LOS ANGELES HARBOR COLLEGE
COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL (CPC)
MINUTES
JUNE 25-26, 2012
9:00AM-3:30PM
Mary & Joseph Retreat Center

Members Present:
   Co-chairs: S. McMurray, A. Patterson (presiding)
   Administration: L. Doffoney, D. Humphreys, N. Malone, M. Martinez, L. Rosas, S.
                  Sanchez, A. Tomlinson
   Faculty: B. Young (AFT Faculty Guild)
            J. Stanbery (Academic Senate)
   Classified: I. Clarke, T. Mariner, C. McClennery, L. Minor
   ASO: L. Daisy
   Resources: K. Blackburn
   Guests: R. Baltazar, N. Barakat, D. Castillo, T. Davis, J. Dominguez, L. Glover, P.
          Grady, B. Henderson, M. Lacy, M. Lange, L. McKenzie, F. Saddigh, A.
          Sanchez, L. Takami, D. Tull, M. Yanez

MONDAY, JUNE 25, 2012

Welcome & Purpose of Retreat (A. Patterson & S. McMurray)
   • Overview of agenda

Overview & New Resource Allocation Formula (M. Martinez)
   • Review of purpose of retreat: how to make CPC work better for all; refine, clarify, and make
     planning process easily understood
   • New resource allocation formula formally approved last BOT meeting, goes into effect July 1,
     2012
   • Reflection on past year:
     o highest transfer rate with less money & less staff, fewer offerings;
     o second year of balanced budget (campus is perceived differently, district allows access
       to other funding sources);
     o Carlos Alvarado (student) will participate in HACU national quiz in Chicago; will likely be
       reaffirmed for accreditation\ Golf tournament raised over $50k – will exceed scholarship
       amount close to $90k – goal is to give out $100k in scholarships to students
     o Grants-over $10million in new funding
   • Challenges for coming year:
     o if tax measure passes in fall will add $213million additional funding for community
       colleges, if not $383million will be cut ($551.6 total loss);
     o will attend (with LAUSD representative) neighborhood council meetings to ask for
       community support
   • Details of new resource allocation (L. McKenzie & A. Tomlinson): [see handout]
     o History of basis for previous funding model (based on square footage & FTES)
     o Explanation of new funding model (based on critical mass of every college)
- Part 1: administration – every college has president, 3 VPs, facilities director, Institutional research, etc – pay is same across the board for all positions, disproportionate amount for smaller colleges – determined to be standard. Determined number of deans based on small/med/large size in base funding.
- Part 2: M&O, actual cost of maint /sq footage, $8.36 average cost $4.4 million average, we spend $3.8 which allows us to spend money in other ways
  - FTES model has not gone away – 83% of base funding is still based on FTES funding
  - Exact difference for new year = $666k
  - Some colleges will lose money with new model, first year held harmless to try to equalize ‘damages’ to larger colleges
  - $29 million is base expenditures for college
  - Discussion involved talk about how growth effects the model; difficult to divide between the 9 colleges, everyone can grow but district has to divide the FTES; East & Valley are more densely populated service area & should have higher FTES; Harbor would like 7000 FTES ($8million paid to district for assessments); M&O number on page 2 will change due to growth in sq footage with completion of new buildings, figure will stay relatively stable; can’t keep up with cuts, really desperately need tax measure to pass

Clarifying & Implementing Our Planning Process (J. Stanbery & K. Blackburn)

- Purpose is not to change the planning process, but to clarify- never been sufficiently specific in order to implement
- One ACCJC recommendation: close loop on planning process – create plans that the documents say we are creating. Plans are not static, not to be shelved, but are changing constantly; “Plans are worthless; Planning is everything.”
- Two basic planning diagrams:
  - Diagram 1 “College Governance, Planning & Budgeting Framework”)is too verbal, key people on campus could not explain the diagram, missing the ‘measurement’ part
  - Diagram 2 “Planning Flow Chart” doesn’t list all plans, could not see actual process working, budget didn’t match plans & vice versa
- Suggestions from visiting team: models need to show process, committees not just for sharing, evidence of ‘process’
- All plans should be informing other plans and thereby the process, review of what documents inform what, don’t need to reinvent the wheel
- Clarifying vocabulary – “functional plan” is Harbor’s version of the “master plan”, planning manual is to be referred to as “Functional Plans”
- Evaluating effectiveness of CPC/Academic Senate committees
  - Most agenda & minutes handled by faculty co-chairs of committees
  - Only 2 committees occasionally use other committees’ minutes; for most part distributed in isolation
  - Learn of actions of CPC & Academic Senate because in the meeting yourself, but not sure how co-chairs learn of actions if they don’t attend both meetings
  - Outcome of recommendations: mostly information sharing. CPC should be planning, not just information sharing (while still critical), should be tied to recommendation or outcome – few see it as implementation
  - Action oriented committees see implementation (under Academic Senate)
- Suggestions for improvement
- Needs to be committee co-chair training re agenda, minutes, scope of committee, how to run effective meeting (action item to keep meetings to least amount of time possible), Roberts Rules of Order (ASO offered to pay for training in this at last year’s retreat)
- Separation of conflated committees e.g. Academic Affairs vs Division Council, how to clarify e.g. WEC/Facilities/CORE scope & differences clarified
- If reps don’t attend, cannot get things done, information doesn’t get back to constituents either
- Alignment – information stops & where it still needs to go, i.e. Academic Senate committees info needs to be shared at Academic Affairs
- Recycling issues when they should have been resolved; eliminate back-peddling if decision is not to individual’s liking, stick with decisions that are made esp if no new information is brought to light
- Flowchart of processes is needed
- Committees want to know if recommendations are being implemented; how do they know?
- Membership list for each committee needs to be readily available; makes voting easier
- Department chair training (outside scope of committees) & writing function of chairs
- Report from Workforce & Economic Development periodically so college can make informed decisions in other areas keeping this office in mind
  - List of committees & why they exist (page 12 of handout); membership taken from AFT contract
    - ASO IS an official member of CPC
    - How to get senate information to greater college planning process
- Go back and tweak the planning process chart
  - Add/consider recommendations
  - Clearly communicate outcomes
  - Implement recommendations and outcomes
  - Academic Senate President report at CPC? How? Build in
- Action Items – suggestions, not just observations, 2mn time limit/increments for each item:
  - Implementing planning terminology: use term ‘master plan’ for all four plans together, individual plans to be ‘functional’; Change Planning Manual to reflect this new terminology – CONSENSUS
  - Discussion of clearance committees routing form included: forms to show routing approvals [draft of what form might look like page 16], committees cannot ‘kill’ proposals at early levels; planning document needs to be updated with such lists of committees, updated routinely; need to define clearance committee & its role, e.g. SharePoint software would have gone through TAC; what happens when committees don’t meet, committees need to meet frequently enough to be able to do their job; needs dollar amount on form, committees may not be familiar with spending guidelines; clearance committees do not prioritize, only say this is feasible or not, does not mean it will happen for sure; what activities/purchases would need to go to committees, committee can tell you if the system will fit with Harbor infrastructure, or curriculum committee can say whether or not its legal; ‘short pathway’ for non-policy related items; dealing with state requirements for programs with special funding; need to clarify scope
& role of clearance committees, one form may not be sufficient for each committee so each clearance committee needs to create a form that will work for them & bring to CPC in a timely manner; function of clearance isn’t only approval, but information back to the folks that have to implement and respond to requirements; whole committee doesn’t always need to meet, approval doesn’t mean anything to do with policy; before items get put in a unit plan or cluster plan should have been run through clearance committee first to assure that proposal is feasible/legal/appropriate.

Recommendations:

- CPC agenda include clarification of clearance committee & list (for afternoon session)
- Call for agenda items 2 days prior to 72 hour deadline (e.g. Academic Senate); post agendas of Brown Act meetings physically, not just via email; only constituents can request agenda items
- Format of CPC Agenda [see draft agenda page 14]: reports submitted in writing to CPC - request for format for report; submitted by chair or designee; Change format draft in the following ways: move Public Comment to number II, Informational Items (from CPC members only) as number VI, move CORE update under President’s Report, add additional column at the top and include constituency members represent. CONSENSUS
- Facilities Committee definition: discussion regarding difference between WEC and Facilities

LUNCH

Revision/Updates to Participatory Governance Agreement (S. McMurray)
Action Items (A. Patterson)

- Review of outcomes covered so far
- Thank you to Abbie for encouraging retreats and to classified and unrepresented for participating and thank you to Leige for bringing back College Hour; Thank you to Marvin Martinez for refocusing Harbor to the surrounding community
- Review of winter retreat recommendations:
  - CPC move to parliamentary procedures: lengthy discussion of pros and cons of both parliamentary and consensus procedures including Roberts Rules of Order; speed and simplicity; since adoption of new consensus nothing has “died” in CPC due to using consensus; CPC suffers from lack of clear procedures; CPC needs to clarify how decisions are made; people finally feel comfortable speaking openly (& not just in caucus); no ability to move forward with consensus as there is with parliamentary because discussion is limited; CPC needs written reports; consensus was already reached regarding moving to Parliamentary procedure and only thing keeping CPC from moving to it is the training, only reason to revisit now is if people are not happy with the original decision; ASO offered to pay for training at last retreat, can see if ASO can still pay the $500; once recommendations are confirmed Participatory Governance document needs to be changed to match the recommendations; will start using parliamentary procedure once training is completed; training is open to faculty too; standing committee chairs required to attend for rules to work in all committees.
  - Remove “Facilities” from WEC title - will review Tuesday with contracts at hand
  - Create task force to review hiring process and form – HR Master Plan Task Force has met once, upon request by President, put on CPC agenda for them to present

CPC 2012 Retreat Draft Minutes 6/24-6/25
- Change name from ATAC to TAC
- The two CPC chairs should belong to two separate constituencies discussion included:
  - needs to be clearer that classified can be a co-chair; there is some fear of retaliation, not limited to classified members only; each standing committee is set up for faculty and administrator so that needs to be changed as well, tenured faculty have less ‘fear’ or hesitancy in voicing strong opinions, set up like this for everyone’s protection; classified staff do not need protection of faculty; if CPC is truly a representative body, all constituents need to be in an environment free of retaliation; next CPC agenda include voting for new co-chairs; think about May elections for positions to start July 1; request for a list of committees and co-chairs published before school starts, CPC on Sep 10th & 24th, won’t have faculty nominations by the 10th; request to post list of membership and actions and activities in SSA 219; final membership list passed out at 9/24 meeting along with shared governance calendar, think about a possible 2-year time limit instead of one (as it takes a while to learn how to chair the CPC committee); recommendation to have shared governance coordinator as a non-teaching assignment to assist with those things being currently funneled through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness; recommend to have outgoing president ‘train’ incoming chairs.
- Confirm composition of CPC – see document notes/changes

Adjourn 4pm.

TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 2012

Continuation of Revision/Updates to Participatory Governance Agreement (A. Patterson & S. McMurray)
- See document notes/changes

Merging Cluster priorities into a College Plan (J. Stanbery, L. Rosas, A. Patterson & A. Tomlinson)
- J. Stanbery-everything in each of these plans needs to be integrated into one document which will tell anyone looking at it everything LAHC plans to do in 12-13
  - Need clusters to use roughly the same format, has been difficult to get clusters to do this
  - Review of format: Part A Narrative, Part B Core Activities, Part B Essential Activities, bundling priorities so that other clusters could see what all of each clusters’ priorities are
  - Wanted to be able to have a ballot for CPC to adopt for CPC to vote with, advisory only – each cluster and even CPC can overwrite the ballot results
- L. Rosas - Academic Affairs
  - Academic Affairs Cluster spent a lot of time working on a format that all three clusters can use, despite the different functions of each cluster, eventually format was simplified to something useable: narrative says what each cluster does, unfunded CORE needs to be higher priority for college; may still need some adjustments
  - Pleased with results of ballot results for Academic Affairs- not everyone put their own needs first; student success rose to the top, as well as Instructional Assistants, library support
- A. Tomlinson – Administrative Services
  - List of additional priorities
  - Explanation of unfunded essential activities
o ‘Penciled In’ items:
  ▪ student pay-per-copy system – through reprographics;
  ▪ re-evaluate book rental (due to students charging books & then closing credit card accounts leaving bookstore with large debt);
  ▪ implementation of electronic time reporting – rather than having payroll inputting by hand

- A. Patterson - Student Services
  o Didn’t separate essential from Core in ballot, can go back and group such as what was done with Academic Affairs, according to Jim is “exactly great”
  o Financial Aid is priority – growing faster than can keep up with, need more technicians to get aid to students faster, system is better than it was before but continue to fall behind due to large number of students – 5-6000 students on financial aid
  o EOPS is second high priority – had to cut back on CORE activities due to loss of funds, critical to try to provide this support to students.
  o Retention, Dan Ruiz is full of energy but matriculation needs additional staff to support these activities, hourly counseling to support
  o Replace retirement for child development center – impacts number of students can serve with amount of staff, impacts revenues able to generate, low on FHPC list, long-term sub still working, but this was prior to retirement anyway
  o Transfer Center/Counselor – currently in selection process now
  o Matriculation: question of where Harbor is headed, esp in terms of assessments. Either need to decide to support it fully or change it or however, but as it is currently requires more support
  o Orientation online in response to AtD – feedback from focus groups is that students do not like online orientations; they want face-to-face
  o SPS – cut 40-50% concerned about how many students they can serve, while increasing student services 22% in the last year
  o Admissions – staffing is low too, trying to be more efficient but still a need for processing paperwork
  o Used Survey Monkey as well
  o Cluster will review results at next meeting

- Discussion included: how state mandates are to be considered when prioritizing; ranking is according to how proposed activity meets the ranking criteria with a link to unit plans on website as evidence; voting is advisory; context of planning & prioritizing for next year is a LOT less money & we need to decide what’s critical as it looks like all of clusters’ CORE items may not even get funded; Student Services is not talking about growing and expanding, but when more students apply for and meet the requirements for financial aid, Harbor is required to serve them, which means those programs themselves are growing in relationship to current student body

LUNCH

Continue/Finish Participatory Governance Document (A. Patterson & S. McMurray)
  • See document notes/changes
  • Corrections on PG document will be brought to the next CPC meeting
“Peacock in a Penguin World” video

“Your View, My View & the Facts” Coming Together to Move Harbor Forward (M. Martinez)

- What does this mean?
  - Participation, decisions based on facts, perceptions cloud ‘facts’ and acting on those facts
  - Have to use data and research to help us debate e.g. looking at contracts to determine composition of committees
  - Goal for harbor this year: now that all have come to the table (unlike 2 years ago when not all were at the table), need to go to next level to address a number of controversial items coming
  - If tax initiative does not pass, looking at MAJOR cuts (similar to reductions in household budgets – get rid of the cable, eat out less, no more movie night etc.)
  - How do we all compromise? Understanding that you’re not going to win but find a way to reach common ground
  - Opening day speaker invited to open dialogue regarding compromise to avoid possible future conflicts
  - Harbor is in a good place to deal with difficult issues, unlike other campuses in district: Mission College is a disaster, brought in mediator, locked doors because of fear, people out on stress leave, Trade has had mediator in past, City College might
  - Approach in previous years was to make progressive cuts, since MM didn’t feel Harbor was ready to make $4million in cuts in one year
  - Today is a milestone: compared to last fall, dug into issues, how to improve the system, unlike last year, at the end of the day we’re all “still friends”
  - Thank you to Susan & Abbie for co-chairing
  - Concerned about creation of more committees – does not want to wear anyone out, although happy that so many want to participate. Re-look at committee memberships in a year from now, concerned about meeting quorum and getting business done
  - Proud of campus for being creative, i.e. athletics; very happy with workforce development, hate to lose Dave – legacy of the next six years, Leige’s work with AtD, more work to be done, will be at as many meetings as possible, Nina is going to retire
  - Continue to be open and transparent, wants campus feedback, wants to make the best decisions for campus

Group Activity (A. Patterson & S. McMurray)

- Talk about what did you learn over last few days, identify things to address over the coming year

Group Reports

- Group 1
  - Thank you to Abbie, Susan, Brian and Megan
  - Would like to see plans discussed during this retreat implemented
  - Recruitment of committee members is important: each one teach one bring one
  - Every new faculty member should have to serve on a committee
  - We’re broke but better off than most campuses
  - Need to be more aggressive
  - Nina Malone needs a shadow to learn her role
  - Students need more encouragement from Harbor staff
o Need leadership training
  o We care, we’re still Happy Harbor, we can work together
  o We are tolerant
  o Time limits were not addressed in the Participatory Governance document

• Group 2
  o What did we get out of the retreat?
    ▪ Reviewing the minutia of the processes on campus is painstaking but beneficial.
    ▪ Clarification of the planning process
    ▪ We are able to come together and fully vet serious issues in an open and collaborative spirit
    ▪ The retreat attendance was good including a large number of college’s leadership
    ▪ This was an opportunity for self evaluation and reflection with a willingness to make decisions, knowing those decisions can be revisited next year
    ▪ It is reaffirming to see how we are able to collaborate as a group

  o What are the next steps?
    ▪ Revisit and review the Planning Policy and Procedures Manual: language should be reviewed, document should have clarification, document should show the alignment with the district and state, manual should be one comprehensive document that does not require other documents as an appendix
    ▪ Utilize a reporting form to record what takes place during each committee meeting
    ▪ Make it the duty of the co-chairs to provide a summary of what their committee has done during the year to present at next year’s retreat
    ▪ Enact a regular evaluation of each committee to determine its effectiveness
    ▪ Establish meeting norms

• Group 3
  o Previous retreats didn’t give as overall a view but were about more specific issues; everyone remained collegial.
  o Why does district allow conflicts regarding contracts?
  o Applaud the decision to focus on data, rather than ad-hoc statements
  o We did not add committees, and we have done some process discussion and streamlining
  o Let’s make sure we get to doing what needs to be done next and not just talk about it
  o Sticks out how we’re still dealing with issues which were discussed 12 months ago

Evaluation & Closing

• Summary of Action items
  o Accreditation feedback re planning process – began to clarify but need to continue
  o Closing evaluation loop – not until new document is approved
  o Merging priorities- combining all three clusters to be done
  o PG document – met & made progress- needs to be approved and start to use
  o HR Task Force deadline – report by end of Aug
  o CPC Co-chair election at next meeting – decide upon 2 year or 1 year
  o Clarify function of clearance committees needed
  o Finalize committee reporting planning form – each clearance committee bring suggestions

CPC 2012 Retreat Draft Minutes 6/24-6/25
- Develop CPC standing committee report form, agree upon information to report, one-page, consistent
- List of Brown Act meetings – (in packet), list of committee members posted in SSA 219, TAC needs to be added to calendar (next CPC meeting)
- Planning Policy & Procedure Manual to match the PG document
- Representatives of bargaining units will be asked to sign PG document
- Create work-plan for next year

Adjourn 3:00pm