

# ACADEMIC SENATE of BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE

May 2 2012, 3:30 P.M.  
Collins Conference Center

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

**PRESENT:** Corny Rodriguez(EB); Kimberly Hurd (EB); Michael Korcok(EB); Gayla Anderson; Leah Carter(EB); Bill Kelly; Bill Barnes(EB); Nick Strobel(EB); Christian Zoller; Marsha Eggman; Reggie Bolton;; Melinda Fogle; Phil Whitney; Kate Pluta(EB); Lisa Harding; Sue Granger-Dickson; Kris Stallworth; Wesley Sims(EB); Matthew Morgan(EB); Jason Stratton; Jeannie Parent; Anna Poetker; Luis Guajardo; Susan Pinza; Nancy Guidry; Kathy Freeman; Julie Lowe; Alex Henderson; Valerie Robinson

**ABSENT:** Bill Moseley (EB); John Gerhold (EB); Rick Brantley (EB); Maria Perrone; Shane Jett; Patrick Fulks; Janet Tarjan; Klint Rigby; Kimberly Hurd; Terry Meier

---

## CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:35p.m.

## REVIEW OF THE MINUTES

A motion was made to approve the minutes as presented. M/S/C: Whitney/B. Kelly

## REPORTS

### President (Rodriguez)

- Refreshments were provided as a thank you for the hard work this past year and as a welcome to new senators. Corny introduced new Senators, Julie Lowe, Valerie Robinson and Alex Henderson. Robby Martinez is also a new Senator but was not in attendance.
- The Senate's reassigned time and staffing is under review. The total amount allocated will be less for next year, but the Executive Board feels strongly that the reassigned time for the Senate President stay the same. Corny will address this issue with Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg and the Executive Board will make the final determination over the summer.
- Corny asked for Senate support in recognizing Greg Chamberlain at Closing Day and asked Senators to attend.
- The Senate can expect the district office to respond to the budget plans on May 22 at the District Consultation Council meeting.
- In response to the idea of giving online waitlisted students access to course materials, Cerro Coso would like to limit the access to the first 10 students. Senators noted the BC policy says students in face-to-face courses must attend class. It was the general feeling of the Senate that online students should be treated the same. There was a suggestion to increase class size by 10, but it was pointed out that there are some legal restrictions for online class size and reasonable class sizes for the instructor should also be considered. Corny will be meeting with Sarah Phinney at Porterville and a committee at Cerro Coso. Phil Whitney agreed to help Corny resolve the matter.
- Corny spoke with Joe Saldivar regarding the 15-unit priority registration policy and perhaps changing the policy to prevent duplication of registration on waitlists. There was debate about whether this already exists.
- Cerro Coso and Porterville Senates have rejected the idea of a districtwide senate council.

### Accreditation (Pluta)

The timeline for finishing the self-evaluation has been changed slightly as the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, and Board of Trustees accreditation committee review the document. They each will submit copies of the document with their notes which SEC will use to update the document.

#### ISIT (Strobel)

Nick deferred his report to New Business Item D, ISIT Proposal for Change.

#### SDCC (Hurd)

Kimberly thanked the faculty that had responded to her survey asking for Flex Week activity ideas. She distributed hard copies of the survey and asked for additional feedback.

#### Secretary (Sims)

Wesley stated he would not be sending a letter of support to the Santa Monica College Academic Senate. He indicated that SMC Academic Senate is in favor of two-tiered system and did not support the students engaged in opposition of the issue at the Board meeting.

#### Treasurer (Brantley)

Corny reported that the Senate office received notice of the five students receiving Academic Senate scholarships.

#### CCA Update (Guidry)

Faculty should have received a survey on the different health plans options being discussed. Based on those survey results CCA will ask for a vote next week on the current plan and the two other most popular choices from the survey.

CCA will also ask for a vote to authorize the negotiating team to work over the summer. If the team does not negotiate the district may impose costs to employees until negotiations can be completed. There was a question about the \$12 million that was moved from district reserves being used for health care coverage. Nancy asked that the question be forwarded to Lora Larkin.

#### Articulation/Transfer

Sue Granger-Dickson reported that several successful transfer events have been held at the main campus and in Delano. Any faculty who would like a Counselor to speak to their class should contact Sue.

#### **OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE SENATE**

There were no requests to address the Senate.

#### **ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA *(must be added with a 2/3 vote of members present)***

There was a motion to add as Unfinished Business Item G, Relocation of Mailroom. M/S/C: B. Kelly/Sims

#### **COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS**

A motion was made to approve the committee appointments as presented. M/S/C: Stratton/Sims

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

##### Constitution & Bylaws Revision

Corny asked if there was feedback on the proposed revisions. There were no comments or suggestions for changes. A motion was made to approve the proposed revisions to the Constitution and Bylaws as presented. M/S/C: Freeman/Whitney

##### Enrollment Management – Course Prioritization Criteria

Michael Korcok reviewed the document and reminded Senators that Enrollment Management would like the Senate to address prerequisites campuswide. A motion was made to create a task force to address prerequisites on a campuswide level and report to the senate in the fall 2012. M/S/C: Whitney/Sims

##### BC Strategic Plan/Values, Vision, Mission

Senators were asked at the last meeting to solicit feedback from their constituents.

Objective 1.3 does not have concrete steps to complete this objective. It was noted that the plan intentionally leaves room for a variety of approaches to reach accomplish the objectives.

Kathy Freeman directed the Senators to two pieces of feedback from the English and Math departments which include specific concerns regarding KCCD Strategic Plan Objective 1.2 which is now referenced in the Bakersfield College Strategic Plan Objective 1.6. The concerns outlined by each of the department chairs are as follows:

*[October 6, 2011, email to Ann Tatum, College Council Representative for Academic Development, English, ENSL, and Math department]*

*Hi Ann,*

*The math department has some concerns with the strategic plan, specifically Goal One, Objectives 1.1 and 1.2. I would like to list our concerns to you so that if this topic comes up in College Council you will be informed of the math department's position. Our concerns are:*

- 1. We are concerned about the composition of the strategic planning committee. There is a total lack of people from either the math or English departments. Yet this group has made a goal for our departments.*
- 2. Concerning Objective 1.1, why are we targeting students successfully completing only 12 units in a year? These students will be at our school for at least five years. We need to concentrate on full-time students planning to finish in two or three years.*
- 3. Why have math and English been singled out as the only areas needing improvement?*
- 4. We can actually increase our percentage of successful students while not increasing the overall number of successful students. We are confident this is not what was intended.*
- 5. Objective 1.2 looks like it is asking the math and English departments to change (lower) their standards.*
- 6. The APR statistics are combined not separated by levels. We need to see success numbers for three levels below transfer all the way up to transfer level and then follow our students through their sequence of English or math classes for these statistics to have any meaning.*
- 7. If the English and math departments reach these goals then we need more faculty, classrooms and offices or there will not be enough classroom space for these successful students.*

*If some of this makes no sense of if you have any questions, please feel free to write or call me. My extension is 4227.*

*Thanks,*

*Mike Moretti*

*To: College Council*

*Date: October 7, 2011*

*RE: Response to KCCD Strategic Plan*

*KCCD Strategic Plan Goal 1, Objective 1.2 singles out math and English departments for an increase in retention and success. While I am certain both departments are keen to improve retention and success, the stated objective places undue burdens on each department. Additionally, I have concerns about access to reliable data. If retention or success increases or decreases, what variables will be credited/blamed for the results?*

*Some background: In the English department, we are already working to improve retention and success. Here are some examples:*

- Compressed classes (Academic Development 68/English 60, second semester, single class): Data collection ongoing; preliminary results good. Planning to increase number of courses and expand the pilot to include English 60/English 50 compressed course.*
- Three English 50 courses and three English 60 courses are part of a Pearson MyFoundationsLab pilot this semester: Data collection will begin at the end of the semester with pilot extended in the spring to include 1,000 additional students.*
- English 50 Department-wide final is being evaluated and revamped (SLOs too) for better alignment and preparation for demands and rigors of English 1a. This is part of an on-going two-year self assessment of the FEE and SLOs.*
- English 1a has completed two years of assessment of a rubric for the research paper, with an expansion of assessment beginning this fall.*
- Taskforce that met all summer to launch the Writing Center included five English faculty.*

*The Math Department is no doubt also involved in many pilots and projects to improve retention and success.*

Writing Standards: Other departments with writing assignments (many/most general education classes) that do not require English placement of 06 (English 1a) unintentionally undermine our pre-collegiate courses, particularly when students in those other classes are earning passing grades on those writing assignments and in those classes. Students argue that our department is being “picky” and as evidence, they point to their passing grades in other classes and other writing assignments.

Outside Factors: As we know, reasons for lack of success and/or retention are often outside the control of the classroom. Example: In math and English, instructors assign homework and test frequently. Some students refuse or are unable to keep up with reading, homework, writing assignments, and such, but continue to show up in class (some sincerely hoping to improve, others just needing units/financial aid, etc). Without effort and practice, students will not advance in their math and writing skills. Example 2: Students who qualify for aid may not be receiving it because of budget cuts to those support services; as a result, the students work more hours at a job and not on homework. In such cases, retention and success are dependent on resources our departments don’t have, yet it is the math and English departments that are under the microscope.

Unintended Consequence: In light of all of the above, not to mention the individual instructors who have made and continue to make changes in their syllabus and classroom instruction in hopes to improve success and retention, many English faculty are stressed that this goal and the recently adopted motto “Just One More” might only be reached (or at least quickly reached) by lowering standards, which they are adamantly opposed to. Additionally, it feels as if their current efforts to improve success/retention are unrecognized—that we’ll have to do something bigger and grander, something certain to succeed. Faculty are becoming stressed and demoralized.

Gate Keepers: Studies indicate that our departments are the gate keepers and that students who are successful in freshman level English and math are the ones who do well in other classes, transfer, etc. But in being the “gate keeper,” we have the unenviable position of having low retention and success; there is no pride in having the lowest retention and success rates. On that note, I must also point out that students **must** take math and English courses. If they fail, they don’t have the option of taking another course in another department to satisfy the general education requirement. That means students who aren’t up to the work repeat our courses, lowering our retention success rates on an ongoing basis. We are doing much to improve student retention and success, but how do we determine what actions are to credit for any success or to blame for any lack of success? The KCCD Strategic Goal 1, Objective 1.2 is well-intended, but it places too much burden on the instructor in the classroom as it is presently stated.

Alternatives: Re-work the wording of the goal. Collect data to discover obstacles preventing retention and success within and outside the departments. Develop an action plan (or plans) that can address one or two obstacles; collect data, evaluate, and continue steps in the action plan or address another obstacle depending on results. This, by the way, is likely to take years and years to accumulate.

Respectfully,

Pam Boyles

Chair, English Department

It was noted that the concerns of English and Math were considered and Objective 1.6 was modified from the original draft to show collaboration from various departments, with the use of district resources, to prepare students for success. Also important is that success in Math and English are primary indicators of transfer success. It was suggested to eliminate the sentence, “ use for baseline: total successful completions fall 2011 through summer 2012 in:” and instead let each department determine the most appropriate baseline. Debate followed on whether the baseline should be open for interpretation or if it should be prescriptive in some way such as the percentage of successful completions. Any change to the Strategic Plan would go forward to College Council and the Strategic Planning Work Group and the Senate after which the Senate would not be able to respond again until fall. Corny clarified that the Executive Board holds authority as the Senate over the summer. The Senate could also schedule meetings during the summer. Several Senators felt that the objective is not threatening and questioned the resistance to measuring successful completions. It was suggested to list every department in the objective or list all courses at transfer and one level below so that not any one department feels targeted.

A motion was made to approve the document with a recommendation to change Objective 1.6 to read, "Develop collaborative efforts with the support of district office resources to increase the percentage of successful completions for all courses at transfer level and one level below using a baseline established in 2011-12." M/S/C: Sims/B.Kelly. The motion carried unanimously.

#### Senate Reassigned Time And Staffing

Corny reiterated that reassigned time for the Senate President will not be reduced. Changes in reassigned time for co-chairs can be expected; however, he will continue to advocate for reassigned time and stipends for those willing to serve and get the work done.

#### Dean of Instruction At District Office

Corny asked for feedback from the Senators. There were several Senators who asked how a Dean of Instruction is warranted at the district office given there is no instruction at the district office. It seems that if the position is coordinating the grant then the position of Grant Coordinator should have been used. Also of concern is the Dean of Instruction vacancy at Bakersfield College that will not be replaced. Corny indicated that he would take the Senate's concerns to administration and noted that the Senate does have input on the process but not on which positions will be hired. There was then a question whether faculty were able to participate in the hiring process for the Dean of Instruction at the district office. The Board Action referenced the hiring as a reinstatement which does not seem appropriate since the position did not exist at the district office previously.

#### **INSTALLATION OF OFFICERS**

Corny noted that each of the officers is continuing next year. The new Senators were installed to conduct New Business items.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

##### Program Discontinuance Policy

Corny explained that the Senate needs to review the policy in light of the current budget plan and that administration has identified several programs for discontinuance. Corny suggested that the Program Discontinuance Policy be renamed the Program Review Policy and that the Senate identify a set of filters that would alert a program to begin reviewing itself.

Senators expressed frustration with programs being identified solely because the program does not award a degree. There are courses required for transfer that if discontinued would negatively reduce the richness of course offerings. It was noted that it is confusing for students to see in the catalog 108 degrees or certificates and then for the necessary courses to not be in the schedule. Bakersfield College needs clearer pathways for students so they may complete more quickly. Based on current mandates for AA-T and AS-T degrees it will be difficult to eliminate programs that offer these degrees.

Administration has identified 68 degrees and certificates and it seems unreasonable for the Senate to fully execute the existing policy for each. The Senate should be proactive in identifying ways to save programs. It was suggested to narrow the opportunity for administration to initiate the process. One Senator commented that changing the policy now does not reflect well on the Senate. Perhaps proposing a hiring freeze or other options to address the budget situation would be more appropriate than refusing to accept the premise of the Program Discontinuance Policy. Beginning the program discontinuance process seems futile until the Senate knows if the ultimate goal is to eliminate personnel. Corny suggested that departments start collecting information outlined in the Program Discontinuance Policy so the Senate can respond in some way to administration's proposal. Bill Kelly shared that the Agriculture department is considering combining their department's offering into one degree with five specialization options. A question was then asked how program discontinuance saves money if the goal isn't to layoff faculty. It was also asked if the Senate's role was to accept the administration's proposal by responding with a list of programs that should be discontinued or rather to refuse being a part of it.

*\*\* A motion was made to extend the meeting time for 10 minutes. M/S/C: Korcok/ B.Kelly*

#### SGA Smoking Policy Proposal

A motion was made to table the agenda item. M/S: Korcok/B. Kelly

There was opposition expressed for tabling the item and Senators were urged to give the matter consideration since SGA asked for a vote. There were also strong opinions expressed about the matter not falling within the scope of the Senate's 10+1. There was concern about how the initial survey was conducted and if the results truly show a desire to prevent smoking on campus. The vote was taken, and with 11 nays and 4 yeas the agenda item was not tabled.

Senators reported on the feedback they received from their respective areas. Feedback included support for a non-smoking campus due to allergies, migraines, the health effects of second hand smoke, and as a way to support the students' request for a more positive environment. Those opposed to supporting the policy again questioned whether the matter fell within the 10+1 scope, and noted that based on the voting results provided by SGA, 51% of the survey respondents voted either for the current policy or a designated smoking area rather than the complete elimination of smoking on campus.

A motion was made to recommend to SGA another survey where the top two choices of the original survey are given. M/S: Stratton/Korcok. It was noted that the topic was not noted as a voting item on the agenda and therefore the motion is out of order.

*\*\*A motion was made to move to New Business Item C. M/S/C: Freeman/Anderson.*

#### 2012-13 Academic Senate & Executive Board Meeting Schedule

Senators reviewed the proposed meeting schedule. It was noted that the Accreditation Team visit would be during the week of October 24. A motion was made to change the proposed schedule so the first Executive Board meeting will be held on August 22. M/S/C: Korcok/Freeman

#### ISIT Proposal for Change

Nick explained the document is a policy the ISIT Committee has approved to facilitate year-round equipment requests and input from Media Services. Nick explained that the proposal is an information item for the Senate but welcomed any input.

##### **Policy Change: Two parts:**

- a) *We will now allow departments to update their technology equipment replacement (those lost to theft or to wear/tear or as non-state funded opportunities arise) needs throughout the year (not just at APR time); and*
- b) *Include the knowledge of Media Services and Information Services personnel to fill in gaps of technology equipment replacement needs.*

##### **Rationale:**

*Right now the only data that are used in determining computer+media technology needs are what are in the Annual Program Review form. Unfortunately, the APR information (discussed internally by the departments in September and submitted in mid-October) can be obsolete as instructional needs or funding sources (e.g., new grant opportunities) change during the school year. (Usually, computer+media technology purchases occur in the April/May timeframe.) Also, individual departments often do not know what classroom technology is in need of replacement sooner than other classrooms. Because of this, ISIT would like to add some flexibility to the data input and include the advice of Media Services and Information Services in the information used to determine what computer+media technology is purchased. Prioritization of technology purchases will remain with the ISIT Committee to maintain our current participatory governance oversight + consent process. Requests for new technology would be made through the APR along with what departments know about their technology replacement needs but ISIT would also like to know of changes in replacement needs throughout the academic year and have the*

flexibility to re-prioritize as needs change.

**Possible Objections or Questions:**

- 1) **Isn't this an end-run around the APR process? Response:** The APR will continue to be used for both technology replacement and identifying new technology needs. However, the APR is essentially a snapshot of a department's needs known at the middle of the Fall semester but computer purchases are done near or at the end of the Spring semester.
- 2) **Won't this give too much power to MS/IS in determining what technology goes into the classroom? Response:** Prioritization of technology purchases will remain with our participatory governance committee, ISIT Committee. Also, individual departments often do not know what classroom technology is in need of replacement sooner than other classrooms. MS/IS can help fill in the gaps in our knowledge of what classroom technology needs to be replaced sooner than other classrooms.
- 3) **What happens now when classroom technology is stolen or broken? IF spare equipment is available or IF funding exists to replace the stolen or broken equipment, then the replacement equipment is installed immediately without having to go through ISIT approval. KCCD is self-insured, so funding for stolen or broken equipment has to come out of our reserves.**
- 4) **How is this proposed process different from what happens now? Although stolen or broken equipment is replaced ASAP as funding allows, this proposed policy change allows departments to request changes in already technology-equipped classrooms at other times in addition to the APR. This proposed policy also allows us to use the expertise of Information Services and Media Services in identifying classroom technology needs. Under current policy, if the academic departments do not identify in the APR needs for the technology-equipped classrooms in which their faculty teach, then those technology-equipped classrooms will not be upgraded. New technology needs—introducing new technology tools to any classroom—will still be done solely through the APR.**

Possible Summer Meetings

Senators should check their email for possible meeting requests.

Senate Goals Evaluation

Corny indicated that the Executive Board would begin this work over the summer.

Mailroom Relocation

It was reported that the Mailroom is being moved to the Shipping & Receiving area and that approximately \$25,000 is being spent to renovate the area. It seems that the faculty mailboxes will go away and Department Assistants will be responsible for delivering mail. There is a concern that this information was not shared during the budget forum.

**GOOD AND WELFARE AND CONCERNS**

**ADJOURNMENT at 5:31**

Respectfully Submitted,  
Jennifer Marden