

Here are the thoughts from the ENGR faculty prior to the vote on changing graduation requirements, specifically the requirement for “A Master’s degree in Counseling must be listed as a minimum qualification, use the STDV course prerequisite or list a STDV course as a co-requisite” for Education Planning courses like ENGR B47.”

The ENGR faculty recognize the role of counselors and understand that they provide information about navigating the transfer process that faculty within the discipline can’t always provide. However, we disagree with the change in requirements for Education planning courses such as ENGR B47 for the following reasons:

1. **This will negatively effect students:** Adding a co-requisite or prerequisite to ENGR B47 adds yet another class to a high-unit major. While a single unit for an extra STDV course might not seem like much it must be added to a course load that already includes 4-unit MATH classes, CHEM and PHYS classes with labs in addition to Gen. Ed. and ENGR classes. Squeezing an extra credit into an already-packed schedule will likely cause students to delay taking ENGR B47, pushing back development of Ed Plans for a semester or more. In theory, the ENGR B47 course could be amended to remove 1 credit’s worth of content to compensate, but the it would no longer align with the ENGR 110 C-ID, making articulation of the course an issue.
2. **The current setup is working well:** In discussion with the counselors and advisors who currently visit our ENGR B47 class to help students develop Ed Plans, they don’t consider the trip to be an extra burden on their schedule. The class provides an efficient way to meet with students that would otherwise be coming to them for individual meetings. Prep work done in the ENGR B47 class prior to their arrival removes much of the busy-work of loading a template, adding in courses in assist.org articulation agreements and rearranging courses to match prerequisite chains.
3. **Teamwork between ENGR faculty and counselors has real (albeit intangible) value:** We think it’s valuable to see faculty and counselors working together. It shows that we’re all on the same team and that no one can offer the complete picture on how to navigate college. In-class meetings have resulted in valuable, instant feedback from counselors to faculty on what issues students are facing. This feedback would otherwise be missed and solutions wouldn’t be rapidly implemented across sections like the current model allows

I don’t have a fully formed alternative to the proposed graduation requirements, but perhaps something like **an exception for high-unit majors** could be considered, similar to the exception granted to ENGR during the development and implementation of AS-T degrees. I’m happy to hear counterpoints and other proposed solutions but wanted to make sure the current sentiment of ENGR faculty made it into the discussion.

Thanks for your time and consideration,

Patrick Aderhold, Ph.D.
Engineering Instructor
Bakersfield College
patrick.aderhold@bakersfieldcollege.edu