend the appropriate amount of time discussing and acting upon issues and topics.	31	2	7	5	12	5	54.8%	3.4
Q6. Overall, the planning councils operated effectively this year.	32	3	1	12	11	5	50.0%	3.4
* Q7. The governance structure allows for expression of ideas, input, and feedback at all levels of the institutions (vertical and horizontal flow of communication).	35	7	2	2	13	11	68.6%	3.5

## Governance Self-Evaluation - ALL Respondents

### Comments:

#### **Q1. I understand the roles responsibilities and relationships of planning councils.**

- 0. *No comment from 29 respondents.*
- 1. I am learning!
- 2. They seem to work independtly @ times
- 3. The deliniation of responsibilities between the SPC and Planning Councils is not always clear.
- 4. Needs to be much clearer
- 5. no comments
- 6. There are mixed messages-we have shared gov. but Admin really makes all decisions

#### **Q2. The governance structure provides an opportunity for each campus consituency to identify and articulate its views on campus-wide issues.**

- 0. *No comment from 28 respondents.*
- 1. Some issues don't go through the process & just happen from VPs group-Don't know issues from HR & Admin P.C.
- 2. The structure is good. The number of decisions made outside the structure undermines it.
- 3. Too few participants from students & classified. Council membership numbers should reflect % of group membership at Palomar, which would mean there would be more students and classified.
- 4. With time constraints I feel discussion is limited. Most things seem to be for information only.
- 5. I've been there, and just given lip service (oh I hear you) but really not listened to.
- 6. I'm not sure how well students are represented within the governance structure-no students serve on HRSPC. Also, CAST has a difficult time finding representation for committees due to the small number of employees in the group.
- 7. yes-but still feel like it doesn't much matter. We're there to rubber stamp-those in power always get what they want.

#### **Q3. The process for proposing changes to the governance structure is clearly defined and understood.**

- 0. *No comment from 29 respondents.*
- 1. I understand how to propose changes due to discussion during meetings, but don't know where to find information in writing about how to do so.
- 2. a lot of overlap
- 3. Better than it was in the past but still needs more work
- 4. It's getting better
- 5. Unclear why some groups were dropped from committee to other type group
- 6. very clear

#### **Q4. The process for presenting issues or matters for discussion within the governance structure is clearly defined and understood.**

- 0. *No comment from 33 respondents.*
- 1. Only to those on the councils. Most students and classified don't know of the councils' existence. It's easy enough to bring matters up for discussion at meetings, or ask for agenda items to be added, but I
- 2. don't know where information in writing exists about how to do so:

## **Governance Self-Evaluation - ALL Respondents**

### **Comments:**

**Q5. The planning councils spend the appropriate amount of time discussing and acting upon issues and topics.**

- 0. *No comment from 31 respondents.*
- 1. Discuss to know end but somehow what happens is what execs want
- 2. don't know
- 3. Many meetings cancelled
- 4. I'd like to see a bit more time for reports & general discussion

**Q6. Overall, the planning councils operated effectively this year.**

- 0. *No comment from 28 respondents.*
- 1. Not being sure of the roles & responsibilities. I'm not sure (and I'm on all of em!)
- 2. More and more, give the appearance that no matter what-Admin will decide & that is final
- 3. Discuss to know end but somehow what happens is what execs want
- 4. Don't know about HR or Admin Planning Councils
- 5. don't know
- 6. I don't know-only on IPC
- 7. I think working toward that

**Q7. The governance structure allows for expression of ideas, input, and feedback at all levels of the institutions (vertical and horizontal flow of communication).**

- 0. *No comment from 29 respondents.*
- 1. Unclear about why decisions are in Governance Structure & which Management Decision
- 2. The structure is undermined when it is not followed.
- 3. Shared governance is one of the best aspects of working at Palomar--I truly believe that all employees have a voice and are listened to because of it.
- 4. I would say information flows but discussion & outcomes don't
- 5. It allows for it, but many figure why do so because not fully listened to
- 6. This process continues to work well, as far as I am able to observe.

**Q8 What are the strengths of the current governance structure. Please give examples.**

- 0. *No comment from 17 respondents.*
- 1. the leadership
- 2. Strong leadership, strong membership (members are well-informed on issues).
- 3. Wide participation
- 4. Each group has representation and is able to participate in the decision making process.
- 5. Openness of the councils to discuss issues.
- 6. In theory this structure supports shared governance. In practice there is a lot of information sharing but very little shared decision making.
- 7. In theory it is good, but not in reality.
- 8. I attend SPC meetings but not the meetings of the other planning councils, so I don't feel qualified to comment on them.
- 9. Strengths include: all constituent groups have a say in college governance and the opportunity to discuss and enact change; communication throughout the district is open and clear; and that the governance of the college is well organized.
- 10. constituency representation

## Governance Self-Evaluation - ALL Respondents

### Comments:

#### **Q8 (cont.) What are the strengths of the current governance structure. Please give examples.**

11. The structure allows participation across the spectrum.
12. Participatory, inclusive, opportunity for all groups to be represented.
12. everyone's opinion is respected & is considered.
14. It provides for an open planning and communication process.
15. Allows input
16. Well organized within itself
17. The structure is fine! The leadership in some planning councils is failing to communicate with their membership.
18. Shared governance is a myth on this campus.

#### **Q9. How can we improve the governance structure. Please give examples.**

0. *No comment from 17 respondents.*
1. Sometimes I just feel like why bother wasting everybody's time just to have something rubber stamped. Just let the execs do what they want to begin with because that's what happens anyway-it's all for show.
2. Listen more to input before making decisions
3. For certain projects it was my understanding that items go through the councils up to SPC and then to RAC for funding, but most times items go up and nothing more is said.
4. Take suggestions made by members other than administrators seriously as we are the ones that are most effected by the decisions made. It is well understood that we give ideas, that will not be used, so that it appears the system is working.
5. Not sure.
3. Have yearly retreat to plan look @ issues in Stud Services and governance structure
7. Follow the process and do not allow unilateral decisions that impact the entire college to be made outside the planning process.
8. Increase the membership & encourage input from outside the council membership
9. Have defined process for movement and discussion of issues through each planning council. Develop process for replacement of classified positions within each group and a process for the consideration of new classified positions. Let people know what is really going on!
10. Streamline decision making. Allow participation in discussions but at some point-act!
11. No major suggestions. Support for the leadership we have should be encouraged.
12. Set goal at first weeks
13. Streamline AIP. Integrate Institutional Review with SLO's & budget
14. Streamline decision making
15. Follow process! Procedures established by district
16. Better role definition - What is the Council role (recommendation) vs decision making. This is Really Important.
17. Discussion & implementation. Don't dismiss unpopular viewpoints.
18. Listen to others and really take into acct what their concerns, thoughts & ideas are. Others do have valid thoughts & concerns ideas that could have benefited the college in the past

## PALOMAR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT STUDENT GRADE DISPUTE POLICY AND PROCEDURES

### I. POLICY

It is the policy of the Palomar Community College District to authorize students to dispute final grades when the student can provide proof that § 55025 of the California Education Code (Title V) has been violated. Students can seek resolution of their dispute as outlined in the Student Grade Dispute Policy and Procedures. Students must initiate the dispute within one semester of the final grade being submitted.

### II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Grade Dispute A claim by a student that his/her final grade was given by the instructor in violation of Title V, § 55025.

Semester One fall or spring semester as defined by the District calendar. For purposes of the grade dispute procedure, summer and intersessions do not count as semesters. Grade disputes for classes that take place in spring, summer, or intersession must be initiated within the fall semester immediately following summer. Grade disputes for classes that take place in fall must be initiated in the following spring semester.

Title V, § 55025 states:

“In any course of instruction in a community college district for which grades are awarded, the instructor of the course shall determine the grade to be awarded each student in accordance with this article. The determination of the student’s grade by the instructor shall be final in the absence of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency.” The California Education Code may be found at [www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov)

### III. INFORMAL GRADE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES

Before initiating formal grade dispute procedures, the student shall attempt to resolve the dispute informally by meeting with the instructional faculty member who issued the grade in dispute and instructional administrator. The student may dispute grades only when there is a question that Title V, § 55025 may have been violated. The student should follow the process described below in an attempt to informally resolve his/her dispute. Students can direct additional questions related to this process to the Academic Standards and Practices Committee, a committee of the Faculty Senate.

- a. The student must make the initial dispute to the instructor of record for the class in question within one semester of the final grade being submitted. The instructor has 10 calendar days to respond to and meet with the student after being contacted by the student.
- b. If the student has not resolved his/her dispute with the instructor, the student should present his/her dispute to the chair of the department that offered the class for which the grade in question was given. The department chair has 10 calendar days to respond to and meet with the student after being contacted by the student.

- c. If the student has not resolved his/her dispute with the instructor and department chair, the student should present his/her dispute to the academic or counseling dean of the division. The dean has 10 calendar days to respond to and meet with the student after being contacted by the student.
- d. If the student has not resolved his/her dispute with the instructor, department chair, and academic or counseling dean, the student should present his/her dispute to the Vice President of Instruction. The Vice President of Instruction has 10 calendar days to respond to and meet with the student after being contacted by the student.
- e. At levels b, c, and d listed above, the department chair or administrator in question does not have the authority to change the grade that was issued by the instructor. Rather, his/her role is to hear the dispute as presented by the student and earlier involved faculty members/administrators. If the Vice President of Instruction feels that Title V, § 55025 has been violated, the student should be encouraged to file a Formal Grade Dispute.
- f. In cases where the instructor of record for the class in question is on sabbatical or other leave, the dispute calendar will be extended until the semester that the instructor returns, within one calendar year. In cases where the instructor is on leave for more than one calendar year, or is unavailable for return or contact, another faculty member may substitute for the instructor, as specified in Title V, § 55025.

#### IV. FORMAL GRADE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES

If a dispute is not satisfactorily resolved through the informal resolution process, the student may file a request with the Academic Standards and Practices Committee for a formal hearing. The student must initiate the dispute process within one semester of the instructor's submission of the grade in question. Grade disputes pursued after one semester will not be accommodated. The Academic Standards and Practices Committee can be reached via the Faculty Senate.

Students must include the following typed and signed information in their request for a formal hearing:

- a. A clear and concise statement of the dispute.
- b. The name of the instructor, course ID, section number, and semester of the class for which the grade is being disputed.
- c. Identification of the resolution, corrective action, or remedy being sought.
- d. A detailed summary of the actions already taken to resolve the issue, including dates and times for meetings that occurred during the Informal Grade Dispute procedure.
- e. Copies of all documents, assignments, or related materials indicating that Title V, § 55025 has been violated.

#### V. FORMAL HEARING PROCEDURES

- a. Within 10 days of receiving a submitted request for a formal hearing, the Academic Standards and Practices Committee will convene to conduct the hearing.

- b. The Academic Standards and Practices Committee will:
  - i. Review the request for a formal hearing submitted by the student.
  - ii. Receive a signed written statement from the instructor, department chair, academic or counseling dean, and the Vice President of Instruction specifying all relevant facts as discovered during the Informal Grade Dispute Procedure.
  - iii. Allow the student the right to be represented at the hearing by a student or staff member of the District.
  - iv. Allow the instructor the right to be represented at the hearing by a representative(s) of the Palomar Faculty Federation and/or the Faculty Senate.
  - v. Hear testimony, examine witnesses, and receive all evidence pertaining to the case.
  - vi. Evaluate testimony and evidence in terms of Title V, § 55025.
  - vii. Provide a transcript of the proceeding and investigation, which will be kept in a confidential file and will be available at all times to the parties to the dispute.
- c. Upon conclusion of the formal hearing, the Academic Standards and Practices Committee will make one of the recommendations listed below under VI. FINAL ACTION.
- d. The formal hearing will be closed to the public unless otherwise mutually agreed upon by all parties involved in the hearing.

#### VI. FINAL ACTION

- a. If the Academic Standards and Practices Committee finds no error or violation of Title V, § 55025, the Committee will refer the student back to the instructor who awarded the grade in dispute. The Committee will provide a statement of finding to the instructor of record, notifying the instructor that he or she has the final decision in resolving the dispute.
  - i. Upon receipt of the recommendation of resolution of the dispute from the Academic Standards and Practices Committee, the instructor of record must review the statement and then decide whether to change the student's grade.
  - ii. The instructor's decision regarding the grade dispute is final.
- b. If the Academic Standards and Practices Committee finds evidence that a violation of Title V, § 55025 occurred, the Committee will provide a statement of finding to the Faculty Senate recommending that the student's dispute be resolved.
  - i. Upon receipt of the recommendation of resolution from the Academic Standards and Practices Committee, the Faculty Senate will review the statement of findings and vote on a resolution of the dispute.
  - ii. The Faculty Senate's decision regarding the grade dispute is final.



**Academic Standards and Practices Committee 4/9/07 (revised 4/25/07)**

**STATEMENT**

As academic matters are under the purview of the faculty, the Senate asks that the category of "Academic Matters" be immediately removed from the Palomar Community College District Student Grievance Policy and Procedures, as overseen by the Office of Student Affairs. A separate policy for grade disputes can be found on the Faculty Senate website.

The Senate requests that the following section be added to the Palomar College catalog under Section 4: Student Rights and Responsibilities:

**Student Grade Disputes**

According to Title V, § 55025, "The determination of the student's grade by the instructor shall be final in the absence of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetency." Students who wish to dispute a final grade under the criteria listed above must follow the Grade Dispute Policy and Procedures, which can be found on the Faculty Senate website. All grade disputes must be initiated within one semester of the grade in question being issued.

The Senate further requests that the following highlighted statement be added to the Palomar College catalog under Section 4: Student Rights and Responsibilities:

**Student Grievance Policy**

It is the policy of the Palomar College Community District to authorize students to start grievance procedures when the student believes that he/she has been subject to unjust action, or the denial of rights as published in District regulations, state law, or federal laws. Copies of the Student Grievance Policy and Procedures are available in the Office of Student Affairs, SU-201. Grade disputes are not a part of the Student Grievance Policy. Please see Student Grade Disputes.



Faculty Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)

	Tenure	Acad. Temp	%FT
Cerritos	357.9	172.7	67.5%
Rio Hondo	213.7	117.9	64.4%
San Joaquin Delta	264.0	150.5	63.7%
Cabrillo	230.0	142.8	61.7%
El Camino	361.4	224.5	61.7%
Long Beach	420.4	261.6	61.6%
Pasadena	411.1	274.8	59.9%
Glendale	272.8	208.4	56.7%
Mt. San Antonio	417.2	319.5	56.6%
Chaffey	243.3	226.0	51.8%
Palomar	337.9	339.4	49.9%
Santa Barbara	233.0	241.3	49.1%
Sonoma County	336.9	363.9	48.1%
Santa Monica	331.1	398.9	45.4%
Southwestern	195.4	277.1	41.4%
Total	4626.1	3719.3	55.4%

Palomar -- 27th percentile % FT Faculty

Mira Costa 112.0 97.1 53.6%

Data from the "Report on Staffing for Fall 2006"

From the Chancellor's Office

Data Source: CCCO MIS Database for the reporting period Fall Term 2006

Presented at SPC 5/1/07 by PFF

	FTEs	Total Revenue	Revenue/FTEs	%FT
Long Beach	19626	\$ 110,741,935	5,642.61	61.6%
Chaffey	13299	\$ 72,750,697	5,470.39	51.8%
El Camino	19525	\$ 106,036,017	5,430.78	61.7%
Southwestern	15253	\$ 81,746,677	5,359.38	41.4%
Cabrillo	11403	\$ 60,847,268	5,336.08	61.7%
Palomar	20314	\$ 106,693,055	5,252.19	49.9%
Rio Hondo	13101	\$ 68,637,439	5,239.10	64.4%
Santa Monica	25653	\$ 134,128,918	5,228.59	45.4%
Cerritos	17410	\$ 90,148,150	5,177.95	67.5%
San Joaquin Delta	15788	\$ 81,222,647	5,144.58	63.7%
Santa Barbara	16844	\$ 85,144,011	5,054.86	49.1%
Glendale	16875	\$ 83,583,272	4,953.08	56.7%
Pasadena	23601	\$ 116,883,443	4,952.48	59.9%
Mt. San Antonio	28964	\$ 142,304,347	4,913.15	56.6%
Sonoma County	20628	\$ 100,906,805	4,891.74	48.1%
Mira Costa	8865	\$ 76,945,514	8,679.70	53.6%

Palomar -- 60th percentile revenue/FTEs

Data 2005 - 2006 Fiscal Data Abstract  
From the Chancellor's Office

Presented at SPC 5/1/07 by PFF

	Ending Fund Balance 2006	2006 Total Revenue	End Bal/ Total Rev.
Mt. San Antonio	\$ 29,414,892	\$ 142,304,347	20.7%
Chaffey	\$ 10,660,555	\$ 72,750,697	14.7%
Southwestern	\$ 10,114,439	\$ 81,746,677	12.4%
Palomar	\$ 12,485,153	\$ 106,693,055	11.7% Palomar -- 73rd percentile -- End Bal/Total Rev.
Santa Barbara	\$ 9,452,694	\$ 85,144,011	11.1%
Cabrillo	\$ 6,684,264	\$ 60,847,268	11.0%
Pasadena	\$ 12,811,145	\$ 116,883,443	11.0%
Cerritos	\$ 9,549,673	\$ 90,148,150	10.6%
Sonoma County	\$ 9,230,055	\$ 100,906,805	9.1%
San Joaquin Delta	\$ 6,757,842	\$ 81,222,647	8.3%
Rio Hondo	\$ 5,043,147	\$ 68,637,439	7.3%
Long Beach	\$ 8,033,246	\$ 110,741,935	7.3%
El Camino	\$ 7,592,095	\$ 106,036,017	7.2%
Glendale	\$ 5,565,638	\$ 83,583,272	6.7%
Santa Monica	\$ 8,385,633	\$ 134,128,918	6.3%
Mira Costa	\$ 12,709,609	\$ 76,945,514	16.5%

Data 2005 - 2006 Fiscal Data Abstract  
From the Chancellor's Office