

BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE COUNCIL
NOVEMBER 8, 2005

MINUTES

Present: Bill Andrews, Mark Staller, Mildred Lovato, Greg Chamberlain, John Griffith, Jennifer Marden, Ken Meier, Jack Hernandez, Tom Greenwood, Andrea Garrison, Don Turney, Patti Ross, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Anna Agenjo, Kathy Rosellini, Jeri Haner, Janet Fulks, Rachel Vickrey, Steven Holmes, Chris Counts, Karen Sallee, John Gerhold, Jeannie Parent, Daryl Minus, Debbie Spohn

Guests: Dan O'Connor, Nick Strobel, Angie Alvarado

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

Review of Previous Meeting Minutes

It was noted on page 2 under the Accreditation Update that the spring semester will focus on college-wide input, rather than student input. It was also noted on page 3. Block Schedule Task Force, paragraph 3, that the counselors noted it was because of scheduling outside the block. Minutes were approved as amended.

Budget Update

John Griffith presented a draft of a paper regarding the carryover policy of the District and of Bakersfield College. The KCCD policy has been board approved. The second portion of the paper is a draft of how to identify BC's carryover policy that will allow for better long-range planning.

The budget subcommittee is working on the 2006-07 process and the budget portion of the accreditation self-study. John shared a document that identified the allocation from 2003, and the actual FTES as funded by the state. Because BC funds the District for centralized services, our total allocation is reduced by that amount. Janet Fulks stated that the formula that was developed was designed to give the same amount per FTES to each campus, but since this was developed, there have been other factors that have affected the allocation. BC is receiving less money per student than we were in 1999. Greg asked if centralized services such as HR have been taken into consideration; BC had its own HR staff in 99, and

now that service is provided by the District. Capital outlay is not part of the equation; that is reflected in a different fund. One thing that is a contributing factor is the rising costs of retiree benefits. Bill added that the District reserve is set higher than in previous years. When the formula was developed, the colleges wanted to retain the right to control the amount of service provided by the District. Subsequent to that time, there have been no discussions regarding the percentage provided to the District for District-wide services.

John stated that it is the charge of the subcommittee to develop and refine BC's budget development process and how this campus deals with the budget. Rachel asked what is being considered based on the District budget allocation model. Janet answered that according to the document, the task force should be meeting to discuss these issues; the task force has not met since the model was developed. An annual evaluation of the effectiveness of the allocation model is supposed to take place, and it is believed that no annual evaluation has been done.

John asked that each council member take the draft of the carryover policy to their constituent group for review and feedback. Rather than bring in the entire document at once, the subcommittee will bring it in sections for greater scrutiny. It is the goal of the subcommittee to have the entire document in final draft form by January. Any suggestions can be forwarded to John or Janet for presentation to the budget subcommittee.

Accreditation Update

Bill Moseley provided a written report in absentia. The second deadline for report development has passed, and the third and final deadline is Nov 21. This deadline is for the development of planning agenda items as indicated by the self-evaluations. By the end of the fall semester, the steering committee aims to have a draft of the report ready to circulate to all parts of campus, seeking feedback for the final report. The committee is working on hiring an editor, and hopes to have someone in place by year's end. Surveys have been distributed to students, faculty, and staff.

Anna Agenjo reported that she recently attended an accreditation workshop. It is her observation that faculty participation at BC is very low by comparison to other colleges. This could possibly be due to the proliferation of strategic planning, master plan development, and of the large number of surveys that have been

circulating recently. It should be noted that the accreditation visit team is coming to evaluate, not validate, BC's compliance with accreditation standards. The self-study must be full of evidence.

Institutional Planning Process

Mark reported on the progress of this subcommittee in Jerry Scheerer's absence. The subcommittee will be meeting on Tuesdays at 1:30 p.m. for the remainder of the semester. The Master Plan will provide the basis for much of the documentation. On Page 26, the newly revised EMP has a 2005-06 leadership plan, and 13 development strategies.

Service Hub Survey

The results of the hub survey were distributed last week, and are in the Public Folder. Since not everyone has had a chance to review the documents, discussion will be postponed to the next meeting. Bill asked that council members seek feedback on whether or not groups agree with the consensus of the report. Is it representative?

Calendar Development Process

Andrea Garrison asked that a process be developed for calendar development that involved faculty and staff input prior to submission to the board. Mark stated that the Senate has discussed forming a subcommittee to deal with academic calendar development. Bill added that College Council should review anything that is developed prior to submission. The first step is to ask the Chancellor's office for a deadline. Calendar issues can to be referred to the Senate for discussion.

Director, Public Information

Bill reported that the college has moved forward with the advertisement for the Director of Public Information position; Don Clark is serving in an interim position. A selection committee will be formed soon; the plan is to have all areas represented on the selection committee. The Director of Marketing and Public Information position has been eliminated. If the budget allows in a future year, it is possible that BC may consider a separate marketing position. The reason for the

elimination is that it is extremely difficult to find someone with expertise in both areas.

Agenda Items for November 29 Meeting

Items for the 11/29 meeting were identified as follows:

1. Accreditation (standing item)
2. Budget (standing item)
3. Marketing Strategies for Spring Semester
4. BC Public Art Guidelines
5. Facilities Subcommittee Report

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

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for November 29th at 2:30 p.m. in the Collins Conference Center. Meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.