

Kern Community College District
 Consultation Council Meeting
 APPROVED SUMMARY
 September 28, 2010

Members

Present:

- Mr. Abe Ali, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources, District Office
(Gatekeeper)
- Mr. Tom Burke, Chief Financial Officer, District Office (Timekeeper)
- Dr. Doris Givens, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services, District Office
- Mr. Frank Ronich, General Counsel, District Office
- Ms. Sandra Serrano, Chancellor, District Office
- Ms. Kellie Van Westen, Executive Assistant, District Office (Scribe)

- Dr. Greg Chamberlain, President, Bakersfield College
- Mr. Cornelio Rodriguez, Academic Senate President, Bakersfield College
- Mrs. Sue Vaughn, President, Management Association
- Ms. Jennifer Marden, CSEA President, Bakersfield College

- Mrs. Jill Board, President, Cerro Coso Community College
- Ms. Mary O'Neal, CCA President (video conference)
- Mr. Matthew Crow, Academic Senate President, Cerro Coso Community College
- Mrs. Tammy Kinnan, CSEA President, Cerro Coso Community College (video conference)

- Dr. David Bezayiff, Academic Senate President, Porterville College (video conference)
- Mr. Baldomero Garcia, CSEA Representative, Porterville College (video conference)

Guests: None

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.

It was noted that this was the first meeting of the new academic year and each of the members of the District Consultation Council were asked to introduce themselves.

1. Agenda
 - a. Review Agenda and Time Allotments

The Agenda and Time Allotments were reviewed.

Action: The agenda was accepted as submitted.

b. Review Consultant Council Purpose

The Basis for Consultation Council was presented and reviewed. It was noted that this document was prepared by members of the Consultation Council and was approved by the Council June 2006. The Council was formed to assist with solving problems faced by the District, receiving input, achieving consensus, or at least arriving at an information based decision. Also the Council reviews, forms, and approves Board Policies for all areas, and strategic planning. It was further noted that the charge of the Council is that it serves as a collegial consultative body and it is designed to serve the good of the District. The Council group facilitates timely, factual, and clear communication between constituents and the Chancellor, to make informed District-wide decisions. It is extremely important that Council members communicate with the constituent groups and that the members represent the views of their respective constituent groups.

Action: Consultation Council members were asked that in their role they provide clear and factual communication; and to share their points of view with respect and civility. There will be decisions reviewed and those agreed upon will be shared with Council member constituents.

2. Approval of Summary

a. Approval of the Summary of the Meeting of May 25, 2010

It was noted that the Luminis Update had indicated that Luminis would be live by the fall semester. It was reported that Luminis was being piloted and there was a deferment until the spring semester as implementation is in progress.

Action: The summary was approved as submitted.

3. Constituency Issues

A question was raised about a discussion of CLASS in terms of recommendations for potential changes in Board Policy for the District. It was noted that a communication was received that CLASS recommended that there be Board Policy changes. The response was that recommendations had not come forward and that the CLASS participants had not gotten to that place in the assessments. It was commented that this would be addressed under the item for CLASS.

4. Educational Services

a. Basic Skills and Students Success/CLASS

Information about the California Leadership Alliance for Student Success, a California Community College Initiative that is managed by the University of Texas, at Austin, through their Community College Leadership Program. It was noted that specifically Mrs. Kay McClenney and Mr. Bryon McClenney are working with 12 California Community College Districts where they are focusing on the role of leadership at each constituent level and their engagement with strategies, using information to develop policies and programs that promote student success.

It was commented that student success has been defined as providing access as well as successful completion of courses, programs, certificates, and degrees. There is also the building of a shared understanding of different kinds of information and reports which have resulted in 200 recommendations have come from different agencies related to accountability and student success over the last few years. It was commented that CLASS is not recommending that every College implement every recommendation.

CLASS is not recommending that a District adopt any particular policy or program; CLASS is really working with the 12 Districts to underscore the importance of leadership and underscore of the importance of the role policies play in promoting student success as well as developing a reliance on a culture of evidence to make informed decision. Also to review best practices across the nation, but not necessarily adopt them just because they are a best practice at another institution, but to be aware of those best practices and adopt/adapt to a particular institution based on the particular characteristics of the students enrolled in the institutions. Another component is measure what you value; it is not just a matter of being innovative and starting to do things, it is a matter of do they work, and how do you know they work?

CLASS concluded that leadership is powerful and it requires the engagement of everyone in the institution at every level, as research shows that the engagement with students helps them feel a part of the institution and actually promotes their retention persistency success. Everyone must remain focused, it must be sustained over time that participants must measure what they are doing, evaluate, modify, and decide whether it is working and if it is working can it be scaled to meet the needs of the students in the institution.

A correction of a wording error on one of the CLASS documents was pointed out. Discussion ensued about the CLASS documents included in the meeting materials

The CLASS information has been shared with staff so that everyone can be aware of who our students are; where they are; and whether the District assumes a 25% error, or a 50% error to see that we have a challenge with persistence, completion, degree attainment, transfer. There is a need to start having the dialog at each of the Colleges to make improvements.

It was shared that this coincides with priorities established by the State, the Legislature, and by the work just completed and unveiled, and that is the Commission on the Future. This is a Commission established by the Community College League of California and they have a draft report with recommendations where community colleges are and what needs to be done to promote student success for the future. The Commission has recommendations centered around four themes: leadership and accountability; teaching and learning; intrusive student support (intensive student support); and finance and affordability.

Documents related to the League Commission on the Future were shared with the Council members and will be distributed by email to each member. The CLASS Cohort comparisons between the District and CLASS total were reviewed.

Action: Council members were encouraged to share this information; to promote discussion, not to blame, but to problem solve; how do the Colleges help the students who are not successfully completing a course; not returning after one semester; not returning after one year, etc.?

It was commented that there must be dialog, to search for solutions and promote success; why because of access, success, and accountability. It was noted that the buzz word right now is accountability.

It was reported that a Student Success Task Force is being formed at the System office and the State Chancellor has had the conversation at Consultation as well as the Board of Governors. Not only will Community College stakeholders engaged, outside individuals will be engaged in order to bring validity to whatever conclusions are reach as a result of the Task Force.

It was asked that Council members take the CLASS and Commission on the Future documents back to their constituent groups and discuss how they would like to proceed; work with their College Presidents and determine what needs to be done at each College and what will be done District-wide. The dialog will continue.

Action: A correction will be made to one sheet on the Class cohort comparison and that will be distributed Council members.

b. Office of Civil Rights Decision

Action: This item will be discussed at the next meeting after Council members have an opportunity to read the decision.

c. Library Access

It was noted that one of the Colleges, through a constituent group, indicated that they would like to have access to more information at their College and asked if that was something the District could facilitate. The District indicated that they would research, and District administration contacted each College to determine the current data bases and software being used. It had been determined that there was no cost savings to provide extensive access to all three Colleges; and no action was taken. .

It was reported that the State library organization was working to determine if at the State level they could negotiate changes in the pricing.

Action: This item will be removed from the agenda.

d. Accreditation – Student Learning Outcomes

It was reported that each of the Colleges had submitted their Accreditation Updates, and when creating the reports, used the rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness.

Action: The Accreditation Reports will be presented to the Board of Trustees at the Board meeting of October 14, 2010. An introduction will be provided in terms of the rubric and where are the Colleges supposed to be and on what date.

e. Academic Calendars 2011-12

Academic calendars for 2011-12 and 2012-13 were presented for review. Discussion ensued about the possible date for the Lincoln Day Holiday and schedules for local schools districts were shared for information.

Action: The Calendars were for the Academic Senate Presidents to take back to respective campuses and through the process that is delineated in the faculty contract.

The question was raised about the fact that the calendars are to be developed by the Academic Senates and why were they being discussed in this venue. It was noted that there are various constituent groups that have purview in developing recommendations that move forward for approval by the Board of Trustees; however, it is brought to the Consultation Council for information and input. The Academic Senates are to develop the Academic Calendars as set forth in the CCA contract

It was stated that the State Chancellor's Office has made it clear in their communications that if the Colleges do not celebrate Native Americans Day that the Colleges are to have appropriate commemorations and hopes that this is addressed.

It was noted that there has been suggestions in the past of developing two or more years of calendars at a time.

Action: It was agreed that the Academic Senates would develop Academic Calendars for 2011-12 and 2012-13. Copies of the calendar templates and additional local school district information will be distributed electronically to Council members. The proposed Calendars should be ready by November 30, 2010. The schedule for receipt of the draft calendars and when they will be presented to the Board of Trustees will also be distributed.

It was noted admissions are opened for the following summer and fall in November and the Academic Calendars are not approved until December.

Action: It was recommended that 2011-12 and 2012-13 Calendars be developed and approved, and then the Academic Senates would begin developing 2013-14 and 2014-15 in the spring, and then move forward on a spring schedule rather than a fall schedule.

It was noted that the proposed calendar templates do not reflect the dates of summer school to allow for flexibility, for last minute decisions about whether to have an abbreviated, doubled, or summer

It was stated that the Colleges need to be mindful of the admissions and financial aid issues. Also, it was reported that it is the Board of Trustees has the expectation that the Colleges will be year around so that all of the FTES is not being generated in the fall and spring.

f. Reporting Enrollment

Action: This item was deferred until the next meeting.

5. Information Technology

a. Campus Emergency Telephones

Action: This item was deferred to the next meeting.

6. Operations

There were no items.

7. Human Resources

There were no items.

8. Business Service

a. Budget Update 2010-11

A Community College Enrollment Demand graph prepared by the Community College League of California was shared. The graph reflected funded enrollments, unfunded enrollments, and the enrollment demand above the unfunded. The system as a whole is slightly less than where it was in 2008-09 but significantly above 2007-08. The demand was a little less than \$138,000; the students are there but the Colleges are unable to meet their need. In the District, the waitlist would be the demand, an enrollment demand; the unfunded is that the FTES target is at the 2008-09 level without implementing the workload reduction; and that is the unfunded.

An update of the differences between the Tentative Budget and Adopted Budgets were reviewed. The increase in the District-wide revenues to be allocated to the Colleges included ARRA and Lottery funds. The increase in expenditures included corrections to salary and benefits; health benefit premiums; a vehicle transfer; a new membership; and to outsource the Help Desk.

Discussion ensued about the chargeback process for the Help Desk costs. There will not be a chargeback for the first year; however, next year there will be a 25% chargeback, and increase over the next three years. The Budget Allocation Model provides for a chargeback to the Colleges for the services provided to the District Office, as this is a cost of doing business by the District Office.

The current Help Desk employees will be focused on other parts of their job descriptions and support others. The example of a triage was provided. A staff member will call the Help Desk service; they will provide assistance at that time, or submit a job ticket if there is a need for a technician, etc.

Discussion ensued on the increase in Health Benefit Premiums. Based on SISC projections and the District's projections, it was agreed by the Fringe Benefits Committee to increase the District's premium to the cap and use the excess reserves for the additional. It was reported that the Fringe Benefits Committee agreed with this change and also agreed to revisit the entire situation in six months because some committee members that believe that not only did the District not need the 10.87% increase, but the District will not have used all of the reserves as projected.

Action: A corrected 2010-11 District Operations Budget will be distributed.

b. 50% Law Status

The historical 50% Law calculations for 2009-10 actual year to date and the 2010-11 Budget was shared. It was noted that 2009-10 numbers were still fluid as the completion of the 311A Report, the Annual Report to the Chancellor's Office, was still in progress. For 2009-10 will be approximately 51.92% and the year to date, mid-September, indicates about 48.34%. It was explained that this figure is low because

there had not been academic costs included until recently. Based on the Tentative Budget is projected at 52.90%. The College data was also shared.

c. Budget Allocation Model (BAM) Evaluation Group

It was reported that the Budget Allocation Model Evaluation group met recently and members are working on the different issues identified and brought to Consultation Council last spring.

Action: There will be a report from the Budget Allocation Model Evaluation Group to the Consultation Council at the November meeting, including recommendations. Council members will be asked to share with stakeholders and return in January with feedback. The model can then be adjusted as deemed appropriate.

9. Board Policy Development

a. Section Three, Business Services, Policy 3A4G, Use of Credit Cards Issued by the District, Procedure, and Appendices

It was reported that there had been some issues related to credit card usage and this Policy is an attempt to streamline and tighten the process.

b. Section Three, Business Services, Policy 3A8, Auxiliary Organizations

The Policy proposes an opportunity to the Auxiliary Organizations to have input in the selection process for the auditing firm. The District would still have the responsibility for making the final decision.

Action: It was recommended that the two proposed Policies be placed on the agenda for October 26, 2010. Council members were asked to call the Business Services Office to advise of any recommended corrections and/or changes. It was asked that Council members discuss with their respective constituent groups.

c. Four, Students/Instructional Services, Policy 4B1I, Academic Year/College Year

It was reported that it had been expressed last year that the academic calendar is a mandated subject of bargaining; the faculty union has worked with the administration to put together the sunshine proposals, so it known that the faculty union plans to exercise their right to negotiate the academic calendar. It was suggested that this Policy be removed from the Council Agenda.

It was commented that the District has a contractual agreement as to the academic calendar and until there is something new, that will be followed.

Action: It was agreed that this Policy be removed from the agenda.

10. Chancellor's Report

a. Board of Trustees Goals Priorities

It was reported that the Chancellor meets annually with the Board of Trustees to review the Strategic Plan, the Board's prior year goals and priorities; they do an assessment as to where the District and Colleges are, strengths and weaknesses, and areas of improvements. At that time they determine if the goals and/or priorities need to be changed for the following year. The District Goals were shared and discussion ensued on the succession planning for management, faculty, and classified, including the District Leadership Academy and financial support for workshops, training, conference, etc.

The priorities were also shared related to strategic focus on core mission; focus on student success, not just access; increase management proficiency and accountability; maintain fiscal stability; improve the identity of the District; promote human resources development and employee accountability; foster knowledge and implementation of education best practices; and strengthen institutional data integrity and data-driven decision-making.

The question was raised as to how to accomplish the goals and priorities.

Action: It was agreed that Human Resources will distribute information and access to the League for Innovation iStream and then place an item on the Human Resources website.

b. Strategic Planning

The Strategic Planning documents that was developed approximately five years ago was shared. The question was raised about the leadership on the strategic initiatives and it was indicated that there was the appointment of committees, some development, but ultimately no conclusion.

Discussion ensued about everyone participating in a review of the Strategic Plan without having to travel. It was commented that District and College staff are overwhelmed with day-to-day and special projects, in addition to preparing for accreditation. It was suggested that rather than reviewing the strategic plan at this time, the District and Colleges need to focus on student access and success, which is crucial and is part of the Strategic Plan. There should be a focus on this priority; the need to respond more effectively to the needs of students, the underprepared, the workforce, and thereby carry on the mission. Discussion ensued.

Action: It was agreed that the District and Colleges need to know where we are and give some breathing room as the Colleges complete their self-studies during the course of the next year. Then immediately determine where we are, narrow our focus on student success; however, over the course of the next year conduct a swat so that the completion of the self-study the District and Colleges are ready to incorporate what has been discovered and move forward with the strategic direction, more through fine tuning than reinvention.

c. Participatory Governance

It was reported that last spring, the Bakersfield College Academic Senate, through a resolution, recommended that the District look at participatory governance. The District administration suggested that it would be good to engage in training. The Academic Senate Presidents have discussed this and it had been shared with the Chancellor that the District should proceed to schedule participatory governance training. It was reported that Mr. Scott Lay, Community College League of California, and Mrs. Jane Patton, Statewide Academic Senates, were asked to provide a workshop and provide dates. It was recommended that based on their calendars, December or January for a session. Council members were asked for their input for proceeding with participatory governance training. Discussion ensued on the best time for any staff member may attend. It was pointed out that the recommendation from the Academic Senate was that members of the Board of Trustees attend.

Action: It was agreed to hold the meeting in January, preferably on a Friday; attempt to stream and record the session; invite the members of the Board of Trustees; and hold this meeting in the District Forums, with streaming to desktop and conference rooms, and videoconference, to allow participants to either stay at their desks, congregate at the campuses, or attend in person at the District office.

It was reported the last time a participatory governance workshop was held, the Chancellor prepared a document as to why and how, and if an Academic Senate President wished to do so, or collaborate, to distribute to staff.

Action: It was agreed to look at January 28, 2011, and February 4, 2011. Mr. Rodriguez, Mr. Crow, and Mr. Ali, will draft a document as to the who, what, when, where, etc.

d. Equivalency

Action: It was agreed to hold a discussion about equivalency in the meeting following Consultation Council meeting with the Chancellor; Vice Chancellor, Educational Services; College Presidents; and the Academic Senate Presidents.

e. Associate Chancellor, Governmental and External Relations
Announcement

It was reported that the position of Associate Chancellor, Governmental and External Relations, was not filled; however, Ms. Michele Bresso, faculty member at Bakersfield College, was provided an assignment for a .4 load to assist with aspects of the Governmental Relations component. It was noted that Ms. Bresso had already attended a workshop looking at information related to grants and programs, as well as making contacts to follow up on legislative initiatives at the state and national level.

11. Next Meeting

- October 26, 2010, @ DO (DO assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.
- November 16, 2010, @ CC (CC assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Kern Community College District
 Consultation Council Meeting
 APPROVED SUMMARY
 October 26, 2010

Members

Present:

Mr. Abe Ali, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources, District Office
 Dr. Doris Givens, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services, District Office, Facilitator
 Ms. Sandra Serrano, Chancellor, District Office
 Ms. Kellie Van Westen, Executive Assistant, District Office (Scribe)

Dr. Greg Chamberlain, President, Bakersfield College (Gatekeeper)
 Mr. Cornelio Rodriguez, Academic Senate President, Bakersfield College
 Mrs. Sue Vaughn, President, Management Association, Bakersfield College
 Ms. Jennifer Marden, CSEA President, Bakersfield College

Mrs. Jill Board, President, Cerro Coso Community College (Timekeeper)
 Ms. Mary O'Neal, CCA President, Cerro Coso Community College
 Mr. Matthew Crow, Academic Senate President, Cerro Coso Community College
 Mrs. Tammy Kinnan, CSEA President, Cerro Coso Community College

Dr. David Bezayiff, Academic Senate President, Porterville College (video conference)
 Mr. Baldomero Garcia, CSEA Representative, Porterville College, (video conference)

Guests: None

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m.

1. Agenda

- a. Review Agenda and Time Allotments

The Agenda and Time Allotments were reviewed.

Action: The agenda was accepted as submitted.

2. Approval of Summary

- a. Approval of the Summary of the Meeting of September 28, 2010

One correction was noted.

Action: The summary was approved as revised.

3. Constituency Issues

- a. Classified Employees Teaching Adjunct

The question was raised as to the rationale for the District's decision to no longer have classified employees teaching as adjunct faculty. It was noted that it was recommended to establish pools for hiring adjunct faculty with recruitment by disciplines and also establish substitute pools. The District hopes to eliminate last minute hires and to ensure that there is a good faith effort in the hiring process. The question was asked, if a classified staff member is teaching adjunct, what is their primary assignment? Concerns were expressed that the classified employee's primary assignment would be affected by the adjunct faculty assignment.

Discussion ensued about Policy 10C6 related to confidential and management teaching as adjunct and the proposal to revise this policy. It was noted that as there is no longer a Board Policy Section related to adjunct faculty as they are included in the CCA Contract; and concern was expressed that classified staff teaching are unrepresented.

It was reported that proposed Board Policy Manual Section Seven will be developed related to adjunct hiring processes. The proposed policies will be shared with the District Consultation Council after review and approval by the Chancellor's Cabinet.

A memo from the Vice Chancellor, Human Resources, distributed to the College Vice Presidents regarding Adjunct Assignments for Classified, Confidential, and Management staff was shared.

Action: The letter will be posted to the portal for this meeting. Any additional information will be provided at the next meeting.

4. Educational Services

a. Office of Civil Rights Decision

A decision issued by the Office of Civil Rights was shared related to a complaint against Porterville College alleging that the College discriminated against students with disabilities. The decision concluded that Porterville College did provide a reasonable modification for students wishing to enroll in Adaptive Physical Education courses more than four times and that the College offering only one section of the Adaptive Physical Education course did not have a discriminatory disparate impact on the students with disabilities.

b. Academic Calendars 2011-12 and 2012-13

Academic Calendar templates for 2011-12 and 2012-13 were shared at the Consultation Council meeting of September 28, 2010, and additional local school district calendars were provided to the Academic Senates for developing the calendars. It was noted that summer session, June and July, were left open to allow for determining the length of sections, number of classes offered, or no summer school at all.

Action: The Academic Calendars will be reviewed by the Academic Senates and forwarded to CCA after November 19, 2010. CCA will meet on November 29, 2010, to review the Academic Calendars, and will forward the Calendars to Educational Services on November 30, 2010, for presentation to the Board of Trustees for approval at the Board meeting of December 16, 2010.

It was suggested that in the spring, Academic Calendars for 2013-14 and 2014-15 will be developed and approved. This will allow the Colleges to be two years ahead and the calendar terms can be established in Banner to allow registration in the summer and fall can begin on November 1st of the prior year which will assist students in considering their educational goals.

Action: It was agreed to begin developing the Academic Calendars for 2013-14 and 2014-15 academic calendars in spring 2011.

c. Enrollment Reporting

It was reported that Mrs. Lisa Fitzgerald, Coordinator, Institutional Research and Planning, Bakersfield College, was employed as the Director, Research Analysis and Reporting, District Office.

5. Information Technology

There were no items.

6. Operations

a. Luminis Update

It was reported that as part of the process to implement Luminis, load testing was done and the District was unable to get through the load testing with the anticipated load on the first day of early registration and the first day of classes. District staff are working with SunGard to determine solutions to the problem.

It is anticipated that Luminis will be up and running by early registration in the spring. The District plans to provide significant training for faculty and staff in November and December.

After some discussion, it was determined that Luminis could be used sooner than the fall, maybe as early as spring, and that Council members wished to use Luminis for distribution of Consultation Council documents. Members will be trained in late January/early February.

Action: In late January/early February, there will be training scheduled for Council members.

7. Human Resources

League for Innovation iStream – It was noted at the Consultation Council meeting of September 28, 2010, that Human Resources would distribute information on how to access the League for Innovation iStream. Also, a link will be placed on the Human Resources website.

Structure Change in the Human Resources Department – It was reported that there had been some changes in the Human Resources Department. There is no increase or decrease in staffing; only the working location of two staff members was changed.

Action: The revised Human Resource organizational chart will be posted to the portal for this meeting.

8. Business Services

a. Campus Emergency Telephones

Action: This item was deferred to the next meeting.

Budget Allocation Model Evaluation Task Force – It was reported that the Budget Allocation Model Evaluation Task Force had been meeting.

Action: A Budget Allocation Model Evaluation Update will be provided at the Council meeting of November 16, 2010.

9. Board Policy Development

- a. Section Three, Business Services, Policy 3A4G, Use of Credit Cards Issued by the District, Procedure, and Appendices

It was reported that there had been some issues related to credit card usage and this Policy is an attempt to streamline and tighten the process.

Action: Section Three, Business Services, Policy 3A4G, Use of Credit Cards Issued by the District, Procedure, and Appendices were approved. Policy 3A4G will be presented to the Board of Trustees for information on December 16, 2010, and for approval on February 10, 2010. (This was actually presented April 14, 2011, and then approved May 5, 2011.)

- b. Section Three, Business Services, Policy 3A8, Auxiliary Organizations

The Policy proposes the opportunity for the Auxiliary Organizations to have input in the selection process for the auditing firm. The District would still have the responsibility for making the final decision.

Action: Section Three, Business Services, Policy 3A8, Auxiliary Organizations, was approved. Policy 3A8 will be presented to the Board of Trustees for information on December 16, 2010, and for approval on February 10, 2010. (This was actually presented April 14, 2011, and then approved May 5, 2011.)

- c. Four, Students/Instructional Services, Procedure 4C4C, Grade Changes

Action: This item was deferred and Procedure 4C4C, Grade Changes, will be presented at the Consultation Council meeting November 16, 2010.

10. Chancellor's Report

- a. Participatory Governance Workshop

The proposed Participatory Governance Workshop was discussed, and it was reported that Mr. Scott Lay, President, Community College League of California, and Mrs. Jane Patton, Statewide Academic Senate, had agreed to present a Participatory Governance Workshop. Possible dates were discussed and it was agreed to be held February 11, 2011. Possible venues and the best way to provide the workshop to all District staff were discussed. District staff will determine if the workshop can be streamed from the District Office to staff at their desktops; via videoconferencing, etc.; however, it was noted that the workshop could not be recorded for future review.

Action: Further discussion will take place the next meeting.

Board of Trustees Goals and Priorities – The Chancellor shared copies of the Board of Trustees Goals and Priorities, indicating that each year the Trustees and Chancellor meet to review and assess the goals and priorities. Discussion ensued about meeting the Board's Goals by using the District and College strategic plans; improving the unification of the District and Colleges; enhancing the institutional and professional development of all staff; improving fiscal stability; focusing on priority policies and issues; and developing a human resources succession plan. Concern was expressed that the Board does not seem to support professional development for faculty and classified staff. It was noted that there are workshops held District-wide throughout the year; the Leadership Academies include management, faculty, and classified staff; and there are budgeted travel funds for staff to travel to conferences.

The Board Priorities were also reviewed.

Ethics Point – It was indicated that any reports to Ethics Point were investigated or are in the progress of being investigated.

Student Success CLASS

It was reported that Trustee Rose Marie Bans and the Chancellor will be attending the last California Leadership Alliance for Student Success (CLASS) in early November in Sacramento. The final queries will be completed at that time. Also, the Chancellor and Mrs. Bans will participate in a presentation related to CLASS at the Community College League of California Annual Conference to be held in November.

Completion by Design (CBD)

It was shared that the District had been invited to submit a proposal to participate in the Completion by Design initiative supported by Bill and Melinda Gates. This initiative is a five-year investment to help low-income students finish postsecondary credentials successfully and quickly. It was noted that the District and Colleges agreed to participate and would be submitting a proposal which has a very quick due date.

11. Next Meetings

- January 25, 2011, @ DO (PC assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.
- February 22, 2011 @ Weill (BC assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.
- March 22, 2011 @ DO (DO) assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.
- April 26, 2011 @ CC (CC assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.
- May 24, 2011 @ DO (PC assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Kern Community College District
 Consultation Council Meeting
 APPROVED SUMMARY
 January 25, 2011

Members

Present: Mr. Abe Ali, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources, District Office
 Mr. Tom Burke, Chief Financial Officer, District Office
 Dr. Doris Givens, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services, District Office
 (Timekeeper)
 Ms. Sandra Serrano, Chancellor, District Office
 Ms. Kellie Van Westen, Executive Assistant, District Office (Scribe)

Dr. Greg Chamberlain, President, Bakersfield College (Gatekeeper)
 Mr. Cornelio Rodriguez, Academic Senate President, Bakersfield
 College
 Mrs. Sue Vaughn, President, Management Association, Bakersfield
 College
 Ms. Jennifer Marden, CSEA President, Bakersfield College

Mrs. Jill Board, President, Cerro Coso Community College
 Ms. Mary O'Neal, CCA President, Cerro Coso Community College
 (video conference)
 Mr. Matthew Crow, Academic Senate President, Cerro Coso
 Community College (video conference)

Dr. Rosa Carlson, President, Porterville College (Facilitator)

Guests: Mr. Frank Ronich, General Counsel, District Office

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m.

1. Agenda

- a. Review Agenda and Time Allotments

The Agenda and Time Allotments were reviewed.

Action: The agenda was accepted as revised.

2. Approval of Summary

a. Approval of the Summary of the Meeting of November 16, 2010

A question was raised about the fact that at the meeting of November 16, 2010, there was discussion about classified staff not teaching and notifications to staff. It was reported that there was feedback at Bakersfield College that some administrators were not notified and some were that this decision had been reached and that District administrators would be meeting with affected classified staff on the campuses.

Action: The summary was approved as submitted.

It was noted that the Budget Allocation Model (BAM) was distributed to the members of the Council to share with constituency groups for feedback by February 14, 2011, for discussion at the meeting of February 22, 2011.

Action: Mr. Burke asked that any feedback be forwarded to him by February 14, 2011.

The Chancellor reported that she had emailed the notification that the Completion by Design grant proposal submitted by the Central Valley of Higher Education Consortium (CVHEC) which includes the District, was not identified as one to visit. There was distribution of a second notice from the Gates Foundation identifying other opportunities that might exist. Consultation Council members advised that they did not receive the second notice. It will be forwarded.

3. Constituency Issues

There were no Constituency Issues presented for discussion.

4. Educational Services

a. Academic Calendars 2011-12 and 2012-13

It was noted that in the discussion of the 2011-12 and 2012-13 Academic Calendars on November 16, 2010, it was reported that staff had been unable to confirm the dates for the Spring Recess in 2013 with local school districts; therefore, only the Academic Calendar for 2011-12 was submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval on December 16, 2010. The Cerro Coso Community College President advised that she had been unable to meet with the District Human Resources Officer as yet to talk about this issue.

It was reported that the Academic Calendars for 2011-12 that were subsequently distributed District-wide did not include the Spring Holiday. This will be verified and a correction will be distributed.

Discussion ensued about issues occurring when summer school starts too soon or ending too close to another term; the entire end-of-term processing for grades will create problems. The College Presidents were asked if a term ever began before the Memorial Holiday weekend and it was suggested that it would be best if it did not happen. The importance of maintaining flexibility was shared.

Cerro Coso Community College discussed the fact that their campus had implemented five-week courses starting early and there was a review of the student's success. There was a determination that most of the five-week courses were not successful. There was still a desire to keep the options open as there could be a decision to have an intensive basic skills class prior to summer school that would assist students in improving their skills and then enrolling in a class that would get them to college level in the fall.

It was reported that Child Development staff had been experimenting with six-week classes and contrary to what was believed would happen, data has shown that students were better retained and more successful in the six-week courses than the 16-week courses. It was noted that the College could possibly have two six-week sessions in a 12-week summer.

Council members were asked to consider what and how much they are offering year round, especially with a two-year calendar, because the Colleges continue to be over cap, and there is a need to focus on success, rather than just access. With all that is being talked about statewide it is not a matter of having a robust summer as looking at the enrollment targets, improving student success, and really focusing on the core mission.

This is not like other years, where the District and Colleges wanted to build summer. Since there is a two-year calendar that is being reviewed and the second year is being presented at earlier than in previous years, staff should look at it year round so that the Colleges are meeting student needs year round. There was a suggestion to add a note on the Academic Calendars to eliminate some confusion (an asterisk at the date of May 20). The notation, where it is indicated that instruction begins, would state that summer classes can run anywhere within those twelve weeks.

Porterville College is currently working on two Academic Calendars, one for attendance accounting and one for students.

Action: It was agreed that the Colleges should maintain as much flexibility as possible and should discuss the start date for summer school each year. There will be an asterisk placed on the 2012-13 Academic Calendars indicating that “summer classes can run anywhere within these twelve weeks.”

Mrs. Board will meet with Sierra Sands administrators to determine the Spring Recess for 2012-13.

The question was asked what the Colleges were looking for in terms of year round academic planning. Would the Colleges plan the second year at this time and they responded not in the next six weeks. It was noted that this would allow incoming students for the following fall to apply early. Bakersfield College has been thinking summer, fall, spring, and now with fall; they will start thinking fall, spring, summer. The high school student registration begins in April. Earlier is better for getting their admission forms submitted.

It was reported that the three Admissions and Records Directors have to meet and decide the time of end-of-term processing, first roll, second roll, and when registration will be held.

If Cerro Coso Community College receives confirmation on the dates of the Spring Recess, the Calendars will be sent to the Council members to share with the Academic Senates.

Action: If not finalized, the Calendars may be discussed at the next Council meeting.

b. Grant Workflow Process

At the last meeting, there was discussion about the Grant Workflow Process, and there was a question raised about whether or not Luminis could handle the grant work flow process. Dr. Givens met with Mr. James and he indicated that Luminis could only be utilized for approvals; it could not be used as a process to develop the grants, do the electronic submittals or the grant budget, and all other work related to grants. She indicated that the software the District was considering to purchase includes all of the processes for developing a grant from beginning to submittal, including all signature approvals.

It was stated that the Grant Workflow software was presented at a meeting of the Vice Presidents, including the signature process. After hearing that Luminis could not be utilized, the Grant Workflow software was recommended. Concern was expressed that the Grant Workflow software was a stand-alone system and does not tie to Banner. The District is going to a single sign in under Luminis; the whole approach is one place for all to access. Anything for approvals and approval queues is a workflow within Banner and Luminis. There may be a need for a product outside of Banner but the whole point is to be able to access through Luminis.

Consultation Council members raised many questions about the grant workflow process. They asked which end users have seen the software program. How much will it cost? Is it recommended for next year's budget and if so, will it go through a budget review process? Council members expressed an interest in seeing a demonstration of the program.

Concern was expressed that Luminis is not running; that Banner 8.3 is not up, and there are needs for Banner registration, CurricUNET, and that taking on something else that requires a lot of work, and will dilute the time required to implement other impending programs.

Action: There will be further information provided at the next meeting.

5. Operations

a. Luminis Update

It was reported that Luminis is scheduled to go live on the three-tier Luminis portal in May; load testing will begin January 31, 2011, of the new configuration; and almost all of the issues for moving to the multi-tiered environment have been worked out. There are currently some old instances of programs being used and those cannot be switched until the end of the semester.

Luminis connects users to a different site for Moodle as it is a portal. Those integrations and connections are set up to the tiers for the new Moodle 2. There is some different looks but the functionality is close enough; however, the frames are a little different. There will be training on Moodle 2 in the spring to allow use in the summer. The training will be held a few weeks prior to the end of the semester and there will be training scheduled at each College. There will also be training prior to the beginning of the next semester. The training will also be placed on line for those adjunct faculty not residing in Ridgecrest.

There are a variety of issues that had been given to the Vice Presidents to discuss with faculty and staff at the Colleges as to how to address and they will be submitted to Operations by the middle of March.

The question was asked if there was going to be a District Policy that all on-line instruction be delivered from the Kern Community College District. There are some faculty that are delivering their instruction on Moodle but off of the Kern Community College District site, and therefore, administration has no access to the class if there is a situation where the instructor is not available to teach.

The problems with non-District Moodle installations is two-fold; one is the possibility that the student will take a class and never be enrolled in the class in Banner; and second when personally identifiable information related to a student is put on a site that does not have an agreement with the District that ensures that there is compliance with all Federal and State rules and regulations. There are other procedural problems including the Help Desk would not be able to assist the students.

The question was asked if these issues need to be vetted through the Academic Senates, with the Vice Presidents and Academic Senates and it appears there needs to be a Board Policy. It was noted that Cerro Coso Community College adopted a policy that classes would be conducted through Moodle access which allow the leeway that students could use Moodle, FrontPage, Course Compass, and the Moodle site would direct students that site.

It was stated that the faculty union is very concerned that all faculty be treated in a fair and equitable way on an equal playing field; it is problematic to say that Course Compass is good, but some other program is not good. It was noted that Course Compass does not replace Moodle. Moodle is the course management system being used by the District.

Action: The College Vice Presidents and Academic Senates will take ownership of this issue and move through their institutional policies to forward their recommendations, including enforcing all online classes in the Kern Community College District to utilize a Moodle instance hosted by the Kern Community College District; and that there be no passing of student information as mandated by FERPA.

This item will be discussed at the Council Meeting of March 29, 2011, and the recommendations are to be posted by March 14, 2011.

There was a request for discussion at a subsequent meeting related to the Help Desk providing support for all students and instructors on Moodle.

b. Luminis Training for Accessing Documents

Council members were invited to participate in training following the meeting related to using Luminis to access documents for the Consultation Council meetings. The materials for the February meeting will be posted to Luminis. The College Presidents asked that their Assistants also be allowed access.

CurricUNET – Mr. James was asked about concerns expressed related to CurriUNET. He advised that he would arrange to meet with Mrs. Fulks and see if he could help move it forward. The issues included approval queues, the operational parameters, the guidelines, the amount of data to be uploaded, etc. He commented that the development people have done a terrific job, but related to the installation and operation systems, he would like to bring in policies, processes, and technical staff to make it consistent throughout at all three campuses.

6. Human Resources

There were no items.

7. Business Services

a. 2011-12 Budget

An email from Mr. Erik Skinner, California Community College Chancellor's Office, was distributed and it provided a Budget Update, January 10, 2011; a Community College League of California Budget Advocacy Action Center; Impact on Proposed 2011-12 California Budget of the Kern Community College District and an article from the Legislative Analyst Office regarding the 2011-12 budget: Prioritizing Course Enrollment at the Community Colleges. Also shared were the following documents: 2011 Budget, Issues and Perspectives, 2011 Kern Community College District Budget Issues and Perspectives and a Legislator's Fact Sheet. These documents will be distributed by those attending the Community College League of California Legislative Conference to advocate on behalf of California Community Colleges.

The current proposed budget essentially deals with a \$24 billion budget deficit and attempts to do it through \$12 billion in spending reductions and \$12 billion associated with extending for five years the temporary sales tax, the income tax change, and the licensing changes. The proposed budget reductions for the Community College System calls for a \$400 million reduction in unrestricted apportionment and the District's portion will be \$7.1 million; these funds represent a decrease to general purpose funds. There is also \$110 million in growth FTES funding which would be \$1.9 million for the District. Also in the budget proposal is a \$10 increase in student enrollment fees, from \$26 to \$36. Currently there is no reduction or restoration to Categorical Program funding. He advised that there is an apportionment deferral of \$129 million, resulting in a \$2.3 million cash flow impact to the District.

A question was raised about the deferrals, if that was the full amount of the deferrals or was it in addition to the \$900 million currently deferred. There was a request to hear about the total amount of deferrals and the total cash flow implication for the District. It was noted that there is currently \$860 million plus the \$129 million. This is a cash flow issue, not an operating income issue. It was reported that the \$860 million deferral funds will be distributed in July 2011.

It was reported that the total impact of the proposed State Budget to the District is \$7.1 minus the \$1.9 million, for a net decrease of \$5.2 million. A question was raised about the -2,514 full-time equivalent students based on the League's information. These are the lost students as calculated by the State and comments were made that this number was overstated.

It was reported that the State Chancellor is stating that this is the funded FTES and community colleges cannot continue to serve the students the way they have by taking away services. The Colleges should enroll the number of students they are funded for and provide them appropriate services. The District has been doing more with less; however, the policy issue is the District is jeopardizing success for access.

Comments were made about the fact that the Colleges cannot take on more students, staff are at the limit, and there is not enough time for Financial Aid, Student Services, and Admissions and Records staff to provide necessary services. It is also affecting the stress levels of the staff.

The State Chancellor has indicated that community colleges are at their limit and they are no longer able to provide students with the resources that are needed to succeed. It can no longer be said to do more with less, because the community colleges are already the most efficient system.

Mr. Burke reviewed the three scenarios shared by the Budget Advocacy Action Center and the impact on the District. Assuming the June tax package is approved, the net reduction would be \$5,160,000 (as noted above); if the June Tax Package fails and Proposition 98 is funded at the minimum, the net reduction would be \$9,074,000; or if the June Tax Package fails and Proposition 98 is suspended, the net reduction would be \$14,056,000.

Action: The Chief Financial Officer will be presenting three budget scenarios at the Board of Trustees meeting of February 10, 2011.

It was reported that the Legislative Analyst Office was recommending a better success rate and one proposal was changing the approach on priority registration. It was noted that the District is probably the only District in the state that does not uniformly allow the students with the most units to register first. The State Chancellor is indicating 90 units, and the Vice Chancellor, Educational Services, and the Vice Presidents have been asked to review look at the priority order.

A report of the number of students who are enrolled with 100 or more units was shared. Bakersfield College, 706 students, with the highest attempted and earned at 340; Cerro Coso Community College, 89, with 305 attempted and 261 earned; and Porterville College, 100, with 175 attempted and 173 earned. These students are currently enrolled.

There are many other questions to be discussed. How many of these students were enrolled for retraining, retooling, etc. Also, apportionment may not have been claimed. If these students are taking seats, could some of the 9,000 students on the waiting list the first week have gotten into a class. Of the 140,000 community college students that were denied access this year, 134,000 were first-time freshman.

The Legislative Analyst's Office recommended eliminating those students who have over 100 units. The District will continue discussions on these types of issues. There needs to be a mechanism for determining if excess units are the result of retraining, retooling, etc. There was a request for the average number of units completed for a R.N. graduate; engineering majors, etc. The Legislative Analyst Office also recommended capping the number of course repetitions.

It was noted that recent discussions included refocusing on mission because community colleges have become everything to everyone. It has been clearly stated that core mission includes Basic Skills, Career Technical Education, and Transfer. Another issue to review and determine is the number of transferrable courses that the Colleges have that are only transferring elective units and do not count towards degree requirements at the District institutions or the transfer institutions. The District must address the 9,000 students that did not get their classes and there is more that can be done.

Advocacy documents were shared and it was noted that these documents were available electronically on the portal. It was reported that the District Leadership Academy members, two College Presidents, the Chancellor, and students met with each District legislative representative and/or Chief of Staff, as part of the Community College League of California Legislative Conference.

8. Board Policy Development

a. Section Four, Students/Instructional Services, Policy 4B8, Independent Instruction

Concern was expressed about the fact that independent study is often used for online courses using the attendance accounting method. The State deemed online courses as being accounted as independent study, DSCH. It was noted that the online courses would not fit the requirements of independent study referred to in the policy.

The comment was made that administration must be aware that an instructor of an independent study class must be compensated. It was noted that this needs to be addressed because that may determine a totally different policy.

A question was raised about the difference between independent study and work experience. Some Council members indicated that they thought independent study was taking a class independently, not taking an independent course. It was commented that Bakersfield College does have approved independent study curriculum in the biological sciences as well as Chemistry and Physical Science. There are usually a small group of students who are particularly skilled and interested in the area and they do extra work with the faculty member. They are not Special Studies that meets on a regular schedule, it is being taught independently.

Action: The College Presidents will charge a member at their campus to bring back a revised policy. The revised Policy will be presented at the Council meeting of March 29, 2011.

- b. Section Four, Students/Instructional Services, Procedure and Appendix 4C4C, Grade Changes

This Policy was shared at the meeting of November 16, 2010, and the language was forwarded to General Counsel for review and to provide clarity of the process. It was suggested to follow the procedures used in filing a grievance. Questions were raised about how many days does the student have to file with the Vice President; establishing a time limit for requesting a grade change and if that was fair; and what was the mandate policy related to document retention related to grades.

9. Chancellor's Report

- a. Participatory Governance Workshop

It was announced that the Participatory Governance Workshop would be held on February 11, 2011, from 9 a.m. to 12 noon and would include Mr. Scott Lay, President, Community College League of California, and Ms. Jane Patton, President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The workshop will be streamed from the Weill Institute Forums; videoconferenced to all three Colleges, the Delano Center, and the Kern River Valley Center. It was suggested that there be a call bank or the use of CCC Confer.

There will be a presentation and then a question and answer period. There were two documents sent to the Chancellor's Office for duplication and distribution. An email notice will be sent with all of the appropriate details.

- b. California Leadership Alliance for Student Success (CLASS)

The Chancellor stated that this topic included CLASS, Commission on the Future, the Student Success Task Force, and the focus heard during the past year about student success, it is the outcome of at least part one of the Chancellor's evaluation, and that is that student success will be the focus of what the District and Colleges do. Everything will be measured by metrics to ensure that there is accountability and that timely progress is being made toward the completion of the goals. She indicated that she will be working with the Chancellor's Cabinet, as it relates to specific goals and the metrics. There will also be consultation throughout the Colleges in terms of what the District and Colleges are analyzing.

It was reported that in an earlier meeting of management at Bakersfield College there was discussion on students' success. One statement was that one way to address student success is by which students are given access and how the College needs to guard against that being the way of solving the problem.

The Chancellor advised that the District has the CLASS Queries in data, the ARCC report, enrollment management report, and there is already dialog taking place about how to measure student success and that students are learning. With regards to the focus, the Colleges need to move incrementally and with a sense of urgency. It is clear that the Colleges provide access to many but are at average at best in terms of student success and in some instances, even below average. The Colleges need to improve what was articulated to her as a vision by the Board of Trustees and that the District be the best in the state.

It was suggested that it be shared with staff as to how the priority registration is programmed. Dr. Givens will provide a report to the College Presidents.

SB 1440 – Mr. Rodriguez reported that there would be a SB 1440 workshop held at Bakersfield College on February 4, 2011, from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. He asked that representatives of the various discipline groups attend. There has been communication with representatives of California State University, Bakersfield, and they will also be in attendance.

Prerequisites – The Chancellor asked if there has been any dialog occurring at the campuses related to prerequisites and the option to use content review. It was reported there had been dialog and this was a topic for the College curriculum committees and the Vice Presidents had discussed this issue the month prior. The Chancellor encouraged the dialog, stating that the Colleges have used both validation and content review. The Colleges still have an opportunity to assess whether or not there is an adverse impact to any group of students.

10. Announcements

11. Next Meetings

- February 22, 2011 @ Weill (BC assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.
- March 29, 2011 @ DO (DO assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.
- April 26, 2011 @ CC (CC assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.
- May 24, 2011 @ DO (PC assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Kern Community College District
 Consultation Council Meeting
 APPROVED SUMMARY
 February 22, 2011

Members

Present:

Mr. Tom Burke, Chief Financial Officer, District Office
 Dr. Doris Givens, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services, District Office (Timekeeper)
 Ms. Kellie Van Westen, Executive Assistant, District Office (Scribe)

Dr. Greg Chamberlain, President, Bakersfield College (Gatekeeper)
 Mr. Cornelio Rodriguez, Academic Senate President, Bakersfield College (Facilitator)
 Mrs. Sue Vaughn, President, Management Association, Bakersfield College (Timekeeper)
 Ms. Jennifer Marden, CSEA President, Bakersfield College

Mrs. Jill Board, President, Cerro Coso Community College (video conference)
 Ms. Mary O'Neal, CCA President, Cerro Coso Community College (video conference)
 Mr. Matthew Crow, Academic Senate President, Cerro Coso Community College (video conference)

Dr. Rosa Carlson, President, Porterville College
 Dr. David Bezayiff, Academic Senate President, Porterville College (video conference) (The videoconference failed at Porterville College and Dr. Bezayiff left the meeting.)

Guests:

Mr. Sean James, Vice Chancellor, Operations Management

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m. Mr. Burke announced that Ms. Serrano was ill and recuperating at home.

1. Review Agenda and Time Allotments

The Agenda and Time Allotments were reviewed. Dr. Givens asked that Board Policy Development Section 8, Item b, be deferred. It was noted that Section 8, Item a, was also identified as a deferred item.

Dr. Chamberlain cited the new Bakersfield College mantra; "start on time, and end early."

Action: The agenda was accepted as revised.

2. Approval of Summary

Approval of the Summary of the Meeting of January 25, 2010.

A question was raised about Educational Services Item a, Academic Calendars, 2012-13, and the Academic Calendars, 2011-12, that were approved by the Board of Trustees on December 16, 2010. It was pointed out that the Board approved calendars for 2011-12 did not reflect the Spring Recess Day for any of the Colleges. It was noted that this was mentioned at the meeting of January 25, 2011, and that it was noted in the minutes there would be a correction distributed. It was reported that the Calendars would not be revised; however, an email to all classified and management staff would be distributed explaining that the Academic Calendars identify instructional days. It was determined that the email had not been sent to date.

Discussion ensued about the statement that in the future the Academic Calendars will not include the Spring Recess Day and that the calendars were operational. The question was asked who made this decision and why was it made. It was stated that these particular Academic Calendars will not reflect the Recess Day. Concern was expressed about how and where that decision was made without discussion by the Consultation Council. The question was asked are there other holidays similar to the Spring Recess Day that are noted for classified and management staff.

It was asked that there be discussion of the Academic Calendars and the summary of what occurred at the meeting of January 25, 2011 later in the meeting. It was also asked that when the email is distributed that it clearly state that there is not a change in the holidays as provided, just a change in how they are recorded on the Academic Calendar. The Academic Senate Presidents were asked if there was concern with the Spring Recess Day being reflected on the Calendar; it was commented that the Bakersfield College Senate did not have a concern, as the holiday was designated on the Calendar when approved at the last meeting. It was commented that the change was not brought to the attention of the Senates because it was on the Calendars that were reviewed and approved by the Senates. This was a process question and concern.

Action: The Vice Chancellor, Human Resources, will distribute a memorandum to all classified and management staff related to the 2012 Spring Recess Day.

The summary was approved as submitted.

3. Constituency Issues

Discussion about Board Priority Registration and the Bakersfield College Academic Senate's Proposal of Unit Limitations

It was reported that the Bakersfield College Academic Senate looked at the issue of priority registration and the number of units students should be allowed to register for during priority registration, in light of a concern of students shopping for classes. They register in an excess number of units limiting the access to other students to also enroll in that class and be placed on a wait list.

The proposal presented was to limit students during priority registration to 14 units or 3 classes totaling 15 units for those classes that are 5 unit courses for priority registration except for the President's scholars and students who have showed that they can progress through courses. There would be a window prior to open registration that would then allow the priority students to then go back in and register for additional units.

The priority registration proposal did include looking at data in terms of what impact this proposal would have on students in terms of availability of courses. It was noted that institutional research indicated that had this proposal been implemented prior to the last semester, there would have probably been 900 available seats to add to classes.

It was reported that at an enrollment management committee meeting held earlier in the day there was discussion about the priority registration process, and the Admissions and Records Directors had met the week prior. The consensus was that the new students who have the opportunity to matriculate should have a chance at classes before the continuing students could go beyond the 14 or 15 units, because the other students would not be able to enroll in any classes.

It was also reported that at a meeting of the Student Services Directors/Academic Deans meeting the possibility of delaying open registration for students who have not completed matriculation and that the discussion was held in the context of student success, not limiting enrollment.

Action: **It was reported that the Chancellor had asked the College Presidents to review the matrix; look at graduation data, the average number of units needed for graduates from different disciplines, and then to come back with their observations and recommendations by March 15, 2011.**

It was noted that the Chancellor has indicated that priority registration procedures will be developed and included in the District Board Policy Manual. This would also include the priority registration grid that was approved as a procedure; however, was never included in the Manual.

The Academic Senate representatives indicated that they recognize and respect the fact that the maximum of 19 units is uniform for all three Colleges. They feel this benefits students in trying to assist the students through in a timely manner, and this would open up seats for those students who have difficulty in getting the classes that they need to move forward.

It was reported that relative to the issues of the Legislative Analyst Office related to the number of students with over 100 units at the College, there was a suggestion to move these students down with either students who already hold a degree, or even lower, new students who matriculate seem to have a greater need than those individuals who already have a degree or have 90-100 units. This decision would have to be made by mid-March.

Discussion ensued about this suggestions related to the fact that there are numerous individuals returning to school to retrain for new employment opportunities; basic skills units; and those degrees that require more units such as nursing, engineering, etc. It was noted that at Cerro Coso Community College they have an over-unit plan for financial aid and Veterans' Affairs students and there has been discussion how they could adopt that plan for those students with excessive units. The plan limits the students to take only the approved classes that they have left to complete their goal and the only change to the process would be placing a hold in Banner which is already in place for undecided students.

There were no other constituency issues presented for discussion.

4. Educational Services

a. Academic Calendars 2011-12 and 2012-13

The question was asked about where the classified Spring Recess Day would be identified for classified and management staff. It was reported that a Calendar for classified and management staff is usually distributed later in the year. A request was made for assurance that management staff will continue to have the Spring Recess on that Friday.

A question was asked as to where the decision was made to remove the Spring Recess Day designation from the Academic Calendars; a question was also asked about when the Cerro Coso Community College classified and management staff would be taking the Spring Recess Day. It is the Friday of College Spring Break.

The Academic Calendar for 2012-13 was presented and it was noted that Cerro Coso Community College would meet with representatives of local schools as to when they would observe that the Spring break holiday. It was reported that there had not been an opportunity for discussion.

There was a comment that in the minutes of the January 11, 2011, that for summer school there would be an asterisk placed on the calendar that states that “summer classes can run anytime between the 12 weeks noted, and that was not on the calendar.

Action: The Academic Senates will confirm that the Academic Calendar for 2012-13 was reviewed and approved by the Academic Senates.

Mr. Rodriguez later advised that he wished to have the Academic Calendar for 2012-13 be added to the Agenda for the meeting of March 29, 2011.

Mr. Ali will distribute the email to all classified and management staff members.

- b. Grant Workflow Process

Action: This item was deferred.

5. Operations

- a. Luminis Update

It was reported that the load testing issues during registration are related to Banner not Luminis. The District has completed an upgrade in Oracle, the servers, and Banner. A load test was initiated and the system worked, however, Banner could not take 3,000 hits. SunGard blamed the old equipment but it has continued with the upgrades, and SunGard now believes it may be in the software. A partial fix has been developed.

Accessing District Consultation Council Portal – Discussion ensued about the various problems Council members had in accessing the materials for the meeting from the Luminis portal. The various issues will be reviewed and corrected.

Bakersfield College – Report of Slow Down in Computer Response – Information Technology will investigate and determine the problem.

Action: It was reported that at the end of March, the District and Colleges will move to Banner 8.3; Luminis in May; and the Campus Information Technology Managers will start coordinating training and determining the needs of the College in moving forward.

6. Human Resources

There were no items.

7. Business Services

a. 2011-12 Budget

It was reported that it appears that California Community Colleges are quickly closing in on the Governor's initial deadline for the 2011-12 budget. It appears that the proposed tax deal must be decided soon in order to be placed on the June ballot; the extension of taxes requires a 2/3 vote by the Legislature. It was stated that there is now a \$400 million reduction and a \$110 million in growth funds which was to be funded by the increase in student fees; however, the growth funds have been dropped and now there will be the \$400 million reduction offset by the \$110 million increase in student fees.

The California Community College advocates believe there is consensus among the Legislature to defer the census date proposal to the student process of the Student Success Task Force.

There remains three scenarios: 1) \$250 million assumes that the tax package is approved by the voters; 2) tax package fails, however, Proposition 98 is funded at its minimum which would be a net of \$510 million; and 3) the Legislative Analyst Office Doomsday scenario which would be a net \$970 million decrease which is the System's proportional share of the \$12 to \$13 billion shortfall. It was noted that these scenarios represent the following for the Kern Community College District; Scenario 1, a net \$5.3 million decrease in overall revenues; Scenario 2, a \$9.4 million; and Scenario 3, would be a \$14.8 million.

It appears that there is agreement by the Legislature to reflect other decreases, including the workload reductions, similar to the decreases made last year. The workload reductions drop the number of FTES that needs to be funded; it is funded at the same rate, just a lower number of FTES funded. A few drastic proposals from the Legislative Analyst office were shared.

b. 2010-11 Budget

It was stated that there will be no reductions to the 2010-11 Budget.

c. 50% Law Status

The summary of the District-wide 50% Law Calculations for 2010-11 actuals was shared and it was noted that the District is running at a little over 53.0%, and the budget was estimated to be just under 52%.

A question was asked about an exclusion from the 50% Law is the amount of funds that goes into reserves and the answer was no. It was noted that there are several exclusions; the data comes out of the denominator, the exclusions are any expense with a program code of 68, 69, 70; those costs are excluded. The costs of student travel; any fund shortfall from the Student Health Center; facility rentals; and a new cost of education is contract education that has been undertaken is part of the numerator costs.

It was reported that a negative to the exclusions is the annual support that it provided to the Child Development Centers; the Centers are essentially offsetting the positive of the other exclusions.

It was commented that the general unrestricted reserves were not included in any of the calculations, so by default that makes them an exclusion, an indirect exclusion, as they are not included in the calculation. When there is \$12 million that goes into newly created accounts, any time those millions of dollars into unrestricted restricted reserves, they are no longer part of the 50% Law expenses.

It was noted that at the last Board meeting, the Trustees approved setting aside \$12 million in reserves to pay off future Certificates of Participation debt. A debt is an exclusion and other exclusions include grant and categoricals. Also, the Colleges are putting aside some of their reserves for scheduled maintenance, capital projects, etc. and those funds are excluded as well.

d. Budget Allocation Model Evaluation Report II

It was reported that Mr. Burke received feedback from Cerro Coso Community College and Porterville College, and he was advised that the Bakersfield College Academic Senate did have some feedback but needed additional time to summarize the feedback.

Porterville College's Overall Response to BAM II Recommendations -- The Porterville College Learning Council remains concerned that one clear inequity in the current model remains unaddressed by the recommendations. Namely, while college allocations are based on FTES, other targets including campus 50% levels and contributions to the district-wide FON are not based on FTES. This inconsistency has disadvantaged Porterville College over many years. We believe that as long as allocations are based on FTES, other targets should also be based on FTES. We are disappointed that the BAMII did not address this inequity and request that the Chancellor consider Porterville College's concern in her review of the BAM II's recommendations.

Porterville College Learning Council recommends that the adopted BAM II report include a calendar that stipulates when progress reports to the Consultation Council will be made.

Recommendation1—District Office Discretionary Carryover -- Porterville College Learning Council is reluctant to support the District Office having a carryover. Since the District Office is not funded in the same way as the Colleges, it should not be treated the same way as Colleges with regard to carryover. If there were a mechanism to determine what a fair allocation to the District Office was (perhaps a % of overall allocation), then the District Office carryover could be treated in a similar manner as the Colleges.

In considering the District Office carryover, Porterville College had the following questions:

What % of the allocation goes to the district office and to district-wide expenses, and how does this % compare with other comparable districts (giving due attention to any differences between districts in what is included in these budgets)?

Who will monitor the DO budget, and who determine when the conditions for discretionary carryover have been met?

Recommendation 6—Structural Cost Differences -- The Porterville College Learning Council supports the recommendation to hire a consultant to analyze structural cost differences. But, in addition, they would like the recommendation to stipulate the following:

The consultant spent time with representatives at each campus and that the time given to those consultations should be divided equitably among the campuses.

The consultant presented findings/recommendations to the campuses before they are finalized.

The final recommendations will be shared with the campuses for discussion and response before actions are taken based on the recommendations.

Recommendation 6—Clarification of the charge backs between Regulatory, District wide, and District Office -- Regulatory should be kept separate because regulatory is dictated externally. District-wide and District Office should be combined—district has control of both of these budgets.

Feedback from Cerro Coso College Council on the BAM Evaluation Report -- The main feedback of College Council to BAM recommendations focused on three areas: use of an external consultant to access structural cost differences between the Colleges, discretionary carryover by the District Office, and deviations from the model. A summary of those concerns follows:

External Consultant: Serious concerns were shared about the use of an external consultant in a time of financial uncertainty and budget problems. A strong consensus recommends that instead of paying funds for a consultant, have staff visit sites and develop an understanding of the structural differences between the Colleges. This in turn would facilitate better trust between the individual colleges and the District. It is the collective belief that that the current Budget Allocation Model effectively accounts for the geographic, structural, and other differences the Colleges in its funding. The strong consensus opinion was that the District not hire an outside consultant.

District Office Carryover: The consensus was against District Office Carryover. Two positive aspects of such a carryover were identified, however. The first is that allowing the District Office to carryover funds would increase the colleges' access to unrestricted general funds the following year, better allowing each individual college to better support its ongoing mission. The second is that such carryover would reduce the perception of each College adding to its own carryover each year when in actuality such increases are often the result of unspent District Office allocations being returned to the Colleges. In general, however, the consensus did not support District Office Carryover.

Deviation from the Budget Allocation Model: The strong consensus was that there is a need to adhere to the budget allocation model. The model addresses the possibility of shortfalls and the District should trust the model.

Other than these concerns, the feedback to the recommendations of the evaluation reports were on the whole positive.

Questions were asked about the recommendation reference for the issues detailed. It was noted that the External Consultant related to recommendation #6; the District Office Carryover was related to #1; and Deviation from the Budget Allocation Model was related to # 9.

Discussion ensued about the recommendations.

Action: It was agreed to wait to have a discussion of all three College's feedback. The Bakersfield College Academic Senate's feedback regarding the Budget Allocation Model Evaluation Report II will be distributed by February 25, 2011.

8. Board Policy Development

- a. Section Four, Students/Instructional Services, Policy 4B8, Independent Instruction

Action: This item was deferred to the meeting of March 29, 2011.

- b. Section Four, Students/Instructional Services, Policy 4C4C, Grade Changes, Procedures, and Appendix

Action: This item was deferred to the meeting of March 29, 2011.

9. Chancellor's Report

The Chancellor was not in attendance.

10. Announcements

It was asked if the Strategic Plan and the results of the survey would be shared at the next meeting. Dr. Givens advised that it may be possible to share a draft of the report on March 29, 2011.

A question was asked about the proposed adjunct faculty hiring policies that are being drafted by Mr. Ali. It was indicated that Mr. Ali would be apprised of this request.

11. Next Meetings

March 29, 2011 @ DO (DO assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.

April 26, 2011 @ CC (CC assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.

May 24, 2011 @ DO (PC assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Kern Community College District
 Consultation Council Meeting
 APPROVED SUMMARY
 March 29, 2011

Members

Present:

Mr. Abe Ali, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources, District Office
 Mr. Tom Burke, Chief Financial Officer, District Office (Timekeeper)
 Dr. Doris Givens, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services, District Office (Gatekeeper)
 Mr. Frank Ronich, General Council, District Office
 Mr. Sandra Serrano, Chancellor, District Office (Facilitator)
 Ms. Kellie Van Westen, Executive Assistant, District Office (Scribe)

Dr. Greg Chamberlain, President, Bakersfield College
 Ms. Jennifer Marden, CSEA President, Bakersfield College
 Mr. Cornelio Rodriguez, Academic Senate President, Bakersfield College
 Mrs. Sue Vaughn, President, Management Association, Bakersfield College

Mrs. Jill Board, President, Cerro Coso Community College (video conference)
 Mr. Matthew Crow, Academic Senate President, Cerro Coso Community College
 Ms. Mary O'Neal, CCA President, Cerro Coso Community College (video conference)

Dr. David Bezayiff, Academic Senate President, Porterville College
 Dr. Rosa Carlson, President, Porterville College

Guests: None

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m.

1. Review Agenda and Time Allotments

The Agenda and Time Allotments were reviewed. The Chancellor recommended adding an announcement about the enrollment management workshop to continue encouragement about attending the workshop.

It was noted that the Bakersfield College Academic Senate had provided a copy of proposed Policy 4B8, Independent Study, and a copy was being sent to members who were videoconferencing.

Action: The agenda was accepted as revised.

2. Review and Approval of Summary

Approval of the Summary of the Meeting of January 25, 2011.

Three typos were called to attention and they will be corrected.

Action: The summary was approved as corrected.

3. Constituency Issues

- a. Status of proposed Board Policy Section 6H, Adjunct Employment and Procedure 6H

There was a question about the status of this policy and procedures, and it was reported that the policy is being reviewed by the Chancellor's Cabinet. It was reported that Human Resources had received input from the Chancellor's Cabinet members. It should be presented at the Consultation Council of April 26, 2011.

There were no further constituency issues presented.

4. Educational Services

- a. Academic Calendars 2012-13

It was noted that previous meeting the Academic Senates asked administration to ensure that the notation be placed on the calendars indicating that "summer session classes may run any dates within the twelve 12 weeks noted." Also, that it would be helpful to have the Spring Holiday noted on the calendars.

The question was asked if the reason the Spring Holiday was not noted on the Academic Calendar, was because it was not an academic holiday. If so, why are the Christmas and New Year's holidays noted. It was noted that these are not State-mandated holidays. The question was asked why not continue placing the Spring Holiday noted on the calendars.

Discussion ensued about the Academic Calendars, calendars for classified staff and management staff, and the various needs of each area such as dates of registration, last date of withdrawal, etc. A question was raised about an operational calendar distributed by Human Resources for classified and management and that this calendar be distributed in advance of the year of the calendar.

It was commented that there has been difficulty in scheduling meetings when staff have Statewide meetings such as CIO's, etc.

Action: The Academic Calendars for 2012-13 will be presented for approval at the Board meeting of April 14, 2011.

A Classified calendar and a Management calendar is to be developed and distributed after the approval of the Academic Calendars, no later than May 1st. If there is a change to the classified calendar as a result of negotiations, the calendar will be revised and redistributed.

The Vice Chancellor of Educational Services, will work with staff to develop an instructionally related student calendar with dates to withdraw, register, dates for grade/no grade, and plus holidays, as well as, statewide annual meetings. This Calendar will be presented for review at the next meeting and the name of the Calendar will be determined.

b. Grant Workflow Process

There had been a suggestion to use a Grant Workflow Software rather than the work flow program in Banner. It was noted that there are two processes; a pre-award process where the narrative, the budget, and what happened to the award is posted along with the requested signatures. These items take place before the grant is awarded and it was recommended to purchase new software. There is also the post-approval process after the grant is awarded that can appear in Banner. It was reported that the District processes a large number of grants processed by the District and Colleges.

It was commented that the District is implementing Luminis and the District owns and trained programmers on Workflow. The process for the pre-award and gathering signatures fits the workflow process in Banner, tied into Luminis, and there could be a grants channel and possibly a hire a consultant at a minimum cost to build the channel and build the workflow process, the District could maintain the program. Dr. Chamberlain expressed concern about the District utilizing staff and processes owned by the District in what is supposed to be a fully integrated system.

It was stated this Information Technology staff are currently overloaded with all of the current implementations taking place and it was recommended that there be a moratorium on new software to be implemented, as all other programs have not been fully implemented. The question was asked if the District moved toward the Grant Workflow Software, would it be essential to do it for next year, and if so it would to go through the budget building process. There has not been a formal proposal.

Action: If there is to be a proposal to implement the Grant Workflow Software, the written proposal must be shared with the Chancellor's Cabinet and then the Consultation Council. The proposal must include costs and the recommendations of the Vice Chancellor, Operations Management.

c. Draft of Strategic Planning Document

Dr. Givens announced that the Strategic Planning Document was completed on time and she expressed appreciation for everyone involved in the process. The document was shared and reviewed. It was pointed out that in the future, at District/College workshops, staff will have planned outcomes and attendees will discuss what is expected to happen at the end of the workshop, what staff have learned, and what will happen with what was learned that needs to be completed within the next six to twelve months, and then report out. Staff will be required to report how it is being implemented on the campuses, closing the loop.

It was commented that changes made since the last Strategic Planning Group meeting were reflected in red to highlight the changes.

The Strategic Planning Working Group held its final meeting and they provided additional feedback. The Strategic Plan is scheduled to be presented to the Board of Trustees on April 14, 2011, for a first reading, and at that point, there will be an opportunity for public comment, input, and as well as input from the Board of Trustees and then be presented to the Board of Trustees for a second reading. Discussion ensued on the next steps.

The Chancellor reported that she had met with members of the Strategic Planning Group and it was discussed as to what is the percent the District/Colleges should increase or improve overall. She indicated that she shared at that time was her discussions with the Board of Trustees in terms of her goal, that there is a need to stretch, everyone needs to be stretched. If 3% is used, then everyone just stretches to 3% improvement rather than maximize the improvement that may be possible to achieve at a 7%.

It was commented that the goals appeared to be by District rather than College and the report refers to baseline; what is the baseline? It was noted that the baselines are defined as the current year. The Chancellor advised that she had met with Mrs. Fitzgerald and the Institutional Researchers related to what is it the District measures, because based on the participation with CLASS, she had asked that the District look at years since 2006-07 and bring it forward to 2010-11. She met with Mrs. Fitzgerald again, and what was discussed was not creating something different than what has already been collected through ARCC and maybe the District needs to focus on the ARCC measures as they are required by the Legislature and the State Chancellor's Office. There had also been a conversation about looking at trends and there is a need to look at six years, whereas others, there may be a need for improvement year after year.

The Chancellor reported that the Board of Trustees wants the District and Colleges to stretch; the Trustees want the District/Colleges to be number one in terms of student success. The comment was made that this would be more easily achieved if there was not a financial goal to increase the unrestricted reserves by 1% per year as part of this Plan rather than investing in student success. The response was that the District/Colleges need to do both. There may be more money or less; however, because expenses are increasing, other expenditures need to be reduced. Regardless the budget is a large and it needs to be determined what is needed in order to support success. It was clarified that in the financial section of the Strategic Planning Document that deals with reserves, and there is to be maintenance of at least 10%. There is also a recommendation to increase ongoing unrestricted revenues by at least 1%, not increasing reserves.

It was stated that it was the hope of the Strategic Planning Group that the Colleges accept the Strategic Plan as their plan and tie their plans into the District Plan.

The Group felt the Colleges would be more willing to do and that there would be more meaningful dialog if they realized the Group was not placing responsibility and/or goals on them; the Group was waiting for the Colleges to tell them what was appropriate for their particular institution.

Action: A clean copy of the Strategic Planning Document will be posted on the website for review. The College Presidents will email the link to staff and direct any questions to the respective College members who served on the Strategic Planning Group. Members of the Consultation Council may also distribute to their respective constituency groups.

Council members were asked to continue to review the Strategic Plan and have discussions on the campuses. The Plan is a draft and will be presented on April 14, 2011, to the Board of Trustees for information. The issues shared in the Plan are to be vetted over the next 45 to 60 days and then there will be the ability to build upon the work of the Group.

The Chancellor commented that the Strategic Planning Work Group did a lot of work in a very brief period time and she acknowledged their good work and commitment to this project. She stated that this is a comprehensive report, but it is still a work in progress.

It was pointed out that throughout the report that there are references to Student Success, and in certain places it stated according to the ARCC set of measures, and it was recommended that this should be emphasized earlier in the report and in a stronger fashion. This will assist in the need for a common base of understanding related to student success.

Action: The definition of student success should be added to the glossary and the glossary should be located at the front of the report

The Council members were directed to page 45, related to reviewing the values in the strategic plan, where it stated that respondents are familiar with the values, believe in them, but feel they are not reflected in current practices, particularly the values representing “communication” (62% lower than “believe in this value”), “efficient and effective systems” (57.6% lower than “believe in this value”, and “faculty and staff” (52% lower than “believe in this value.” The question was asked how and where communication was explicitly addressed in the document. It was responded that it was addressed in objectives 2.1 and 2.2.

Discussion ensued about the survey process, the fact that surveys will be distributed each year, and the comparisons will be developed. The results of the surveys will be distributed at a later date. Recommendations were made for presenting the results in a clearer format, such as providing the number of responses, percentage of responses, and the primary outcome, before seeing the objectives.

d. Priority Registration

The matrix related to Priority Registration Procedures was shared. The Chancellor asked how what was being shared aligns with best practices for student success. She stated that she had asked for a Board Policy and the document presented as a procedure. She commented that she did not believe the matrix aligned with student success best practices. She cited that the first priority for special populations, recognizing that some are legal mandates’ however, she did not believe there was any relationship to completion of any the matriculation components. It was noted that the Presidents’ Scholars at Bakersfield College must complete matriculation. The DSPS and EOPS generally have, but it is not required; athletes must have completed matriculation and meeting their eligibility; and honor students are good students.

The Chancellor stated that the best practice for promoting students success is to have adopted Board Policy because it is a demonstration of what is being valued by the organization to promote student success. The Chancellor referred to the third priority related to new students and she reported that new students are a statewide issue in terms of them being blocked from enrollment, even though there may be continuing students who are not necessarily in good standing, have not met all of the matriculation requirements, and or not making progress towards a degree. She believes that there has been progress towards the registration period that begins shortly; however, it is not a policy and it is not a policy that addressed best practices.

Action: A Board Policy including priority registration must be developed to include a review of best practices and reflects some of those practices so that the Colleges can implement a best practice Board Policy related to priority registration.

Discussion ensued about who should be involved in the development of the Board Policy. It was reported that the three Directors of Admissions and Records meet and discuss these issues; however, there are no Vice Presidents currently involved. The comment was made that the District is missing something by not have a District-wide Students Services Committee, as there a number of issues. In the past the student services group was the Vice Presidents, Students Services, and other staff were invited as needed.

Action: It was suggested that the Vice Presidents, Student Services, take the leadership of this entire issue, and include the Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs, and the Academic Senates. It was noted that to effectively make change, the changes need to be made early enough so that the students can take advantage of those changes. Students need to be advised in the fall.

The Vice Chancellor, Educational Services, will work with the Vice Presidents, Student Services, who will coordinate through the Colleges with the Academic Senates, and others to develop the Board Policy. The Policy will be brought forward as a group who will hammer out the Policy.

The Chancellor stated she has two concerns; one is priority registration which supports student success, and the second is the statewide concern about students with 90 or more units, and whether they should not receive any type of priority, and what kind of process should be implemented. She stated that the State will likely develop their own regulation and they are looking at others for input.

Action: The charge of developing a policy for priority registration and a proposal for how to deal with 90 or more units will be distributed to the Colleges.

Enrollment Management Workshop – It was reported that the Enrollment Management Workshop would be held April 1, 2011, from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. and would be held in the Forums of the Weill Institute. There are currently 39 people who have indicated that they would be attending. The College Presidents were encouraged to have all Educational Administrators attend the workshop, and certainly Faculty Chairs, Deans, as the District is facing and will continue to face challenging times with expectations in terms of what is being taught. This topic is extremely important.

5. Operations

- a. Luminis Update

Action: This item was deferred.

6. Human Resources

There were no items.

7. Business Services

a. 2011-12 Budget Allocation

Mr. Burke reported that recently the 60 day deadline for getting the ballot initiative to extend the taxes went by and it became evident that the State is headed away from the Governor's proposed budget which included a combination of expenditure reductions and the extension of the taxes, which would have been the District's best case scenario and moving towards the Proposition 98 maintenance scenario or pro rata portion of the \$24 million State Budget shortfall. He stated that at that point the Chancellor's Cabinet met and there was consultation with the District Board Finance Committee, and it was agreed that it was prudent to move forward to the Colleges an allocation that reflected the worst case scenario so they could begin the planning to meet the worst case scenario budget.

Mr. Burke advised that this will not all be done in one year; reserves will be used to bridge, so that the Colleges can take time to plan changing operations to essentially function at a lower level of resources.

Mr. Burke shared the 2011-12 Tentative Budget Unrestricted Fund Allocation (Worse Case Scenario). He stated that the allocation builds into the ongoing revenues the 15% reduction of those revenues. The District made a conscious decision to move some of the reserves into other funds in an attempt to protect those reserves from potential raiding by the State and/or Department of Finance. Some reserves were moved into the Debt Service Bond and the Colleges have moved some into Capital Outlay. The District-wide reserves are down to the 10% level and that is the desired level of the Board. He advised that the reserves in the Debt Service and Capital Outlay are still available to the District for cash flow purposes.

The Chancellor asked Mr. Burke to address with Council what had come up at Porterville College related to one-time reserves versus ongoing. Mr. Burke reminded everyone that the reserves are one-time monies; however, something created those reserves. What created the reserves were ongoing revenues minus ongoing expenditures, the revenues exceed the expenditures, due to some reason. This has taken place one way or another for a few years for each of the Colleges.

Discussion ensued about College reserves, District reserves, and the unknown factors related to the 2011-12 Budget.

A question was raised about a comment made at the last Board Finance Committee Meeting related to a bonds clarification of how bonds affect the calculation of the FON. Mr. Burke advised that the State Chancellor's Office Legal Counsel had been reviewing the Full-time Faculty Obligation numbers and rules. He provided the legal opinion that temporary faculty or non-tenured faculty can no longer be incorporated into the full-time faculty compliance obligation calculation. The District must hire three of the proposed twelve to stay in compliance. This change, along with the fact that the State may be looking at the worst case scenario, and the State implement workload reductions that will put a downside pressure on the need for forty incremental faculty members. The Chancellor reported that there is legislative support and support by the Governor for the work load reduction.

b. Budget Allocation Model Evaluation Report II

Mr. Burke shared the Budget Allocation Model Evaluation Report II and the feedback from all three Colleges. It was noted that CSEA continues to have concerns about the implementation of the time study of personnel at the District Office. It was noted that Bakersfield College was in agreement with the Report and that included the external consultant.

The Chancellor asked questions related to concerns by the Colleges about the Budget Allocation Model related to budget shortfalls and stabilization. Related to a Cerro Coso Community recommendation, it was stated that the Budget Allocation Model is designed to stabilize the Colleges in case there is a drop in FTES, a differentiation in FTES at the Colleges, or the lack of funded FTES, the District and Colleges should follow the allocation model, that is its purpose. It is a very conservative model.

The Chancellor also asked about the Porterville College recommendation related to budget allocations based on FTES, other targets including campus 50% levels and contributions to the District-wide FON are not based on the FTES. It was commented that Porterville College believes that because their cost structure is different, they are relied on more heavily to develop the District as a whole to meet the 50% Law and the Full-time Faculty Obligation. It is felt that this is constricting their ability to hedge the College, whereas others in the District are not necessarily under the same constraints. It was commented that where Porterville College is where they are at because of decisions made years ago.

The Chancellor stated that the District may need to look at Porterville College and how their concern could be addressed and an adjustment be made if possible. She recommended having a discussion and to determine if there is a way of redistributing. It was pointed out that it was a recommendation for the external consultation recommended by the Budget Allocation Model Committee to look at structural costs. .

Action: Mr. Burke stated that the feedback will be accepted and be included in a summary document for presentation to the Chancellor as recommendations.

8. Board Policy Development

a. Section Four, Students/Instructional Services, Policy 4B8, Independent Instruction

The Bakersfield College Academic Senate shared their proposed changes to Policy 4B8, citing the purpose of Independent Study. It was noted that policy is utilized as intended. In a search for a definition of Independent Study, the best that could be determined was that Independent Study is not designed to replace courses that are offered, it is designed to extend education into areas that are not offered.

In the past, Independent Study classes were allowed when students had classes that were too close together and Banner would not allow enrollment. When that was corrected, Independent Study was no longer allowed. When a student needs one course to graduate and they could not take a particular course, there is a waiver process where the student can petition to use a different course to meet that requirement.

The question was asked that with current technology is there really a demand, or need, and today, the budget, for Independent Study?

It was reported that there are some independent courses at Bakersfield College in Chemistry where they pursue whole new interests that they have, and it was believed that the faculty is not paid for this course, it is project.

It was commented that faculty members should be compensated if the District is being compensated for the course. A question was asked about whether the faculty contract addressed Independent Study, and it was stated that the faculty contract is silent on independent study. It was further stated that Independent Study has been handled in a variety of ways; a special compensation agreement, which has been inconsistent, etc.

The question was asked about how many Independent Study courses there have been.

Action: The Policy and Title 5 regulations will be reviewed by General Counsel and deferred to the meeting of April 26, 2011.

b. Section Four, Students/Instructional Services, Policy 4C4C, Grade Changes, Procedures, and Appendix

The Bakersfield College Academic Senate advised that they would be reviewing this policy the following day.

Action: This item was deferred to the meeting of April 26, 2011.

9. Chancellor's Report

ARCC Reports – The Chancellor reported that the ARCC Reports by College were submitted four weeks earlier and they are to be finalized and posted by March 31, 2011. Mrs. Liza Fitzgerald will present the ARCC Report to the Board of Trustees at the April 14, 2011, meeting. The College Presidents were advised that following Mrs. Fitzgerald's presenting the data for the ARCC measures, the College Presidents or their designee will have an opportunity to summarize what the Colleges intend to do to make improvements.

10. Announcements

There were no announcements

11. Next Meetings

April 26, 2011 @ CC (CC assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.

May 24, 2011 @ DO (PC assigns) 1 to 4 p.m.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.