

BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE COUNCIL
OCTOBER 25, 2005

REVISED MINUTES

Present: Bill Andrews, Mark Staller, Mildred Lovato, Greg Chamberlain, John Griffith, Jennifer Marden, Ed Knudson, Ken Meier, Tim Bohan, Jack Hernandez, Tom Greenwood, Andrea Garrison, Ash West, Don Turney, Daryl Minus, Patti Ross, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Anna Agenjo, Kathy Rosellini, Ryan Busby, John Hart, Jeri Haner, Debbie Spohn

Guests: Dan O'Connor, Bill Moseley, Sean James

The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m.

Review of Previous Meeting Minutes

Minutes were approved as presented.

2005-06 Budget and FTES Target

John Griffith reported that progress is being made with the Budget Subcommittee, which has met twice since the Council's last meeting. It is the subcommittee's goal to have a formal plan to present by January. They are also working on the fiscal component of the accreditation review. The committee is considering a long-term policy to allow more purchasing flexibility by carrying fund forward to improve the purchasing power of a single department. Mark asked Dr. Andrews to share his vision on the budget building process on next years budget cycle. Bill answered that he would like to have a sense of what departmental needs there are. These should tie directly to the unit plans. Mark further asked if Dr. Andrews if College Council would be a part of the prioritization process for items that fall outside departmental auspices. Bill answered that this should be the first step in setting institutional priorities. The Master Plan provides direction for the college and for the departments. If we use it as we should and discuss both that and the outcomes through the expenditures, we should have a process that tries to link those things together at the same time.

Bill added that a challenge to the subcommittee is that the process should try to address funding patterns. We should have a plan to address budget reductions or funding increases. Ken stated that Chancellor Serrano is looking at best practices in this area; the district may be moving toward building 3 budgets to reflect increase, decrease, and no change. Sean James reported that the district-wide allocation model is under consideration because it is not built to handle reductions.

Accreditation Update

Bill Moseley provided an update. Self-evaluations are due at the October meeting for each standard. The next step is the planning agendas, which are due at the end of November. A campus-wide review of the final document is planned for the spring semester. The steering committee has decided to hire an editor for the self-study report, and they are in the process of formulating a job description. Mark asked that the timeline be clarified. Bill answered that for each standard, there are three pieces: a descriptive summary, a self-evaluation, and the planning agenda. By the end of November, a rough draft of the self-study should be ready. This allows the spring semester to gather college-wide input. The steering committee meets Monday at 2:30 p.m. in the Collins Conference Center; all are welcome to attend.

Block Schedule Task Force

Mark reported that the Block Schedule Task Force convened in October, charged to gather information and make decisions regarding needed changes. Mark chaired the task force, and shared their report, outlining their recommendations. It is the finding of the task force that minutes need to be added to some blocks. Another recommendation is that one official schedule be published and distributed across campus. Part of the difficulty lies in the finding that almost half of the classes lie outside the blocks. The problem is not within the schedule itself, but in getting departments to use the schedule as written. Core gen ed classes need to be spread across the schedule to allow students greater flexibility. These recommendations are made for the 2006-07 school year. There is a recommendation that a long-term task force continue to look at these issues due to the complexity of the problems. 44% of all classes are now scheduled in the morning; it is not known if the distribution of core curriculum classes reflects this percentage.

One of the problems delineated is that when classes overlap by a few minutes, Banner will now allow a student to enroll in both; nor will the state pay for a student with classes overlapping. Ed added that there are so many courses outside the pattern, it was impossible to identify where individual problems. We are currently looking for clear explanations from the state regarding cap load ratios. Greg commended the task force for their quick and concise work, and commented that these recommendations should not have to wait 18 months for implementation. A mid-year change is in order.

Jack stated that there is an assumption being made that students are not getting their classes because of scheduling difficulties. Has there been any survey of students to determine if this is really the case, or just a perception, and to determine how many are actually affected? Mark answered that the counselors reported that, from their perspective, it was because of scheduling outside the blocks, and lack of afternoon classes. We currently have rooms vacant for 3-4 hours at a time; cascading the blocks would reduce this down time. It is critical that we maximize facility utilization to maximize the budget dollars.

Forward any further reactions to Bill or Mark.

Classified Position Review Process

Dr. Andrews asked if everyone is satisfied with the process as put forward by this committee as a starting place, and move forward with classified hiring. Ken stated that there was a general discussion in Faculty Chairs/Directors Council, and they are supportive of this model. Timelines need to be considered. Consensus is that this document will be the basis for the classified position review process. Any changes will be brought to the College Council for further review.

Institutional Planning Process

Mark stated that the Academic Senate has appointed members to a subcommittee, using the 3-3-3-1 formula. It has been suggested that the President appoint a chair for that subcommittee so that it can move forward. Jennifer asked for clarification on the charge of this committee. Bill answered that the Institutional Planning committee tries to tie everything together in one document. This document would outline how input is provided, where decisions are made, and where to go for decisions in various areas. Mark added that this would be a short term

subcommittee to put the institutional planning process in writing with a timeline of 1-2 months. This document would go back to Academic Senate for approval. Bill will ask Jerry Scheerer to chair this subcommittee.

Service Hub Survey

Dr. Andrews shared a report from Jerry Scheerer. To date, Jerry has received 97 surveys, which is not enough responses to draw accurate conclusions from. Final results will be available for the November 8 meeting. Greg suggested that another e-mail with the link to the survey be sent out as a reminder. Bill asked everyone to encourage staff to respond.

Organizational Chart

A Public Folder has been created, and the current organizational chart is posted.

Revised Calendar for Spring Semester & Summer

This expanded calendar lists new meeting dates, and some possible dates for summer meetings if necessary. Please forward any conflicts. Each area is supposed to have alternates designated; this should make it easier to get representation at summer meetings.

Agenda Items for October 25 Meeting

Items for the 11/8 meeting were identified as follows:

1. Accreditation (standing item)
2. Calendar Development Process
3. Institutional Planning Process
4. Hub Review and Survey Results
5. Budget (standing item)

Other items may be forwarded to Mark Staller or Bill Andrews.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for November 8th at 2:30 p.m. in the Collins Conference Center. Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.