

From: @bakersfieldcollege.edu>
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2019 2:44 AM
To: bc_faculty <bc_faculty@listserv.bakersfieldcollege.edu>; bc_adjunct <bc_adjunct@bakersfieldcollege.edu>; @bakersfieldcollege.edu>
Subject: Requesting an apology from

To (and Recipients of an email sent out regarding a curriculum issue),

Purpose: I am requesting a professional apology from , and that stop campaign of false statements (or lies) about the issue and against those who do not share views--in this case, me--in order to advance own agenda.

Context sent out an email to those whom wished to persuade to take side on a curriculum issue. Whereas, painted as taking the moral high ground, maligned my character and deliberately misrepresented my position on the issue with the effect of attacking my integrity to advance own view as superior. used emotionally charged language and false claims when attempting to educate the reader on the issue or about my position (and others whom names as well). Many of claims were out-rightly false.

My Response: On a professional level, I find action at the least academically dishonest and biased, uncollegial, and unprofessional, and, at the most, aggressive, toxic, and emotional -- with a bent toward being deliberately hostile to me and my views.

The troubling part for me is that I have treated and department chair with the uttermost respect, both publicly and in private, and have consistently supported right to have opinion heard. I am okay with dissent and respect it. And through it, I would argue democracy thrives. Yet, chose to go behind my back and undermine me by sending out a biased email without my knowledge and calling me out by name, making the issue personal, i.e., about me (well and others names in the email, but I can only speak for me here). Issues are not personal or about people. They are about the issue. went personal, undermined me personally, to try to persuade others that I somehow am the bad guy - but I am bad because I don't agree with . And if I am bad, then my position must be bad. This is not collegial or what anyone who was skilled in critical thinking would do.

Thus, I seek a professional apology for mischaracterizing me and misrepresenting my position and the facts about the issue.

Disclaimer:
My apologies to those who did not receive email, as this email is not intended for you. I do not know to whom had sent email, albeit I confirmed from that sent it to many departments without my knowledge--but did not disclose to me which departments. *Had did, I would have only emailed those involved.* That said, however, sent email without ensuring was sending accurate information about other people's positions or facts on the issues.

All of us should be vigilant and more disciplined about the information we spread across campus, whether it be about people, topics, or issues--and always with an intent of respecting people.

Respectfully,

From: owner-bc_faculty@listserv.bakersfieldcollege.edu on behalf of
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2019 9:40 AM
To: bc_faculty; bc_adjunct
Subject: RE: Requesting an apology from

and others,

It is true that we are coming to the end of a yearlong discussion on the History Department's proposal to broaden the GE requirement for critical thinking to involve disciplines beyond those that currently teach such courses: Communication, Philosophy, and English. Those departments cannot meet student enrollment need and CSUB specifically asked history to develop a methods course. We had quite a lively debate about this in curriculum one year ago and though it appeared history had sufficient support to pass the course, it was clear that [redacted] and the many members of the philosophy department who attended the meeting would be very upset. They had insisted rigor would be diluted by broadening the GE. In an act of friendship and professional collegiality, I withdrew the proposal to give one year for discussion in hopes that we could find some solution that would not leave hurt feelings.

I invite all to ask your own department curriculum representative if anything I have written above (or below) is in any way inaccurate.

Despite our best efforts to explore a variety of mechanisms to guarantee rigor (a concern I share as well [redacted] and I could not find a solution—and we spit-balled a LOT of crazy ideas together.

As we inched closer to the resubmission of Hist b9, [redacted] asked me not to resubmit the course, [redacted] informed me that English had joined [redacted] Phil-Comm voting bloc, and [redacted] closely followed the curriculum committee agenda (via email) and requested time for each ir. [redacted] bloc to speak. [redacted] met with our mutual dean who subsequently withheld administrative approval and requested a special meeting wherein history would have to demonstrate its understanding of critical thinking to [redacted] (some version of that meeting is set for Monday). And more public comments have been made by several folks associated with Comm to undermine the validity of the course proposal.

At that point, yes, in an attempt to offset [redacted] self-admitted voting bloc, I wrote to half a dozen departments (chairs and/or curriculum committee representatives) who I suspected would be sympathetic to expanding the critical thinking GE. I invited them to "get the pulse of their department" so that they could vote with confidence when the Hist 9 proposal appeared on the curriculum agenda. Nothing in those emails maligned [redacted] or anyone else, and to demonstrate that I have included one of these emails below for your review. In each email I pointed out that a variety of disciplines teach critical thinking statewide (Psych, Hist, Soci, Chem, Math). In the email to mathematics I pointed out that Butte College teaches a math class that meets the critical thinking GE, and I speculated that such a class might thus be possible at BC. As you can see in the email below, nothing I wrote was untrue nor anyone misrepresented. I simply dared to invite departments to consider their own self-interest before they would face the prearranged opposition.

I apologize to those who did not ask to be pulled into these department politics and continue to invite any solutions that can resolve the above concerns.

From: [redacted]@bakersfieldcollege.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2019 1:23 PM

To: [@bakersfieldcollege.edu](mailto:>@bakersfieldcollege.edu)
Cc: [!@bakersfieldcollege.edu](mailto:>@bakersfieldcollege.edu)
Subject: Critical Thinking in Math

As you may know, one year ago I proposed a course in history to fulfil the critical thinking GE requirement. The curriculum committee was generally in favor, but _____ and the entire philosophy department were very vocal in opposition. They (along with English) currently enjoy a monopoly on that GE. Rather than drive it through with hurt feelings, I volunteered to withdraw the proposal and wait one year to help resolve concerns before resubmitting it.

Several weeks ago I resubmitted the proposal and it was falsely believed to be on the agenda for discussion a week ago. As it turns out, it will be introduced next week.

_____ and _____ vehemently opposed the course last year and continue to now. They have argued that their disciplines are uniquely capable of teaching critical thinking and opening the door for other disciplines would ultimately dilute the rigor of the GE requirement.

The de facto Comm-Phil-Eng monopoly is not a state policy, nor is it practiced statewide. A variety of critical thinking GE courses exist across the state in community colleges, CSUs, and UC schools. Berkley has one in history. So do three other community colleges (and Taft college just approved one in history as well, but is waiting on state approval). There are also community college critical thinking GE req courses in psychology, sociology, and even in natural sciences/chemistry (Pasadena College). Indeed, there is even one in mathematics taught at Butte College.

http://www.curricunet.com/butte/reports/course_outline.cfm?courses_id=4769

And I would imagine a pre-statistics course could probably serve to better prepare students for stats and allow for completion of the critical thinking GE, but I'm obviously speculating here.

So I am writing you to encourage you to actively think about the critical thinking GE. Is it something your department believes could be taught in other disciplines, or is it something that only Philosophy, Communication, and English are able to teach? The state clearly states that all disciplines require "critical thinking" and calls for a "variety" of disciplines to teach the critical thinking GE, and that is what is occurring state-wide. Obviously I hope you will come to the conclusion that our students are best served by the state's recommended policy and practice: that a variety disciplines teach such courses.

No matter how you feel about the issue, clearly it is much larger than one class in a committee vote next week. I do hope you will think on this issue and get the pulse of the department so that your representative (I believe _____ is the rep?) can speak with the full confidence of the department's wishes when this curriculum committee engages the issue next week.

Thanks,

Bakersfield College
1801 Panorama Dr.
Bakersfield, CA 93305