COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
MINUTES
Wednesday, June 15, 2011

PRESENT: Charlotte Achen, Dennis Bailey-Fougnier, Jill Gallo, Diane Goody, Paul Harvell, Steve Hodges, Renée Kilmer, Victoria Lewis, Michael Mangin, Graciano Mendoza, Dan Rothwell, Stephanie Stainback, and Kathie Welch

ABSENT: Brian King and Barbara Schultz-Perez

VISITORS: Debora Bone, Flor Chacon, Nancy Brown, Robin Ellis, Rick Fillman, Anya Finke, Wanda Garner, Jeff Hancock, Massina Hunnicutt, Michael Kelley, Ray Kaupp, Jana Marcus, Rachel Mayo, Chyrel Nicholson, Nikki Oneto, Margery Regalado Rodriguez, Margaret Tam, Ben Tan Cate, Tootie Tzimbal, Jim Weckler, Daniel Wooten

1.0 Call to Order and Introduction of Substitutes
Renee called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m. Debora Bone substituted for Barbara Schultz-Perez.

2.0 Review of Agenda
CPC members agreed to add a Cisco debrief to the agenda.

3.0 Oral Communications
None

4.0 Management Dialog
Charlotte read a memo regarding her concerns how SPRAC’s work is disseminated and distributed.

5.0 Cisco
CPC and Admin Council members had the following comments about the Cisco change management workshop:

- Steve found it completely useless. Thanked Rock for organizing.
- Stephanie felt similar. All the classified staff were put in the same session. It was very awkward. Waste of time.
- Jill said it wasn’t anything we didn’t already know. There was a lot to cover and it was discouraging.
- Dennis said the last 45 minutes was the best part of the day.
- Victoria agreed with Dennis and said there was no closure.
- Charlotte suggested adding to the next CPC agenda a follow up, next steps discussion.
- Ray loved it. It was a framework for change. Unless everyone buys in it is not going to work. Ray came away looking at where the small wins were.
- Renee said the destination discussion was good. Renee agreed with setting aside a period of time to discuss it at the next meeting.
- Ray said it took a lot of odds and ends and helped us arrange them. Putting the framework on what you are doing instead of just doing it.
- Rock said he formed the all classified group. The idea was to bring people who had been advocating for reduced expectations if the college is going to reduce services and people.
- Rachel felt like she gained insight into some of the pitfalls of change. She already knew some of it but it made her more rounded. Rachel felt like she did learn. It made her more conscious.
- Steve said it was much a more high level overview of the process. The idea of managing change by gathering information and bringing people on board is the Cabrillo way. That is shared governance.
- Margery was disappointed that they didn’t spend enough time on resistance.

CPC agreed to add Cisco next steps to the July 6 CPC agenda.

6.0 SPRAC Processes
Renee began by saying there seems to be different expectations about SPRAC and asked attendees if it would be a good time for the SPRAC members and the affected managers to get together and do a review of what is working and what isn’t. Renee said there are different issues. Some managers feel the process is different for different groups. Each manager has been treated differently. The question is if the group can come up with a process everyone agrees on. Jill said CPC did agree at the beginning to review the process.

Renee added there is also another level of process question of what to do after the recommendations are sent to CPC. How or do they get to the Board? Steve said that is up to CPC. Steve said CPC gets the results from SPRAC and if CPC decides to take action then that is what it will do. Steve found the reports wonderful and informative. That was a good result of SPRAC.

SPRAC Chair Jeff Hancock said he had a written statement and echoed Charlotte’s statement. Jeff said SPRAC is an advisory committee but they would hate to see their hard work go to waste. SPRAC wants to know what to do with it. Dennis said he has worked with SPRAC on three different plans and SPRAC’s recommendations have been helpful. SPRAC’s comments and recommendations confirm some of his own thinking and help him with other pieces. Dennis said he has a concern when just one member of SPRAC meets with the manager or staff. Dennis feels it waters down the value and hurts the process. Jim said he hopes SPRAC’s work is thoroughly redundant; verifying what we have been looking at is what we should have been looking at and confirms that all areas have been thought about.

Kathy said her understanding was that SPRAC as a group was going to meet with affected managers and component heads. Debora said the process has unfolded really quickly and SPRAC had to delegate. SPRAC did meet as a committee to discuss each position. Jill added that feeling of waste of time is happening when the checklist that SPRAC is running through does not confirm all has been done and that isn’t going anywhere. Going back to SPRAC’s processes Ben said SPRAC has made it a general practice to send an email to the affected unit. Some people respond and some don’t.
Stephanie suggested CPC considering voting on each position to get to determine if CPC wants to accept a particular report. Stephanie also suggested then forwarding the report to the Board and said that would bring about some conclusion from the college governance process. She said the amount of time and energy that SPRAC puts into this justifies that consideration; view on an individual basis and not as a group.

Jeff expressed concern that a Board item had his name (as chair of SPRAC) on it, and was presented as accepted when it really was not. He said it is very complicated but he does not want his or the committee’s name on it when there are problems with the report. There were concerns that were brought up but not addressed. Jeff asked CPC to find a way to address concerns cited in SPRAC report. There should be a formal record of agreement and disagreement.

CPC discussed the use of the word accept. Steve said he believes accepting a report is fine, it doesn’t mean CPC agrees or disagrees with the results but that the information has been brought forward there is no controversy there. Debora said SRPAC worked from the premise that none of these proposals are great but was the decision making processes inclusive? What are the subsequent issues and concerns? Debora added that the best outcome is that SPRAC’s concerns are taken seriously. Kathy said there is no amendment to SPRAC recommendations when the manager provides a response. Victoria asked if the manager is involved before SPRAC writes there report? Wanda said she turned in a written response to the questions on the form. She then assumed there would be a meeting where SPRAC could ask questions and that meeting didn’t happen.

Stephanie said the timeline is being driven by the August 1 Board deadline and asked CPC to consider asking Brian to ask the Board to move that to the Sept. 12 meeting. She said this is a shared governance process that is being taken seriously and the Board needs more concrete feedback. This would allow the SPRAC members to feel more supported. Stephanie asked for this to be put on the agenda for the next CPC meeting. Victoria said the downside is that cuts will not be incorporated into the final budget.

Victoria asked that SPRAC consider separating suggestions and concerns. As the reports are currently written it is not clear what SPRAC expects managers to respond to.

CPC agreed that the next step is for members of SPRAC, component leaders and managers who have had interaction with SPRAC need to meet and discuss the process and determine if changes are needed.

CPC will discuss the timeline at its next meeting.

5.0 Round II SPRAC recommendations
Jeff provided an update on where SPRAC is in the Round II review process.
   1. A&R II – Still under review
   2. Math LIA - Complete
   3. Lab Tech – Complete with concerns. CPC discussed it concerns which had to do with safety and workload issues. Wanda was able to clarify a number of issues and CPC determined the review is complete.
4. Marketing and Communications Coordinator – still under review. Stephanie said she has serious concerns about this position being eliminated. There are also differing opinions between the manager and employee on workload. CPC noted this was a plan where SPRAC communicated with the manager via email, and did not meet with them in person. It was determined this plan would go back to SPRAC so SPRAC can meet with the manager and employee to clarify workload issues.

CPC asked the SPRAC/manager/component head group to discuss the communication process when they meet because there seems to be a discrepancy between SPRAC and the managers about who SPRAC should be communicating with. An example of this is the Lab tech positions and the faculty that the dean talked to about the issue versus the faculty SPRAC contacted about the issue were two different groups. The Dean talked to the faculty she thought is directly affected and SPRAC contacted every faculty member in the department.

CPC also discussed work plans. CPC determined a number of issues that SPRAC has identified in their reviews will be addressed through the required work plans.

Jeff said SPRAC will finish their review of Round II by the July 6 CPC meeting.

6.0 Adjourn
The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.