

# ACADEMIC SENATE of BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE

November 16, 2011, 3:30 P.M.

Collins Conference Center

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

**PRESENT:** Corny Rodriguez (EB); Kate Pluta (EB); Michael Korcok (EB); Bill Moseley (EB); Kimberly Hurd (EB); Wesley Sims; (EB); Leah Carter (EB); DeAnn Sampley; Anna Poetker; Christian Zoller; Jeannie Parent; Kathy Freeman; Klint Rigby; Kris Stallworth; Maria Perrone; Nancy Guidry; Nick Strobel; Shane Jett; Sue Granger-Dickson; Susan Pinza; Phil Whitney; Marsha Eggman; Janet Tarjan; Danitza Romo (Student); Gayla Anderson; Terry Meier; Lisa Harding; Patrick Fulks

**ABSENT:** Bill Barnes (EB); Matthew Morgan (EB); John Gerhold (EB); Rick Brantley (EB); Bill Kelly; Melinda Fogle; Brent Damron; Jason Stratton

**GUESTS:** Susan McQuerry; Michael McNellis; Tom Greenwood; Nancy Perkins; David Koeth; Richard Marquez; Scott Waylan; Andrea Garrison; Pam Boyles

---

## CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:35

## REVIEW OF THE MINUTES

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

## REPORTS

### President

Corny deferred his report to items on the agenda.

### Accreditation

Kate Pluta provided the following report:

- Many people are working very hard to finish the Self Evaluation. The draft is due Monday, November 21.
- There is a remarkable collection of organized and accessible evidence in SharePoint.
  - The Self Evaluation process requires documentation of statements we make to describe what we do.
  - The evidence reveals just how much activity occurs at BC—some that many of us may not be aware of no matter how involved we are.
- The eleven subcommittees have identified issues for potential Actionable Improvement Plans (formerly Planning Agendas).
  - These are self-identified issues the college recognizes it needs to address.
- We want to begin working on them now. Wouldn't it be great to solve problems rather than continue to document them in reports?
- The goal is to include the following specifics in the Improvement Plans:
  - **Who is responsible for achieving/implementing the process/changes?**
  - **What committees or governance groups will be involved?**
  - **What are the desired outcomes?**
  - **How will they be measured?**
  - **What is the timeline for completion?**

### Curriculum

Bill Moseley reported that everything is great and he received a round of applause. Corny stated he is appreciative of the work Bill and the Curriculum Committee has done to streamline the curriculum review and approval process.

### Catalog Committee

Corny reported that the committee met to discuss how best to move forward and set priorities. There was positive discussion on what the types of materials should be provided to students. Sue Granger-Dickson will be chairing to this committee and the committee will report back to the Senate.

### SDCC

Kimberly Hurd indicated there was nothing new to report from SDCC.

### Correspondence

Wesley Sims reported that Nick Strobel has Valley Fever. He is on campus working but it very fatigued. It was noted that a condolence card should be sent to Cindy Hubble.

### Student Representative (Romo)

Danitza Romo announced that the online voting regarding a campus smoking policy will take place on November 29. An email with the voting details will be distributed by email to bc\_all. Danitza had a copy of the survey and offered to distribute it as she would like Senate input. SGA officers are also requesting permission to present information on the topic to classes or faculty can take a copy of the survey to distribute to their students. Corny mentioned that as part of his Government class, he asked his students about the issue and that his students were not aware of the issue.

On a related note, Danitza encouraged faculty to become more involved in student activities as a way to increase the connection between faculty and students. Corny noted that he was asked by Danitza to request a Senate liaison to attend SGA meetings.

### Articulation/Transfer

Sue Granger-Dickson reported that the Transfer Advisory Group met last week. The group will be developing several workshops and Sue will be contacting faculty to participate.

## **OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE SENATE**

### Greg Chamberlain: Grade Change Resolution

Corny shared the results of the survey where faculty were asked two questions: Have you ever felt pressure from an administrator to change a student's grade? And, has an administrator ever overridden or changed a grade that you have given to a student? There were 68 responses and four positive responses to feeling pressure and three responded that a grade had been changed. There were other comments of concern with where our energy and focus is being exerted and for what purpose. Perhaps the situation is being blown out of proportion and do not have all of the facts. Although there is concern about the weight of the committee and if it will be respected, Corny also asked the Senate to consider creating a venue where faculty have more involvement with situations that do not fall within the existing procedures, such as the committee Greg suggested in his memo. Corny encouraged Senators to take this opportunity for courageous conversation and to not leave and later wish they had made a comment or ask a question.

Greg began by stating he wished he were addressing the Senate about a more positive topic. He indicated that he would like to make a few comments and then answer questions. Greg said that the events that occurred and decisions that were made are unfortunate. He cannot talk about the student. He shared that discipline had occurred but cannot discuss the details. The primary problem was the time it took to resolve the issue and that delay has been addressed. Greg indicated his concern was first to deal with the internal issues and then to make sure this does not happen again. Greg encouraged the Senate to consult with counterparts at Cerro Coso, where they have a committee that deals with atypical circumstances such as this. It may be helpful to have something in place that looks at these

issues and resolves them quickly. Greg feels having more people looking at the issue would give better results.

Questions began with how much influence the committee could have since personnel issues may be involved. Greg indicated that he envisions the group working similarly to the student discipline committee in that members would commit to confidentiality and all the facts would be shared. The committee would provide recommendations, but Greg then would make the final decision.

There was a question about why this situation is considered an exceptional circumstance. Was there a mistake made in assigning the grade? Greg noted that even the interpretation of what happened would have benefited from review by a committee. It was then asked if the committee would deal with only exceptional circumstances or grade changes not initiated by the faculty. Greg suggested that the committee review all exceptional circumstances. Greg stated that he would like to be involved in the discussion of how the committee would be shaped, but ultimately the committee structure is the Senate's decision. It was noted that grade changes are unquestionably faculty purview and that a committee that deals with multiple issues, some of which may not fall within the faculty purview, could have the effect of diminishing the faculty authority.

A question was asked regarding what process students follow when they want to challenge a grade. The student files an appeal and ultimately ends with the Executive Vice President. It was noted that an interesting question to include in the faculty survey would have been, "Has an administrator upheld a grade when challenged by a student?"

A faculty member noted that although mistakes can happen, it appears that administration is not willing to admit to a mistake in this instance and asked if it would be better, for the sake of academic integrity, to admit that the administrator did not have the authority to change the grade. Assigning to the student a grade which they did not earn hurts the faculty and the institution. Greg stated that he shared that concern but could not give more details than what he included in his memo. Greg stated that he will not change the grade. An additional concern was shared about sending students forward to the next skill level without the skills we promise.

It was then noted that there are processes already in place, as outlined in the student handbooks, which were not followed. It was then suggested that it would be better to educate faculty, administrators and students about the existing policy. Greg stated that the Senate could decide that training is needed and noted that he has put training as a topic on the Administrative Council Executive Retreat agenda. It was then noted by a faculty member that even in situations where grades have been upheld, timelines have been an issue. Specifically when dealing with issues during the summer months and clarity in the process about the appropriate person to see for each step of the process.

A faculty member reminded the Senate when the Academic Dishonesty policy was changed without any dialogue with the Senate about the change, and asked Greg why that was done. Greg stated that he did communicate with who he believed were the right people. Unfortunately, that information was not shared and the college was obligated to meet a timeline that was set by the state Chancellor's office.

The question was asked if the instructor was included in the negotiation of the grade change all along. Greg indicated that, yes, there were several conversations with the instructor involved.

There was a concern expressed regarding the need for another committee. It seems that that we have policies in place, and pay administrators good money to follow these procedures and uphold faculty roles. If the existing policies had been followed this situation would not have happened. Greg agreed that there is no need to add a layer that does not need to be there; however, if there is interest in the committee then perhaps a small group will consult with Cerro Coso about how it can work best.

There appears to be confusion about language in the student handbook specifically between the assignment of grades policy (page 55) and the academic dishonesty policy (page 50) as it was applied to this situation. The instructor was told not to file the grade and then a grade was assigned without

consultation of the faculty member. Greg agreed that the cheating and plagiarism language needs clarification and stated that it may have been a factor in the decision to change the grade.

Greg was asked if he could give some explanation for letting the grade stand, rather than leaving people to guess the reasons for his decision. Greg stated that he cannot give a great deal of detail and apologized. He realizes that it is an unsatisfactory answer, but that he made the best decision at this point and time. He was then asked to clear any suspicion of faculty fraud, bad faith or mistake? Greg clarified that the faculty member was not disciplined. Greg was asked who was disciplined and he indicated that a management person had been disciplined.

It was suggested to insert the use of a committee prior to the determination of fraud, bad faith or mistake. The committee could then give primary advice on if or to what the grade should be changed. Greg agreed that the committee would be of great use in that way.

A Senate member expressed frustration with Greg's memo stating that in the third paragraph Greg states he does not want a situation like this to occur again, but in second paragraph states that the outcome is not satisfactory but letting the grade stand. They further stated, that if we do not follow Title 5 and the policies and procedures we have in place then we will get nowhere. The Senate member stated that mistakes should be rectified and that Greg's response was not acceptable.

Another Senator commented that the big concern is the idea this committee would provide a process that supports faculty. The process already does and what faculty want to hear is that administrators support faculty. Greg stated that he clearly understands that sentiment. He believes that he does support faculty but in this case, with everything he knows, leaving the grade stand is the best decision. The Senator stated that they understand the need to move forward but asked for reassurance for the future. Greg stated that as long as he is President of Bakersfield College, this situation will not be repeated in this way. The faculty responded with applause.

A comment was made that we expect our leaders to be ethical and follow procedures just as we have an obligation to hold students accountable. There were additional comments about holding students accountable, and the appropriate timeline to request grade changes. It was mentioned that students often, and for many reasons, are not aware of the grades they receive until many years later. Although it seems unfair to request a grade change after 20 years, if the grade is not accurate it deserves to be reviewed. Also mentioned was the ethical dilemma of allowing students to advance through a program without legitimately earning the grade they receive, especially if there cheating involved.

Corny thanked Greg for addressing the Senate and asked that any further comments be sent to him or Greg.

Senators continued discussion, expressing appreciation for Greg's comments and how best to move forward. It appears that most of the time the existing policies are effective. Some Senators expressed support of the committee, others feel it would be ineffective and redundant. Perhaps a flex workshop on these policies would be helpful. It was suggested to include all faculty and administrators so that everyone hears the same information at the same time. It was also suggested to add a statement on syllabi that directs students to the faculty member, Department Chair and then the Student Handbook for information on dealing with these issues.

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

There were no additions to the agenda

#### **COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS**

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

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### Grade Change

It was decided that Senators would report to those they represent about the discussion with Greg and be ready to discuss next steps at the next meeting. Kimberly Hurd will work on a spring flex workshop related to the grade change and academic dishonesty policies.

### KCCD Strategic Plan

Corny will distribute an updated version with changes from senate feedback.

### Written Procedures for Skills Pre-requisites (Gerhold)

In the absence of John Gerhold, this item was tabled.

### KCCD Curriculum Council

Corny noted that this would be a replacement for ACES and that he will forward to the Senate the proposed charge. There was a question regarding what this districtwide group would accomplish that the college Curriculum Committees and Vice Chancellor cannot.

### EODAC Proposal: Faculty Screening Committee Training (Morgan)

In the absence of Matthew Morgan, this item was tabled.

### Time of Board of Trustees Meetings (Guidry)

This issue is related to the KCCD Strategic Plan's goal related to community involvement. The time of Board of Trustees meetings does not seem to be a time that college or community constituents are likely to attend. It was noted that other education boards meet in the evening and that the KCCD meeting time of 2:00 p.m. is unique. It was decided that Corny will bring the issue to District Consultation Council.

### 13-14 Academic Calendar

The calendar has been reviewed by the Executive Board and the full Senate. Corny will take Senate recommendations forward to CCA.

A motion was made to support moving the fall 2013 start date out one week. M/S/C: Sims/Poetker

### Board Policy: 6H, Adjunct Employment

It is unclear if this policy will establish a pool of adjunct faculty. Corny indicated that this revision does incorporate recommendations from the Senate.

A motion was made to vote on this item. M/S/C: Granger-Dickson/Stallworth. There was one abstention. There was no motion made to approve the policy.

### Board Policy: 4A3, Matriculation

Corny reminded the Senate that the primary change is to explain matriculation by describing each part of the process.

A motion was made to vote on the item. M/S/C: Sims/Granger-Dickson

Student Services faculty feedback was shared related to the order of priority registration as it does not seem to align with the priorities established at Bakersfield College. Additionally, section 4A3B establishes cut off scores. Although there is a desire to have common assessment components at the state level, the college could still have a choice.

There was a request for more time to review and discuss and for justification for the changes. Corny will request this information at District Consultation Council.

**A motion was made to extend the meeting time for five minutes. M/S/C: Korcok/Carter**

KCCD Decision Making

In the interest of time, this item was tabled.

Repeatability

In the interest of time, this item was tabled.

Title 5 Change to Withdrawal Date and Effect on Apportionment

It was noted that the Senate is waiting for data from Sean James. It was decided this topic will be tabled until the next Senate meeting or until the Senate has had time to review the information from Sean.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Common Assessment (Gerhold)

In the absence of John Gerhold, this item was tabled.

**GOOD AND WELFARE AND CONCERNS**

**ADJOURNMENT at 5:14**

Respectfully Submitted,  
*Jennifer Marden*