

Kern Community College District
 Consultation Council Meeting
 UNAPPROVED SUMMARY
 April 26, 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
 Ms. Primavera Arvizu, Representative, Management Association,
 Bakersfield College

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

Dr. David Bezayiff, Academic Senate President, Porterville College
 (video conference)
 Dr. Rosa Carlson, President, Porterville College
 Mrs. Tammy Haynes, CSEA President, Porterville College (video
 conference)

Guests:

Mr. Sean James, Vice Chancellor, Operations Management,
 District Office
 Mr. Stephen Kegley, Accounting Manager, Bakersfield College

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

1. Review Agenda and Time Allotments

The Chancellor advised that Mr. James would address the items under Operations first and Mr. Kegley would address the Operation of College Bookstores second.

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

Action items from the last meeting were reviewed. It was noted that there was an action that the Vice Chancellor, Operations Management, would review a proposal to implement the direct work flow software. It was stated that the proposal would be shared with members of the Chancellor's Cabinet and then Consultation Council.

Related to the proposed Strategic Plan, it was noted that a copy was posted to the website and that the College Presidents would email the link to staff and direct to respective College representatives that served on the Strategic Planning Group. The members of the Consultation Council were also to distribute the Strategic Plan to their respective constituency groups. It was noted that the Plan was presented to the Board of Trustees on April 14, 2011, and any issues related to the Plan were to be vetted over the next 45 to 60 days.

The College Presidents and Consultation Council members advised that the Strategic Plan had been distributed appropriately. It was reported that CCA had received feedback since distributing the Strategic Plan.

A question was asked if the Strategic Plan would be presented for approval by the Board on May 5, 2011, if there is still time to receive feedback. It was stated the Plan would be on the agenda for the Board of Trustees meeting on May 5, 2011. It was noted that not all of the Trustees were present at the last Board meeting and it was uncertain as to what questions might be raised. The topic of Strategic Planning was placed under Educational Services for discussion.

At the last meeting it was agreed that a Board Policy related to priority registration be developed to include a review of best practices and to reflect some of those practices so that the Colleges can implement a best practice. The policy should also include a proposal for how to deal with 90 or more units as this has not been done.

Related to Independent Study courses, the District's proposed policy and Title 5 regulations were to be reviewed and discussed with the Academic Senate.

Action: It was agreed to accept General Counsel's legal viewpoint on Independent Study courses.

The summary was approved as corrected.

3. Constituency Issues

It was noted that the proposed Constituency Issues were placed on the agenda under the appropriate area of the agenda. They were Luminis update, Operations; Operation of the College Bookstores, Business Services; and Strategic Planning, Educational Services.

4. Educational Services

a. District-wide Calendar

It was noted that at the last meeting, it was agreed to develop a District-wide Calendar of Conferences/Meetings to assist in the scheduling of additional meetings. It was reported that additional information had been received to include in the Calendar.

Action: Council members were directed to review the Calendar, submit any additional information necessary. The Calendar will be shared for any discussion at the next meeting.

b. Strategic Plan

The Vice Chancellor, Educational Services, reported that the Strategic Plan had been distributed to the Colleges and that there was an issue that staff did not have enough time to review and there may be changes that have not been received. It was noted that Ms. O'Neal had indicated she had some changes to share. Ms. Marden indicated that she had received feedback, but did not bring it to the meeting; she will provide the changes to Dr. Givens in writing. Ms. O'Neal recommended discussing the Strategic Plan at the next meeting; however, the Chancellor had stated that the Plan was to go to the Board in May, and asked if it could go in June? The Chancellor replied that it was on the Board agenda for May; however, it does not mean the Board has to take action.

Dr. Carlson advised that some members of the participatory strategic planning group had some questions on the timeline, and she knew that people were looking at it, but she did not realize it was going to the Board of Trustees next week. She stated that she had not given any deadlines thinking there was more time. She asked if the feedback could be sent to Dr. Givens.

Dr. Carlson stated that the biggest concern from Porterville College staff was the specific objectives about doing surveys every single semester to obtain the information for the Strategic Plan; would the CSSEE be done every semester, which is a high cost type of survey, and was this being done this year; and are the Colleges budgeting for these costs every year? She commented that these were the questions Porterville College was struggling with; they are not sure if they are obligated to do this, or just a suggestion to continue with the CSSEE. The CSSEE responses will not be received until the end of the semester as they are still being collected. She stated that Ms. Pat Caldwell had mentioned that the Colleges still had to work on the targets, and that was what she thought the Colleges were going to be given time to work on.

The Chancellor stated that the Strategic Plan had a timeframe from the first presentation that was made to the Cabinet; it did go to the Board according to the timeframe; the process with the Board was a first reading and a second reading; the first reading was last month; the second reading was scheduled for this month. With regards to CSSEE there is nothing in the Strategic Plan that says that CSSEE will be offered every year. The Strategic Plan is an overall roadmap from which the Colleges would develop their plans. She stated that it was not expected that each college could achieve the plan by performing in the exact same way; but that those would be tailored by the colleges based on college programs and college information.

The Chancellor stated with regards to expectations, the expectations are already established already; there are ARCC Reports; the Student Success Task Force from the State; the Vision 2020; the Obama from the Federal government, all setting targets in terms of student completion as measured by degrees. In the case of ARCC it is more than measured by degrees, it includes persistence, includes a number of factors that were included in the packet of materials, everyone could look at the criteria used with ARCC.

The question was asked if the Board would approve the plan at the Board meeting. It was responded that they would most likely not approve the plan with the blanks. Then the Colleges need to have the numbers quickly; and the Chancellor responded that the District has to have some over arching kind of a goal. Should the Colleges improve student completion, attainment of degrees by 30% by 2020? The Colleges and District should achieve to new heights that will not keep the Colleges where they are. That is the bottom line; it is not good enough. It does not represent the excellence we have said we want to represent.

It was asked what was not good enough and the response was where the Colleges are today. When asked in what way it was replied in terms of ARCC data; having about a 49% student success rate; in terms of the IPEDS being closer to 25%; and this is the data that people are looking at. If data is disaggregated, what does that mean in terms of access and achievement? When looking at persistence rates, what is learned and that is really what the strategic plan is overall; it is improving as an organization, wanting to be better.

The Strategic Plan was done by a work group using internal and external information; yes there is a blank in terms of how we will improve. It was commented that even a 10% improvement is going to take the District forward. The term the Board used was that we should be looking towards exponential improvement. The Strategic Plan is really to provide a roadmap to areas of improvement or a road map to our preferred future. It is not a plan as to how to get there. The issues are related to student access, student success, training for the workforce, basic skills, and operational effectiveness.

Does the Strategic Plan outline the core issues? Does Strategic Plan miss something that should be included? There was something related to facilities that is not even addressed by the plan. This is why feedback is needed.

The feedback shared by faculty with CCA was shared. Faculty are currently doing so much work on program outcomes and the amount of responses, and the number of them included wondering about the lack of specificity, the vagueness, the inability to truly measure the objectives outline, the word vague and insubstantial. Another was issue of communication and morale. There were numerous questions wondering how the Strategic Plan was truly addressing the communication issue.

The key with the strategic plan is that it is establishing the goals in a metric for measuring, but the plans need to be developed by the entities, the Colleges and those objectives for the District Office.

The next set was setting the goal to increase the reserves by 1% a year seems foolhardy, it does not allow for the fact that we do enter times like we are right now so we do not want a goal of increasing the reserve by 1% when we need to be using the reserves for a rainy day.

There was concern expressed about the District chasing money for money sake; grants always have strings, are they cautious. Are the Colleges and the District marshaling the resources to achieve the goals? These were the major points from faculty to CCA.

It was stated that it was important to get things in writing when looking for commonalities and they need to be addressed; they can be presented to the Board; the Strategic Planning Group can come back and address the Board; the Consultation Council can be the one take the Plan and develop it further; or the Board can decide to do it.

The Chancellor can report to the Board that Consultation Council was still receiving feedback, here are the issues that tend to be of concern to the various constituents, and recommend that action not be taken by the Board and it will be presented at the next meeting.

5. Operations

a. IT Update

It was reported that the Information Technology Department had recently completed an upgrade of servers, Oracle, ODS, and Banner, there were a few problems but they were worked out. The testing and training databases have been shut down to put all resources into the first day of open registration. With input from the Colleges, the first day of open registration will be spread out into three time slots across the District.

It was noted that Information Technology was working on a data storage process and there is a major upgrade on data storage. They are working with the Colleges on data backup and centralizing this project; this project is partially funded by the Safety, Repair, and Improvement District Bond (SRID). The data storage process was completely funded by the SRID.

The next project was the Active Directory which is currently structured wrong and it is difficult to synchronize the passwords and the integration of other systems. This project should be resolved by the end of the academic year; the new structure has been completed, and the problem with the password reset process will be fixed in two weeks, before Luminis comes online.

Other issues include MIS submissions and it was reported that Cal B version of Banner has an MIS submission; in the past the District has not used this, but will now use it. It was noted that the MIS HR will be in line shortly and staff are identifying the tables, fields, and proper usage of codes for student MIS submission, which needs to be completed by July. The secondary issue related to MIS submissions is related to data integrity and there has been discussion in District-wide meetings as to who is actually the owner of the data, who is responsible for the accuracy of the data, what kind of reporting needs to be done to help the people responsible, and by the end of the week, to provide to the Colleges all of the MIS submissions fields that are completed by the District. The Colleges will then respond with which staff are responsible; MIS submission covers a wide spectrum such as EOPS, DSPS, Student, HR, etc.

It was stated that looking into the future, a major problem facing the District is the integration of all of the systems into Banner and Luminis; a problem as the District moves forward. There are so many systems spread out with numerous authentication sources, different logons, etc., the District is focusing on the Active Directory process and how to synchronize through Luminis and capabilities throughout the District and this project will be completed next year.

The District has written the password reset process internally; however, it needs to be moved to an externally supported software program, and this will all be integrated into a single product.

b. Luminis Update

There are two servers up and running Luminis; one server is being used for testing until the end of the term and is being used by the students such as for Moodle. It was noted that starting in the summer there will be a new Luminis platform which has been redesigned and it will be integrated into Banner and into Moodle Two which is the updated version of Moodle on the third-party server. This will happen at the end of May.

It was announced that Luminis training had been scheduled on each campuses; Bakersfield College, May 17, 2011; Porterville College, May 18, 2011; and Cerro Coso Community College on May 19, 2011. The training will be lead by the Information Technology Managers. There will be subsequent training at Bakersfield College, August 16-17, 2011; August 18, 2011, at Porterville College; and August 19, 2011 at Cerro Coso Community College. Announcements of the training dates will be distributed.

Staff and students working in the "old" Moodle will still have access until the semester is completed; all classes beginning in the summer must be in Moodle II.

Concern was expressed about the training scheduled in May as those dates were following the end of term; faculty had been advised that the training would take place at the end of April. It was noted that the College Information Technology Managers had set these schedules, they are the campus representatives of this project, they report to the College Presidents, and they are the communication source used to communicate with the Colleges on these issues. It was commented that staff will be able to access Moodle without going through Luminis.

The question was asked at what point does everyone have to be on Luminis. The response was that the links for online delivery of courses, these links do not have to go through Luminis; staff can go directly to the links. It is anticipated that staff will be forced to go to Luminis either in the fall or the spring, depending on how it works out. Students will find it easier to go through Luminis as the classes are listed and they can go direct. Staff, students, and administration will be notified to continue to go through Moodle for the summer, and fall, if necessary.

Action: The District will work with the College Information Technology Managers to publicize in writing about the dates of training at the Colleges in May for those interested in utilizing the instructional tools of Moodle through Luminis, and also publicize the dates in August for faculty to participate in Luminis training.

c. Help Desk

It was reported that the company engaged to provide Help Desk Services, Presidium, was purchased by Blackboard; this is not good for the District. The District has experienced significant issues with the Help Desk and the Information Technology Managers discussed the issues with District Office Information Technology staff. Part of the problem is that implementation is very difficult because documenting everything that has to be done on each and every call. There have been numerous changes to the directions.

It was noted that the District is unhappy with Blackboard because all of the people that were experts and staff were comfortable with no longer work for Blackboard. It was stated that Mr. Palinsky continues to work with them; they did not meet their response time standard last month and the District is in a serious discussion with them about the desire to not pay them if they do not meet the terms of the contract. He stated that one good sign was that when staff started looking at the numbers from the Help Desk, over half of the calls are after 5:30 p.m. and before 7:30 a.m. in the morning. There is support for students outside of the normal work hours which is a positive. The District is still not happy about the response time and there continues to be an evaluation.

c. Password Reset

This item was discussed under the IT Update item.

6. Human Resources

There were no items.

7. Business Services

a. 2011-12 Budget

Mr. Burke shared the presentation provided by the Chancellor at State Senator Rubio's Town Hall meeting the prior week. The three-slide PowerPoint discussing the best case scenario for the budget which was the \$400 million reduction to community colleges and the five-year extension for the taxes, the revenue impact of that change, compared to the worst case scenario which was a \$1.08 billion reduction to community colleges assuming a 100% all cuts budget and revenue reductions associated with that scenario, as well as the enrollment fee increases. In the worst case scenario, it is contemplated that there will be a \$40 per unit increase in enrollment fees as opposed to a \$10 increase in the best case scenario. The ramifications when comparing the best case and the worst-case impact on the District, looking at projected eliminated course sections, students turned away, full-time equivalent students lost, and adjunct faculty, classified, and administrative positions lost.

Also shared was a summary matrix, a history of what has happened over the last three years based on four factors; impact on courses, impact on faculty, budget impact, and impact on students. The impact on students 2009-10 was minimal. It was noted that the total number of course sections reduced between 2009-10 and 2010-11, is 704. There is an increased impact due to a higher demand by students. For 2011-12, based on the worst case scenario, the District will probably reduce higher enrolled courses; there will be significant reductions to adjunct faculty; there will be a cost-savings through few offerings; cost savings due to reorganizations and a reduction in force; and there will be a significant impact on students due to the elimination of high demand courses. There will most like be a continued increase in demand, as the \$60 fees may affect enrollment.

The Chancellor reported that Senator Rubio held community forums in Bakersfield and Fresno with the intent to understand the worst case budget scenario on public health, law enforcement, and education.

The Chancellor stated that the consistent message from the State Chancellor is that it has been accepted by the Legislature and the Governor, that recognizing the magnitude of the cuts to education, including community colleges, that a workload reduction is expected. She commented that some community colleges are reducing or eliminating their summer programs. There have been conversations about the fact in terms of expectations that first begin with intersessions; second is to move summer school; and then third have the regular fall and spring.

Action: Mr. Burke and Mr. James will prepare FTES targets by College based on the State allocation model to include what is the target and what has been discussed in the District and applied for the past five year, is that the District can work towards being above target, but we should stay in the range of about 3% above the target, because historically that has been a range that if there is funded growth, and if other Colleges are not achieving their target, there is usually some funds left that can be reallocated to those Districts that actually grew.

It was commented that under the worst case scenario the District would see some of the effects this year; the position losses would probably be deferred to 2012-13. If it is the worst case scenario that comes about, the District will use an eighteen-month period to do the adjustments.

The District 2011-12 Summary District Operations Unrestricted Budget was shared, which did not include categorical or contract education. He stated this was an important piece as it goes into the allocation model as a charge backs. He shared a breakdown by department of labor and benefits and costs and not-labor benefits. He indicated that the net budget proposal for 2011-12 is \$20,517,000 as compared to the 2010-11 adopted budget of \$19,769,000. He detailed the incremental increases by department including the percentage change.

Changes of the District Departmental budgets were highlighted. A question was asked about Degree Works and if all three Colleges would be implementing that program next year, and if so, why was the cost not included in the Budget? It was indicated that Degree Works was not placed in the budget because of the cost of the program and the cost of implementation, and it was stated that as it is determined if the Colleges will move in that direction, it may be proposed as something that gets funded through the reserves.

It was reported that the District Human Resources will retain a firm to complete a classified reclassification study during 2011-12, and the implementation of live scan fingerprinting. It was noted that this was being brought in house as the District has not been fully compliant in fingerprinting all student workers. An economic analysis was completed and it indicated that by taking on that significant volume, the District can save by doing it in house. There will be live scan printing equipment at each major College site and the District Office.

There was a question raised about District Office expenses being increased by 4%, whereas but the Colleges are going through reductions of at least 5%. It was indicated that the Colleges would be receiving allocations with less revenues, however, most likely a significant portion of that will be offset with carryover. The District Operations budget to their needs; they do not have the carryover capability to offset the increased costs. It was stated that the District truly try to budget to what is expected to be done by the District; there are numerous projects in the Information Technology area that the District staff have been asked to deliver. It was also stated that the \$700,000 was left as a yearend balance in the District Office is actually allocated out to the College for their reserves.

b. 50% Law Update

The District is currently at 54% related to the 50% Law through April 25, 2011.

c. Budget Allocation Model (BAM) Evaluation Report (Final Recommendations)

It was stated that the recommendations were developed based on the BAM Report, feedback from the Colleges, and Consultation Council. The recommendations were summarized as follows:

- 1) District Office Discretionary Carryover – if the stakeholders truly embrace the District Office budgeting to its needs, there is no reason to modify the carryover process for District Office operations, and therefore, it was recommended to continue the existing carryover policy with the following exception. It was cited that this was for efficiency matters, and it is believed that when the District is involved in a project that has been approved in one fiscal year, it is underway, and it is crossing fiscal years, that in those instances the remaining portions of those project costs should be allowed to carryover.
- 2) Enhanced Stakeholder Communication, Understanding, and Input into Model Components – It was recommended to adopt the BAM II Evaluation Team's recommendation for improving communication and understanding of both the budget status and the budget allocation model. Also, enhanced input into the model components will be served by regularly scheduled evaluations by continued reviews of the BAM.
- 3 and 6) Allocation of Chargebacks/Structural Cost Differences – It was agreed that there are significant demographic/structural differences between the three Colleges, and that there may be more equitable chargeback mechanisms that could be developed through an in-depth study of cost causing factors/drivers from the services provided by District operations. However, it was recommended that these studies be deferred until the following issues have improved and/or there is clarity:
 - a) Cost of the study using independent consultants and the current budget situation does not warrant an investment of this kind.
 - b) Cost of the study using internal resources and the significant amount of manpower time across the District.
 - c) The shift from Access to a Student Success oriented funding mechanism is beginning and the Chief Business Officer that created the SB 361 Model will be reassembled in May 2011 to look at this and other issues related to the current State allocation model.

It was suggested that rather than retain a consultant, the District could complete a self-evaluation on allocating chargebacks based on a combination of not just FTES, but a combination of FTES and FTE, all staffing not just student funding. Two concerns were expressed; would staff have time to do such a study and if there are significant changes in the next few months, such a study might become obsolete as a result of all the changes.

- 4) Over Cap – It was recommended to concur with the BAM II recommendations related to modifying to ensure clarity regarding only “funded FTES” being used in the model and calculation additions to the Budget Premises supporting the worksheet contained in the model.
- 5) Strategic Initiative Process – It was recommended to concur with the BAM Evaluation Teams recommended modifications to the model to ensure clarity of this model process. It was recommend changing the name of the process to “*Special Projects Initiatives*” and having Consultation Council re-review the process prior to calling for 2012-13 or future projects in order to achieve greater clarity of this model process.
- 6) (See #3 above)
- 7) Clarification of the Charge backs between Regulatory, District-wide, and District Office – It was recommended to concur with the BAM II Evaluation Teams recommended modifications to the model to ensure clarity of this model process. It was recommend consolidating the current three cost categories in order to simplify and thus should enhance understanding of the current allocation model components.
- 8) Line Item for Minimum Reserve Levels – It was recommended to concur with the BAM II Evaluation Teams recommended modifications to the model to enhance stakeholder budget information. It was recommend adding the percentage of prior year carryover/reserve and for the current year projected budget for informational purposes.
- 9) Stabilization Mechanism – It was recommended to concur with the BAM II Evaluation Teams recommended modifications to the model’s FTES stabilization formula. I recommend this change be made in order to avoid the potential for double stabilization occurring within the model calculations in subsequent fiscal years.

d. Operation of College Bookstores

Mr. Burke introduced Mr. Kegley, who coordinated the study of the College Bookstores and Analysis, as well as coordinating the Request for Proposal with the Bookstore Management Companies to assist in the process. It was reported that the Bookstore Management contract had ultimately been awarded to Barnes and Noble and they have begun the process of meeting with the Directors of Administrative Services at the Colleges to fine tune the transition plan. The transition has begun at Bakersfield

College and Cerro Coso Community College and the meeting with Porterville College was schedule the following week.

Barnes and Noble is targeting the date of May 31/June 1, 2011, for the takeover date. There will be an inventory buyout taking place prior to the takeover, they will be receiving books, and there will be a few days to prepare their merchandise, switch over their systems, bringing up the websites at each College for on-line purchases, establishing the book renting program, and a used book program. There will also be integration in the system so that when a student registers for classes they will be directed to the specific booklist for those classes

A question was asked about personnel and it was explained that when Barnes and Noble officially takes over it will most likely be staff of Barnes and Noble. They have offered employment to the current employees and if they accept they will be employees of Barnes and Noble. If they do not accept that offer, then they will be placed in a position that was previously negotiated with CSEA and that agreement was ratified to allow the Colleges to move forward. All changes will take effect no later than May 31, 2011.

Mr. Kegley indicated that book adoptions by faculty have already been ordered for summer classes and auditions for the fall have been submitted. There is an online adoption system which will be used for spring and training will take place in the interim. The process should be seamless in the interim. He indicated that Barnes and Noble will be doing an aggressive marketing campaign, pushing their rental program, and the marketing will be for the fall.

A question was asked about the profits from the bookstores and whether they will continue to be used for students or is there a change? The response was that net profits will be placed in the Student Development Funds.

8. Board Policy Development

- a. Section Three, Business Services, Procedure 3B1(a), Guidelines for Use of District/College Property/Facilities, Appendix 3B1(b), Facility, Equipment, and Service Fee Schedule

It was noted that the Procedure and Appendix were the accumulation of feedback from the Directors, Administrative Services.

Action: It was agreed to approve Procedure 3B1(a) and Appendix 3B1(b), Facility, Equipment, and Service Fee Schedule. The Procedure and Appendix will be posted on the Board Policy website.

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

It was reported that there has been additional input provided recently and it was requested to defer this item to the next meeting. It was noted that the packet did include the suggestions from the Bakersfield College Academic Senate.

Action: This item was deferred to the next meeting. The Cerro Coso Community College and Porterville College Academic Senate please review the information and comment prior to the next meeting.

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

It was reported that there has been additional input provided recently and it was requested to defer this item to the next meeting. It was noted that the packet did include the suggestions from the Bakersfield College Academic Senate.

Action: This item was deferred to the next meeting. The Cerro Coso Community College and Porterville College Academic Senate please review the information and comment prior to the next meeting.

- d. Section Six, Certificated Academic Senate, Policy 6H, Adjunct Employment and Procedures 6H

Discussion ensued about the proposed establishment and maintenance of applicant pools for Adjunct faculty, and the fact that there may not be a position, only a pool.

It was commented that the District felt it was important to establish and maintain an applicant pool; to ensure consistency in the employment policies across the District; the other was to bring clarity in the process for all faculty and staff; and to avoid the likelihood of last minute hiring that done. It was noted that this process was started after the adjunct faculty became part of the bargaining unit. All of the employment working conditions were to be eliminated from the policy.

Suggested language included "Advertising in specific positions in Mathematics, Science, and Philosophy; Accepting Applications for Adjunct pools for possible future assignments in disciplines". It was stated that the California Community College Registry, every region, no matter the size of the college or the number of Colleges within the District, they all have that kind of a statement regarding the creation of pools. They either state they are creating a pool in anticipation of future job openings and the list of disciplines, or it indicates the opposite, we are not accepting applications for the following areas in the part-time adjunct pool.

Discussion ensued about the criteria for hiring adjunct faculty; circumstances not permitting the inclusion of discipline faculty in Contingency or Emergency screening of adjunct instructors; and the new proposed selection committee and committee composition.

Action: It was agreed that the proposed policy and procedure required additional review and discussion and Ms. O'Neal and Mr. Crow will review the policy and procedure and will distribute the new proposed language prior to the next meeting for review by all Council members.

- e. Section Ten, Confidential and Management Employees, Policy 10C6, Confidential and Management Compensation

Council members expressed concern about anyone working and not receiving salary for their work; about assigning a management employee to an adjunct assignment which would be taking away a position from an adjunct faculty member. It was noted that employees who are Deans or higher are usually in authority positions with faculty and there is the need to eliminate any type of conflict of interest. A question was raised about whether or not there is a Fair Labor Law that if you work the person must be paid. General Counsel indicated that he did not believe so as the manager is being paid for their management position and that they are fitting the teaching in after 6 p.m.

It was noted that there was not consensus to move forward with this Policy and the question was asked if there was a way to improve the Policy other than to say that they will be paid and will be able to work any time they want. There was not consensus; however, there were no suggestions other than being paid and not deleting anything. The Chancellor stated that she would accept the input and she would figure out how to move forward.

Action: General Counsel will review the Fair Labor Law and advise of his findings related to teaching without pay.

The Council members were advised to submit any suggestions about the Policy.

- f. Section Eleven, General Personnel Administration, Student Employment and Appendix 11C5, Student Worker Salary Schedule

It was pointed out that the student worker should be compensated at an hourly rate based on the State and Federal minimum wage law, whichever was the higher rate. This will eliminate making changes when the wage laws are changed, and this eliminates the appendix. It was noted that any restriction on the number hours worked other than related to financial aid. It was also noted that students cannot make satisfactory progress towards their goal if they are a full-time employee.

Action: It was agreed to move Policy 11C5, Student Employment forward to the Board of Trustees.

9. Chancellor's Report

- a. Defining Student Success

This was addressed under the discussion of the ARCC report related to the Strategic Plan.

Virtual Symposium – The Chancellor announced that there was a Virtual Symposium Summit the following day. This Summit has been announced at the campuses, and it will be available at the District. Council members were urged to view and listen to the Federal agenda.

Participatory Governance Workshop – The Chancellor mentioned to the Academic Senate Presidents that the Workshop was held, where are the Academic Senate Presidents with that, and how does the District and Colleges move forward? It was suggested to move forward on a District-wide Senate which would actually facilitate participatory governance at the District level.

10. Announcements

a. Consultation Council Meeting Calendar, 2011-12

The Consultation Council Meeting Calendar for 2011-12 was reviewed. It was suggested to keep the date of May 24, 2011.

Action: It was agreed that a special meeting be called if there is news about the Budget after May 24, 2011. It was further agreed to change the date of May 15, 2012, to May 22, 2012.

11. Next Meetings

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

12. Adjournment

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