

ACADEMIC SENATE of BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE

September 12, 2012, 3:30 P.M.

Collins Conference Center

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Corny Rodriguez (EB); Nick Strobel (EB); Rick Brantley(EB); Kate Pluta(EB); Kimberly Hurd (EB); Michael Korcok(EB); Billie Jo Rice (EB); John Carpenter (EB); Bill Kelly; Gayla Anderson; Christian Zoller; Kris Stallworth; Jeannie Parent; Susan Pinza; Nancy Guidry; Kathy Freeman; Maria Perrone; Patrick Fulks; Klint Rigby; Terry Meier; Valerie Robinson; Julie Lowe; Brian Hirayama; Robert Martinez; Ron Grays; DeAnn Sampley; Marsha Eggman; Brent Damron; Alex Henderson; Danitza Romo

ABSENT: Bill Barnes (EB); Leah Carter(EB); John Gerhold (EB); Lisa Harding; Janet Tarjan; Anna Poetker; Wesley Sims (EB); Shane Jett; Jason Stratton

GUESTS: David Moton; David Neville; Tom Moran

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:31p.m.

REVIEW OF THE MINUTES

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

Corny welcomed the new faculty and faculty friends in attendance and asked them to introduce themselves. Academic Senate members then introduced themselves.

REPORTS

President (Rodriguez)

Corny reminded the Senate that changes to the Constitution and Bylaws were approved last spring. The Senate will need to conduct a vote for the Senate Association (all faculty) to confirm and implement those changes.

Accreditation (Pluta)

Kate attended ACJCC training for team members. She asked specifically about waitlisted student access to online courses. Neither presenter would make a judgment call on whether not allowing waitlisted students access to online courses violated the "comparable but not identical" concept for providing instructional programs and student services to distance education students. In terms of accreditation, it is a gray area. So perhaps the stronger case can be made with Title V. Kate also noted that the issue of curriculum delays due to staffing and CurriUNET has surfaced at ASC. ASC has put the topic on the agenda to help resolve the issue.

Curriculum

John Carpenter reported that the Committee is splitting into two groups with the intent of each group reviewing 20 pieces of curriculum. There are several new committee members and training will be held for new members on Thursday, September 20.

Enrollment Management

The first committee meeting is scheduled for September 25. Michael Korcok reported that BC is on target for fall FTES. Also, there appears to be no obvious campuswide issues with changing the census date. Please contact Michael if you have any questions or concerns that he can take forward to the committee.

EODAC

Members of the Executive Board interviewed two candidates on Tuesday, September 11, and expect to make a selection by the end of the week.

ISIT

Nick Strobel provided a written report by email that can be found here:

<http://www2.bakersfieldcollege.edu/nstrobel/isit/sep2012.htm>

Topics include:

- 1) Policy and procedure language that encourages innovative but "safe" use of instructional technology
- 2) Piloting of Moodle v2.x
- 3) Our one-card system for financial aid, campus ID, and printers
- 4) Closed captioning of AV materials
- 5) Need for training in the technology tools we use everyday
- 6) Department codes will be installed on the hub printers
- 7) BC_ADJUNCT and BC_ONLINE listservs
- 8) Media Services and Distance Ed now under Info Services
- 9) ISIT Goals for 2012-13
- 10) ISIT members available for Accreditation Visit

SDCC

The first committee meeting will be held Friday, September 14.

CCA Update

Nancy Guidry reported that CCA representatives are still working with Human Resources to determine when health benefit deductions will begin.

SGA (Romo)

Danitza reported that SGA will be hosting Constitution Day on September 17. As part of this activity, Assemblywoman Shannon Grove will be speaking from 11:30 – noon. Danitza asked that faculty encourage students to attend. SGA is also developing a resolution in support of Proposition 30 as well a Strategic Plan for SGA that will align with college goals.

OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE SENATE

This item was tabled pending arrival of those wishing to address the Senate.

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: Rigby/B. Kelly

Commencement Committee	
Jack Pierce (Phy Sci)	Vienna Battistoni (FACE)
EODAC	
Helen Acosta (Comm)	Luis Guajardo (FL/ASL)
ISIT	
Adie Geiser (Student Services)	Dan Kimball (Phy Sci)
Brent Damron (ISIT)	Matthew Garrett (Soc Sci)
Scholarship Committee	
Jack Pierce (Phy Sci)	David Besst (Eng)

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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.

PROGRAM VIABILITY TASK FORCE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE	
Committee Charge	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review and establish criteria utilizing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section III, Early Warning Signs and Section VI, Evaluation Criteria listed in the Program Discontinuance Policy. • Program Review data • Other relevant data 2. Review and assess program viability based on the criteria 3. Provide recommendations for action to the Academic Senate based

	on the criteria
Membership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Senate President (<i>or designee</i>) • One (1) representative from each department (<i>identified by the department chair</i>) • One (1) representative from Curriculum Committee • One (1) representative from Program Review Committee • One (1) representative from Accreditation Steering Committee • Students or others (<i>identified by the task force</i>)

****A motion was made to suspend the agenda to allow for the Opportunity to Address.
M/S/C: Guidry/Anderson.**

Andrea Garrison: Faculty RIF Procedures

Andrea Garrison was in attendance to review the faculty reduction procedures on behalf of CCA College Chair, Lora Larkin. Andrea explained that Article X, pages 147 and 148, of the faculty contract outlines the "Reduction in Force" process which can be accessed through this link

<https://intranet.kccd.edu/Human%20Resources/Employee%20Contracts/2011-14%20CCA%20contract%20-%20READ%20ONLY.doc>

Andrea then distributed and reviewed the following highlights of the process:

FSAs – term used at KCCD for discipline in which faculty member is considered competent to teach

- *Competence is defined as meeting minimum qualifications as listed by ASCCC or equivalency as granted by equivalency committee*
 - *No recency requirements or other requirements have been added to senate min quals*
- *Faculty must have FSA recorded in personnel file by KCCD HR*
 - *Send evidence to KCCD HR by Feb 15th*
 - *Apply for equivalency in time to have evidence to HR by Feb 15th*
 - *At BC, equivalency committee meets once a month*

RIF Process

- *KCCD HR must notify CCA 60 days prior to lay-off*
 - *CCA has 10 days to request to negotiate effects on bargaining unit members*
 - *CCA will definitely request to bargain*
- *KCCD HR must notify faculty member by March 15th*
- *KCCD cannot terminate a faculty member if there is any less senior faculty (or PT faculty) teaching a class the terminated faculty member is competent to teach*
- *RIFd faculty are placed on a 39-month rehire list. No one can be hired to teach in a discipline the RIFd faculty member can teach without first offering the position to the RIFd faculty member. This includes full-time and part-time loads. If a RIFd faculty member receives only a partial load, it will be paid on a prorated basis from the full-time salary schedule. Benefits will also be paid on a prorated basis (faculty can elect to pay the rest, or not accept benefits).*
- *Senior faculty who lose position have right to load taught be less senior faculty*
 - *Senior faculty probably won't have choice*
 - *May be moved to location of least senior faculty in that FSA*
 - *District may decide which of faculty member's FSAs (if >1) they are placed in*

Faculty who receive March 15th notices

- *Have right to hearing with PERB "judge"*
 - *Must request hearing in writing (CCA has forms)*
 - *CCA will provide lawyer for hearing*
 - *Lawyer will most likely represent all RIFd faculty at hearing*

- *Hearing only ascertains that RIFs were done according to Ed Code*
 - *If done according to Ed Code, RIFs stand*

*District does not have to follow through on March 15th notices (can leave people hanging)
District cannot RIF someone who hasn't received March 15th notice*

For reference the Faculty Seniority/FSA listing can be found here:

<https://intranet.kccd.edu/Human%20Resources/Employee%20Contracts/FSA%20Seniority%20List%202011-12.pdf>

If you have any questions about Faculty Services Areas or the Reduction in Force process please contact Lora Larkin.

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

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

Resolution in Support of Allowing Access to Waitlisted Students in Online Courses

Corny reported that Phil Whitney is working on language for a resolution.

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

NEW BUSINESS

Change Proposal: Dissolution of DE Committee

A question was asked how matters related to distance education other than curriculum approval would be handled. Billie Jo Rice indicated that those matters would be handled by the Curriculum Committee as a whole. Senators should be prepared to vote on the proposal at the September 26 meeting.

Proposal to dissolve the Distance Education Committee

- 1) Issue: The BC Curriculum Committee requests that the Distance Education Committee be formerly dissolved. Duties and/or responsibilities of the Distance Education Committee will be integrated into the overall role of the Curriculum Committee.
- 2) Rationale: Having the Distance Education Committee function on its own and not part of the larger Curriculum Committee requires an additional step in the curriculum approval process, thus delaying processing.
- 3) History: Historically, prior to CurricUNET, courses were doled out to various subcommittees (General Education and/or Distance Education committees) based on need for approval. However, with the implementation of CurricUNET, the Curriculum Committee has incorporated the roles of said committees into the overall approval process and are no longer needed to operate separately.
- 4) Opposition: No opposition has been stated at this time.
- 5) Solution: Request formal dissolution of the Distance Education Committee.

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.

Senate Goals: 11-12 Evaluation and 12-13 Proposed

The Executive Board provided the table below that summarizes the accomplishments of each 2011-12 Senate Goals and also proposed Senate Goals for 2012-13. Senators should review the 12-13 goals, gather input from their departments and prepared to vote at next meeting either in support of goals as presented or with suggestions for changes or additions.

Goal	Status	12-13 Goals
1. Ensure the catalog committee is in place by the end of the fall semester to allow for the submission of changes during the beginning of the spring semester. <i>(Linked to college goals 2 and 3.)</i>	Complete	1. Ensure active faculty participation in developing processes and procedures that impact academic senate purview and responsibilities.
2. Ensure all courses that have not been reviewed in over six years are reviewed and entered into CurricUNET. <i>(Linked to college goals 2 and 3.)</i>	Not met.	2.Address issues that are impeding the approval and renewal of curriculum to meet Title 5 compliance. <i>For example: staff and faculty involvement in committee work, encourage faculty training.</i>
3. Increase communication within the college community and actively promote the inclusion of adjunct faculty, classified staff, and administration in governance activities. <i>(Linked to college goals 2 and 6.)</i>	Open forum on college budget reduction plan that included invitations to classified and student representatives. ASC Co-chair reports to Academic Senate and College Council.	3.Increase faculty participation in college governance activities, in particular curriculum and program review.
4. Establish a mechanism to support the mission, vision, and values of Bakersfield College. <i>(Linked to college goals 1-7.)</i>	Approved the Bakersfield College Strategic Plan; participated in the Vision, Mission and Goals survey; discussed strategic plan outcomes and measures which have been incorporated into program review process.	
5. Support the 2011-2012 college goals.	Complete as part of Goal 4	
6. 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.” <i>(Linked to college goals 2 and 7.)</i>	ASC faculty co-chair, SEC faculty co-chair, faculty editor of self-evaluation with reassigned time or stipend. Faculty co-chairs on each accreditation standard. ASC Co-chair reports to Academic Senate and College Council.	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

7. Ensure the college demonstrates it values diversity. <i>(Linked to college goals 1, 2 and 6.)</i>	Increased EODAC Co-chair reassigned time.	
--	---	--

Program Review Committee: Update to Charge

The Program Review Committee is requesting approval of the following changes to the committee charge:

- Addition of a bullet in the Committee Charge section, as follows:
 - Prepare APR summary reports for submission to the College President, College Council, and Academic Senate.
- Membership update:
 - Director of Institutional Research & Planning (ex officio)
- Additional communication lines to include:
 - Academic Senate, Accreditation Steering Committee, and Faculty Chairs & Directors Council
- Minor grammatical and punctuation changes

NAME OF COMMITTEE	PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC)
COMMITTEE CHARGE	<p>The Program Review Committee (PRC) will help ensure the institution has a systematic way of reviewing effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student services and administrative/operational area; act as a resource and provide training to programs scheduled for review; and provide recommendations, commendations, and budget implications in response to reviews completed.</p> <p>Committee members will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Attend meetings regularly. ▪ Participate in committee training. ▪ Provide training for programs undergoing Program Review. ▪ Review each program’s document, verify the validity, and complete the forms associated with the Annual Program Review (APR) process. ▪ Evaluate the processes used for Program Review annually and modify as necessary to meet the needs of the institution. ▪ Participate in the Accreditation Standard Subcommittees as individual schedules permit. ▪ Prepare APR summary reports for submission to the President and College Council.
SCOPE OF AUTHORITY	Program Review recommendations will be a primary source of information to develop institutional planning as related to enhancing student learning and administrative unit outcomes.
COMMUNICATES WITH	College President, College Council, Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee, Assessment Committee, Accreditation Steering Committee, and Faculty Chairs & Directors Council.
MEMBERSHIP	<p>The Program Review Committee (PRC) will have one faculty co-chair and one administrative co-chair.</p> <p>Committee composition will include 8 full-time faculty appointed by the Academic Senate, with representation in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Career and Technical Education (CTE) 1 General Education (GE) 1 Basic Skills 1 Student Services 1 Library

	<p>1 Faculty Chair and Directors Council (FCDC) 1 Assessment Committee Liaison 1 at large</p> <p>Up to 4 classified staff appointed by CSEA. CSEA recommends the following representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Student Services 1 Instructional 1 Administrative 1 CSEA president or designee <p>Up to 4 administrators appointed by the College President. The committee recommends the following representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Student Services 1 Instructional 1 Facilities 1 Information Technology Director of Institutional Research (ex-officio) <p>1 student representative appointed by the Student Government Association (SGA).</p> <p>This will achieve the ideal composition of at least 50% faculty and no more than 25% each of classified staff and administrators. If the Academic Senate deems more (or fewer) faculty are necessary to the operation of the committee, the composition percentage must apply and classified and administrative membership adjusted accordingly. Training in the process of program review at Bakersfield College will be provided for committee members. Members are encouraged to serve for a term of at least three years and may serve more than one term.</p>
--	---

Senators should be prepared to vote on this at the September 26 meeting.

GOOD AND WELFARE AND CONCERNS

There were no comments for the good and welfare.

ADJOURNMENT at 5:18 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jennifer Marden