



College Planning Council

Minutes For Friday, May 26, 2017		10 AM - 12 PM	PSA 19 A&B
Members Present:	Joel Kinnamon, Christen Smith, David George, Courtney Doussett, Carl Farmer, Linda Emerson, Denise Diamond, Lauro Jimenez, Liliana Casas, Arturo Delgado, John Ramont, Jeff Larson, Karen Tabor, Jessica Enders, Sheri Willis, Mary Anne Gularte, Pamela Ralston, Lisa Howell, Pam Hunter, Daniel Martinez, Katie Chartier, Lisa Howell, Annebelle Nery, Joseph Aguirre, Robert Holmes, Cody McCabe, Luis Castellanos, Lisa Soccio		
Members not Present:	Rick Rawsley, Maria Jasso, Sarah Fry, Andrew Johnson, John Learned, Maria Herrera, Brian Koenig, Mary Lou Marrujo, Amanda Phillips		
Guest(s):	Gary Ginther, Rick Deutsch		
Parliamentarian:	Carlos Maldonado		
Recorder:	Julia Breyer		

AGENDA

1. Call to Order/Roll Call: 10:11 AM	
2. ACTION ITEMS	
2.1 Approval of May 12, 2017 Minutes	
DISCUSSION	<p>Lauro Jimenez referenced he has one correction to be made for an action item, 2.19 - Health and Welfare Committee Recommendation. Lauro Jimenez requested the word 'substantial' be changed to 'substantive'.</p> <p>He commented that although that may have been the statement he wanted to clarify that 'substantive' is the word, it's a significant enough situation during negotiations to merit long discussion so he does not know what the appropriate thing to do would be but he wanted to ensure it's noted that it is substantive and not substantial.</p> <p>Lauro commented there was nothing in writing on vote and recommendation. Typically, recommendations that come to CPC, there's item in writing what the recommendation may be and there was nothing provided in writing so there has been confusion in terms of getting the material back to their constituents about what the actual recommendation was. He wanted to make sure it was reflected.</p> <p>Christen Smith asked if there is a note taker for the Health and Welfare meetings.</p> <p>Lauro Jimenez replied, yes there is but it was relayed to him that the minutes were not ready but whether there is or isn't, if they are going to follow the formal process, typically what you find in all of these there is a document noting the recommendation. There is confusion as to what was voted on.</p> <p>President Kinnamon asked if there was something in the minutes that Lauro Jimenez was referring to that he needed to address. Lauro indicated there are not page numbers to work off of. President Kinnamon referenced the minutes and explained to turn back two pages, and the first word was 'pocket'. Look to the bottom on the page and President Kinnamon re-read the committee's</p>

	<p>recommendation <i>“The Committee’s recommendation to the President was to wait for the final quotes from CVT in order to be able to make a decision on behalf of the members’ constituency groups. Five of the individuals on the Committee represent bargaining groups and two represent confidential staff and management. The vote was three yes and two no. This is the recommendation brought to President Kinnamon.”</i></p> <p>Lauro Jimenez thanked President Kinnamon for clarifying but noted the item of concern was it was difficult for anyone to really know so he highly requests that recommendations be like everything else.</p> <p>President Kinnamon continued to review the conclusion for the recommendation and re-read the recommendation to the committee;” Motion carried with 15 votes in favor, 6 against, and 1 abstention.”</p> <p>Lauro Jimenez clarified, the recommendation is to wait.</p> <p>President Kinnamon, replied yes.</p>	
CONCLUSION	Approved as amended.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Correct verbiage in minutes.		
2.2 Administrative Procedure 2360 Minutes – 2nd Reading		
DISCUSSION	<p>Motioned by Lauro Jimenez, seconded by Liliana Casas to approve Administrative Procedure 2360 Minutes – 2nd reading.</p> <p>There were no additional corrections brought forward.</p>	
CONCLUSION	Motion carried.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
2.3 Administrative Procedure 2365 Recording Board Meetings – 2nd Reading		
DISCUSSION	<p>Motioned by Lisa Howell, seconded by Pamela Ralston to approve Administrative Procedure 2365 Recording Board Meetings – 2nd reading.</p> <p>The procedure was an update and review with no changes. There was no additional corrections brought forward.</p>	
CONCLUSION	Motion carried.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
2.4 Administrative Procedure 2740 Board Education – 2nd Reading		
DISCUSSION	<p>Motioned by Lisa Howell, seconded by Lauro Jimenez to approve Administrative Procedure 2740 Board Education – 2nd reading.</p> <p>Reference to additions made by ACCJC.</p>	
CONCLUSION	Motion carried.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
2.5 Administrative Procedure 5011 – Admission and Concurrent Enrollment of High School and Other Young Students – 2nd Reading		
DISCUSSION	<p>Motioned by Lisa Howell, seconded by Luis Castellanos to approve Administrative Procedure 5011 – Admission and Concurrent Enrollment of High School and Other Young Students as a 2nd reading.</p> <p>Annebelle Nery read the update on the new paragraph that was added regarding concurrent enrollment students.</p>	

	<p>Lauro Jimenez asked if someone is a minor they are still required to speak with the parents.</p> <p>Annebelle Nery replied they require a signed form from their parents.</p> <p>Lauro Jimenez reviewed the language for highly talented and noted that the new item is identified as highly gifted. He asked if these will remain the same or would they like to remain consistent.</p> <p>Annebelle Nery replied that highly talented is the original language which is defined specifically for music and arts. Highly gifted is the language recommendation provided directly from CCLC. Annebelle Nery replied that they will keep both.</p> <p>Christen Smith mentioned if she understands correctly, the recommendation would be to add highly gifted to the second paragraph.</p>	
CONCLUSION	Approved as amended; motion carried.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
2.6 Administrative Procedure 5050 Student Success and Support Program – 2nd Reading		
DISCUSSION	<p>Motioned by Liliana Casas, seconded by Lisa Howell to approve Administrative Procedure 5050 Student Success and Support Program as a 2nd reading.</p> <p>Annebelle Nery commented the changes that are noted are primarily CCLC recommendations and corrections to the new legislature.</p> <p>David George, the role of the teaching faculty is not significantly addressed and he would hope moving forward as they look at the document that there will be a proactive and systematic process involved with the entire area, teaching improvement would help towards the efforts involved with the student success program.</p> <p>Annebelle Nery responded that the legislation of student support and student success programs, this specific to assessment, orientation, student educational planning and follow up services. They are waiting to develop a program.</p>	
CONCLUSION	Motion carried.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
2.7 Administrative Procedure 5070 Attendance Accounting – 2nd Reading		
DISCUSSION	<p>Motioned by Lilian Casas, seconded by Lisa Howell to approve Administrative Procedure 5070 Attendance Accounting as a 2nd reading.</p> <p>Annebelle Nery commented this is part of the review process and incorporated changed made from CCLC.</p>	
CONCLUSION	Motion carried.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
2.8 Administrative Procedure 5110 Counseling – 2nd Reading		
DISCUSSION	<p>Motioned by Annebelle Nery, seconded by Liliana Casas to approve Administrative Procedure 5110 Counseling as a 2nd reading.</p> <p>Annebelle Nery commented this is part of the review process.</p>	
CONCLUSION	Motioned carried.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

2.9 Administrative Procedure 5150 – Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS)/Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE) – 2nd Reading

DISCUSSION	<p>Motioned by Annebelle Nery, seconded by Liliana Casa to approve Administrative Procedure 5150 – Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS/Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE) as a 2nd reading. Christen Smith inquired about the interim position currently held and wanted to know if the new person be added part time in the future.</p> <p>Annebelle Nery replied there is an expectation of the position to play a role. Minimum qualification was management but the job description has changed to incorporate director’s position as well as counsel students within those programs. The position is 100% funded by the district.</p> <p>Christen Smith asked if this should be clarified further. Annebelle Nery responded that is why they included this minimum qualification into the job description.</p> <p>Denise Diamond asked if the faculty member who currently is in the position at the current time was consulted.</p> <p>Annebelle Nery replied they currently had a manager in that role who was currently working for us and yes, Carol Lasquade was consulted regarding the position.</p> <p>President Kinnamon made a recommendation to postpone this item.</p>
------------	--

CONCLUSION	Administrative Procedure 5150 – Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS/Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education (CARE) will be postponed.
------------	---

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Item postponed.	Julia Breyer	Sept. 8

2.10 Administrative Procedure 5300 Student Equity Plan – 2nd Reading

DISCUSSION	<p>Motioned by Lauro Jimenez, seconded by Liliana Casas to approve Administrative Procedure 5300 Student Equity Plan as a 2nd reading. Annebelle Nery commented this is part of the review process.</p> <p>Lauro Jimenez wanted to clarify that it will dove tail the equity committee. Annebelle Nery, replied yes.</p>
------------	---

CONCLUSION	Motioned carried.
------------	-------------------

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

2.11 Administrative Procedure 5410 Associated Students Elections – 2nd Reading

DISCUSSION	<p>Motioned by Lisa Howell, seconded by Denise Diamond to approve Administrative Procedure 5410 Associated Students Elections as a 2nd reading. Annebelle Nery reported there were recommendations added from CCLC. There was no additional feedback provided.</p>
------------	---

CONCLUSION	Motioned carried.
------------	-------------------

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

2.12 Administrative Procedure 5420 Associated Students Finance– 2nd Reading

DISCUSSION	<p>Motioned by Annebelle Nery, seconded by Liliana Casas to approve Administrative Procedure 5420 Associated Students Finance as a 2nd reading. Annebelle Nery reported there was a correction to the education code section. There was no additional feedback provided.</p>
------------	---

CONCLUSION	Motioned carried.
------------	-------------------

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
2.13 Administrative Procedure 5610 Voter registration – 2nd Reading			
DISCUSSION	<p>Motioned by Lauro Jimenez, seconded by Liliana Casas to approve Administrative Procedure 5610 Voter Registration as a 2nd reading. Annebelle Nery reported there was a paragraph added by the recommendations implemented from CCLC. They did not receive any additional feedback.</p>		
CONCLUSION	<p>Motioned carried.</p>		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
2.14 Health and Welfare Committee Recommendation– 2nd Reading			
DISCUSSION	<p>President Kinnamon read the recommendation made by the Health and Welfare committee which was to delay a recommendation to the president until CVT provides rates in late May or June.</p> <p>Motioned by Mary Anne Gularte, seconded by Annebelle Nery to approve Health and Welfare Committee Recommendation as a 2nd reading.</p> <p>Lauro Jimenez commented he wanted to reflect for the record that his understanding that this should not be an action item. There are concerns about how last time there was not a written document that made it clear as to what they were voting on so he thanked President Kinnamon for providing the information during the meeting. Further there was no documentation just the verbal report.</p> <p>Lauro Jimenez clarified for the record and noted he would provide the verbiage to the note taker that the Board of Governors regulations implementing AB1725 apply certain standards on local governing boards, and require that local participatory governance procedures “shall not intrude on matters within the scope of representation under Section 3543.2 of the Government Code. . .” and shall not “impinge upon or detract from any negotiations or negotiated agreements between exclusive representatives and district governing boards.” (California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 51023.5(b))</p> <p>Lauro Jimenez referenced page 22 of CPC handbook for matters related to staff:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">3. Staff <i>Matters having a significant effect on staff are not defined in the regulations except that there is a requirement that a district governing board “reasonably determines, in consultation with staff” that the matter has significant effect on staff [51023.5 (a) (4)].</i></p> <p>Lauro Jimenez noted in section (b) it states and clarifies what he just read in that the whole concept of what they are doing shall not impinge upon or detract upon from any negotiations or negotiated agreements between the representative and the districts governing boards. He wanted to reflect for the minutes that it is their position that first off that this recommendation may come to CPC as an information and not as action and if this body chooses to go forward and approve any recommendation related to bargaining that is within scope of bargaining that the union reserves the right to demand to bargain over either the decision or the effects of the recommendation.</p>		

President Kinnamon reminded everyone that there are a lot of subcommittees and they are consultation committees. The Health and Welfare committee as acknowledged by their own representative for CSEA has acknowledged that bargaining does not take place at that committee. The district is not bargaining in that venue. They are vetting and making a recommendation so that they may fully understand and more broadly understand Health and Welfare benefits. It is correct that ultimately wages and benefits and other working condition matters are bargained at the table with the three collective bargaining units. He wanted to make sure everyone is aware of that distinction. He noted he may be out of order, there was a motion and a second so he now will provide Mary Anne Gularte the opportunity to present the item as he did for everyone else.

Mary Anne Gularte commented she will go through the documentation which provides the overall recommendation from the Health and Welfare Committee. She included the list of companies where the RFP was sent and also the RFP is attached. As she mentioned at the last meeting, the committee had the opportunity to review the (RFP) document and then Mr. LaBounty incorporated information that was received. As provided, there are a list of companies and their responses. Alliant then gathered all of the information that was received by Friday, April 14th. Then on Monday, April 7th, Alliant met with the Health and Welfare committee and provided information on the SISC renewal rate. From what she understands from other committee members that was an annual activity and that Mr. LaBounty would come and provide that information. Later in the week, when Human Resources received the packet of material from Alliant in an electronic format, Misti Santana sent out all of the information to the committee for their review. Three proposals were submitted by the deadline which were SISC, CVT, and Blue Shield. SISC had completed all of the information that was requested in the RFP. CVT and Blue Shield were incomplete. CVT provided illustrated rates. Blue Shield did not respond to the questions. The other component to this was the committee then asked Mr. LaBounty to contact CVT again to see if there were answers to the questions that they wanted further explanation on from the RFP responses. Once Mr. LaBounty did that, the responses from the gentleman at CVT indicated that there were was no change from his responses that were provided in the RFP. He clarified about blended and unblended. Rates could be blended from medical but unblended for vision and dental, which was clarified and very useful.

On May 8th, their committee made a recommendation. The motion was made to recommend to the Superintendent/President to wait for final quotes from CVT in order to be able to make a decision on behalf of the committee member constituency groups. The motion passed by a majority. There are 7 members on the committee and from the attendance at that time, 3 voted yes, 2 voted no. This is the recommendation that was presented to President Kinnamon and the recommendation that she stated during the presentation at the last CPC meeting. This was the recommendation from the committee.

David George asked if it is fair to ask what was the essence of the NO's were. He wanted to know what the essence of their objections were.

Mary Anne Gularte responded, incomplete responses from CVT and only illustrative rates. They requested quotes by April 14th and also upon review of

CVT's material they had concerns, just as last year with some of the practices and their contract. CVT's contract could not be modified and the contract was going to be the same. There were some provisions of the contract that were not in alignment with how some things they would like to occur. They also have a legal opinion that then reviewed to determine that as well. Last year, the District had a legal opinion also, and then the CVT attorney working with CVT provided legal opinion. There were other things that they discussed but mainly there were concerns with CVT. They also looked at cost difference. There was an analysis provided by the broker and when they backed out the broker fees, he identified it was approximately a \$20,000 difference. You'll see some head shaking as there was a difference in opinion as to how it was calculated. It would be a 1.1 % difference. They also looked at the final rate quote from CVT last year and compared it to their illustrative rate and looked at what that increase was, which was around 9%. When they looked at SISC rate last year to this year to their rate they provided in April, it was a 6.2% increase. They looked at that for future years as well along with projections of how it might be in the future. There were a combination of things and they spent a lot of time discussing it. They had two meetings discussing it. David George asked if there are consequences in delaying the decision and will the coverage continue on. What is the time?

Mary Anne Gularte replied they did have a time line and they were aiming to have everything completed in May so that the recommendation could be made to the President so that he could then do the vetting he felt necessary and be able to take it to the board. The board had asked for it to be completed in a timely manner so that decisions could be made by employees before the summer and to not come back and find out that maybe their benefits had changed. That was also a concern.

Denise Diamond commented, to answer the question about the timeline, there are other ways of looking at it. Open enrollment is October 1st. The collective bargaining agreement for the full time faculty expires June 30th of this year and everything stays in effect till they ratify another contract. The timeline from their point of view is not compromised because the board of trustees does meet June, July and August and as such there is plenty of time. Committee members who voted in favor and those who voted against have been more than willing to come in June. Some on them come in June to meet on the budget so there is a willingness to come in and to understand what the final rate quotes are. One of the reasons for the recommendation was to avoid and get out of the spinning loop of making comparative charts with final quotes and illustrative quotes because they could not come to an agreement. They could not come up with a comparison chart that both the district and the union agreed with, therefore to get out of that spin cycle, they wanted to compare apples to apples to compare final quotes to final quotes and such show good faith by coming in at June, looking at final rates and making an informed recommendation of company and plans to the constituency groups. Also, not compromising the timeline because of the reasons she just offered. They felt that this was reasonable and appropriate. They are charged to find good, healthy and beneficial rates at a competitive cost of behalf of their constituency groups. She pointed out one item in the document on page 2 of 2. Recommendation of Health and Welfare Committee, the second sentence

reads that prior to the vote, that not making a recommendation meant the president would be left with status-quo. The minutes that they are presented with today, have a discussion in there that shows that there is a different point of view between herself and the people at what exactly the status-quo. She is concerned about what the definition or potential intention of the word status-quo. She has reason to be concerned about that because they are still in arbitration over the meaning of other words as related to Health and Welfare. The intention of the recommendation is to make an informed decision once final CVT quotes have been given so it's not to compare un-alike things. President Kinnamon commented there have been two legal opinions for CVT and whether or not they have met the threshold of submitting acceptable responses and based on those, the district does not believe CVT has. They believe CVT could provide rate and quotes. The district should not be held hostage to their timelines in providing rates verses their timelines of really being able to make a decision when they are together so that they can to it in a very transparent and consultative manner verses over the summer, having the Health and Welfare committee meet again, and maybe look at something that another party had not really had an acceptable proposal within the guidelines of RFP. Then to make a recommendation that ultimately would require this body to come back together over the summer for him to vet and make a recommendation he feel is needed. So, they are back in the corner they were in last year by CVT and their non-responsive proposal to this.

Mary Anne Gularte commented their committee had agreed to the April 14th date as they wanted to have things completed before summer. They did agree to April 14th for the deadline for the RFP.

Pamela Ralston commented, as a member of an unrepresented group, she wanted to say how much she appreciated being able to have the conversation here and in a timely fashion. It's meaningful to her as a person that is a big fan of participatory governance. First and foremost, she felt this is a very important conversation and an important vote for them. She is very uncomfortable with things happening over the summer having lived in an academic environment most of her adult life. She tries to avoid a summer surprise. Continuing to roll out time and space for a company that is non responsive makes her personally uncomfortable. She appreciates being able to hear about this and being able to form an opinion because she does not have a constituency group that is able to vote on her behalf. She is thankful for the time and consideration of the topic.

President Kinnamon commented there are others on the side of the room that wanted to comment further on the topic.

Pam Hunter asked about process in terms in RFP. Her understanding of their processes, deadlines, and those types of things is pre-written in stone and then by allowing one respondent some kind of leeway, do they not open themselves up for, perhaps somebody who didn't respond because they couldn't get that packet put together within the deadline. Had they known there was a longer period of time they might have acted differently? That is her understanding of RFP and maybe she is not understanding this but that was her question, are they not jeopardizing with some of those other respondents by allowing one respondent a special period.

Lisa Howell commented that it's been her understanding that open enrollment occurs in August/September. Open enrollment is last week of August and then

the actual transition of the plan occurs in October. Touching on what Pam Hunter noted, from a business side, they do RFP and bids frequently. It would be called an unfair bid practice if they proposed a date or had a date, sent out the bid and had proposals come in and you allowed a person or an agency to undercut. You would have to reject everything and re do. They cannot allow a group to come in and do their best work and provide the best price and then wait a month and half and allow another group to come in a month later to unbid them, for example by \$1.00. She understands Health and Welfare is a bit different but it would be unfair business practice to allow for anyone to have a separate date range.

Linda Emerson commented she does not understand why they wouldn't have gotten the prices within the timeline they were asked. She noted that as a professor, if a student asked her to turn in an assignment a month late, she would tell them she is sorry but it was late. It does not seem right and for them to vote on changing something, she is concerned about the delay and the ethics of it and it doesn't feel good to her.

Denise Diamond, there are interesting arguments on the table with incomplete information. As a part of it, RFP's as what was done with the golf center, if you don't get enough responses that there were a lot of declines so the offer was extended so that the RFP process is fuller. Had the district had legal and technical issues with going out with CVT in the first place, why even have that be part of the bid list. They were never told in Health and Welfare committee that they could not participate in the RFP listing.

President Kinnamon commented, point of clarification. That did not happen till after CVT submitted this round, it wasn't prior to her meeting. That's occurred since her meeting. They reviewed what was submitted afterwards, not prior to. CVT had a level playing field with everyone else.

Mary Anne Gularte commented she has no information. It was CSEA in particular who had asked for CVT, VEBA and High Desert Trust but they wouldn't have told CVT they could not bid. It's a new year and a new process and they needed to respond to the questions on the RFP so she would have no knowledge as to whether they would address some concerns from the last year or not.

Denise Diamond noted there configuration as a trust, which is completely different than then configuration of SISC, is not such that there just not providing the college of the desert with final quotes. Anyone in the Coachella Valley is awaiting the bids all at the same time. Everybody will get the information all at the same time. She noted we are not being treated differently than the other K-12 districts. Collective Bargaining process would not support and never has supported any summer surprise. They have to present any information to their constituency groups and they have to hold Q&A discussions so that people can ratify a contract with a full opportunity to ask the questions they need answered. Open enrollment has been pushed back and open enrollment also changes when something at the negotiating table changes. If it involves a change, then the open enrollment timeline has changed to reflect that. They go hand in hand and are cooperative that way.

Annebelle Nery commented in light of conversation, she asked if they extended the time into summer to all of these groups for the sake of fairness. She noted

there are 12 companies that we requested proposals. She is concerned and asked if the deadline was extended to all 12.

Mary Anne Gularte replied, no. She noted that was a short discussion in a committee meeting.

Lauro Jimenez commented that would be an excellent recommendation. He referenced you could see the companies who declined and they declined for specific reasons. He continued to state, yes it would be fair that as part of the idea waiting for CVT that this be opened up again. For example, VEBA, he doesn't know for sure because it went through the broker but VEBA allegedly did not meet the timeline. It would actually be of great value to the district to be able to see they are all fair.

Annebelle Nery commented she does like everything to be transparent and open.

Courtney Doussett, wanted to clarify the motion on the table. If they say yes, that delays for summer discussion till the responses come in. They would like more time to vet all companies and moving forward.

President Kinnamon clarified the motion and reread the recommendation again.

Annebelle Nery requested assistance from the Parliamentarian.

She recommended to amend the motion to wait and extend the RFP to all the companies on the list and any additional companies for the 18-19 quote and we not wait and stay with current medical care.

The parliamentarian, Carlos Maldonado responded that is too many at once but you can take action on the motion on the table, then make another type of recommendation. Your recommending body is offering something different.

Christen Smith asked if the amendment is different that the first reading.

President Kinnamon stated it's the same. He thinks what Lauro Jimenez stated earlier in the meeting is true. There was a lot of confusion because there was not a documented recommendation on the table and it was verbal.

He believes based on the review of the minutes and the tape of the minutes that the recommendation that came through is the recommendation that was made by the sub-committee.

Lisa Howell asked if the work of this committee would happen regularly and on an annual basis which would address the concerns. So the recommendation moving forward would be taken further.

Mary Anne Gularte replied she does not think so. She noted they met 12 times this year which is more than what is in the charter. Typically, companies start issuing their quotes in the spring and look at the actuarial and experience ratings monthly so that's why some of these companies are able to provide the final quotes in the spring. Some of the other companies did not provide quotes. In particular they would be competing with a sister company or they weren't large enough. They had particular reasons why, it was not because they did not have a quote to provide. Many of them, if she recalls correctly, provided that documentation that was shared with the committees. They provided a rationale as to why they didn't. Additionally from VEBA, there was some specific things about plans that they could offer and not offer that would not have met the RFP. It also came in late but it would not have met RFP even if it had been on time.

Lauro Jimenez wanted to get clarification. This is the first year that the district is insisting on having health benefits get voted on at CPC. He wanted to clarify that the district is changing its practice and its policy, to include, as part of its process, that this body be present and available to approve a recommendation of the collective bargaining committee.

President Kinnamon replied that is not correct. The Health and Welfare committee is not a collective bargaining committee. The Health and Welfare committee is making a recommendation to the college planning council. It's a recommendation from one sub-committee that's a consultation committee of college planning council.

Denise Diamond commented its marked collective bargaining committee.

President Kinnamon noted it's a consultation committee as with all committees. The umbrella of those committees is the college planning council and so, yes, it's a recommendation of a sub-committee and that's why it is at college planning council.

Lauro Jimenez asked President Kinnamon, if you are saying that you are now requiring that recommendations, for the first time, in the history of this institution that you are requiring the Health and Welfare committee to makes its recommendation and your bringing it to this body and consequently if this body is not available therefore that committee cannot make a recommendation to go to another plan.

President Kinnamon responded that he has not been with the institution since the beginning of time, but he will say the subcommittees of CPC should always come before the CPC with their recommendations so the college community can be part of that consultation.

Lauro Jimenez asked if that would include the reclassification committee. Any time that there is a reclassification of classified staff, since it's in this handbook, are you saying by extension it needs to be.

President Kinnamon replied, he is not saying that. He would not know what he is responding to without having the context of what he is talking about. He clarified what he is saying is what they are presently discussing on this item. There is a recommendation from a committee that you sit on or that you vote to support the recommendation and now it's before a broader audience and now they are going to determine whether or not they want to support that recommendation or not to support the recommendation.

Lauro Jimenez clarified, he voted to recommend to the Superintendent/President, as they have, since the history, a recommendation to wait. He did not vote to send it to CPC and there are copious minutes and an assessment where they have had long discussions.

President Kinnamon commented as the Superintendent/President, it is his prerogative to bring it to CPC, it is outlined in the CPC manual that he may bring things forward to the committee and he believes that greater transparency and consultation is the utmost importance especially after what the college experienced last year and he does not want to experience that again. He commented they are going to be transparent, and he will bring it to CPC. They will vet it, discuss it, and then people will vote on it. This will allow for him to have a more informed decision on moving forward.

David George asked out of concern, if whatever is decided at CPC, it does not preclude anything in negotiations.

	<p>Lauro Jimenez responded to David George and thanked him for clarifying. He continued stating if you reference CSEA's initial proposal, which was received by the board, it actually states we will be proposing based upon what we receive, this is in the best interest of their particular bargaining unit and if the best interest of their bargaining unit is to go to CVT. What we're basically hearing here is that the district has made the determination that it has to go through this body then consequently they would not have the opportunity to propose to conceivably go to CVT, and so therefore that would be, from his perspective as he stated from the very beginning, that this would be interfering with Ed process using shared governance as a way to make sure that they would stay with what the district wants to stay with which is SISC.</p> <p>David George replied this is not the decision making body, its consultative for the president.</p> <p>Lauro Jimenez responded what the president is basically saying is you need to bring it to CPC, correct me if I'm wrong, because it requires this body to make a decision and so the moment this body stops meeting for the summer, everything stops. However on the opposite side, let's talk about constituent groups. The people who have constituency groups who actually do the work of collective bargaining. Faculty have a union president, classified staff have a president in terms on constituent groups the Health and Welfare committee, management and leadership are represented by the Vice President of Human Resources at that committee. Directors, classified staff and confidentials are represented by Misti. So that committee continues to work as part of and be represented by constituency groups. He does not know if those representatives report back. He doesn't know. He knows he does and so he would like to express that it comes to their area of an unfair labor practice.</p> <p>President Kinnamon responded that they will bargain at the table and not in the room.</p> <p>Pamela Ralston, called for the question.</p> <p>Lauro Jimenez asked what they are voting on.</p> <p>President Kinnamon asked if there are any objections to calling the question. The parliamentarian, Carlos Maldonado, clarified to the body if they have an objection to raise their hand so that they President would be made aware. He commented that he views there to be 1 objection and this is a 2/3 vote.</p> <p>President Kinnamon stated that the Health and Welfare committee recommends to the Superintendent/President to wait for final quotes from CVT in order to be able to make a decision on behalf of the committee members' constituency groups.</p> <p>President Kinnamon asked, all those in favor. 5 in favor, 18, opposed and 1 abstention.</p>	
CONCLUSION	Motion did not carried.	
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
2.15 Diversity and Equity Council Recommendation: Equity Committee Description – 1st Reading		
DISCUSSION	<p>Motioned by Annebelle Nery, seconded by Lisa Howell to approve Diversity and Equity Council Recommendation: Equity Committee Description as a 1st reading.</p>	

Annebelle Nery provided a brief history on the council and reviewed the recommendation. They also proposed to add three members and she requested to make one amendment. It should state, Department Chair of English or 1 designee, Department Chair of Math or designee, Department Chair of Reading/Communications/Language/ESL Representative or designee. It was discussed at their meeting that some of the chairs may not know that they are going to be appointed or maybe they have a colleague that has more of a passion for that work so they want to defer to the chair of other areas for that appointment.

Diversity Council has now been separated out of Equity Committee and are forming their own group to address EEO plan. They wanted to update their name to equity committee.

Christen Smith requested a correction to go back to the committee to state Department Chair English and ESL. Then under Department Chair reading they should strike through Communications because it does not fall under Equity. She would also like for them to consider adding Department Chair of Non-Credit because that would be ESL Non-Credit.

David George, word of concern. There has always been an uphill fight to ensure the basic skills consideration was raised and delivered across the campus. Given the fact that still, some 90% of the students coming in are basic skills challenges and he would hope before forming that committee, that they don't lose sight of the importance on basic skills.

Christen Smith responded that she spoke at great length with the chair of basic skills and as he supported the move. She thinks they addressed making sure basic skills gets highlighted by redefining the membership to include all of the chairs over basic skills area. Her hope is that they will do a better job by making sure and trying to make sure that they have the key people in the discussion is the intent.

Lauro Jimenez commented, particularly coincidental and because they were discussing the student equity plan. Because this committee been tasked to deal with the student equity plan he would like to ask the committee consider adding a second classified position.

CONCLUSION	Motioned carried.
------------	-------------------

FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

3. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

3.1 Equity Prioritization Results

DISCUSSION	<p>Annebelle Nery commented at the last CPC meeting she stated that the instructional equipment on the high list only was funded. She has an update, fiscal services has to reconcile the funds and will send out a notice after July 1st. She asked everyone to please be patient with them as they get better at the process. They are held to the fiscal calendar which will not be completed till June 30th. Referencing the document that was provided, there was not enough fiscal dollars to fund everything on the high list. Provided to everyone was a list, ranked 1-19 and it was prioritized by the equipment prioritization committee coming forward as a recommendation.</p> <p>Lisa Howell commented that they heard the May revise came out with a higher than what they anticipated for instructional equipment.</p>
------------	--

	<p>She just returned from conference, making its way through the budget committee, 90% of the funds will not be available till late 2018-19. Unfortunately, we are getting the bad end of the bargain. They will show that a certain amount was allocated but a large amount, about 90% of the funds will be provided 2018-2019. They will do what they can to make it work. Kelly Hall asked if we know how far down on the list they can go if there may not be enough funds to cover everything. Annebelle Nery replied, they won't know till September when they do the final budget updates. Lisa Howell commented this is something they have not discussed in cabinet yet but it was discussed between her and John Ramont and they will look at the math to see what they can do to move forward and try to figure it out.</p>		
CONCLUSION			
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
3.2 Budget Sub-Committee Update			
DISCUSSION	<p>Lisa Howell mentioned they received new information through the May revise. They computed what it means to College of the Desert as additional revenues. That information was put into the multi –year projections. They have reductions in other areas. May revise, at this point in time, they hoped that would be the budget that would be acted upon but there is no guarantees. A lot of people are lobbying for the same dollar. She anticipates a lot of change to the budget beyond the May revise.</p> <p>John Ramont commented they met on Monday for the Budget Sub Committee. He chaired the meeting in Lisa's absence. He commented the budget committee is becoming more knowledge and they've covered a lot of material. They are being asked questions that are much more specific creating for great discussion. He distributed a legal size packet and asked everyone to reference page 2. This projection reflects what they updated back in March. Back in March they were showing a significant deficit. In parenthesis he referenced that's a negative number and a positive would be the opposite. In referencing, last year, one-time money dumped on them, in projections for next year, they have three years' worth of negatives. Last time, the budget sub-committee approved adopting, if they see three years of negatives. Structurally they are in a deficit position, ongoing expenditures are more than ongoing revenues. This doesn't put in an immediate bind, but on an ongoing basis you can only do that so far. Next step will be presenting this to the board on June 15th as tentative numbers. New programs are being added in; career workforce solutions center, KCOD, and other things coming online that they are trying to get a handle on the budgets. They receive new rates on things.</p> <p>Lauro Jimenez commented one of the things they talked about whether the million dollars was included that they were hoping to get.</p> <p>John Ramont asked if he was referring to center status and confirmed yes it was included in the report. What's included is what they know to the best of their availability and excludes things that they don't know such as bargaining unit agreements, things that have not been defined as of yet.</p> <p>Lisa Howell commented at the conference she was informed there are about 2/3 of the way through, they anticipate going forward. They noted it looks</p>		

	<p>good, over the 1000 FTS. She would say 95% would get the money in 2018-2019.</p> <p>Another item brought forward was Kelly Hall completed a tremendous amount of work on. They have discussed for about three years, developing a formula for allocating instructional material funds. Kelly Hall has worked with the deans in developing a formula that the budget sub-committee reviewed and approved. Reflecting for example, the high cost of running a biology lab verses an economic course. This is the recommendation coming forward from the budget subcommittee accepted this.</p> <p>Annebelle Nery commented to be clear, the instructional deans, she recalls this discussion in working with Pamela Ralston and Kelly Hall. They all worked together. You now can work with your Deans and relay what you need. This is what they have been asking for.</p> <p>Lisa Howell commented she would like to thank Kelly Hall and the committees who worked on this as well. This idea arrived in 2013 as an idea that would be of value. They wanted to have it mean something and grow with the growth.</p> <p>Lauro Jimenez commented he's confused, the budget sub-committee why is this coming as information verses an action item.</p> <p>Lisa Howell commented it will come back once the budget is revised as a tentative budget item.</p> <p>John Ramont replied it's informational because he's relaying what happened at the budget sub-committee.</p> <p>Lauro Jimenez asked if this will be coming back as an action item.</p> <p>Lisa Howell asked for clarification.</p> <p>President Kinnamon replied it will vary and the reason it will vary, as there will be times where he states it will need to come to CPC. President Kinnamon will then make the most informed decision. He mentioned that Health and Welfare sub-committee, if you reference the way it's structured, does say the reporting relationship ultimately is to the CPC. If you reference the reclassification committee that Lauro Jimenez referenced earlier it doesn't say it goes to the CPC.</p> <p>Luis Castellanos noted from a student perspective he wanted to thank Kelly Hall for getting the students supplies and it's definitely necessary.</p>	
CONCLUSION		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
3.3 Facilities Advisory Committee Update		
DISCUSSION	<p>Lisa Howell provided a brief update and noted they were going to be meeting with the consultants on their facilities master plan at the last meeting. They since have met with the consultants and they are excited to get underway. They've provided them with a plethora of documentation and they will be working over the summer.</p> <p>Christen Smith asked if they plan to form a Facilities Master Plan taskforce. Lisa Howell replied they have a facilities advisory committee, she is unsure if they will call it a taskforce but there will be plenty of opportunities provided for participation by all.</p>	
CONCLUSION		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

3.4 Board Policy 5570 Student Credit Card Solicitations		
DISCUSSION	<p>Annebelle Nery reported they are proposing to the board, incurred student debt has been a problem on many levels.</p> <p>This does not prevent students from obtaining a credit card, it just prevents them from being invited.</p>	
CONCLUSION		
FOLLOW-UP ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE
		DEADLINE
4. Adjournment		
DISCUSSION	<p>President Kinnamon expressed his gratitude to Christen Smith for serving on the committee as co-chair and noted she put the interest of the college first even when there may have been other factors at play, she was able to come forward with a strong position that often times had him have to modify his stance.</p> <p>Sheri Willis commented that everyone will be able to watch commencement live on the College of the Desert, YouTube channel. The Information Technology Department will be sending out an email with the direct link to allow everyone to watch remotely should they not be able to attend later in the day.</p> <p>President Kinnamon adjourned the meeting at 11:48 AM.</p>	
Next Meeting: Friday, September 8 th , 2017 10:00-12:00 PM		Location: Cravens Multi-Purpose Room

DRAFT