

## **BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE ACADEMIC SENATE 2012-13 MOTIONS/RESOLUTIONS**

### **FALL 2012**

#### **August 29**

##### Fall Election Timeline

A motion was made to suspend the usual voting rules and to vote on the timeline immediately.  
M/S/C: Gerhold/Tarjan

A motion was made to approve the fall election timeline as presented. M/S/C: Carter/Stallworth

#### **September 12**

##### Program Viability Task Force

A motion was made to approve the formation of the task force with the charge and structure as presented. M/S/C: Korcok/Lowe.

Discussion began with strong concern about how the task force would be able to review every program in the expected timeframe. There was also a question about the deadline for managers to provide information on “all potential impact to employees” by October 16 that was mentioned at the Town Hall meeting. Corny acknowledged that he did not know about that deadline and made note to ask for more detail at the District Consultation Council meeting of September 25.

Corny explained that the Senate is caught in a difficult situation. The Program Discontinuance Policy was not intended to be used to address collegewide budget reductions. The Senate needs to look at all programs with filters that can help in deciding what programs, or portions of programs, need to be modified. It was further noted that the Program Viability Task Force could accomplish the work more quickly than a committee following the Program Discontinuance procedures. Without this task force the Senate is forced to either use the Program Discontinuance procedures or leave the decision to administration. Again the concern of time was mentioned. Concerns were expressed about the need for the task force at all; departments could “clean up” course offerings themselves. In response, it was noted that the Senate needs some process by which to provide recommendations to administration on how budget reductions will affect programs. Although the Senate has not received a written request from administration to initiate the Program Discontinuance Policy, the Senate should be prepared to respond to such a request. The Senate cannot prevent programs from being discontinued from happening and needs to ensure there is adequate and appropriate faculty voice in the decision making process.

The initial work of the task force is to evaluate academic viability and then to make recommendations for program modifications based on that initial evaluation. If Proposition 30 does not pass, there is a process in place to address programs on a broader scale. If it does pass the impact to programs will be significantly less. Faculty do not want to point fingers at other departments and say which should be cut, but it is important for the Senate to decide on what criteria are used to make budget decisions.

An alternative to the task force would be to honor the budget resolution passed by the Senate last spring and insist cuts are made farthest from students. If the task force moves forward, Senators asked that the charge is clear, the group will report back to the Senate and will consider program costs when making recommendations.

A friendly amendment was made to change item #3 of the charge to read, “make recommendations for action to the Academic Senate based on the criteria” which was accepted. The vote followed with 12 votes in support, 5 votes opposed and 1 abstention.

<b>PROGRAM VIABILITY TASK FORCE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE</b>	
<b>Committee Charge</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review and establish criteria utilizing:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section III, Early Warning Signs and Section VI, Evaluation Criteria listed in the Program Discontinuance Policy.</li> <li>• Program Review data</li> <li>• Other relevant data</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Review and assess program viability based on the criteria</li> <li>3. Provide recommendations for action to the Academic Senate based on the criteria</li> </ol>
<b>Membership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Senate President (<i>or designee</i>)</li> <li>• One (1) representative from each department (<i>identified by the department chair</i>)</li> <li>• One (1) representative from Curriculum Committee</li> <li>• One (1) representative from Program Review Committee</li> <li>• One (1) representative from Accreditation Steering Committee</li> <li>• Students or others (<i>identified by the task force</i>)</li> </ul>

Renaming ESL Department

Jeannie reported that the department would prefer to keep the change of English for Multilingual Student (EMS) as was originally proposed. A motion was made to approve the department name change as presented. M/S/C: Korcok/ B. Kelly

Proposal to change ESL Department to EMS (English for Multilingual Students)

- 1) *Issue: Currently, there is a stigma attached to ESL. Students, especially in outlying areas such as Arvin and Delano, do not want to be labeled ESL, and feel that is a designation they have long outgrown, or that it is a label for Adult School. As a result, filling classes in areas that have a high concentration of non-dominant English speakers has been surprisingly difficult.*
  
- 2) *Rationale: The name English for Multilingual Students has a positive connotation for students, especially Generation 1.5 students, those who immigrated as children, but have grown up in the U.S.; they are orally fluent in English, and have not been in an ESL class for many years, but they could still benefit from the linguistic support TESOL instructors at BC provide. For them, the term ESL sounds negative and regressive.*

*English for Multilingual Students is also the trend in the discipline at other colleges and universities such as UCSB, University of Michigan, San Francisco State University (Composition for Multilingual Students), Ventura College, and East Los Angeles College. These schools have embraced this positive direction, and renaming the ESL Department at BC would demonstrate a similar goal of considering our students.*

*EMS is also a more accurate description of our demographic as English is not always the students’ second language, but sometimes their third or even fourth language. We have*

students from not only Central or South America but also from South East Asia and Africa who speak multiple languages.

- 3) *History: The Department has been known as English as a Second Language as long as it has been in existence (four years), and as long as it has been part of English or Foreign Language/ASL (forever).*
- 4) *Opposition: None known of except to the cumbersome task of renaming all the courses and getting all of that into CurricUNET.*
- 5) *Solution: Request approval from Curriculum Committee on name changes, and get CurricUNET to work, perhaps?*

Co-Chairs Committee Charge

The Senate reviewed the following charge for the Co-Chairs Committee. A motion was made to approve the charge as presented. M/S/C: Korcok/B. Kelly

<b>NAME OF COMMITTEE</b>	<b>Committee Co-Chairs (bc_commcoch)</b>
<b>COMMITTEE CHARGE</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Share information</li> <li>2. Coordinate activities and calendars</li> <li>3. Prevent duplication of work</li> <li>4. Integrate accreditation into committees and college activities</li> <li>5. Establish goals and review issues for the next year</li> </ol>
<b>SCOPE OF AUTHORITY</b>	Authority is vested in committees the chairs represent.
<b>REPORTS TO</b>	College Council and Academic Senate
<b>COMMUNICATES WITH</b>	Accreditation Steering Committee and the college community
<b>MEMBERSHIP</b>	Co-Chairs: College and Academic Senate Presidents Members: Co-Chairs of collegewide governance committees: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)</li> <li>2. Assessment Committee</li> <li>3. Budget Committee</li> <li>4. Curriculum Committee</li> <li>5. Enrollment Management Committee</li> <li>6. Equal Opportunity Diversity Advisory Committee (EODAC)</li> <li>7. Information Systems Instructional Technology (ISIT)</li> <li>8. Program Review Committee (PRC)</li> <li>9. Staff Development Coordinating Council (SDCC)</li> </ol>

Resolution in Support of Proposition 30

A motion was made to suspend the typical voting rules and vote on this item immediately.

M/S/C: B. Kelly/Freeman

A motion was made to approve the resolution as presented. M/S/C: Guidry/Pinza.

***Resolution in Support of Proposition 30***

***Schools and Local Public Safety Protection Act***

*WHEREAS, community colleges have taken extensive cuts to funding over recent years, while trying to educate the largest high school graduating classes in California history and need funding to provide the programs and services necessary to increase the number of successful degree and certificate holders;*

*WHEREAS, community colleges have been forced to turn away as many as 130,000 potential students in a single year due to the need to reduce course sections, generally from 5 to 15 percent annually per district;*

*WHEREAS, community colleges have carried an estimated 252,000 students over the last five years (2007-08 to 2011-12) for whom they have not received any apportionment, categorical, or student support funding;*

*WHEREAS, community colleges operated with \$809 million (12%) less in unrestricted apportionment funding 2011-12 than in 2008-09, including cuts to both apportionment and categorical funding;*

*WHEREAS, per-student funding in community colleges has been reduced from \$5,659 in 2007-08 to \$5,115 in 2011-12, a loss of 9.6% over this five-year period, while the unfunded cost-of-living (2008-09 to 2012-13) has increased by a compounded 16.3%;*

*WHEREAS, the Legislature has increased fees from \$600 annually in 2008-09 to \$1,380 for the 2012-13 school year, while the majority of community college students have incomes so low that they are eligible for the Board of Governors' (BOG) Fee Waiver;*

*WHEREAS, California community colleges are essential for providing higher education opportunity for over two million Californians annually;*

*WHEREAS, California community colleges are essential for providing students with the skills to be economically success in the California economy;*

*WHEREAS, Proposition 30 would temporarily increase the state sales tax by 0.25% and the marginal personal income tax rate for individuals earning over \$250,000 and households earning over \$500,000 and dedicate the funds to K-12 schools and community colleges;*

*WHEREAS, Proposition 30 will avoid the elimination of funding for an additional 85,000 students by providing \$548.5 million in 2012-13;*

*WHEREAS, Proposition 30 will enable California's community colleges to restore essential student service programs that were cut by up to 60% over the last three years;*

*THEREFORE, the Academic Senate of Bakersfield College supports Proposition 30, The School and Local public Safety Protection Act, which has the official title, "Temporary Taxes to Fund Education. Guaranteed Local Public Safety Funding," on the November 2012 ballot.*

## **September 26**

### Change Proposal: Dissolution of DE Committee

A motion was made to approve the dissolution of the Distance Education Committee.

M/S/C: Gerhold/B. Kelly

### Proposed 2012-13 Senate Goals

A motion was made to approve the 2012-13 Senate Goals as presented.

M/S/C: Gerhold/B. Kelly.

- 1. Ensure active faculty participation in developing processes and procedures that impact academic senate purview and responsibilities.*
- 2. Address issues that are impeding the approval and renewal of curriculum to meet Title 5 compliance. For example: staff and faculty involvement in committee work, encourage faculty training.*
- 3. Increase faculty participation in college governance activities, in particular curriculum and program review.*
- 4. Continue to ensure the Academic Senate effectively fulfills its defined role in the accreditation process in #7 of the 10+1 "academic and professional matters," which addresses "faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self-study and annual reports." in an effort to embed accreditation into the culture of the college*

### Program Review Committee: Update to Charge

Although this topic was listed as a voting item, Corny asked that the Senate defer action pending additional feedback from the Program Review Committee.

A motion was made to defer a vote pending feedback from the committee. M/S/C: Gerhold/Pinza.

### Discussion on How to Best Publicize the Senate's Position On Proposition 30

The Executive Board brought forward this topic for Senate discussion and to brainstorm ideas.

Suggestions were made to contact local media for interviews, submit editorials to the newspaper and to prepare a press release that would include the Senate resolution as well as information comparing Proposition 30 and Proposition 38. The Senate discussed further urging the KCCD Board of Trustees to take a support position of Proposition 30. A motion was made directing the Senate Executive Board to prepare a press release of the resolution. M/S: Gerhold/Fulks. A friendly amendment was made and accepted that the Executive Board develop a proposal for Senate action at the next Senate meeting. The motion carried without objection.

**October 10**Resolution in Support of Allowing Access to Waitlisted Students in Online Courses

Senators reviewed the resolution as was revised at the Senate meeting of September 26.

*Whereas, the Kern Community College District's highest priority is to promote student success;*

*Whereas, the Academic Senate is to be relied "primarily upon" for any elements of the "10+1" Responsibilities, #5 of which is "standards or policies regarding student preparation and success;"*

*Whereas, waitlisted students who are eventually enrolled into an online course have a higher drop rate and lower success rate because of the disadvantage of not being able to fully participate in the online course while waitlisted;*

*Whereas, the current Online Course Management System (Moodle) configuration settings do not allow waitlisted students for online courses to fully participate as equals to officially enrolled students as do students in face-to-face courses;*

*Whereas, employees of Kern Community College District Information Technology have stated previously that allowing waitlisted students to be given full and equal status in Moodle as officially enrolled students is not difficult;*

*Resolved, the Bakersfield College Academic Senate asserts the necessity of students in online courses parity in class participation with enrolled students and urges the Kern Community College District to implement this change immediately for spring 2013.*

A motion was made to approve the resolution as presented. M/S/C: Gerhold/Korcok

Program Review Committee: Update to Charge

A motion was made to table this item pending further input from the Program Review Committee.

M/S/C: Stratton/Gerhold

**October 24**

There were no motions or resolutions related to the Business Items of the Agenda.

**November 7**Waitlist Size Purpose and Guidelines

A motion was made to approve the Waitlist Size Purpose and Guidelines as presented.

M/S: Korcok/B. Kelly

There was significant discussion on whether the guidelines take away the ability of faculty to make the decision on the size of the waitlist. Faculty should not have to get permission from the Dean on the waitlist size. There are instances when the size of the waitlist does not accommodate the number of students that do not show up to class, which leads to low enrollment for that course. It was noted that the guidelines establish standards and there is an expectation that instructors, department chairs and deans will work collaboratively in setting the size for each course waitlist.

The chair called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

### ***Waitlist Purpose and Guidelines***

*The Academic Senate, as part of their 10+1 Responsibilities, affirms the purpose of waitlists as providing a fair and consistent option for students to enroll in an otherwise full class if a seat in that class becomes available.*

*The size of each class waitlist will be set to give students a reasonable expectation a seat in the class will become available.*

*Waitlists should not be used to determine demand for any particular course.*

### **Program Viability Criteria**

Corny noted that Executive Summaries were submitted from most every department. Although Proposition 30 has passed, the college will still need to reduce expenditures by \$1.2 million for 2013-14. The college still needs to evaluate program viability and the work of the Senate and the Program Viability Task Force (PVTf) will be important as the college moves forward. PVTf plans to meet with administration on November 13 to discuss the list of program viability criteria. The Senate will need to approve the criteria now so the task force can go forward with this meeting.

A motion was made to suspend the usual voting rules to allow voting on the item immediately.  
M/S/C: Carter/Korcok.

A motion was made to approve the Program Viability Criteria as presented. M/S: Korcok/Sampley. Discussion followed with concern expressed about comparing Bakersfield College programs to similar programs statewide. It was clarified that the Program Viability Task Force's intent is to allow individual departments to decide what similar programs will be used in comparison. Another concern was related to how the criteria will be measured and how they will be weighted. Corny clarified that when PVTf meets with administration that group will communicate how each of the criterion should be interpreted when programs are being considered to be sustained, suspended or discontinued. PVTf will not make recommendations for specific ranking of programs.

Corny indicated he will ask if faculty can expect the Cost Per FTES data to be updated.

Freeman made a friendly amendment to change the phrase "as compared to similar programs statewide" to read, "as compared to similar programs at California community colleges with similar demographics." The friendly amendment was accepted. The motion carried with two objections.

### **November 28**

#### **Program Viability Update**

There was a request that the Program Viability Task Force (PVTf) provide a report to the Academic Senate based on the letter of response related to Program Viability Criteria received by Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg. Further, there was a request to include a criterion specifically related to basic skills. Leaving out basic skills has long term ramifications for meeting our FTES target given the local demographics. Corny reassured the Senators that there was no purposeful intent from PVTf to omit specific basic skills criteria. Corny also reminded the Senators that the criteria had been approved by the Senate at a previous meeting and that any additions needed to be done immediately since the criteria have already been submitted to administration. The Senate can make further recommendations to the Program Viability Criteria without reconvening PVTf.

Separately, there was a concern about Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg adding criteria to the Senate's list of program viability criteria. If this matter falls within the Senate's 10+1 purview, it seems problematic that administration would not honor that list of criteria as it is written. There was a comment that it seemed reasonable for the college president to have an opinion on how program viability will be evaluated and that administration would make decisions that include the Senate's Program Viability Criteria.

A motion was made that the Academic Senate recommend that basic skills be identified as a significant component in achieving student success and it be included as such in the Program Viability Criteria document. M/S: Stratton/B.Kelly. A friendly amendment was made by Gerhold and accepted to clarify what should be identified is basic skills instruction. A friendly amendment was made by Pinza and accepted to include this criterion under a separate heading for Basic Skills on the document. Gerhold called the question and the motion carried without objection.

The final resolution will read as follows:

*A motion was made that the Academic Senate recommend that basic skills instruction be identified as a significant component in achieving student success and it be included as such in the Program Viability Criteria document under a separate Basic Skills heading.*

## **SPRING 2013**

### **January 30**

#### Spring Election Timeline

A motion was made to approve the Spring Election Timeline as presented. M/S/C: Sims/Korcok

### **February 13**

#### Committee Charges Updates

A motion was made to approve the Accreditation Steering Committee charge with one revision to the title Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs and Student Services to the current title, Vice President, Academic Affairs. M/S/C: Sims/Gerhold

A motion was made to approve the Program Committee Charge as presented. M/S/C: B. Kelly/Rigby

### **February 27**

#### Accreditation (Pluta)

Kate Pluta reported that the college is moving quickly in response to the ACCJC Recommendations. Lisa Fitzgerald, Institutional Researcher is now attending Accreditation Steering Committee meetings. Kate is also meeting with Lisa and Heidi Gilliard, Research Analyst, to discuss a survey to evaluate the self-evaluation process. Kate shared the timeline that will be followed to prepare the response. The Recommendation Teams will prepare responses for each recommendation and will submit the report to the Oversight Committee by April 22. Kate then shared the proposed composition of the Oversight Committee and the Recommendation Teams and noted that Bonnie Suderman is the Project Director. The Recommendation Teams are comprised of people who worked on those same areas in the self-evaluation, and college committees whose work is related to the recommendation. In addition to the Academic Senate, both of these documents will be presented to the Accreditation Steering Committee and College Council. Kate noted that the ACCJC Report is clear that Bakersfield College will need to resolve the deficiencies outlined in the recommendations, not just prepare an action plan for addressing

the deficiencies. The faculty for each of the Recommendation Teams will need to be approved by the Academic Senate.

A motion was made to add the names listed for each Recommendation Team to the Committee Appointment approval list. M/S/C: B. Kelly/Gerhold.

#### BCOUGH Policy and Voting Results

Senators were given the policy on February 13, 2013 and were asked to share with their constituents. A motion was made to show support for the BCOUGH Policy. M/S: Freeman Harding.

Discussion followed with clarification that smoking in personal cars in campus parking lots would be banned. It was unclear if smoking on sidewalks surrounding the campus would also be banned. Concerns were raised about how visitors to campus would be made aware of the policy and how Public Safety would handle citing visitors. Nick Acosta, SGA General Council, clarified that once the policy was approved, SGA would engage in an education campaign for students, employees and the community. Nick also noted that Public Safety's first steps would be to issue warnings, not to automatically issue citations. For further clarification, it was explained that the policy will first go to College President, Sonya Christian, who will then take the matter to the Chancellor. Ultimately, the policy will need Board of Trustees approval. There was a suggestion the Board Policy simply state that each of the colleges will have a smoking policy, but that the specifics of the policy would be left to each college to decide. It was noted that both Cerro Coso and Porterville College have designated smoking areas. The question was called and the motion carried with two objections and two abstentions.

#### Change in the Definition of a Program

This change was first presented to the Academic Senate on February 13. A motion was made to approve the recommended change of the definition of a program to model Title 5. M/S/C: Gerhold/B. Kelly.

### **March 13**

#### Achieving the Dream

Senators expressed concern with the lack of clarity of the costs involved and the possibility of additional projects in which the college will be asked to participate. It was noted that President Christian does not need the Senate's approval to move forward; however, Senate support in the spirit of partnership and working together may be beneficial. Discussion continued, noting that, in the spirit of collaboration, the college president should divulge more about the costs and responsibilities. There was also concern expressed about involvement with ATD impacting Curriculum. There were also comments of support, noting that working with ATD could help the campus move in the direction of more transparency, allow the college to better use data to make decisions and also make information more accessible to faculty. It was noted that Foundations of Excellence generated good ideas and energy but were dropped in the end and that the same could happen after three years with ATD. There was a request for more time to research ATD. It was noted that the Academic Senate has had adequate time to research ATD. The deadline to submit the proposal is March 26 and support or opposition after the proposal has been submitted does not have any impact.

A motion was made to make the submission of the ATD proposal a voting item. M/S: Korcok/Robinson. The motion carried with three objections and one abstention.

A motion was made to support submission of the ATD application. M/S: Gerhold/ B. Kelly.

A friendly amendment was made by Korcok that the motion include a Senate recommendation that any Bakersfield College expense be capped at \$50,000.00 per year for participating in ATD and a request

that a clear explanation that participating with ATD does not obligate Bakersfield College to participate in any of the recommendations of ATD. The friendly amendment was accepted.

The question was called by Gerhold and the amended motion carried with three objections and one abstention.

#### Senate Scholarships

A motion was made to approve five student scholarships in the amount of \$500.00 each.

M/S/C: Korcok/Parent.

#### **April 3**

##### Concern with ASCCC Proposed New Discipline

A motion was made to approve the resolution as presented. M/S: Korcok/Stratton. Gayla Anderson read an excerpt from a letter from CCCECE to the Academic Senate giving the following reasons to oppose the proposal:

1. *This proposal does not accurately characterize the “teacher education” context in California as P-12<sup>th</sup> grade, preschool through 12<sup>th</sup> grade.*
2. *This proposal inappropriately excludes faculty well qualified to teach courses within the teacher preparation discipline and who are currently doing so.*
3. *The “legal” interpretations are misleading and are not given by an authority qualified to give the legal interpretations.*

It was also noted that there seems to be no argument given by the authors why they want to exclude the Master’s Degree in Child Development, Early Childhood Education or Human Development.

With no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote. The motion carried with one abstention. Corny explained that John Gerhold will take the Senate’s voice forward to the ASCCC Spring Plenary and a copy of the resolution will also be shared with administration.

#### Budget Committee Charge Revisions

The Budget Committee charge revisions were distributed to the Senate by email on March 14, 2013. A motion was made to approve the revisions as presented. M/S/C: Korcok/Stallworth

#### Special Senate Meeting, May 15

The “Timeline to Prepare Report in Response to ACCJC Recommendations” lists May 15 as the date the Academic Senate has the opportunity to review the finalized content for the purpose of providing additional evidence. There was concern expressed about meeting a quorum after the end of term. A motion was made to review the timeline and provide input by email. M/S/C: Freeman/Parent.

#### **April 17**

##### Treasurer (Brantley)

Rick asked for Senate approval of faculty retiree gifts in the amount of \$900 and a contribution to supplement the Levinson award in the amount of \$336.

A motion was made to suspend the agenda to address New Business Item D, Senate Expenditures for Faculty Retiree Recognition and Margaret Levinson Award Contribution. M/S/C: Korcok/Anderson

A motion was made to suspend typical voting procedures and to approve taking action on this item immediately. M/S/C: Korcok/Sims.

A motion was made to approve the expenditures as presented. M/S/C: Korcok/Anderson

#### CSU GE Breadth Area E Exception for Veterans

Senators were provided with the following information:

*On November 15, 2012, Sue Granger-Dickson, Bakersfield College Articulation Officer, proposed the following to the Curriculum Committee:*

*CSU Executive Order 1036 encourages campuses to use evidence of military training to satisfy Area E of the California State University General Education Breath. Typically this evidence is the completion of basic training as listed on a veteran's discharge papers, form DD-214. This proposal is to follow the lead of the CSU campuses that have all elected to honor GE Breadth transfer certifications that clear Area E Lifelong Learning with a DD-214 for Bakersfield College student veterans.*

*I propose that Bakersfield College Curriculum Committee recommend to Bakersfield College Administration that BC will use an approved veteran's DD-214 to clear Area E of the CSU GE Breadth Area E Lifelong Long Learning.*

*The Curriculum Committee discussion and action are reflected below in the committee minutes of November 15, 2012:*

*Sue Granger – Dickson reported that there is a curriculum proposal on the back of the agenda. It states "CSU Executive Order 1036 encourages campuses to use evidence of military training to satisfy Area E of the California State University General Education Breath. Typically this evidence is the completion of basic training as listed on a veteran's discharge papers, form DD-214. This proposal is to follow the lead of the CSU campuses that have all elected to honor GE Breadth transfer certifications that clear Area E Lifelong Learning with A DD-214 for Bakersfield College student veterans." The Community Colleges are being urged to accept student veterans. Basic Training counts for credit under Area E of the CSU GE Breadth - Lifelong Learning and Self Development. m/s Dawn Dobie/Mark Staller to approve the proposal that Bakersfield College Curriculum Committee recommend to Bakersfield College Administration that BC will use an approved veteran's DD-214 to clear Area E of the CSU GE Breadth Area E Lifelong Learning. Motion passed by a unanimous vote.*

*Language from the CSU Chancellor's office:*

#### **DD214 Separation Document**

*Upon receipt of the [DD214 Separation Document](#), campuses will award units of credit in Area E for completing basic training.*

*Executive Order 1036 language:*

#### **Military Service**

*CSU Executive Order 1036 encourages campuses to use evidence of military training to satisfy Area E for their students who enroll without a prior certification in GE. Typically the evidence is the completion of basic training as listed on the veteran's discharge papers, Form DD-214. All CSU campuses have elected to honor GE Breadth transfer certifications that clear Area E Lifelong Learning with a DD-214.*

*January, 2012 "Guiding Notes for General Education Course Reviewers"*

*Link to entire document*

*<http://www.pasadena.edu/educationalservices/candi/documents/2012-January-GE-Reviewers-Guiding-Notes1.pdf>*

With Academic Senate approval, Bakersfield College student veterans, in addition to the current practice of waiving Area E requirements, would also have the Area E units transcribed and be awarded four transferable units.

A motion was made to suspend the typical voting practices and to take action on the matter immediately. M/S/C: Korcok/Sims.

A motion was made to approve the Area E exception for student veterans as presented. M/S/C: Korcok/Sims.

#### Instructional Materials Committee (Change Proposal)

Michael Korcok asked Senators if they had any feedback from the proposal that was shared on April 3. Kathy Freeman shared that about one half of the English Department responded and 12 responses were against forming the committee, one response in favor and one response was indecisive. Comments from English included a fear of censorship and that the faculty contract and board policy already addresses faculty purview of instructional materials and academic freedom. The ESL Department does not support the creation of another committee and both Math and Library faculty feel the matter falls within the Curriculum Committee purview. It was noted that the Curriculum Committee has an enormous workload already. It was suggested to create a temporary task force with specific guidelines to develop a faculty handbook related to procedures for electronic materials, materials created by faculty and royalties. Michael Korcok expressed support for the handbook, but again emphasized the need for a standing committee to take a proactive stance in creating a collective knowledge of issues that arise due to a lack of clarity in Board Policy and Title 5.

A motion was made to bring this item back to the next Senate meeting. M/S/C: Freeman/Parent

It was noted that ASCCC published a position paper on Textbook Issues, Economic Pressures and Academic Values which can be found online at: <http://asccc.org/node/174998>.

### **May 1**

#### COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

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

Discussion followed with questions related to the number of representatives listed for the Scholarship Committee. It was noted that more than three faculty representatives are needed to review scholarship applications. Committee Chair, Primavera Arvizu, intends to revise the committee charge in the fall to reflect an adequate number of representatives. Similar questions arose regarding other committee membership limits. It was suggested to enforce the limits and encourage faculty participation in other areas.

The question was called and the motion carried without objection.

#### Instructional Materials Committee (Change Proposal)

Michael Korcok introduced the agenda item and reminded the Senate that this proposal had been discussed at previous Senate meetings. Michael thanked Kathy Freeman for providing the information regarding the bookstore. The Communication department has been deeply involved with this issue and the matters of printing and selling class materials off-campus had not before been mentioned. Michael noted that the exclusivity of the Barnes & Noble contract seems to be in conflict with the faculty contract with regard to instructional materials. Each semester faculty report issues with the bookstore procedures. These issues arise due to the lack of institutional structure and this committee would give that structure. Michael referenced multiple documents from ASCCC that deal with academic freedom, establishment of bookstore policies and handling of instructional e-materials but noted these policies and procedures are not articulated at the college level.

A motion was made to approve the creation of the Instructional Materials Committee. M/S: Gerhold/Sims

A second memo was distributed and a friendly amendment was made by Freeman that membership for the proposed Instructional Materials Committee be amended to include the following: Faculty members who receive royalties of any kind for instructional materials are disqualified from membership on the Instructional Materials Committee due to the possibility of a financial conflict of interest per ASCCC 20.00, Conflict of Interest (Feb. 10, 2006). Gerhold accepted the amendment, Sims did not.

A friendly amendment was made by Korcok that the committee membership will include a notation related to conflict of interest and will read, "Such person shall inform the Executive Committee of such interest or relationship in a manner that shall include the name of the individual, the name of the institutional interest and the nature of the relationship the person has with each interest. Such person shall thereafter refrain from discussing or voting on the particular transaction in which s/he has an interest, or otherwise attempt to exert any influence on the Academic Senate to affect a decision to participate or not participate in such transaction." Gerhold and Sims both accepted.

A friendly amendment was made by Parent to identify the group as a Task Force. Gerhold and Sims decline the amendment.

Discussion continued and it was said that membership on this committee is slightly different and may draw faculty members with different interests. It was noted that the membership notation will indicate the expectation that members have an ethical responsibility to reveal any bias which would then also be recorded in the minutes of the committee.

Discussion continued with Kathy Freeman distributing a memo and a price list regarding class packs from the Communication department that are printed and sold at Minute Man Press.

*May 1, 2013*

*The Communication Department sold 38 class packs at Minuteman Press in Bakersfield in Fall 2012. According to a Minuteman employee, each of these generated royalties.*

*Two examples:*

*I bought two class packs there and compared the price with tax there to the price at the BC Graphics Center with tax to try to get an idea of the differences.*

***Public Speaking B1 Class Pack for Helen Acosta***

*Minuteman cost w/ tax:*

*\$14.75*

*BC Graphic Center cost w/ tax:*

*\$9.08*

*\$5.67 difference*

***Rhetoric & Argumentation Class Pack for John Giertz***

*Minuteman cost w/ tax:*

*\$36.50*

*BC Graphic Center cost w/ tax:*

*\$19.24*

*\$17.26 difference*

*If these class packs are sold at B&N Bookstore at BC, students can expect an additional 25 percent mark-up on the price of each unless these prices, and royalties, are adjusted.*

*Kathy Freeman*

*English Department*

Kathy noted that the potential for making money was not being shared in the creating this committee. Michael Korcok explained Communication department does not keep the practice of selling these materials a secret, from students, faculty or administration. Michael noted that anyone from the Senate could have asked why the materials were printed at Minute Man Press rather than the bookstore at any time. The Communication department generates approximately \$20 thousand each year through a Foundation account that is used as faculty development fund to attend conferences and to keep up with skills. Students cannot use financial aid vouchers at Minute Man Press, but the class packs are available at the campus bookstore. There was criticism of the Communication department's practice of selling the class packs at Minute Man Press at a higher price and funding faculty development by students. It was noted that the Instructional Materials Committee could investigate and develop policy for these types of issues.

The question was called and voting resulted in a tie, with 10 votes in favor, 6 votes against and 4 abstentions. Discussion continued with a comment that without the committee current practices will not change. It was suggested to make a formal relationship between the Senate and the faculty liaison to the bookstore committee. With the vote at a tie, the chair cast the deciding vote in favor of creating the committee. Corny Rodriguez commented that the committee creates an opportunity to address the various concern raised during the Senate discussions. The Instructional Materials Committee will operate under the auspices of the Senate and therefore any policy changes will be brought to the Senate for consideration.

#### Proposal to Change Catalog Language

Curriculum Co-Chair, Billie Jo Rice, presented the proposal below and explained the change would create clearer pathways for students. With Senate approval, Corny would then take the matter to District Consultation Council to initiate the change in Board Policy.

*1) Issue: The BC Curriculum Committee voted and approved (3/21/13) to forward a request to the Academic Senate to change catalog language, in an attempt to make clear pathways, regarding acceptable criteria for students to pass a class.*

*2) Rationale: Currently, there is a discrepancy in catalog language, based on wording from the Kern Community College District Board Policy\*, regarding acceptable criteria to pass a class. Specifically, KCCD board policy requires students to pass courses counting towards their degree or certificate with a "C" or better. However, courses counted towards completion of the general education requirements require a grade point average of 2.00 or better. Theoretically, a student could earn a B in one general education category and a D in another general education, and still meet the requirement of a grade point average of 2.00 or better, thus meeting graduation requirements. This situation presents a problem for students transferring to the CSU or UC system.*

*4) Opposition: No opposition has been stated at this time.*

*5) Solution: Request a change in catalog language to include:*

***"All courses applied towards a degree or certificate of study, including courses in the general education pattern must be completed with a "C" or better, or a "P" if the course is taken on a pass/no pass basis."***

*\*Kern Community College District Board Policy*

*4D1C "(18) units of study must be completed in a discipline or from related disciplines as listed in the Community Colleges Taxonomy of Programs. Each course counted in this section must be completed with a grade of "C" or better, or a "P" if the course is taken on a pass/no pass basis."*

*4D2B2 "The Colleges may award locally approved certificates with fewer than 18 - units that certify that a student has completed a credit course or a sequence of credit courses to meet*

*documented workplace needs/ standards by demonstrating a level of knowledge, skill(s), and ability(ies) sufficient to earn a minimum grade of "C" in each required course."*

*4D1D "Eighteen (18) semester units of general education must be completed and shall include at least one (1) course in each of the following areas: (1) Natural Sciences, (2) Social and Behavioral Sciences, (3) Humanities, and (4) Language and Rationality. A course designated by each College as meeting the Ethnic Studies requirement must be taken in at least one of these four (4) areas. Courses counted to meet this general education requirement must be completed with a grade point average of 2.0 or better."*

A motion was made to suspend the typical voting procedure and to approve taking action on this item immediately. M/S/C: Korcok/Anderson. The motion carried with one objection.

A motion was made to approve the proposal as presented. M/S: Parent/Harding.

Concerns were expressed about how many students would be affected by such a change. It was clarified that very few students would be affected and only new students would be affected due to catalog rights of current students. It was unclear if UCs or CSUs accept 'D' grades for general education courses.

*\*\*Counselor, Alex Henderson, provided the following information after the meeting: "D grades will transfer and satisfy requirements on the general ed pattern for CSUB (with the exception of Areas A and B4 – English language/critical thinking and math), provided the overall GPA is 2.00 or higher."*

The question was called and the motion carried with one objection and one abstention.

#### Proposal to Add Non-Participation Language for Face-to-Face Classes

Nick Strobel presented and reviewed the proposal to include non-participation language that would apply to all classes, not just distance education courses.

**1) Issue:** *We need to adapt the non-participation language in the Distance Education Attendance and Non-Participation Policy section on p. 23 of the 2012-13 Catalog for use in all of our classes, including face-to-face, to make our class attendance and participation policies uniform across all modes of instruction. The adapted language will be added to the Attendance Policies of the catalog (currently, p. 22 of the 2012-13 Catalog).*

**2) Rationale:** *The rigor of a course is not supposed to be dependent on the modality of instruction, including the participation level expected of students. [Background: The need to explicitly state the non-participation policy in the distance education courses was originally a result of the tightening of federal financial aid guidelines for what constituted active attendance in distance education courses—students at some colleges were signing up for a number of online courses simply to get federal financial aid money and not participating in the classes. Bakersfield College needed to state its participation policy for distance education courses to meet federal financial aid requirements and to make it clear to regulators. The policy was stated in a separate distance education sub-section of the Attendance Policies section of the catalog.]*

*In whatever mode of instruction, the students who succeed are those who do more than just "show up"; the ones who succeed in college-level courses are those who are active participants in the course—for example, engaging in class discussions and doing homework assignments. We need to make it clear to face-to-face faculty that they can adopt the distance education non-participation policies for their classes and we need to make it clear to college students what it takes to succeed in college. Title V also makes it clear that the rigor of college-level courses must be such that for each hour spent inside the classroom, a*

student will spend at least two hours of academic work outside of the classroom studying, doing homework assignments or other course assignments in order to earn a C.\*

- Title 5 § 55002. Standards and Criteria for Courses. (a) Degree-Applicable Credit Course. (2) Standards for Approval. (B) Units. The course grants units of credit based upon a relationship specified by the governing board between the number of units assigned to the course and the number of lecture and/or laboratory hours or performance criteria specified in the course outline. The course also requires a minimum of three hours of student work per week, including class time for each unit of credit, prorated for short-term, extended term, laboratory and/or activity courses.
- Title 5 § 55002. Standards and Criteria for Courses. (a) Degree-Applicable Credit Course. (C) Intensity. The course treats subject matter with a scope and intensity that requires students to study independently outside of class time.
- Title 5 § 55002. Standards and Criteria for Courses. (b) Nondegree-Applicable Credit Course. (2) Standards for Approval. (B) Units. The course grants units of credit based upon a relationship specified by the governing board between the number of units assigned to the course and the number of lecture and/or laboratory hours or performance criteria specified in the course outline. The course requires a minimum of three hours of student work per week, per unit, including class time and/or demonstrated competency, for each unit of credit, prorated for short-term, extended term, laboratory, and/or activity courses.

Reference: <http://government.westlaw.com/linkedslice/default.asp?SP=CCR-1000> and then choose the Title 5 Education link (will then automatically sign you on to the weblinks.westlaw.com site) Accessed on 22-April 2013

**4) Opposition:** Are not the distance education guidelines just for distance education courses? Answer: We cannot require a greater level of activity or engagement or rigor in our distance education courses than what we have in our face-to-face courses and vice versa. If students are required to have above a certain threshold of active participation in a distance education mode for a course, then such a threshold of active participation is required for face-to-face courses. Furthermore, the BC college transcript makes no distinction between a section of a course taught face-to-face and another section of the same course taught via distance education. They are supposed to be "equivalent".

**5) Solution:** Adapt the Distance Education Attendance and Non-Participation Policy language on p. 23 of the 2012-13 catalog for application to all of our classes, including those taught face-to-face and insert that generalized language in the Attendance Policies currently on p. 22 of the 2012-13 catalog.

**Suggested language** inserted in the third paragraph of the Attendance Policies section (p. 22 of 2012-13 catalog) after the sentence "Excessive absence may result in the student being dropped from the course" and before "Instructors may drop a student from a course...":

---

"In order to succeed in college-level courses, students must actively participate in the class such as doing required assignments and studying. In the case of college-level courses, 'absences' include 'non-participation.' Non-participation shall be defined as, but is not limited to:

- Not following the instructor's participation guidelines as stated in the syllabus
- Not submitting required assignments
- Not contributing meaningful discussion in required classroom activities
- Not participating in scheduled activities
- Failing to communicate with the instructor as required

It should be noted that simply showing up for a course does not constitute participation. Students must demonstrate by submitting required assignments and contributing to classroom discussion, as outlined above."

---

*We can either keep the distance education attendance and non-participation policy as it is or have it refer to the new absence/non-participation language on the previous page with the clarification that “meaningful discussion in required classroom activities” for distance education courses means “meaningful discussion in required chat rooms, discussion boards, or other online forums.”*

A motion was made to suspend the typical voting procedures and to take action on this item immediately. M/S/C: Lowe/Anderson

A motion was made to approve the proposal as presented. M/S: Staller/Anderson

A friendly amendment was made to remove “and studying” after “such as doing required assignments.” The friendly amendment was accepted and the motion carried without objection.

#### 2013-14 Academic Senate and Executive Board Meeting Schedule

A motion was made to suspend typical voting procedures and to take action on this item immediately. M/S/C: Parent/Korcok.

A motion was made to approve the 2013-14 meeting schedule as presented. M/S/C: Parent/Lowe.