

ACADEMIC SENATE
October 6, 2010, 3:30 P.M.
COLLINS CONFERENCE CENTER

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Corny Rodriguez (EB); John Gerhold (EB); Michael McNellis (EB); Kate Pluta (EB); Rachel Vickrey; (EB); Phil Whitney; Christian Zoller; Diana Jackson; Kathy Rosellini; Clint Rigby; Nancy Guidry; Michael Korcok; Bill Kelly; Jeannie Parent; Gayla Anderson; Richard Marquez; Kimberly Hurd; Maria Perrone; Kathy Freeman; Matthew Morgan; Jack Pierce; Sue Granger-Dickson; Nancy Guidry; Rick Brantley

ABSENT: Diana Kelly (EB); Natalie Bursztyn (EB); Janet Fulks (EB); Bill Moseley (EB); Adel Shafik; Luis Guajardo; Debbie Kennedy; Marsha Eggman; Jason Stratton; Terry Meier; Pam Kelly;

GUESTS: Nick Strobel

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:33 pm

REVIEW OF THE MINUTES

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

REPORTS

President's Report (Rodriguez)

- The Executive Board has discussed reviewing the role and purpose of each committee to ensure the work being done is in line with the committee charge.
- There seems to be concern about some programs not participating in program review. The Senate needs to define what it means to be a program. Administration seems to be defining program in relation to program discontinuance which is specific to discipline. It was suggested to review how assessment defines program.
- Need volunteers to research the issue of listing Emeriti in the college catalog. Rick Brantley volunteered.
- Still looking for SDCC faculty co-chair; Senators were asked to solicit volunteers and to forward suggestions to Corny.
- Has not yet scheduled a face to face meeting with Frank Ronich, but will report out once that meeting occurs.

Co-Chair Reports

Accreditation: The committee is recommending that the IEC Co-chair become a permanent member just as the Assessment Co-chair. This change will need Senate approval. The committee also needs a representative from the Basic Skills area. ASC will bring forward a proposal for the Self Evaluation Committee. The recommendation includes a faculty co-chair with .400 reassigned time through spring 2012 and a report editor with .200 reassigned time. The committee is not sure if administration supports the reassigned time but feels the work warrants the time.

The annual Accreditation report was shared with Senators and will be presented to the Board of Trustees on October 14. Kate Pluta pointed out a few keys areas in the report: The rubric on page 3 shows the categories that are established by the commission. Bakersfield College must show quality, continuous improvement by spring 2012 in the area of program review and planning. The SLO area needs to remain at the proficient level across all departments and classes. Details about each standard can be found in the full report.

Correspondence

There was no correspondence to report.

Treasurer

Rachel Vickrey has sent faculty an email about Senate dues. The recommendation is \$5.00 per month for ten months which can be paid in one lump sum or taken as a payroll deduction. The money is spent on faculty awards, retiree gifts and student scholarships.

CCA Report

The negotiation team will hold its first meeting on November 19. At this point the district team will be an attorney. Other administrators will participate but no one specific has been identified. The district's sunshine list will go to the Board of Trustees on October 14. After that meeting the list will be shared with faculty. Andrea will keep faculty informed about how negotiations progress. The negotiation team is still looking for faculty willing to be resources for each of the specific sunshine topics. Faculty who have questions or are willing to be a resource should contact Andrea.

SGA (Student Government Association)

Sean Hill reported there will be a Student Health Fair at Delano Wednesday, October 13. A Health Fair at BC will be held next semester. Along with the club floats the awarding of Homecoming King and Queen will be reinstated this year. All students may participate with the required petition, a 2.0 GPA and a minimum of six units. Decisions for each will be decided by popular vote but the process for selecting the final candidates has not yet been decided.

DMTF (Decision-Making Task Force)

The committee has not met face to face but is aware of the discussion from College Council. Recommendations passed through the Senate and College Council were implemented and the updated document was distributed to the Senators. It was noted that the decision making document outlines the process for the college community to provide information to the President. The chart represents how the recommendations and input make it to the President's desk. It was suggested that a like image that illustrates the Senate's decision making process would help make clear for faculty how their voice and recommendations go to the President. Michael McNellis noted that he provided a narrative of the Senate process that was not included in the document. Michael and John Gerhold will follow up with Dr. Chamberlain. Also noted is that some decisions are not made by the President but by lower level administrators and that process is not covered in this document. The decision making document is meant to explain those decisions that impact the college as a whole. Additional suggestions included making the College Council box smaller and to make the arrow from College Council to the President dotted rather than solid. Accreditation Steering Committee members feel the Decision Making document should be considered a planning document. Planning is a 10+1 matter but decision making is not. DMTF members reminded the Senate that feedback on the recommendation and evaluation process is needed.

BDPTF (Budget Development and Planning Task Force)

This item was discussed as New Business Item A.

OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE SENATE

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

It was decided to add as New Business Item B, Decision Making Document. M/S/C: Rosellini/B. Kelly

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Class Size Determination (task force)

There was a motion to table this item. M/S/C: Gerhold/B. Kelly

Grading Policy (task force)

Christian Zoller reported that he cannot find any legal case that prevents the current policy. He also asked Frank Ronich for input on the matter and was referred to Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg. Christian will meet with Nan on October 13. The Senate expressed a desire to keep with the current policy barring any legal requirements to change the policy.

General Education (SB 1440)

This bill has now been signed by the Governor. Correspondence related to SB 1440 from the CCCO and ASCCC was provided to the Senate. The letter from ASCCC explains that a college can satisfy its commitment to offering these degrees in a single program. It is not required to have a transfer degree available in all disciplines. Faculty should be cautious in determining which programs will have the transfer degree(s) since students will likely find the transfer degree attractive and college administrators may focus course offerings to the areas with transfer degrees. Counselors expressed concern with offering only one degree since Bakersfield College has very low rates of degree and transfers. Several departments will be affected by the limited number of units needed for a transfer degree. It was suggested that the Senate form a task force to review and recommend which degrees should be offered for transfer. Corny Rodriguez asked the Curriculum Committee to work on this and to keep the Senate informed

2010-11 Bakersfield College Goals Review

College Goals one through six were approved at the previous Senate meeting. Goal 7 was revised by the Accreditation Steering Committee and presented to the Senate. The recommended revision is: *Make accreditation part of college life by embedding it in college committee charges, conducting training, and creating a Self Evaluation Committee that participates in training; reviews previous reports, recommendations, and planning agendas; identifies constituencies to communicate and gather information; identifies evidence needs; identifies gaps and makes recommendations to the Accreditation Steering Committee; documents findings; writes self evaluation sections; reports to ASC at the end of fall and spring terms; and trains standing committees.* ASC developed three completely new goals but presented one goal that is in line with how the initial goal was written. The initial strategic initiative was established to confirm the college's commitment to connecting the work of each committee, task force and working group. The committee does not feel this goal adequately addresses the meaning of linkages. It was noted that the wording may be more closely related to oversight and accountability. A motion was made to recommend adding the revised wording to the oversight and accountability goal. M/S/C: Gerhold/Vickrey

Senators expressed concern with carrying forward the same goals as the previous year. There were questions about how the goals were evaluated. Members of College Council explained that a small group from College Council distributed a survey last spring asking for feedback on the goals. This small group recommended goals for 2010-11 based on this feedback and presented the recommendations to College Council members. College Council members are now vetting through their respective constituency groups.

There were comments that Goal 2 was unclear. It seems that each of the college goals should be more specific and need to be written in a way that makes them more measurable. A comment was made that goals should not be accepted without responsible people or groups identified to accomplish the goal.

A motion was made to take the linkages goal as revised and recommend that it be included as part of Oversight & Accountability and instead make Goal 7 a goal to assess, share and report to the college community progress on each of the goals. M/S/C: Gerhold/Rigby

A motion was then made to forward the amended goals to College Council. M/S/C: Gerhold/B. Kelly. There was one objection

2010-11 Senate Goals Review

Senators expressed concern with the goals not being measurable. A motion was made directing the Executive Board to revise the goals to include measurable outcomes. M/S/C: Rosellini/Gerhold

Waitlist Issues

An update was not provided. This topic will be carried to the next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Budget Committee Proposal

Dr. Chamberlain along with members of the budget task force developed a proposal for a standing budget committee. A document that describes the committee charge, scope of authority and composition was reviewed. This committee is not intended to make actual allocations but instead will develop criteria and the process for determining budget needs that would result in allocation decisions by administration. The committee will base the criteria and budget development process based on such things as goals, strategic plans and program reviews. The committee will be one component of the college's planning and budgeting processes.

Senators should share this proposal with faculty in their department and be prepared to vote on the proposal at the October 20 Senate meeting.

****There was a motion to extend the meeting time by 5 minutes. M/S/C: Rosellini/Korcok**

Discussion and debate continued about the composition and whether specific representatives needed to be identified by virtue of the position they hold such as department chairs or committee chairs. The process for selecting the faculty representatives is completely up to the Senate. There was a question about how the budget committee will interact with the district. How does the college make recommendations about the district allocation? It was suggested that the district issue should be addressed by CCA and Senate presidents at District Consultation Council.

Decision Making Document Draft Review

This item was not addressed due to a lack of time.

GOOD AND WELFARE AND CONCERNS

ADJOURNMENT at 5:08