COLLEGE PLANNING COUNCIL
MINUTES
Wednesday, March 7, 2012

PRESENT: Gabby Avila, Dennis Bailey-Fougnier, Jill Gallo, Diane Goody, Steve Hodges, Renee Kilmer, Brian King, Victoria Lewis, Michael Mangin, Graciano Mendoza, Dan Rothwell, Barbara Schultz-Perez, and Kathie Welch

ABSENT: Stephanie Stainback and Paul Harvell


1.0 Call to Order and Introduction of Substitutes
Alta for Stephanie

2.0 Review of Agenda
No Comments.

3.0 Oral Communications
None.

4.0 Approval of Minutes
Minutes Approved

4.0 SPRAC Report
SPRAC provided reports on the proposed reductions in enrollment services. SPRAC is reviewing Student Services and Instruction proposed reductions this coming Friday.
Brian asked CPC if there is a consensus that CPC will receive the SPRAC reports on proposed eliminations in enrollment services. CPC agreed to accept the two reports (enrollment services – admissions and record assistant II and financial aid program specialist).

Alta asked that SPRAC receive reports prior to the plans being submitted to the Board.

Jill brought up new and modified positions and the role SPRAC might play in evaluating the implementation. Jill would like clarity.

5.0 SPRAC Processes Discussion
Managers commented that the process to date has been positive. Marcy commented that there is a challenge when it comes to getting input from the person whose job is up for elimination. Marcy suggested a new form, which could be filled out by the worker. Renee said an email template can feel very impersonal but an in person interview can also be difficult. Dan said they are sensitive to that, but it is not SPRAC’s job to hear special pleas to have a job saved by someone who is losing their job. Dan conceded that it is impersonal by email, but SPRAC is not the appropriate body to hear pleas. Jill said
she thinks sequentially the affected person would receive the form after they have been spoken to by their manager, this would not be their first notice.

Georg said one of the challenges SPRAC will have to face is if one of the outcomes is reassessing the work, and the incumbent is very close to the work the way it was done in the past. Marcy said one staff member did share their responsibilities with SPRAC, and it was helpful to see what was there and compare what is moving and what is going away.

Victoria suggested including the SPRAC plan in the email to the affected employee, and that the response is directed to the SPRAC chair.

Marcy said this is only for situations where the position is completely disappearing. Marcy said the email template will be added to the SPRAC guide.

Next Marcy brought up the six month review. Marcy provided a draft template for a six month review. Marcy said SPRAC hopes to compile the information and bring it to CPC for review. Dan said it would be helpful to see if duties, that SPRAC was told would go away, really did go away.

Georg says he understands the interest in something like this, and thinks one of the reasons that things have gone better this year is the clarity of purpose. He sees the six month review as muddying the purpose though and said it is a manager’s duty to conduct a review, and managers already do it inherently.

Tama asked if reviewing in six months implies a position will be reconsidered.

Marcy said SPRAC was wondering if any part of this would be helpful to a manager. Georg said it should be a manager’s goal to have a “reality check” meeting. Marcy said the fear of staff is they will not be heard in the evaluation. Brian suggested surveying managers to see if this would be valuable.

Jill said one of the primary charges of SPRAC is unintended consequences. Jill said departments have to go back and revisit change, and determine if it is working and it needs to happen collectively.

Wanda said the SPRAC report does ask if there are unintended consequences. Managers are supposed to pay attention and evaluate those issues. The changes involved multiple meetings with the manager and affected staff.

Isabel said there are proper venues to address issues. Isabel asked if SPRAC were to review plans in six months, what the process would be. Who is at the table? Isabel said it sounds like a large amount of work that can be dealt with in other, already established, venues.

Jill does not see it as massive work, and when positions are reduced there are a lot of people affected. They need a place to voice their concerns.

Alta said that when SPRAC submits it recommendations to CPC, and they say they see issues, there should be a follow up plan.
Dan said he understands the manager’s position of not wanting to be critiqued. Dan does not care who does the review but CPC needs to know if the implementation actually works or if there are problems. To keep CPC out of the loop cuts CPC out of the whole process.

Lena asked how to plan for the next round if the results of the first round are not known.

Rachel said looking at unintended consequences is SPRAC’s main charge. To make that work she can’t imagine any manager who is going to be waiting six months to do a review. Especially with as many changes that are happening campus wide. Managers do not made decisions in a vacuum; they are talking to people and getting input. Rachel does not think it is necessary to go through a SPRAC filter; managers can let CPC know directly. Managers are going to be doing a lot of check in and reviews, and much sooner than six months.

Victoria said managers are not just dealing with the issues that are in SPRAC minutes. It does not seem like an accurate representation to isolate and look at what SPRAC has reviewed.

Jill said SPRAC’s job is not solely to review workload. It is a much bigger issue they are addressing. Jill feels a strong sense of managers being offended. SPRAC is not a filter, but a mechanism that is meant to be useful to the CPC.

Kathy said the interest is there for information, so everyone is in agreement on that point. Brian said concerns can be added directly to the CPC agenda.

Wanda said the underlying issue is that this may be building false hope that these positions may come back in six months. Jill said that is not the intention. Wanda added that managers want their units to function well. They do not want to create some sort of plan that makes them dysfunctional. These are damaging cuts and managers are doing the best they can to mitigate.

Michael agreed that CPC need information to make decisions and likes the idea of a six month report, or check in. Victoria suggested a high level report, because of personnel confidential issues that cannot be shared.

Brian pointed out that there are a number of faculty and adjunct positions that have been eliminated, but not reviewed by CPC. Victoria asked to what end CPC is going to revisit plans.

Lena said it seems that trust has to go both ways, and she is hearing a lot of lack of trust from management. There seems to be a real hesitance of being judged and held accountable.

CPC agree to revisit the impact of the implementation of plans as appropriate at future meetings.

Marcy asked if the SPRAC plans and reviews should be posted. CPC agreed the plans contain sensitive information, and should not be posted on a public site.
Marcy said SPRAC is not meeting on March 23.

6.0 Budget Update
Graciano presented the budget update which included slides on the general unrestricted and restricted funds and the fund balance.

7.0 Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.