**PALOMAR COLLEGE**
Learning for Success

# STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL
# AGENDA

| Date: | February 27, 2009 |
|---|---|
| Starting Time: | 2:00 p.m. |
| Ending Time: | 4:00 p.m. |
| Place: | SU-18 |

**CHAIR:**  Deegan

**MEMBERS**:  Barton, Brannick, Brockett, Claypool, Cuaron, Dowd, Duran, Frederick, Gowen, Halttunen, Hoffmann, Hogan-Egkan, Japtok, Jennum, Kelly, Kovrig, Lienhart, Madrigal, McCluskey, Owens, Sheahan, Talmo, Titus, Tortarolo, von Son

**RECORDER:**  Ashour

| | Attachments | Time |
|---|---|---|
| **A.** Check in | Exhibit A | 60 min |

    1.    Review Self-Study Planning Agenda  Item #10

    2.    Summarize and review comments from  last session

    3.    Add, delete, clarify strengths and  challenges

    4.    Describe/Discuss themes identified in the comments

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **B.** Discuss the purpose, roles, and responsibilities of the Governance Process | | 50 min |
| **C.** Next steps:  Where do we go from here? | | 10 min |

A special shared governance meeting of the Palomar College Strategic Planning Council scheduled for February 27, 2009, was held in RS-5.  President Robert Deegan called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

| | |
|---|---|
| Members Present: | Barton, Brannick, Brockett, Claypool, Cuaron, Deegan, Dowd, Duran, Gowen, Halttunen, Hoffmann, Kovrig, Lienhart, Owens, Talmo, Titus, Tortarolo |
| Recorder: | Cheryl Ashour |
| Members Absent: | Frederick, Japtok, Jennum, Madrigal, McCluskey, Talmo, Tortarolo, von Son |
| Guests: | Laura Gropen |

A. **CHECK IN (Exhibit A)**

1. **Review Self-Study Planning Agenda Item #10**
   Michelle Barton briefly reviewed the self-study planning agenda item #10 with members.

2. **Summarize and review comments from last session.  Add or clarify strengths and challenges.**
   Ms. Barton distributed notes collected on the flipchart during the December 5, 2008 SPC meeting. She requested that everyone read the comments on strengths and challenges and asked if anyone had additional comments.  There were no comments.

3. **Describe/Discuss themes identified in the comments**
   Ms. Barton identified and discussed the following themes derived from the December 5 comments:
   - Strengths: commitment, structure, inclusive process, process/outcomes
   - Challenges: communication, perception, what decisions are made, when decisions are made, mutual respect

B. **DISCUSS THE PURPOSE, ROLES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE GOVERNANCE PROCESS**
   Ms. Barton gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the purpose, roles, and responsibilities of the governance process.  She asked the following questions about process:
   - What are governance issues?
   - What is the outcome of our governance process?
   - When a governance-related decision is made, what happens?
   - Is the process reactive or proactive?

   Ms. Barton distributed a questionnaire and asked everyone to spend a few minutes answering the following questions:
   - What is governance? What is the purpose of a governance process?
   - What are your roles and responsibilities in the governance process a representative of your constituent group (or as an identified participant based on your position)?
   - What are your roles and responsibilities in the governance process as an individual?

   After everyone filled out the questionnaire, the items were discussed in detail.

C. **NEXT STEPS: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?**
   After discussion, there was consensus to have one more meeting with only SPC members to discuss practical issues of process versus operational decisions.  A few potential meeting dates were discussed.  March 26 was tentatively chosen but people needed to review their calendars before it was agreed upon.

## What are strengths of our shared governance structure/process?

1. Well-established structure and all constituent groups are represented and actively involved

2. Inclusiveness –involved and participating

3. Many voices=better results

4. All constituent groups should have investment

5. Respect for roles of constituent groups in process

6. Interconnected between councils and committees

7. Anyone can participate/opportunities (campus-wide)

8. Over last 5 years, roles and responsibilities of planning councils have evolved

9. There is a commitment to ongoing review and growth

10. Attempt to separate strategic from operational (planning perspective)

11. Unity

12. Established and formal communication format

13. EFMP 2022 is an example along with other products and plans we have developed to guide and are actively used for planning

14. Continuity

15. Our academic programs and professionalism are highly regarded and validated externally

## What are the Challenges/Problems that we face with our governance structure/process?

1. Taking responsibility for things that go wrong and assume it's a structural problem

## Self-Study Planning Agenda #10

The Strategic Planning Council will engage in formal dialogue on its shared governance and decision-making processes in order

- to distinguish the types of decisions that have significant institution-wide implications and thus must be arrived at through systematic participative processes;
- to clarify the authorities and responsibilities of the decision-makers and other participants in these processes in order to produce decision-making guidelines; and
- to enhance professional development opportunities for the college to learn about shared governance. (IV.A

21. Issues of confidentiality

22. Type of planning information and what is appropriate information to be shared at planning council level

23. SPC lacks knowledge on how its decision making impacts students

24. Resistance to engage in difficult conversations

25. Need for respectful and dispassionate discourse

26. What decisions am I involved in, what decisions do I want to be involved in and what decisions should I be involved in?

27. Governance vs operational/managerial

28. Look at the good of the whole institution


## Next Steps

1. Guidelines on appropriate communication with decision making for planning councils/process

2. What's appropriate decision making planning for the planning process and what is not

3. Define who makes what decisions

4. Define guidelines for 2-way communication

5. Planning councils and directions for what they will plan in future and further clarify planning councils' future roles.

6. Additional training from Faculty Senate or State Academic Senate or a representative from CCLC to help us understand (AB1725)

7. Meet next in February (a Friday between 8 and 11)

2. Building trust among/between constituent groups is a slow process

3. Lack of guidance and training to new members

4. Lack of sharing meeting items with all constituent groups and among members

5. Breakdown in communication at table and externally

6. The ease of reactive vs proactive planning

7. Boundaries where governance ends and management begins

8. Lack of brainstorming all-inclusive

9. Clear understanding of constituency roles and responsibility (self & others)

10. Lack of transparency in decision making process and big decisions are made outside the process

11. Inability to distinguish matters for discussion

12. Timing/rushed process/balance decision making on items outside of our control/external pressures

13. Confuse message with messenger and personalize

14. Emotional responses and perceive lack of willingness to listen to other people's perspectives

15. Democracy paradigm vs expertise paradigm but both require trust

16. Taking issues seriously early on

17. Resolve issues at low level before situations escalate

18. Attitudes/defensiveness

19. Need to accommodate strong personalities and different opinions and need to recognize not always going to agree

20. Information sharing