ACADEMIC SENATE of BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE
January 24, 2018 – 3:30 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: K. Amin, G. Anderson, B. Braid, C. Dean, V. Diaz (EB), M. Fredenberg, M. Garrett (EB), J. Giertz (EB), R. Grays, S. Holmes (EB), J. Huston, Q. Jimenez, J. Johnson (EB), S. Johnson, M. Jones, B. Kelly C. Kim (EB), D. Kimball, I. Kimbrough, K. Klopstein, A. Loken, R. Martinez, (EB), T. McAllister+ proxy for T.Bohan, S. McQuerrey, E. Menchaca (EB), K. Nickell (EB), M. Ocean (EB), L. Peet, D. Rosenthal (EB), G. Samples, N. Stanifer, J. Thompkins (SGA), P. Whitney, R. Williams, J. Wojtysiak (EB)

ABSENT: S. Baron, T. Bohan, L. Harding (EB), D. Hoffman (EB), D. Koeth (EB), R. Marquez, C. Newton, K. Rigby, G. Romo (SGA), L. Salcido (SGA),

GUEST: Officer Mattheus, Paula Parks, Johnathan Ward

I. CALL TO ORDER
   The meeting was called to order at 3:34p.m.

II. GOOD, WELFARE AND CONCERNS
   - Don Turney is home and feeling well
   - Corny Rodriguez' mother passed away
   - Leann Riley's father passed away

L. Harding motioned to suspend the agenda to New Business, A- AS Resolution No. 2: New Faculty Responsibilities, S. McQuerrey seconded, motion carried.

III. OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE SENATE
   ### A. Umoja ASTEP Program
   Paula Parks, Faculty Lead and Johnathan Ward, Counselor provided an overview of the Umoja ASTEP Program.
   The Umoja Community African-American Success Through Excellence and Persistence (ASTEP) is a year-long program designed for motivated African-American students with the goal of increasing their success and graduation rates at BC. Parks solicited faculty support to:
   - Identify and recommend students who might benefit;
   - Offer to allow Umoja ASTEP cohorts to reserve a few dozen seats in a class section
   - Identify possible funding sources
   The power point presentation is located on the Academic Senate website.

   ### B. DPS 2017 Survey
   Officer Mattheus was available for Q & A. Chief Counts will attend February 7th to follow up on any unaddressed questions.
   - De we have statistics on responding to calls

- What is the survey used for
- Would it be possible to post the last two surveys to the website for documentation for Accreditation
- Would like DPS phone numbers be added to all the classroom phones
- Can you provide more information about the cadet program; How can one go about becoming a cadet
- What does a back ground check involve and would it prevent a student who was previously incarcerated from being hired
- How do you get alerts

The survey results are located on the [Academic Senate](#) website.

IV. ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA
There were no additions to the agenda.
- Kelly proposed the question if Dual Enrollment classes count in the total department FTEF used in determining department chair release time. This question should be directed to CCA.

V. REVIEW AND APPROVE THE MINUTES
Minutes of October 25, 2017
N. Stanifer motioned to approve the minutes, S. McQuerrey seconded, motion carried.

Minutes of November 8, 2017
N. Stanifer motioned to approve the minutes, S. McQuerrey seconded, motion carried.

Meeting of November 22, 2017- *no meeting*

Meeting of November 29, 2017
N. Stanifer motioned to approve the minutes, S. McQuerrey seconded, motion carried.

VI REPORTS
PRESIDENT'S REPORT:
- BP Revisions: DO sought outside council to review policies, but process would cost $70,000-80,000. New plan is to address only new policies, which is not favorable.
- CSEA Adjunct Faculty: Classified and Faculty will be able to negotiate a blended rate from a 40-hour work
- DO Screening Committee: Holmes addressed District for not following proper hiring protocol; moving forward procedures will be adhered to
- Zero Cost Textbooks: new state law requires BC to identify to students any classes that use a zero cost textbook, and so information must now be included in our online class schedule for student perview
- W Grade: Faculty was reminded to include the last date of attendance for all students receiving a W grade; failure to do so results in significant delays in fianalizing grade distribution

- Waitlist update: Purged on Friday Jan. 26th even though census day is several days after; faculty encouraged to record names of waitlist students
- Committee Charges: Assessment, Curriculum, Equivalency- approved
- Hayward Award: Kimberly Bligh nominated
- Admin Structure: Annual review of Admin Structure
    - Dean to replace Cindy Collier
    - Dean to cover extensive English areas
    - Nan Gomez-Heightzeberg retiring in February; Liz Rozell to be Interim VP and Jason Dixon to be Interim Dean
    - Department Chair for Allied Health pending CCA review
- Dual Enrollment Task Force- no update
- Guided Pathways- no update
- Election update: EIT Dept. Chair Special Election is in process, College Council and Senator Special Elections are commencing; February Officers, Senators and Co-Chairs will commence

COMMITTEE REPORTS:
(AIQ)ACCREDITATION & INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY (Wojtysiak)-*submitted as written*

Accreditation and Institutional Quality (AIQ) Committee

Academic Senate Report
Prepared by Jessica Wojtysiak, Faculty Chair
January 24, 2018

The Accreditation & Institutional Quality (AIQ) committee will meet next on Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at 3:30 pm in Levinson 40.

Accreditation/ISER
- *Accreditation featured prominently during the spring opening day. Accreditation leads Liz Rozell and Jason Stratton reported on the status of the ISER. The accreditation team also held a workshop focused upon the use and design of the BC accreditation website.*
- *Members of AIQ engaged in advanced ISER training with Gohar Momjian, ACCJC VP and the staff liaison for all KCCD colleges, on January 17th. AIQ will be ramping up its effort to prepare for the upcoming site visit in fall, 2018, including providing support for the ongoing effort by the public relations department to improve the quality and accessibility of BC web pages.*
- *AIQ continues to have openings in the basic skills and CTE faculty positions.*
- *Janet Fulks and Jessica Wojtysiak are the leads for the Qualify Focus Essay (QFE). We have commenced drafting this final component of the ISER. The QFE is forward-thinking and focuses upon identifying 2-3 action projects to improve student learning and student achievement.*
- *The Board of Trustees is opting to adopt a more engaged approach in the review and approval of the ISER. Trustee Bill Thomas is chairing an accreditation subcommittee that*

will start reading the draft ISER, standard by standard, in March. The first Board review of the completed ISER is planned for June. Trustee Mark Storch will be the lead reader for Cerro Coso's ISER, Trustee Romeo Agbalog will be the lead reader for Porterville College's ISER, and Trustee Bill Thomas will be the lead reader for Bakersfield College's ISER.
Strategic Directions

      • *We will close the current Strategic Directions cycle on Monday, April 2nd. All reports should be submitted by the April 2nd deadline. No action plans are required for the final report. Rather, reports should clearly offer item scores and evidence to support the scoring. Additional reporting information is available through the AIQ website:*
https://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/accreditation*.*

      • *The Strategic Directions Taskforce hosted a workshop on January 19th to support the crafting of new initiatives for the upcoming 2018-2021 Strategic Directions cycle. The workshop took place in the Levan Center at 10:30 am. The workshop was well-attended, and the taskforce collected many submissions from that workshop and the preceding College Council meeting.*

      • *The new initiatives must be measurable, and those submitting initiative ideas will be asked to identify a manager responsible for the ultimate scoring of the initiative. Information on how to submit an initiative is available through the Strategic Directions Taskforce website:*
https://committees.kccd.edu/committee/strategic-directions*.*

ASSESSMENT (Hoffman)
TABLED 2/7

BUDGET (McAllister)
TABLED 2/7

CURRICULUM (Johnson/Menchaca)
TABLED 2/21

(EMC) ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT (Koeth)
TABLED 2/21

(EODAC) EQUAL OPPORTUNITY & ADVISORY COUNCIL (Ocean)
TABLED 2/7

(ISIT) INFORMATIONAL SERVICES INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY (Marquez)
TABLED 2/21

(PDC) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Giertz)-*report submitted as written*
        PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REPORT
           1/24/2018 by John Giertz, Committee Chair
Opening Week Activities

Opening week activities were held starting on January 8th through the 12th with most workshops occurring on Monday –Wednesday. The Opening Day Ceremony was held to welcome Faculty and Staff back to the Spring semester and was held on Thursday morning. The event was followed by lunch and some afternoon sessions. It is important to remember

that while we were able to plan many sessions, our week is structured around the president's decision for opening day and major planning sessions; such as pathways. So we understand that sessions were not offered every morning, but we work to provide as many sessions as possible during the hours available.

Sessions: *54 sessions*

Number of individual attendees: *470 different individuals attending at least one session*

Total attendees: *758 attendance log-ins, without the adjunct faculty orientation*

Total number with adjunct orientation: *828 (70 who attended the adjunct orientation)*

(PRC) PROGRAM REVIEW (Nickell)-*report submitted as written*
Program Review Annual Summary Fall 2017 Prepared by the Program Review Committee Program Review Members: Chairs: Emmanuel (Manny) Mourtzanos, Dean of Instruction, Fine & Performing Arts, Admin Co-Chair; Kimberly Nickell, ACDV, Faculty Co-Chair; Kristin Rabe, Media Services, Classified Co-Chair Members: Faculty Mindy Wilmot, Library; Anna Poetker, Philosophy; Brenda Nyagwachi, FACE; Andrea Tumblin, Mathematics; Heather Baltis, Agriculture; David Neville, Foreign Language; Brent Burton, Fire Technology/EMS; Brian Sivesind, Theater; Lillian Pimentel-Stratton, FACE; Neeley Hatridge, Communication; Hibba Ashraf, Biology; Nicole Hernandez, Nursing; Savanna Andrasian, English; Jennifer Johnson, Nursing (Curriculum Liason); Diane Allen, Counseling; Administrators:Sue Vaughn, Child Development Center; Classified Meg Stidham, CSEA designee Antonio Alfaro, CTE Student SGA Genae Romo Ex-Officio Purpose of Annual Report: The Program Review Committee prepares an annual report for the College President, Academic Senate President, and College Council. The purposes of this report are as follows: ¬ To summarize themes and issues among the 109 (of 112) programs PRC reviewed, which included: ♣ 10 Admin Units- all Annual Updates ♣ 13 Student Affairs-1 Comp (Counseling) 12 Annual Updates ♣ 13 of 14 Academic Affairs-All Annual Updates ♣ 11 of 12 Other Areas-1 Comp (English for Multicultural Learners) 10 Annual Updates ♣ 1 Baccalaureate-Annual Update ♣ 61 of 62 Instructional-16 of which were Comprehensive Reviews and 45 Annual Updates. ¬ To assess the Program Review Annual Update and Comprehensive Program Review processes and the validity of their outcomes for the purpose of providing recommendations for future improvement as well as to share best practices. ¬To provide information to help decision-making bodies such as the Budget, ISIT, Facilities, Assessment, Curriculum, and Professional Development committees; FCDC; College Council; CTE; and the College President in the resource allocation process. ♣ Budget Requests = 25 ♣ Classified Position Requests = 43 2 ♣ Faculty Position Requests = 52 ♣ Facilities Requests = 100 ♣ ISIT Tech Requests = 95 ♣ Other Equip Requests = 52 ♣ Professional Development Requests = 31 ♣ Certificates Reported = 12 ♣ CTE Reported = 30 ♣ Curricular Reviews Reported = 23 ♣ Assessments – 81 areas submitted Program Review Annual Update: Synthesis of Common Themes and Issues: While individual program reviews provide insightful information specific to that program, a synthesis of all programs seeks to identify common themes and issues that tend to appear among several programs, as well as to identify outliers who deviate from shared tendencies among other programs. For the 2017 reporting year, the Program Review Committee identified the following emergent themes. Themes and issues do not necessarily reflect shared experiences among all programs, but certainly emerged as

common among multiple units. ¬ We created a single naming convention for all documents. Each dean/chair received his or her own thumb drive with their forms. ♣ This helped in getting a larger number of correct forms back, which was something we struggled with in past years. ¬ Increase in overall annual update submissions (98%). This is due in part to the inclusion of more programs in the process (112 in all). ¬ List of programs was more conclusive this year. In turn, we had more programs complete program reviews. ¬ Assessment Form was restructured from last year. While the form was better received, there appears to be a need to create assessment forms that better reflects admin units and non-instructional programs. ¬ With the implementation of eLumen, PRC will be ready with the process and forms for a smooth transition. ¬ Equity Question still left unanswered or answers did not reflect the question. ¬ With the change of leadership in the budget management, there was some confusion about who would receive the budget form. For the most part, we were able to clarify that the deans were responsible for submitting budget. ¬ Some departments had difficulty understanding the need to do a program review for all AA, AS, AST, and certificates. 3 Outcomes based on the process: As a result of the Program Review process, we are affecting change: • We look forward to an electronic process for program review. The adoption of the software program eLumen will facilitate the Program Review process more effectively: no confusion about forms, it will be linked to Assessment and Curriculum, and it will be housed in one location. • The Program Review Committee has become a strong repository of evidence that can be accessed for accreditation purposes. • Our systems are better integrated. We work more effectively with other committees...we are breaking out of our silos. • Campus culture has shifted o Many of the faculty and staff are changing their perspectives on program review, regarding the process as an opportunity to promote educational excellence and improve instruction and services to students. o The resource acquisition process and budgeting process is more fully understood and integrated. o There is a better understanding among faculty and staff the implications of the program review process and its important role in accreditation. This has been vocalized within committee meetings across campus. Findings for the 2017 cycle: ⌐ The instructional programs (degrees and certificates) we offered continue to evolve. The Master List of Programs we used this cycle was a better snapshot in time; however, we still need to continuously monitor and evaluate current degrees and certificates for validity. ⌐ While we sent out packets with accurate forms with specific naming conventions, PRC continued receiving outdated forms; however, there were fewer than previous cycles. ⌐ Some programs took immediate advantage of feedback and resubmitted their program reviews ⌐ AUs submitted without any forms ⌐ Some received resources were assessed, not all. We struggled with the section on resource assessment overall. We are looking to revamp this for the next cycle. ⌐ Some programs had spoken to resource and staffing needs within the AU or Comprehensive without submitting appropriate forms or submitted forms without justification. ⌐ Received resources were not assessed ⌐ Equity question was not answered or not effectively addressed. ⌐ There was confusion or lack of communication within programs/deans/chairs as to who submits budget form. ⌐ Conclusions were better drafted. ⌐ Missing mission statements 4 ⌐ Programs didn't understand that they had program learning outcomes or administrative outcomes. ⌐ Trend data not used. Trend data not broken out for individual programs, i.e. Business Administration ⌐ Requests...one form to include previous requests, new requests ⌐ Some "Other" equipment requests were distributed to Facilities and

ISIT requests – they were submitted incorrectly ⌐ Goals: lack of action plans. Too many ongoing goals. Not making staff or faculty request a goal. It can be part of the action plan to request. Goals student or campus centered, not resource centered. ⌐ Sue Vaughn gave an example of keeping the goals and needed resources ongoing, even if it is 15 years. ⌐ Relate the program or administrative outcomes to the institutional outcomes. ⌐ Give programs that are not instructional some training…spring training should help them develop a better program review. ⌐ Can we speak to a program that is less than two years old…is there a way to identify that it is a new program early in the review to allow PRC to give relevant and constructive feedback. ⌐ Training for instruction and non-instructional ⌐ Who makes the call on space allocation? How would two areas wanting one space be resolved? Look at the Education Masterplan along with the Facilities Masterplan ⌐ Budget form issues. Only deans received them, and it seemed to cause confusion with some chairs. This may be resolved next year if we keep the format that they will go to the deans again. This is to spark conversations between deans and dept. chairs. ⌐ Equity piece is still a conundrum. Maybe meet with Equity and Inclusion and figure out what we need to ask and what we are looking for in the answers. Do we include it as a box within the goal section? Still need to speak to it in the trend data. Be sensitive to the issues of disproportionate impact. ⌐ Put the conclusion at the beginning as an abstract. ⌐ Welcome to your Program Review Packet letter with hard and fast deadlines. Some may think forms are optional. ⌐ The Handbook may be too much information ⌐ Bullets within the assessment form made it confusing and difficult to enter dialog. ⌐ How did some people not have unexpected things crop up in Program Analysis? ⌐ Encourage to answer NA when it isn't relevant. ⌐ Categorical budget programs don't have to submit HR form for staffing 5 Opportunities: The Program Review Committee considers the following as training opportunities for the next cycle. 1. Clarify the importance of assessing resources received from previous cycle and the impact on the program. 2. Streamline the handbook. Create better prompts and examples within handbook to help with the forms. 3. Meet with department chairs and deans (FCDC) to clarify budget request responsibilities. Provide an informal training at that time, with timelines in place. 4. Facilities Requests: programs had a better understanding of the process and the difference between a work order and a request PRC will provide examples of request types within handbook. Encourage programs to become familiar with the M&O Work Orders. 5. Some areas requested faculty, staff, and an increase in budget in order to be able to fulfill the college mission, implying that they could not do the job if the requests were not granted. Remind programs that these elements can be part of the action plan but not the goal or fulfillment of mission. 6. Overall, the responses varied in their consistencies. Some were very strong, with many model examples this year. Others were not as robust, and some conclusions could have been fleshed out. Again, PRC can create better examples/models. 7. Because the conclusion can be an opportunity to spotlight the program, changing it to an abstract at the beginning of the form could strengthen its purpose and help programs refine this section. 8. Because every program serves students in some way, maybe reframe how we ask programs to describe the students they serve, i.e. type of student, what is their focus, CTE, transfer, etc. Remind student services and administrative services serve ALL students. 9. The equity question still stumps some programs, and the Assessment Committee is having questions about this. Maybe take that off the assessment piece and pull that back into the AU and Comp. forms. Develop the Equity question to be more relevant. Maybe introduce with philosophical aspect. Give an example of a problem to help with the connection. 10. PRC

chairs have already met with a representative of the assessment committee and have better direction leading into the Spring Semester of where we need to be on our assessment form. 11. Administrative units are refining (based on feedback and further direction from the Institution) their assessments with their Administrative Unit Outcomes. They are resubmitting them to the Program Review Committee for inclusion with their packet as of 12/5. 6 12. Overall, we want to work together to be transparent, make this right and steer ourselves into a positive direction that will ultimately benefit future generations to come at Bakersfield College. Recommendations: Program Review's Future Practices: 1. Continue to track the connection between the program review process and resource allocations. 2. Continue toward the accuracy of master list of programs. 3. Develop a 3-year comprehensive cycle for Student Affairs and administrative units. 4. Develop tailored Assessment Forms for admin and other non-instructional units. 5. Buy in, outreach, training, constituencies will continue. 6. Defend the process. 7. Maintain compliance with ACCJC standards 8. Always looking to improve efficiency of the process through feedback, surveys, selfreflection to support a successful institution and student success. 9. Committee will address the need to meet with deans of admin units and other programs to help in classifying special programs and programs that do not lead to degrees. 10. Provide more training for administrators, current and incoming department chairs, and interested employees. 11. Develop a written policy for out-of-cycle position requests. 12. Continue to post examples of effective program review elements. 13. Advise authors to write the conclusion as though it were an abstract. 14. Engage initiatives to participate in the program review process. 15. Strive to ensure that direct correlation between the Budget Request Form and the Budget Request Process exists. 16. Send budget form to directors instead of VP. 17. Hold a college-wide dialog about scheduling facilities for meetings, workshops, and events. 18. Develop a policy on consequences for programs that do not complete the Program Review Process. 19. Continue to find the most effective method of providing a document packet for each area which includes the most recent version of forms until an online process becomes available. 20. Provide a report to the President and VP regarding areas that did not submit a program review. 21. Reach out to College Council how to address the issue of areas who have not turned in their program reviews. 22. For AU/CR that are missing forms: send one email to Nan to send to FCDC, SS, and Admin SVC. The email will acknowledge receipt of the program review and request the missing forms (specifically best practices, faculty position request, classified position request, technology, and facilities). 7 23. Next year before program review is due, verify program title for each department. Include verification of programs that are not offered. 24. Update handbook to provide relevant examples and directions. 25. Continue to provide training for administrators, department chairs, and interested employees that are specific to those areas. Offer drop-in workshops at a variety of times. 26. Will generate a survey to provide data for the closing the loop document. 27. Work with the Assessment Committee on the Assessment Form. The goal is to better understand what the Assessment Committee needs. Develop an Assessment Form that serves non-instructional units. Three-year Summary Report Trend: ¬ Over the past three Program Review cycles 2015-17, the number of programs included in the Program Review process has increased: ♣ 2015 98 programs-85 submissions ♣ 2016 107 programs-104 submissions ♣ 2017 113 programs-110 submissions Title 5 definition of an "educational program": (m) "Educational program" is an organized sequence of courses leading to a defined objective, a degree, a certificate, a diploma, a license, or transfer to another

institution of higher education. Source: 5 CCR section 55000 Barclays Official California Code of Regulations Title 5. Education Division 6. California Community Colleges Chapter 6. Curriculum and Instruction Subchapter 1. Programs, Courses and Classes Article 1. Program, Course and Class Classification and Standards Conclusion: The Program Review Committee has already developed a plan to address many of the opportunities and self-evaluated recommendations discussed in this summary report and have started the process toward refining the program review forms and the process to be more streamlined and relevant, with language that engages editors in thoughtful dialogue. The Program Review process continues to evolve, and its contributions to the resource allocation, the accreditation processes, and ultimately student success continues to grow and strengthen. The perception of Program Review is at an all-time high. This was evident at the November 6, 2017 Standard III Accreditation Forum, as well as the dialog about the importance of program review at governance committee meetings. While so much has been accomplished this 2017 cycle, the Program Review process can always be improved. The committee will 8 strengthen its commitment to affect change of Program Review and to strengthen connections across the BC campus with other committees. We will work to set and achieve goals to create an effective Program Review process and to complete the highest quality of work to meet the stringent standards of ACCJC, the accreditation process and to represent a comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of programs on the Bakersfield College campus, recognizing the mutual dependency of programs and activities, a faculty engaged in effective teaching and scholarship, an effective administration, and adequate facilities and support services, all of which contribute to the success of our student body. This report and the following information is/will be available online at the Program Review Committee page: https://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/programreview 1. Program Review Annual Update Evaluation Results Summary 2. Program Review Annual Update Evaluation Survey Responses 3. List of Model Annual Updates and Comprehensive Reviews 4. Annual Updates 5. Comprehensive Program Reviews 6. Best Practices 7. Faculty Position Requests 8. Classified Position Requests 9. ISIT Requests 10. M & O Requests

OFFICER REPORTS:
VICE PRESIDENT (Diaz)
Diaz provided an update on College Council:
- Adult Education Block Grant (AEBG) helps Rural initiatives
- Offering 66 sections at Wonderful; Grimmway Farms starting a similar program
- Arvin HS now has an on-site BC counselor

To view College Council minutes:
https://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/collegecouncil

TREASURER (Kim)
Fundraiser and donation details are located on the Academic Senate website.

SECRETARY (Garrett)
Meeting summaries are emailed to faculty after each meeting.

(ASCCC)ACADEMIC SENATE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE (Rosenthal)
No report

(CCA)COMMUNITY COLLEGE ASSOCIATION (Greenwood)
No report

(BCSGA)STUDENT GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES (Romo/Salcido)
James Tompkins, *BCSGA Senator 04* represented BCSGA and shared they are providing ethics training. A little about Tompkins:
bcsgasen04@bakersfieldcollege.edu
Major: Psychology
James Tompkins is a returning second-semester student. He hopes to use his degree to positively impact the issue of mass incarceration and the school to prison pipeline.
Connect on Facebook
Involvement:
• ICC Rep for Free on the Outside Student Organization
• Counselor at Positive Visions
Goals for the Term in Office:
• Develop ways to expand the pantry
• Create more partnerships between the community and students
• Tackle the very real problem of student housing
Students Event Calendar: https://www.bakersfieldcollege.edu/studentevents

VII. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS
  a. Standing Committee Appointments-
  There were no appointments to review.

  b. Screening Committee Appointments-
  Mathematics
  Stephen Waller (Dean)
  Regina Hukill (Department Chair)
  Carol Smith (Faculty)
  Kurt Klopstein (Faculty) Mark
  Osea (External Faculty)

N. Stanifer motioned to approve the appointments, K. Klopstein seconded, motion carried.

  Counseling-BC/Delano (2)
  Grace Commiso (Dean) Abel
  Guzman (Director)
  Mark Osea (Department Chair)
  Marisa Marquez (Faculty)
  Jonathan Schultz (Faculty)
  Christine Cruz-Boone (External Faculty)

Faculty appointments approved by E-Board 1/17/18

N. Stanifer motioned to approve the appointments, S. McQuerrey seconded, motion carried.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
   a. **Senate C's & B's** (Holmes)
      Description: review Senate Constitution and Bylaws every three years.
      TABLED

X. NEW BUSINESS
   a. **Resolution no2: New Faculty Responsibilities** (Giertz)
      FIRST READ
      Holmes provided an overview of the resolution. CCA is supportive of the resolution and assisted in its development. Giertz recommended Senators take the information to constituency groups and bring back questions/concerns.

   b. **Bookstore Committee** (Holmes)
      A new bookstore committee will be organized to ensure smooth relations with faculty, correct orders, affordability, etc. A charge will be developed and then a call for members will go out.

   c. **OEI Implementation Team/Resolution** (Holmes)
      A new online Education Task Force will be organized to work on initiative. Resolution to be developed by Task Force. Volunteers: Charles Kim, Carl Dean, Glen Samples.

XI ANNOUNCEMENTS
      Campus Closed: 2/16, 2/19
      Spring Recess: Week of March 26th
Statewide Academic Senate (ASCCC): http://www.asccc.org
      Award Submission Deadline:
      NBFFF 2/1
      Stanback-Stroud Diversity 2/5
Travel: Accreditation Inst: 2/22-24
      Area A: 3/23
      Plenary: 4/12-14

XII ADJOURNMENT
      The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.
      Digitally signed by T.Perry
      Meeting minutes recorded by S. Boyles