



The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m.

Present at the meeting: Jason Gardner, Lorrie Hopper, Bill Turini, Elba Gomez, Donna Berry, Dr. George Railey, Jothany Blackwood, Sandi Edwards, Jo Lewis and Diane Clerou.

I. Minutes - the minutes of May 3, 2013 were approved and there were no corrections.

II. Process check, rumor control, heads up, and elephants – there were none.

Bill T. stated we have had conflicting schedules and perhaps we should have alternates for meetings.

Diane stated there has been a lot of difficulty in scheduling meetings so alternates should be identified by each constituent group. Also, if a current member cannot make the meeting schedule eventually agreed to by the task force then he/she will have to ask his/her constituent group for a replacement.

Dr. Railey stated that constituent designees should report back to their respective group. This task force has more than twelve people on it so it will be difficult to schedule meetings.

Donna asked that scheduling meetings be done via outlook because sometimes people do not get a chance to get to their emails.

Diane stated this taskforce has to have a plan up and running by July 2014.

Bill stated that faculty did meet on May 17th even though the meeting was cancelled.

III. Review definition agreed to for decision making – “qualified consensus”

Diane reviewed the agreed upon definition for “qualified consensus”. When two people do not agree it is not considered critical. However, if three people disagree we cannot move forward. She agreed to resend the “qualified consensus” definition to be discussed at the next meeting

IV. Status Update of Summer Progress

Diane stated we held eight meetings between November 2012 and May 2013. Dr. Blue presented the taskforce with the charge, and the chief finance person from FCC, RC and WI shared an overview of their college/campus prioritization process for replacing positions. The Director of Classified Personnel discussed the classified recruitment procedures. The taskforce looked at several HR Staffing Plans and chose the Palomar Plan. The taskforce decided they liked several things from the Palomar plan and we should take that information and revise it to fit our plan. At the beginning of this taskforce we only needed to have a report to Dr. Blue in December 2013 along with the taskforce’s objectives for accomplishing the staffing plan. However, in mid-July 2013, the district received a letter from the accrediting agency indicating

ALL district plans must have milestones, show they are on track to meet the milestones when the accreditation teams come back in November 2013, and complete the plan by June 30, 2014.

V. Review FCC Taskforce members' memo dated 05-17-13

Diane asked everyone to review the memo dated 05-17-13 from FCC faculty recapping the results of their meeting. FCC is thinking we need to begin the process of writing this document. Their suggestion is to have HR begin drafting the plan and taskforce members can critique the draft plan.

VI. Provide list of all documents either sent to Task Force members or posted on Blackboard.

Diane stated that all the documents requested to date have been uploaded in Blackboard except the new HR report that was worked on over the summer. Those documents can be found on the left-hand side of the page under the tab "Taskforce Documents."

VII. Provide list of reports/documents HR is working on.

Diane discussed that Sandi Edwards has been working on data and getting reports done for this taskforce. We have also provided you with a copy of the State Franchise Task Board Workforce Planning Guide which Elba located. Diane stated one option is to complete the State Franchise template, choose things from this template and merge them with the Palomar plan to get the HR Staffing Plan accomplished.

Bill asked if it needs to be implemented for 2014-2015 fiscal year. Diane and George both stated that we must be using it by July 1, 2014. Diane asked everyone to review the DRAFT Timeline for Human Resources Staff Plan Taskforce (HRSPT) handout so we can discuss it. She asked Wendell if he had a follow up phone call with John Tortola at Palomar CCD. Wendell said that he did speak to John.

Diane asked Sandi Edwards to discuss the data and reports she worked on over the summer. Sandi explained the information she has compiled and the data that the taskforce has requested for the departments and for staff. She also has compiled information regarding discipline and the campus information. She has restricted the program for the biology department, administrative services, divisions/departments/campuses, Reedley, FCC Social Science, by faculty contract and FTE course assignment, as well as split FTE's on a class assignment. The system has information in it now and I have fixed it to get real time data including instructional time which is now available.

Donna asked if there is a limited term or vacant position does the money exist? Diane stated that the position has to be Board approved and then the position must be funded by the college/department if they want to use.

Bill asked if this is a standing committee. Jothany asked if this going to be a standing committee? Diane stated this taskforce has to make a recommendation to Chancellor's Cabinet on whether this should be a standing committee or not. It seems like it should be a standing

committee that meets at least once a year to check the progress of the staffing plan, evaluates the process/results and then makes recommendations, but that all has to be recommended by this taskforce.

VIII. DRAFT Timeline to meet accreditation goal

Two DRAFT timelines were distributed. One showed a proposed timeline for the taskforce to review the Palomar Plan and adapt it to a SCCCD HR staffing plan and the second was a DRAFT timeline for review of the taskforce's DRAFT plan by the constituent groups. Diane explained that she and Jothany drafted the timelines due to so much work having to be accomplished in less time than we originally thought.

Bill stated he is very thankful for the February 2014 and April 2014 1st and 2nd reads by constituent groups which was built into the timeline.

Donna stated we need to make sure the constituency groups bring up their questions and concerns. There needs to be a better way to communicate with our constituency groups throughout the drafting process so we do not have a problem at the end when we take the draft document to the groups.

Bill stated that the documents have been posted to Blackboard and the first and second reads will facilitate the approval process. Bill asked if we could sit in on the Chancellor's Cabinet.

Jothany noted they will have the Cabinet's revisions to review in their respective constituent groups.

Diane reminded the taskforce we only make recommendations to Chancellor's Cabinet.

Bill stated that if we were there everybody would be on the same page.

Jothany stated that a recommendation can be changed and send it out again. You have an opportunity to change it again.

IX. Discuss two plan design choices: Palomar CCD and Workforce Planning Guide from State of California Franchise Tax Board

Diane discussed the Palomar plan. Elba discussed the Workforce Planning Guide from the State of California Franchise Tax Board. Elba indicated she believes it would be better to use the State Franchise Tax Board outline because there may be steps did not use and we will have no way to know that unless we double check it against the Tax Board's outline.

Donna stated that she thought we were going to take components from the Palomar plan.

Diane stated things like the formatting on critical analysis, etc.

Elba stated we need to figure out where we are in three to five years. Things like work force changes, etc. She stated she could not answer some of the questions in the template by the State

Franchise Tax Board template. There are ten areas and we need to figure out the scope, future staffing needs, gap analysis, etc.

Donna talked about the job descriptions and the different areas. She stated we need to do away with the 1990's mentality.

Jothany asked what questions you could not answer on the State Franchise Tax Board template.

Elba stated things like the organization as a whole, staff development, issues facing the staffing levels; we do not evaluate training, other questions, etc. The State Franchise Tax Board template is totally and completely different than the Palomar plan. The Palomar plan does not apply to us. We need to think about the needs of the college and campuses.

Dr. Railey stated that every department should have a program review and we can use this information.

Bill said we can use this information for the gap analysis.

Donna stated that program reviews will help us with the data.

Bill stated we can extract the FTE's and every area could provide the gap analysis. Most of the information is generated from the census data. We can do some type of an adjustment after the classes are filled. Things like how many students are we losing?

Jason stated do not toss out the Palomar plan.

Donna stated that we need to adapt or change our process because it is not really working. We need to get a person in the position, we need to get someone and we need a body to do the work.

Dr. Railey provided an overview of the planning process.

Diane stated we cannot get into the campuses and change that process.

Lorrie stated we need to use this template and the Palomar plan.

Dr. Railey directed the taskforce to page 4 of the State Franchise Tax Board template and stated that we don't recreate the wheel.

Jothany talked about priorities.

Elba stated we need to pull information from the Strategic Plan.

Jothany stated this will be an overall Districtwide HR Staffing Plan. We could put information about the campuses and colleges.

Diane stated there are national standards for some positions like custodians. The standards say how many square feet a custodian should optimally clean. We can also communicate with other

colleges and campuses on their standards. We can integrate the principles and state standards for the number of people required to perform a specific function.

Donna stated in developing our plan we need to look at what our overall objective is for the staffing plan and that will determine what our staffing plan should look like.

Elba stated we have to match our plan with the charge from Dr. Blue.

Diane stated the consensus appears to be to use the Palomar plan and check it against the State Franchise Tax Board template to make sure we considered all of the information on the template.

Lorrie stated yes we use it as a guide.

Donna stated we should use as much detail as we can from a district perspective.

Bill state that he cannot say yes for a community college, define the gap, state formula, square footage for custodians, etc. Some formulas we already have. Can we get a list of those?

Jothany asked what the priorities are.

Bill stated we definitely need a gap analysis. This would be a districtwide priority process. We cannot identify those areas (OAIH's, etc.) We need to prioritize these.

Elba stated that we should list what we want and try to figure out what we are doing.

Diane wrote out on the white board the Plan Objectives for the HR Staffing Taskforce as identified by this half of the HR Staffing Plan Taskforce:

1. Identify current gaps
2. Identify future staffing needs
3. Method for prioritization for DW needs
4. Succession planning
5. Acknowledgement – align staff needs with priorities from State Chancellor
 - a. Transfer
 - b. Basic skills
 - c. CTE
6. Districtwide plan integrates with campus plan and other DW plans (RAMT, Tech faculty, mission statements)
7. Hiring qualified staff
8. Staff development to keep staff current
9. Address accreditation standards.

a. Standard III A. Human Resources

The institution employs qualified personnel to support student learning programs and services wherever offered and by whatever means delivered, and to improve institutional effectiveness. Personnel are treated equitably, are evaluated regularly and systematically, and are provided opportunities for

professional development. Consistent with its mission, the institution demonstrates its commitment to the significant educational role played by persons of diverse backgrounds by making positive efforts to encourage such diversity. Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning.

b. Standard III A. 2.

The institution maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty with full-time responsibility to the institution. The institution has a sufficient number of staff and administrators with appropriate preparation and experience to provide the administrative services necessary to support the institution's mission and purposes.

c. Standard III A. 6.

Human resource planning is integrated with institutional planning. The institution systematically assesses the effective use of human resources and uses the results of the evaluation as the basis for improvement.

10. Identify process for systematic cycle of evaluation and who is responsible

Define the context worksheet

- District profile (Pages 6-11) Strategic Plan use and bring back the define context worksheet
- Find the scope and charge

Refer to DW campuses staffing plan

- Elba's unit (Classification study)
- Campus Program Reviews

Diane – Page 13 by Dr. Railey

Sandi stated page 13 – attrition

- Five years, history, etc.
- Age trends

Elba stated Palomar plan page (A-6)

Bill stated staffing supply relative to the positions.

Elba stated too detailed.

Diane stated page 13 – consider (when identifying).

Question: Qualified folks who meet the minimum qualifications?

Elba stated professional growth.

Diane stated conduct a gap analysis worksheet.

Jothany stated we look at other Districts to fill positions.

Diane stated we need to look at the plan objectives.

Bill stated HR Staffing Plan Taskforce meetings – can we do polycom from DO, Willow, Reedley?

Diane stated we can try to reduce it down
-two to three hours for blocks of times for meetings

Diane said it sounds like we want to use the Palomar plan and then just use components of the State Franchise Tax Board guide. The taskforce did not make up their mind clearly. Meetings may be on Monday mornings at 8 a.m.

Donna suggested we have a facilitator.

Dr. Railey suggested Jothany Blackwood.

Jothany agreed to facilitate this team if Diane wants her to.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Next Meeting: Friday, September 13, 2013 at 2:00 p.m. for the other half of the taskforce bec they could not all meet on one day. We will decide the meeting day and time on Friday at that meeting based on when the most people’s schedules will allow them to be present.



The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. (This is part 2 of 1 meeting)

Present at the meeting: Ed Eng, Wendell Stephenson, Mary Helen Garcia, Samerah Campbell and Diane Clerou.

- I. **Minutes** - the minutes of May 3, 2013 were approved and there were no corrections.
- II. **Process check, rumor control, heads up, and elephants** – there were none.
- III. **Review definition agreed to for decision making** – “qualified consensus”

Diane discussed what she told the team members on Monday, September 9, 2013, she believes everyone agreed we would use qualified consensus. She indicated she would resend the “qualified consensus” definition to be discussed at the next meeting.

IV. **Status Update of Summer Progress**

Diane provided the following update and overview from November 2012 to May 3, 2013. The HR Staffing Plan Taskforce held eight meetings. Dr. Blue provided the charge to the taskforce, and Victoria Simmons spoke on meeting etiquette and establishing ground rules. There were presentations from all campuses regarding the process for acquiring new positions at each of the campuses. Elba Gomez addressed to the process of classified recruitment. The group collected and reviewed different staffing plans from other colleges. It was decided to follow the Palomar plan as template for putting together the SCCCD plan. The group discussed the components they wanted to see in the plan and agreed upon a list. That list will be provided at the next meeting.

Diane explained that she and Elba met over the summer and used the HR department as an example for gap analysis. There was not a lot of progress in writing plan.

Diane again explained the process of new positions being approved through the chancellor’s workgroup and shared the guideline on this that was approved by the chancellor’s cabinet. Diane stated in Elba’s research she found a workforce planning guide from the State Franchise Tax Board. She stated the plan is good but may not do all that is needed for the HR Staffing Plan.

Diane explained that the timeline for completing the HR Staffing Plan has been accelerated due to accreditation milestones needing to be in place. The plan must be written and ready for implementation by July 2014. She will discuss calendar later in the meeting.

V. **Review FCC Taskforce member’s memo dated 05-17-13**

Wendell stated FCC is thinking we need to begin the process of writing this document. They are suggesting HR write a draft staffing plan and present it to the taskforce to critique.

VI. Provide list of all documents either sent to Task Force members or posted on Blackboard.

Diane provided a list of all the documents that have been posted on Blackboard. They can be found on left-hand side of the page under the tab “Taskforce Documents.” Diane explained Jothany Blackwood is on special assignment and will be helping write the plan.

VII. DRAFT timeline to meet accreditation goal

Diane again discussed the accelerated timeline. The draft plan must be completed and sent to the Chancellor’s Cabinet by 1/6/14. It will have to go to the other constituent groups and then back to Communications Council and the Cabinet prior to being approved by the Board in June. Diane provided the breakdown of the timeline. There are two separate documents, one is an action plan and the other is a timeline presenting to the constituent groups prior to being sent to the Board. Diane explained in order to meet the deadline it will be necessary to meet twice a month for three hours each time until December. It will also require breaking up into the site/location work groups to complete homework assignments.

VIII. Discuss two plan design choices: Palomar CCD and Workforce Planning Guide from State of CA Franchise Tax Board

Following discussion it was decided to continue to use the Palomar HR Staffing Plan as opposed to the workforce planning guide from the State of California Franchise Tax Board. Diane explained the franchise tax board information may be contained in our final document but may not be exactly like Palomar or the Franchise Tax Board document.

Sandi Edwards has been working on building a database that will allow the information in the database to be extracted by department, division, and campus. This will allow us to drill down to get information needed for the gap analysis. There is still work to be done on this but it should be ready in the very near future.

The new action plan is very aggressive to meet the proposed timeline. Wendell asked to back up and talk about the Palomar and the Franchise Tax Board. He stated parts are helpful and some of the worksheets are good for future staffing. There was general discussion regarding the Franchise Tax Board document. Elba gave us information about a website for national standards, (i.e. how much square footage should one custodian clean) that can assist us with the gap analysis. Diane stated there is information from Pedro Avila about graduation rates over the past 10 years.

Ed Eng asked once we figure out the gap analysis how will we set priorities. He stated Palomar is a single college and everything goes up to the president of the campus, but we have multiple presidents, how will we manage the different competing priorities?

Following discussion it was decided that Diane would rewrite sections 1 and 2 of the Palomar plan, and then others would will edit and see if we should include information noted in the Franchise Tax Board template.

At second meeting in September, we will review the draft of the revised Palomar which Jothany and Diane will work on.

We will also review the list of the components the taskforce already indicated it wants in our staffing plan.

It was decided meetings will be held Mondays 8am-11am. If you can't make this timeframe talk to constituent groups and tell them you want to be replaced.

Next meeting September 23rd and then every other week as follows:

Oct. 7th, 21

Nov. 4, 18

Dec. 2, 16

Next Meeting: Monday, September 23rd at 8:00 a.m. via polycom



The meeting was called to order at 8:05 a.m.

Present at the meeting: Wendell Stephenson, Jason Gardner, Samerah Campbell, Bill Turini, Mary Helen Garcia, Barbara Wells, Amie Voorhees, George Railey, Lorrie Hopper, Jennifer Johnson, Ed Eng, Diane Clerou and Jothany Blackwood

1. **Minutes** - the minutes from the previous meetings, September 9 and September 13, 2013, have not been completed so they were not approved at this time.

2. **Process check, rumor control, heads up, and elephants**

There were no comments.

3. **Review definition agreed to for decision making – “qualified consensus”**

The following definition was distributed to the taskforce members: If two people do not vote in favor of the motion then it is called a qualified consensus. Those two people explain their reason(s) for not supporting the motion to the rest of the committee. After listening, if anyone else on the committee requests a new vote, a vote will be taken. However, the two who originally dissented cannot ask for a vote, that request must come from one of the committee members who initially supported the motion.

4. **Review list of desired components/critical elements**

The following list was agreed to by taskforce members on March 15, 2013 and distributed again for this meeting to the taskforce members. It was agreed that this is a “living” document and can be added to as we work through the process. There was the addition of “District” in item 2 below.

Critical Elements

1. Gap Analysis
2. **District** prioritization process – is it going to be a standardized process throughout the district, or will colleges/campuses/district office have different prioritization processes?
3. Program review/program needs
4. Regular review of hiring plan
5. Transparency
6. Simplicity
7. Succession planning
8. Legal requirements on staffing
9. Integrating with other plans
10. Efficiency goal

5. **Review Section 1 and Section 2 of the HR Staffing Plan Draft**

Discussion was held regarding the executive summary. It was agreed that once the rest of the plan is completed the executive summary will change to reflect what the plan will become.

Where there was agreement/consensus, the document was edited. Those edits/changes appear as strikeouts or as “purple font” in the latest version of the document.

Follow-up from section 1

- Possibly change title of section 1 as it is repeated in section 2
- Figure 1 needs to reflect SCCCD information
- Figure 2 needs to be clear to explain how all of the plans work together, strategic plan, facilities plan, HR plan; Jothany will add explanation language as to how the integration of the plans work
- Figure 2 may make better sense if moved to paragraph 1.4
- Add links to the various other plans in section 1.4
- Add the flow chart for the Resource Allocation Model to page 6
- Address what we mean by diversity; don't assume it is understood
- Figure 6 needs to be updated to include SCCCD information
- Figure 7 - Decide on the number of years the staffing plan will be in effect prior to review and insert that in a flow chart. Jothany will work on this and add the ASUR calendar so it represents district office units.

Follow-up from Section 2

- Add to glossary definition of “planning horizon,” “optimum staffing levels”
- Figure 8 may not be necessary and may be removed
- Add to glossary definition of “minimum”, “actual”, and clarify “rates of attrition”
- Under section 2.2 - Prioritization may be further broken down into a 2.2.a. – district prioritization and 2.2.b. – campus prioritization
- Work on gap analysis as a group and see what is logical and will work
- Need to clearly identify the factors to be used for the gap analysis and prioritization as people will want to know that information
- Ensure timelines in section 2.4 coincide with the budget planning process so that new proposed positions can be considered prior to the adoption of the budget. Rework paragraph to align with the budget process
- Revise the “Annual Plan Update” graph on page 16

6. **Agree on Assignments for Next Meeting**

Read sections 3 and 4 and critique. It was agreed that while reading sections 3 and 4 note points from sections 1 and 2 that need to be revisited. Make a note of those concerns and they will be discussed at the next meeting.

Items for the glossary

- EEO staffing plan
- HR staffing plan
- Planning horizon
- Optimum staffing levels
- Attrition
- Prioritization
- Minimum
- Actual
- Rates of attrition

**Next meeting – Monday October 7, 2013 at 8:00 a.m.
OAB 126; AC2-233; RC PCR**



The meeting was called to order at 8:25 a.m. due to technical difficulties.

Present at the meeting: Wendell Stephenson, Amie Voorhees, Jennifer Johnson, Ed Eng, Elba Gomez, Donna Berry, Bill Turini, Diane Clerou and Jothany Blackwood

1. **Minutes** – Due to the absence of the regular secretary at the September 9th and September 13th meetings, those minutes will be distributed later in rough draft form for taskforce members to critique. The minutes of September 23 and October 7, 2013 will be sent to taskforce members for review and approval prior to the next meeting.

2. **Process check, rumor control, heads up, and elephants**

Amie stated the Academic Senate from FCC has requested an update from the taskforce and they are asking for copies of approved HR Staffing Plan Taskforce minutes. She stated she also tried to find an electronic version of the timelines that were distributed at the first meeting this fall. It was agreed that two timeline documents will be sent to the taskforce members as soon as possible, with the minutes to follow as listed above.

3. **EEO Advisory Committee Make-up**

At the last meeting there was a request for this information to be provided to the HR Staffing Plan Taskforce. Diane confirmed that the information had been sent via email to all the participants.

4. **Review Any Additions/Corrections to Draft HR Staffing Plan Section 1 and 2 since last meeting**

Diane stated she added a few items since the last meeting. They are:

- Under the executive summary section, she added the program review, unit breakdown for RC and FCC. She also added the district office breakdown used for the administrative services unit review. Using these units is an option for the taskforce to consider to break down our large district for the gap analysis.
- Per Bill Turini's comment at the last meeting, Diane changed the title in Section 1 to strike out "and plan design".

There was discussion regarding using the program review units and being able to compare "apples to apples" between the campuses. It was agreed there are other factors that may need to be taken into consideration. There may be dissimilarities as we work through the document. This will be revisited as the taskforce works through the actual gap analysis.

5. Review Draft HR Staffing Plan Section 3

Section 3.1 - Context

- Struck out the language that speaks to the history of Palomar and added approved historical/population language regarding SCCCD from the Strategic Plan.

Section 3.3.1 – Growth

- Green highlights reflect areas where HR needs to provide data to the taskforce
- Yellow highlighted language is wording from the Palomar plan that needs to be changed to reflect the terminology that we use at SCCCD.
- It was agreed that HR will create a list of the “green highlights” showing the data that needs to be provided.

Section 3.3.2 - Attrition

- Attrition data should be for the last ten years if possible.
- There was discussion regarding Table 1 – EEO6 Occupational categories should be changed to show two separate categories for the full-time and part-time faculty however, we should add a notation, “we have broken down faculty to be full-time and part-time”
- The information in the table may need to be broken down further
- Discussion of how the resource allocation plan will help address the allocations for the district. In that plan the breakdown for the district is FCC, RC, DO and WICCC; Madera and Oakhurst are included in RC

Section 3.3.3 – Age Distribution

- It was agreed to change the age report to break at the age of 55 instead of 50

Section 3.4.1 - Budget

- In terms of budget assumptions changed the language to read “for the purpose of this Plan the District assumes the state will provide access/restoration funds, and finances are on an upward trend due to Proposition 30 for roughly the next 5 years.”

Section 3.4.2 – Vacancies Due to Budget Constraints

- Add “in fiscal years 2008-09 through 2012-13, due to budgetary constraints (workload reduction),” the District...
- It was agreed the SCCCD didn’t really have a hiring freeze, but rather a “frost” for addressing vacancies. Freeze was changed to frost throughout this section.
- Table 2 cannot be completed until we know the unit breakdown, then we can look at unfilled positions
- Donna pointed out there is another category that could be considered and that is “unfunded classified positions”
- The classification study will also provide information that will be used to help with the analysis of the statements made in this section

Section 3.4.3.1 – the 50% Law

- Add “and benefits” into the paragraph for the 50 percent calculation

Section 3.4.3.2 – The Faculty Obligation Number (FON) and the 75/25 Ratio

- Need to add our own levels and history of FON numbers. There was discussion on the 75/25 percent for faculty and the fact the FON was frozen this year by the State Chancellor’s Office. Ed explained we will have to take into consideration the fact that the FON will be “unfrozen” next year and it will require the district to hire more instructors
- Wendell specifically asked for the information showing the FON numbers as it relates to the 75/25 percent and how close the district is at reaching the goal. Diane said we will provide this information
- Add “frozen”, “unfrozen” and “frost” to the glossary

Section 3.4.4 – Systems and Software Support

- Diane explained at one time there was a part-time position in the HR department dedicated to HR/MIS data research. She stated the district is in dire need of that position again and she may want to add a statement in this section addressing the need for that position to be funded again on a part-time basis. There is no person dedicated to producing data requests.

Section 3.4.5 – Classification Study

- Add the personnel commission classification study schedule into this section

6. Review Draft HR Staffing Plan Section 4

Section 4.1 – Information and Data

- We will add in our links to table 3

7. Agree on Assignments for Next Meeting

Section 5 will not be able to be completed until data is obtained and an analysis of it completed

- By Wednesday HR will create a list of all the data that needs to be provided
- HR will send a digital copy of the timelines
- It was agreed to break into the following groups for the purpose of looking at the specific language highlighted in yellow in each section, identify data needed for each section and change the language in yellow to reflect SCCC information where ever possible
 - **FCC work group – section 1**
 - **RC work group – section 2**
 - **Willow work group – section 3**
 - **District Office – obtain data and plug it in wherever possible for sections 1, 2, 3, and 4**
- **Next meeting – Monday October 21, 2013 at 8:00 a.m. OAB is unavailable**
- **Meeting Locations; DO Conf Room on Weldon, AC2-233; RC-PCR**



The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m.

Present at the meeting: Wendell Stephenson, Amie Voorhees, Jennifer Johnson, Ed Eng, Elba Gomez, Donna Berry, Bill Turini, Mary Helen Garcia, Barbara Wells, Jason Gardner, Lorrie Hopper, Diane Clerou, Jothany Blackwood, Sam Campbell, and Sandi Edwards

1. **Minutes** – The minutes of the following meetings were approved as submitted:
 - September 9, 2013
 - September 13, 2013
 - September 23, 2013
 - October 7, 2013
2. **Process check, rumor control, heads up, and elephants**

Diane said she had an opportunity to speak to John Tortarolo from Palomar and he said hello to Wendell and wished us luck in using Palomar's staffing plan as a guide for the SCCCD HR Staffing Plan document.

3. **Review progress of individual workgroups**

Fresno City College – Section 1

The FCC group went through section 1 and discussed their proposed changes and/or questions. The document was changed to reflect those changes where appropriate and agreed upon. Discussion was as follows:

- Figure 2 and the district's integrated planning model. Wendell suggested changing the box with "Plan implementation to "staffing plan implementation. Jothany explained that the titles in the figure are broad "functional" titles.
- Inserted the specific accreditation standard and the goals of the Board of Trustees. Jothany also explained that the grid in figure 3 shows the relationship of the accreditation and the goals to the staffing plan document. Wendell asked that the chancellor and board of trustee goals be sent to the taskforce for reference
- Section 1.3 and figure 4 – there was discussion regarding how the staffing plan will be incorporated into the RAM document. The RAM document is in draft form and will be sent to the taskforce for reference
- Diane read the following statement from Dr. Railey explaining the relationship of the plans as follows: Optimal staffing needs should be identified through the existing program and service reviews at the campus level. From that process the districtwide HR staffing plan should be informed by the results of the campus level staffing (instructional and service) needs summary as reflected in the campus strategic plan. The metrics by which each campus arrives at their "optimum" staffing should be similar across the

district so as to address data validity inputs to the HR staffing plan. The accreditors will need to see the pathway from campus level staffing priorities, district HR staffing plan recommendations and districtwide expenditures on staffing. The loop needs to be there for them to see.

- Wendell stated this section 1.3 will still need to be revisited
- Jothany and Ed will work on some tentative language that will be inserted in this section to address the relationship of the plans to the RAM
- Section 1.4 – Jothany will draft additional language for this section to reflect the processes of how the plans “inform” each other
- Section 1.6 – Wendell does have a comment regarding this section but it was “premature” to share at this time. Will reserve the comment for later in the process.

Reedley College – Section 2

The RC group went through section 2 and discussed their proposed changes and/or questions. The document was changed to reflect those changes where appropriate and agreed upon.

Discussion was as follows:

- Defining optimal staffing levels, minimum staffing levels, ideal staffing levels and actual staffing levels. The RC group feels “optimum” will usually fall somewhere between “minimum” and “ideal,” and the important part will be how these numbers relate to our “current” condition. In some instances, we may find that our “optimal” may be significantly more or significantly less than our “actual.” Definitely need to define these levels. Bill stated optimum refers to the functionality, ideal is if there is no budgetary issues and it is an ideal world. Others felt that optimum and ideal were the same thing.
- It was suggested discussing this concept of staffing levels in the subgroup meetings and bring back our thinking on this to the next meeting for discussion.
- Sandi Edwards presented the database information that she has formatted for use by the group. There was discussion regarding the district institutional research site containing much of this same information. It was decided that Diane, Sandi, and the institutional research assistants within the district would meet to discuss this data as well as the IR data and the manipulation of it for use by the taskforce
- In terms of retirement information it was discussed whether there should be 10 years, 7 years, 5 years, or 3 years’ worth of historical data.
- There was discussion about getting started with one department to see if the data presented is going to be what is needed for drilling down to the discipline level.
- Again, it was stated that the levels need to be defined
- Diane stated the taskforce may want to make a recommendation on what information should be contained in the program review in order for the HR staffing plan taskforce to do an analysis
- Section 2.2 in terms of the “factors to be used for the gap analysis and prioritization” there was discussion as to which key variables serve as the drivers for the work.
- It was agreed for faculty the data will be broken down by discipline.

- Administrators will be broken down by division or work responsibility; for academic administrators we will need the full time equivalent number as well as head counts and look at both of them.
- There are subgroups to the administrative component: executive level, managerial level and director/coordinator level and metrics need to be uniform for comparison.

Willow International Group – Section 3

The WI group went through section 3 and discussed their proposed changes and/or questions. The document was changed to reflect those changes where appropriate and agreed. Discussion was as follows:

- It was agreed that language should be added to this section regarding the fact that Willow International is advancing to candidacy and will become a college
- It was agreed to remove all of the strike-out language within the entire draft document to make it easier to read
- The EEO6 categories will be used for this document
- Jason stated that our plan needs to inform the technology committee of the types of data we need to have tracked and to have the data easily accessible
- It was agreed we would ask Pedro Avila for the number of people graduating from local colleges per discipline with master's degrees in order to use that data when discussing constraints and factors need to be identified.
- Possibly might need private sector data relative to demand for certain disciplines as well as wages for certain disciplines – Elba stated this information is available from EDD
- Elba will also send a link containing HR metrics calculations
- Hiring “frost” will be added to the glossary
- We need external data from other colleges for making comparisons. (Send information from CBT)

Homework Assignment

1. Work in individual groups discussing:
 - a. defining units: faculty, classified, management, how you want to do it and the metrics we should use in order to determine it
 - b. additional data that is needed
 - c. ideas on the prioritization process on a district level
 - d. definition of optimum vs ideal
 - e. whether it should be a five or six year plan

- **Next meeting – Monday, November 4, 2013 at 8:00 a.m.**
- **Meeting Locations; OAB 126, AC2-233; RC-PCR**



The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m.

Present at the meeting: Wendell Stephenson, Amie Voorhees, Jennifer Johnson, Ed Eng, Elba Gomez, Donna Berry, Bill Turini, Mary Helen Garcia, Patrick Stumpf, Jason Gardner, Lorrie Hopper, Diane Clerou, Sam Campbell, and Sandi Edwards

1. **Minutes** – Bill Turini moved to approve the minutes of October 21, 2013, with the addition of Sam Campbell being present at the meeting, Sam Campbell seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

2. **Process check, rumor control, heads up, and elephants**

Bill Turini thanked Sandi Edwards for the thorough reports she put together and emailed. He stated after looking at the information, he is thinking the elephant is who is going to be making staffing decisions? What is a district function and what is supposed to be a college function? Who will decide that? He stated from a faculty perspective he is wondering where the prioritization process belongs...at the district level or the local sites. Bill expressed concern the taskforce will be spending time doing comparisons of positions throughout the district when it is the district that will tell the sites how many new positions they will be getting each year.

Diane explained the process will be different than it has been in the past. She stated the cabinet level is relying on the campuses to have done all the filtering out of the variables and provide the cabinet level with the recommendation that is needed for each site. She stated the requests will be “filtering” up for the cabinet to consider and support. She stated it is the role of the taskforce to set up the metrics for staffing that the campuses would use to establish their priorities. Diane clarified that there will be exceptions to the standards for such things a signature programs and those decisions will be made at the campuses.

Amie asked why we would include all the comparative data if we are really only establishing metrics. Diane stated that is still to be decided. Jason asked for clarification as to what the cabinet is expecting from the taskforce, he stated it is sounding like the taskforce is going to establish the metrics and not develop any process for prioritization. Elba Gomez stated we are back again to where we are confused about what we are doing and what we are supposed to be doing. She said we need to get this done by December. She reminded the taskforce that she had a guide that she provided everyone. She said we have to have a process established not just establish metrics. There was discussion of the Resource Allocation Model being established and approved, and it clarifies the way the money/budget will be divided among the campuses. Diane explained campuses will look at the money they have been allocated and then establish their priorities. From there the campuses will look at the metrics that this taskforce has set up, then they will send their recommendations to this taskforce/committee, then to the cabinet and then communication council. Diane stated she does not think the cabinet will be deciding on where the “new” positions go. Rather there will be an allocation of money and then the campuses will use the established metrics. Ed Eng added the FON will also have some determination on the number of new positions needed. Diane added the campus level programs really need to be

driving all of the positions from a campus level. Jason pointed out the Willow group did put together a prioritization process and presented it to this group last spring. Diane stated one issue she had with the Willow proposal was that it seemed the taskforce would be dictating the process to the campuses. She stated it is not the role of the taskforce to tell the campuses how to set up their prioritization model.

Bill Turini stated a key part of the process is going to be timelines for receiving information such as the funding for new positions. Diane again stated the campuses will be given a “pot of money” to fund classified, faculty and management as well as supplies for the classroom and campuses will decide on how the funds should be spent. She said our taskforce will set forth metrics such as number of administrators to secretaries versus dean to number of clerical positions, FTES will be considered along with head count in some cases. There was discussion about the need for the job analysis to be finished to help determine the need for certain positions on the classified jobs.

Diane stated that she and Sandi met with institutional research assistants within the district and showed them the kind of data Sandi has put together. Diane stated it is becoming clear the district needs to add back the position of HR/MIS data researcher. She explained that the institutional researchers gather instructional data only, not non-instructional data. She stated the other way to get some of the information we need is to use Ralph Schwear, the database manager of the district. Sandi and he will meet regarding some of the requests for data.

3. Defining Units: Faculty, classified, management and the metrics we should use
(below is a listing of the definitions from the Reedley College workgroup)

- Faculty unit is defined at the discipline
 - Then further broken down by full-time and part-time (with overload being considered too)
- Classified unit is defined by function within the institution
 - Where appropriate we will use EE06 for consistency with other reports, however there will be times where more detail is needed
- Administrative unit is defined by level – executive, dean, director

There was further discussion regarding the process for positions being added to campuses. It was again explained that the campuses would be given their funding amounts and the campuses will prioritize and determine the needed positions instead of being told how many positions they will be receiving it will be up the campuses to allocate the funds to the positions they believe are necessary. Prioritization processes are already in place on the campuses. It was suggested to use those internal processes in this document.

4. Additional data that is needed (below is a listing of the data requests that were made throughout the meeting)

- Timelines
 - Date the campuses will receive the budget numbers for the next fiscal year
 - typically in late February or early March

- Date when the program review is due on campuses effects our timelines
- Date RAM will be approved each year
 - October 31st of each year
- Date for the governor releases his preliminary proposed budget
 - approximately January 10th
- Date the May revise comes out
 - approximately May 15th
- Date of preliminary budget
 - June board meeting
- Date of final budget
 - September board meeting
- District timeline for the strategic plan adoption
 - It was adopted July 2012
- Campus timeline for the strategic plan be finished
 - Campus strategic plans were adopted July 2013
- Number of FTES/FTEF by discipline for instructional faculty
- Number of FTES/FTEF by ~~are~~ **discipline** for non-instructional faculty
- FT/PT ratio by discipline
- Headcount/FTEF for non-instructional setting (counseling, etc.)
- Number of FTES/employees by area for classified
- Headcount/employee for classified
- Number of FTES/employee by area for maintenance, grounds, custodial broken up by square footage, and acreage where appropriate
- Number of FTES/employee by area for technical/professional/skilled craft for college staff & faculty/employee by area
- Number of FTES/administrator by area for administrative executive, managerial, director/coordinator
- Private sector data for field with master degree creating high demand
- Availability of qualified applicants for every employee category
- Full-time faculty overload per discipline
- How many students get into a class off of the wait list
- How many students are on wait list (would be good data to help determine the demand)
- How much has the governor's budget generally changed from the original budget to the revised budget
- EE06 definition is good for some areas but will need more specific information such as FTES for division for the faculty
- For faculty need to have the numbers broken down by full-time and part-time per division/discipline (Sandi explained that this is doable with the way the database is built, they just need to use the database which should be available)
- Data on the range of work done per classification at each site – classification study might flush that out, some of the functions may be very different at each of the sites

- The number of students that get into a class from the wait list, if possible.

5. **Ideas on the prioritization process on a district level** (below are the bullet points from Reedley College workgroup)

FACULTY

- what is each site's FT:PT faculty ratio (approaching 75/25)
- full-time faculty equalization of the FON
- anticipated growth and demands on the college/site
- CCCCO core goals of basic skills, transfer, and CTE as required by the service area
- market demand (*may be more appropriate for college-level plans*)
- requirements for maintaining licensing programs (*may be more appropriate for college-level plans*)
- program review data (e.g., mark analysis, success rates, retention rates) (*may be more appropriate for college-level plans*)

CLASSIFIED

- Consideration of function of area and demand on that area
 - Direct contact with students (e.g., Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, Library Services)
 - Indirect support of students (e.g., Grounds, Maintenance, Custodial) influenced by square footage and the degree/method of use of the facility
 - Some areas may fall into both categories (e.g., Business Services)
- What positions are necessary to simply “open the doors” as discussed in SB 361? This would set a minimum/base level, and from there we can establish factors based on headcount and/or facility use.

ADMINISTRATION

- Consideration of function of area and demand on that area
 - Instructional
 - Noninstructional
- What positions are necessary to simply “open the doors” as discussed in SB 361? This would set a minimum/base level, and from there we can establish factors based on headcount and/or facility use.
- Is the goal to have the District make position/title determinations, or for the District to be able to say to a college “you get a maximum of \$X to add administrators—figure out how you’re going to establish your organizational structure”?
- Our difficulty here is trying to determine an appropriate level of District involvement vs. what should belong to the college decision-making processes.

Lengthy discussion followed regarding the prioritization process and the roles of the campus level and district level. There was a general discussion about the comparison process across the district and the challenges of trying to make comparisons for instructional deans and non-instructional deans. Diane again clarified the new process that will be used to determine additional positions within the district. It will no longer be driven from the top down, but rather be driven by student and program needs. The Resource Allocation Model will give the funds to the campuses, the metrics from the HR staffing plan will be used for the staffing and the process will filter up and be integrated. She added Dr. Blue wants this taskforce to end up with a plan for each time there is a new center or college added there would be a standardized staffing level that would be used to staff the new center or college. Ed Eng offered to have the group meet in one location and he would go over the RAM document so that people would better understand that process. There was discussion that the factors that will determine the prioritization process at any level need to be the same. The colleges will still keep their process in place but this taskforce will identify factors that they should be using and those should drive the decisions. Diane stated there has to be some standard that is in place for predictability and consistency between the colleges to keep staffing equitable.

Jason asked in terms of prioritization how the RAM is going to communicate to the HR Staffing taskforce committee and stated there should be some accountability for people that are not using their staffing resources efficiently. Bill stated a presentation on the RAM would be helpful and added there should be something built into the RAM where it gets information from this committee and is built into the budget timeline process and timelines for staffing committee interacting with the resource allocation committee. Diane explained the RAM is driven by the strategic plan, the strategic plan drives everything.

6. **Definition of optimum vs. ideal** (below are the bullet points for the Reedley College group)

- ***minimum***: not all areas will have “minimums”—this includes areas that have statutory or regulatory staffing requirements. Not necessarily what is required for best service to the students, but what are we mandated to provide.
- ***actual/current***: the levels that are presently in place
- ***optimum***: the level that provides the best service to the institution, with consideration for external forces (e.g., state budget issues).
- ***ideal***: the level that provides the best service to all aspect of the institution with no concern for external factors (the truly IDEAL world)

Following a lengthy discussion regarding staffing levels and the definition of optimum/optimal it was decided:

- we will not use the term/concept of ideal
- optimum and optimal can be used interchangeably in the discussion and document
- we will use current and not use actual
- the plan will be for 5 years in terms of using attrition data with a note that next year we will have multiple comparison points of three years and six years

It was decided the HR staff would continue to write language into the document and send the latest draft copy of the document to the taskforce members by Friday, November 8th.

Homework Assignment

Members will review the latest draft of the plan and make their comments and be prepared to discuss at the next meeting.

- **Next meeting – Monday, November 18, 2013 at 8:00 a.m.**
- **Meeting Locations: District Office Conference Room; CC1-208 and AC2-233**



The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m.

Present at the meeting: Jothany Blackwood, Wendell Stephenson, Amie Voorhees, Jennifer Johnson, Ed Eng, Elba Gomez, Donna Berry, Bill Turini, Mary Helen Garcia, Patrick Stumpf, Jason Gardner, Lorrie Hopper, Sam Campbell, Sandi Edwards and Diane Clerou,

1. **Minutes** – Diane pointed out the minutes from the November 4, 2013, reflect specific answers/dates to the timelines that were discussed at the meeting. Also a correction on page 3 to remove the word “are” and add “discipline”. With those changes the minutes of November 4, 2013, were approved.

2. **Process check, rumor control, heads up, and elephants** – none

3. **Review of latest draft of HR Staffing Plan Taskforce**

Prior to reviewing the document, Diane stated that Michelle Johnson, institutional researcher, would be working with Ralph Schwehr to simplify and automate the data that has been discussed. This will make it easier for the information to be manipulated for our purposes.

Jothany explained the changes and additions that she made to the latest version of the HR Staffing Plan document. Discussion was held and the taskforce worked through the latest version of the document making edits and changes where there was agreement. The new version reflects those changes.

Ed Eng provided a copy of the DBRAAC resource allocation documents and gave an overview of the document as it relates to funding allocations for the campuses.

After lengthy discussion regarding the challenges of writing this plan it was decided:

- The latest version would be sent to the taskforce members and members will review the document again specifically the items that are highlighted in yellow to determine if the context is right and if the placement of language is where it needs to be.
- Bill Turini, Jennifer Johnson, Lorrie Hopper will each send the office of instruction program review for their campus.
- HR/PC/Ed Eng will look at the data and apply the written word to the data and see what we come up with. This information will be sent to the members.
- Wendell pointed out there is only one more regularly scheduled meeting left where the instructors are still on duty days.
- Diane stated that the members should work individually on the document and get their work product to everyone and then Diane and Claudette will put it together before the December 2 meeting.
- Jason mentioned given the timeline there is still a lot of work that needs to be done on the prioritization in section 2.2 and 2.3.

- Diane again stated that the group should feel free to work on those areas to and get the responses back to her as soon as possible.

Jason asked if the taskforce or a committee might, at some point in the future, look at each college or center and see how they have used their budget in terms of staffing needs. Jason asked if there would be some kind of evaluation of the use of funds at some point. Diane stated she does not know what the charge will be if this taskforce becomes a standing committee. She stated she sees the taskforce's role as setting up the metrics that will show where we are in terms of staffing and where we want to be eventually.

Assignment

Members will review the latest draft of the plan, make their comments and send them to Diane or Claudette as soon as possible.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

- **Next meeting – Monday, December 2, 2013 at 8:00 a.m.**
- **Meeting Locations: OAB 126; CCI-208 and AC2-233**



The meeting was called to order at 8:10 a.m.

Present at the meeting: Wendell Stephenson, Amie Voorhees, Jennifer Johnson, Ed Eng, Elba Gomez, Donna Berry, Bill Turini, Patrick Stumpf, Jason Gardner, Lorrie Hopper, Sam Campbell, Sandi Edwards and Diane Clerou,

1. **Minutes** – It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of November 18, 2013, as presented.
2. **Process check, rumor control, heads up, and elephants** – none
3. **Review of office of instruction program reviews for Fresno City College, Reedley College and Willow International**

Jennifer Johnson provided the copy of Fresno City College's program review and stated it was also available on the FCC Institutional Research website. Lorrie Hopper will be sending a copy of the Willow International Office of Instruction Program Review. Bill Turini sent the copy of the Reedley College Office of Instruction Program Review. All will be posted on the Blackboard site.

Discussion was held regarding the data provided by Sandi Edwards relative to the FCC business division and the breakdown of the data from office of instruction, then by division, then by discipline, drilling down by dean. Diane explained there will be a sampling of this same information across the district and then a comparison can be made such as how many deans per FTES. Diane stated once a sampling is done, the narrative can be written based on the data. She added there is no way to do the whole district at this time. Diane said when the workgroups meet they will look at just one division and break it down for purposes of writing the narrative. She stated it will just be the office of instruction across the district. Sandi will send RC and WI the same information as was provided for the FCC business division.

Bill Turini read off some additional comments he has made to the document and that will be posted on Blackboard for everyone to view. General discussion followed regarding sections of the HR Staffing Plan, small changes were made to the document as the discussion evolved. Jason Gardner stated the document needs to highlight how the funding actually drives how the colleges or HR hiring decisions are made. He stated not much of the document actually talks about the process of how our communities will be informed about the plan.. Patrick Stumpf stated WI thought it looked like there are three different processes at the different colleges, he suggested adding a flow chart showing how the DRAM drives the process. There was further discussion regarding the new concept of DRAM and the relationship to the distribution of resources to the colleges and centers. Ed Eng provided a general explanation regarding the DRAM. Diane agreed this process will be spelled out in the document.

There was discussion as to whether or not this taskforce would become the actual HR Staffing Plan Committee that would oversee the operation of the plan.

There was further discussion regarding the process for positions being approved. It was agreed that each colleges' staffing plan would be included as appendices to the document.

Bill Turini stated it seems as though the standing committee will receive more staffing requests than can be funded.

Diane stated we will need to make sure that we stay within the FON and be cognizant of the 75/25 goal.

Bill Turini asked if that will be the responsibility of this committee.

Diane again explained the process that the visioning comes from the Board of Trustees in January. That visioning from the board goes into the district strategic plan, the district strategic plan then drives the RAM and the RAM dispenses the money. The campuses do their prioritization and then the campuses or centers send their staffing plan requests forward to this committee, this committee assesses the campus recommendations for staffing based on the matrix that this committee establishes, then the committee will substantiate or maybe cannot substantiate the recommendations by the campuses, then the committee's recommendation along with the campus budget is sent forward to the Chancellor's Cabinet. There was further discussion back and forth about how this process will work and discussion about possible glitches in the process. After this discussion it was suggested that the matrix be added to the program review level so that the prioritization of positions can be done in a more consecutive line with the budget development process.

Jason stated that would require the schools to justify and substantiate the positions based on our matrix.

Discussion continued regarding the timeline as it relates to notification of funds expected for the next year, staffing for the next year as well as advance recruitment for each year. There was also discussion of the full process from visioning to the strategic conversation to the strategic plan and the possibility that all of those things may need to be adjusted as far as the timeline in order for this taskforce plan to play a role in the staffing at the campuses and centers.

Bill Turini suggested that a cover page be designed for use with requesting positions. That cover page would identify the matrix and then the campuses or centers would provide a narrative of how the proposal meets the matrix. Diane agreed this sounded like a good process to try for the first year. Whoever is requesting the position will be required to say how the position meets the matrix, then this taskforce or committee will determine if the position does meet the established matrix and then the committee will make a recommendation.

Bill Turini stated a cover memo needs to go out stating these are the components that need to be addressed in the proposal, broken down by employee category. Diane stated this form should make the process move faster and not get bogged down in this committee. There was discussion about the prioritization process and gap analysis changing from what the original vision was for this document. Diane will rewrite this section of the plan to reflect discussions as well as address other areas discussed today. The document will be sent to the taskforce members by 5:00 p.m.

on Friday. Next meeting is scheduled for December 12, 2013. Taskforce members will have a week to review the document before meeting again.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

These minutes typed but not reviewed by the committee.

- **Next meeting – Thursday, December 12, 2013 at 3:00 p.m.**
- **Meeting Locations: DO Conference Room; RC PCR and AC2-233**



The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

Present at the meeting: Wendell Stephenson, Amie Voorhees, Jennifer Johnson, Donna Berry, Bill Turini, Patrick Stumpf, Jason Gardner, Lorrie Hopper, Sam Campbell, Sandi Edwards, Mary Helen Garcia, Jothany Blackwood and Diane Clerou,

1. **Minutes** – The minutes for December 2, 2013, were not available for approval at this time.
2. **Process check, rumor control, heads up, and elephants** – none
3. **Review changes/comments on latest version of draft HR Staffing Plan document**

Jothany explained the timeline as it currently is written and the necessity to stay on task so the document will complete the approval process in a timely manner. There was discussion as to whether or not the document would be brought back to this taskforce for further input after the constituency groups have their opportunity to review the document and make suggestions to the document.

The taskforce worked through the document starting with section 1 and reviewing the changes and revisions. Discussion was held about using consistent language, such as “colleges, centers and district office”. The group worked through the document agreeing to changes within the document as discussion was held.

The document still required revisions. It was decided that taskforce members would send any changes or comments on the remaining sections to all members of the taskforce. With the end of the semester near, it was decided to meet again on Thursday, December 19 at 8:30 a.m. Any faculty member who wants to be part of the meeting will receive Schedule C Lab Rate for the hours that are worked on December 19th. Wendell volunteered to be part of this meeting. All members are to send Wendell any comments relative to the document.

- **Next meeting – Thursday, December 19, 2013 at 8:30 a.m.**
- **Meeting Locations: DO Conference Room; DO North Room 305**



The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

Present at the meeting: Wendell Stephenson, Lorrie Hopper, Jothany Blackwood and Diane Clerou,

1. Review changes/comments on latest version of draft HR Staffing Plan document and continue editing document.

The meeting was set up via poly com and the four participants worked through the document making changes and edits. This meeting was concluded at approximately 11:30 a.m.



The meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m.

Present at the meeting: Wendell Stephenson, Amie Voorhees, Bill Turini, Jason Gardner, Patrick Stumpf, Ed Eng, Sam Campbell, Vicki Roth and Diane Clerou

1. Elephants or Rumors in the Room

Wendell Stephenson discussed the topic of constituency representation and the fact that all participants were selected to serve on this taskforce and to provide a certain amount of expertise to the process. He also stated it was the idea that each person on the taskforce would be a contributing participant and help each other so as to lighten the load for others. He said when somebody does not do any work on the plan it means the others have to do a lot of work. He asked why the Vice Chancellor of Educational Services has not appeared at a meeting except one time, in addition he does not send his representative either.

Diane explained that he sits on many different community boards and committees. She said that Jothany Blackwood, who represents him, asked if she should come to this meeting today or go to the Leadership Academy session taking place on this same day. Diane told her she should attend the Leadership Academy.

Wendell stated he is too busy to be on this committee so he should not be on this committee, he should not have been assigned to be on this committee. He asked that the minutes reflect his question as to why Dr. Railey is not here. He added, Dr. Railey is supposed to have the overall picture. He said Bill Turini, Amie Voorhees, Jason Gardner and himself are expected to write this thing because there is not an administrator here doing any of the work. It shows contempt for the shared governance process and for this committee. He asked that it be reflected in the minutes that he feels this way. He said he would be interested in knowing if others feel this way too?

Bill stated he does not think it is just relative to this committee. He said he has heard similar comments about administrator's not attending meetings so this is relative to other taskforces as well

1. Continue review changes/comments from all constituent groups (feedback following all constituent group review of the document)

The members of the HR Staffing Plan taskforce worked through the document addressing the "comments" and reviewing "changes" that were made by all of the constituent groups. Each individual comment was addressed by the participants.

During the process of editing the draft document, discussion was ensued as to whether or not this should be a standing committee. Amie pointed out that the charge to this committee was to make a recommendation to the chancellor on whether this should become a standing committee and its composition. Bill moved to recommend the task force become a standing committee, Amie

seconded the motion. Discussion ensued as to composition and what it would be called. It was suggested to call it the HR Staffing Plan Oversight committee. Ed Eng stated the composition of the committee should be current taskforce members until such time as the taskforce decides on the make-up of the committee. The motion carried unanimously.

Diane clarified this will be a recommendation that this become a standing committee and we use the taskforce committee members until such time as we have an operating agreement in place and committee composition is delineated in that operating agreement.

There was discussion that there has been a paradigm shift in the hiring procedures within the district. There will no longer be a chancellor's cabinet subgroup approving positions. The shift will be back to the campuses in terms of determining which positions need to be filled. The only positions that will now require approval at the chancellor level are new positions.

Next Meeting: March 31, 2014; DO Conference Room; RC CCI-208; AC1-270

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

These minutes were typed after the conclusion of the spring semester and have not been officially approved by the taskforce.



The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m.

Present at the meeting: Wendell Stephenson, Amie Voorhees, Bill Turini, Donna Berry, Jason Gardner, Patrick Stumpf, Lorrie Hopper, Ed Eng, Sam Campbell, Jothany Blackwood and Diane Clerou

1. Elephants or Rumors in the Room -None

1. Continue review changes/comments from all constituent groups (feedback following all constituent groups review of the document)

Jothany Blackwood stated she received feedback that there was concern regarding George Railey not participating on this taskforce. She stated she and he came to the first two meetings and then she has been his designee since that point. She stated she meets with Dr. Railey every two weeks and she updates him on the status of the taskforce. She stated that she has contributed as a writer on his behalf. He is providing input into the process via her. She said they both have been actively monitoring the process and ensuring that the timelines are met for the next level.

The members of the HR Staffing Plan taskforce continued working through the draft document addressing the “comments” and reviewing “changes” that were made by all of constituent groups. Each individual comment was addressed by the participants and changes were made to the document as necessary.

This was the last meeting of the taskforce for 2013-14. The document then began the approval process in accordance with the timeline.

These minutes were typed after the conclusion of the spring semester and have not been officially approved by the taskforce.