

Re: Senate November 2 meeting materials

FOR FULL CONTEXT OF the HIGHLIGHTED STATEMENT THAT DOES NOT SHARE THE IMPORTANT MISSING CONTEXT, PLEASE READ .PDF PublicCommentReference-McNellis-2of3.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Tue 11/1/2022 12:47 PM

To: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Cc: BC_ACADSEN <BC_ACADSEN@bakersfieldcollege.edu>

Yep, it's a different Senate than we had a decade ago. Times have changed and work relationships are not what they were back then, so the Senate had adjusted to the current time.

In an email you sent last week to the faculty chairs and myself, you indicated that the faculty chairs should come to a consensus on next steps and decide as a body whether or not to involve the Senate. If the faculty chairs as a body have a spokesperson and/or document and/or something else they want to bring forward for the Senate's consideration, that'd be great.

HIGHLIGHTS MINE

--

XXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Astronomy Notes website:
<https://www.astronomynotes.com>

On Nov 1, 2022, at 11:53 AM, XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX wrote:

Thank you for the clarification. Okay, I understand, despite being an Academic Senate Executive Board Member, a Co-Chair of an Academic Senate Committee, a Member of FCDC, and a Department chair, that I would only be allowed to speak during public comments because I am considered only as the "general public." Well, apparently not all of us fully understood the ramifications of such a standing rule that creates, in my opinion, avoidable and now obvious barriers to an effective and meaningful Senate. Perhaps we need to revisit this rule next year, if not sooner, "rules" providing.

This is a very different Senate than it was a decade ago when free and welcomed faculty voices, regardless of minute details, could speak and share their ideas freely and openly on important academic and professional matters that impact the lives of faculty, chair or otherwise.

Cheers y'all,
XXXXXXXXXX

Department Chair and Professor, Philosophy
Co-Chair, Bookstore Advisory Committee (BAC)
Member, Academic Senate Executive Board
Member, Faculty Chairs & Directors Council (FCDC)

From: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Sent: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 11:07 AM
To: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Cc: BC_ACADSEN <BC_ACADSEN@bakersfieldcollege.edu>
Subject: Re: Senate November 2 meeting materials

XXXXXX

As you well know, the Senate had lengthy discussion about comments from non-Senators/officers on agenda items in Fall 2021. The Senate finally decided after 2-3 meetings the process for getting feedback and debate with non-voting members that is given in the Standing Rule posted in the "Joining Senate Meetings" section of the Senate website. Direct link: <https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/StandingRule-PublicComments-v2.pdf> . The Senate re-affirmed that standing rule at its first meeting this Fall.

Non-voting members speak during Public Comments. "For the rest of the meeting, the Senators and Officers are the only ones allowed to discuss/ debate the agenda items, unless a majority of the Senate votes to allow a member of the general public with relevant information or expertise to speak on a given agenda item." I believe that you were present at all of those meetings leading up to setting up the Standing Rule in Fall 2021 and the re-affirmation this Fall.

XXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Astronomy Notes website:
<https://www.astronomynotes.com>

On Nov 1, 2022, at 9:38 AM, XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX wrote:
XXXXXX

Thanks for the outline of Wednesday's events. Question of clarification for you before the meeting, you say, "5) Scheduling ratio concerns — hopefully, the department chairs **who are part of the Senate** will be able shed light on discussions with the VPI about this." [bold, mine]

1. Can you clarify that statement, as it reads that you may be discouraging any chair who is not "part of the Senate" from speaking or offering their experience? Is this what you intended? Regular faculty who may not be a part of the Senate may want to speak as well.
2. In that light, do you mean only voting Senate members can speak? What about members of some of the Executive Board members who are not voting members? May they speak?

I would hope your comment doesn't intend to discourage any faculty member, chair or otherwise, from providing a free and welcomed opportunity to share their set of experiences regarding the schedule (and the manner in which it was executed) and/or any other set of experiences related to the items on the agenda.

Academic Senate should always be a place welcoming all the voices of the faculty, regardless of their roles.

Thank you so much for the clarification,
XXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Department Chair and Professor, Philosophy
Area Chair, Harvard Schools Committee
Co-Chair, Bookstore Advisory Committee (BAC)
Member, Academic Senate Executive Board
Member, Faculty Chairs & Directors Council (FCDC)
ACH Pathway Completion Team
<Outlook-nlpele20.jpg> <Outlook-3smn3142.png>

From: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2022 6:59 PM
To: BC_ACADSEN <BC_ACADSEN@bakersfieldcollege.edu>
Subject: Senate November 2 meeting materials

Senators + Officers:

The agenda and supporting materials for the November 2nd meeting were posted Saturday evening. We will take a brief break to take a picture of this year's Senate.

- Action items include:
- 1) Approval of October 19 minutes
 - 2) Standing Committee Appointments (as of today, there are just two committee slot changes — highlighted in yellow and in bold face font)
 - 3) Student Equity Plan . VP Simos-Valdez has had family medical issues that has delayed posting the action plans. About 85-90%

of our students will be covered in the action plans. See the materials from the October 19th meeting that describe the data analysis that was done to determine the student populations that would be part of the plan.

4) Senate Goals for 22-23

Discussion items include:

- 1) Committee appointment revision proposal to handle the cases where a particular committee slot has multiple applicants all within a short timeframe. It should take care of the problems we dealt with in the "start of business day" discussion of the first Senate meeting.
- 2) Revision to the Equivalency Committee procedures to allow for summer work since hiring is now continuing through the summer. Also having members serve two-year terms, disallowing proxy votes, and removal of members who have excessive absences.
- 3) Racial Climate task force — this was discussed at multiple E-board meetings and was blessed by EODAC as requested by Eboard before being brought to the Senate. Rather than rehashing the debate we had last year about the NACCC survey, please note that the task force will also look at the data from the CCSSE survey which included questions about the racial climate and it will do other surveys if we need more data to formulate appropriate plans. The results from the CCSSE are posted in this meeting's supporting documents.
- 4) Draft of a resolution about the evaluation and scheduling of Early College courses in our service area.
- 5) Scheduling ratio concerns — hopefully, the department chairs who are part of the Senate will be able shed light on discussions with the VPI about this.

I'd like to restate some of the comments I made at the October 19th meeting about discussion of controversial topics, particularly about race/ethnicity issues. Tensions are extremely high when we talk about anything touching on race/ethnicity. As I've watched the debate play out over the past several years at BC, I've seen a number of calls asking to be given grace for any unintended offensive comments that were expressed but not a whole lot of grace given in return. I have also been in meetings or heard about meetings where I wonder if the participants were really at the same meeting because of the wide divergence of opinions in who said what in which order, etc.

In the early days of the COVID pandemic, I was introduced to the idea of the "Overton window" in David French's book "Divided We Fall", a book that has been remarkably prescient about today's tensions. The Overton window is the range of acceptable political discourse on any given topic. In the "old days" there was a lot of overlap of the Overton windows for the groups of various political/religious/philosophical/etc. persuasions. Thanks to social media the Overton windows have grown apart—in some cases, very far apart.

SO: it is very likely that there will be views expressed that will cause offense. I ask that as we deal with controversial topics, particularly around race/ethnicity, that we endeavor to not assign motives to people when none has been explicitly stated and to not impugn the professionalism of our colleagues whether they be faculty, classified, or administration. When (not if) someone says something offensive, please take a few deep breaths before responding or firing off that email to all of the faculty. As you craft your message, please try to keep in mind how the receiver will receive it. Treat others how you'd like to be treated even if they don't treat you well in return. Easier said than done and I'll probably need reminding myself as I'm still learning.

See you on Wednesday!

XXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Astronomy Notes website:
<https://www.astronomynotes.com>