

ACADEMIC SENATE of BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE

February 29, 2012, 3:30 P.M.
Collins Conference Center

APPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Corny Rodriguez (EB); Kate Pluta (EB); Michael Korcok (EB); Kimberly Hurd (EB); Wesley Sims; (EB); Leah Carter (EB); Matthew Morgan (EB); John Gerhold (EB); Rick Brantley (EB); Nick Strobel (EB); Bill Kelly; Melinda Fogle; Jason Stratton; Anna Poetker; Christian Zoller; Kris Stallworth; Nancy Guidry; Susan Pinza; Phil Whitney; Janet Tarjan; Gayla Anderson; Terry Meier; Luis Guajardo; Kathy Freeman; Klint Rigby; Reggie Bolton; Patrick Fulks; Barbara Braid;

ABSENT: Bill Barnes (EB); Maria Perrone; Lisa Harding; Jeannie Parent; Marsha Eggman; Shane Jett; Sue Granger-Dickson;

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m.

REVIEW OF THE MINUTES

A motion was made to approve the minutes as presented. M/S/C: Gerhold/Whitney

REPORTS

President (Rodriguez)

- At District Consultation Council (DCC), there was discussion about the forthcoming DegreeWorks software that will allow students and staff to understand better what students need to accomplish their goals.
- At the C6 Consortium grant meeting there was discussion about getting the TMCs approved. It was clear that the TMCs are templates and do have options. Also at that meeting were breakout sessions focusing on TMC development in the areas of Kinesiology, Business Administration, Criminology, and Early Child Education.
- Corny reminded Senators about the current nomination period for Senate representatives and officer elections. If there is no nomination, the position will remain vacant for the two-year term. Also coming soon will be a call for co-chairs of Curriculum and ISIT.
- At the next Senate meeting, Senators can expect to have a draft revision of the Constitution & Bylaws to review and expect for Dr. Jensen to attend the next meeting.
- There was a question about when the Senate can expect an answer from PC and CC on the online waitlist issue. Corny will ask for a date.

Accreditation

Kate Pluta reported that an email from the college president will be sent to all employees on March 1 with a link to the first edition of the self-evaluation. Senators were encouraged to read the document over the next two weeks and give feedback. There was a request for hard copies to be provided in the Senate office and Library. Kate agreed to forward the request to the SEC co-chairs.

Budget

Corny reported that the committee met on Monday, February 27 with interim president, Robert Jensen. The committee is reviewing state, district and college budget development timelines as well as other documents such as the collegewide committee reports and the program discontinuance policy.

It appears that college reserves are adequate to carry the college through 2012-13 fiscal year. Cuts are possible but will most likely be implemented in the 2013-14 fiscal year. It was noted that department

chairs have been asked to build their fall schedules with 7% of courses in reserve. These courses will be built into the schedule as “ghost” courses and will only be released if necessary.

Curriculum

Bill Moseley reported that the committee continues to work as quickly as possible. The priority is to approve those requests for substantive changes over routine curriculum reviews so the courses can be included in the catalog.

Enrollment Management

Michael Korcok reported that internal scan data is being compiled and that he will be able to report on that at the next Senate meeting.

EODAC

Matthew Morgan asked if Senators had any feedback on whether to include students during the teaching demonstration conducted during the hiring process. Most Senators with feedback indicated their departments did not support including students. There were concerns about confidentiality and how students would be selected. It was also noted that including students is a standard practice at other colleges and a suggestion for EODAC to research how it is done elsewhere.

SDCC

Kimberly Hurd reported that SDCC has not met since the last Senate meeting so there was nothing new to report. SDCC will meet on Friday, March 2, 2012.

Correspondence

Wesley Sims has no correspondence on which to report. It was requested that condolence cards be sent to both Greg Chamberlain and to Rebecca Head.

CCA

Nancy Guidry reported that CCA officer nominations will begin on March 5 and that online voting will be held March 28 and 29. Nancy also noted that hard copies of the faculty contract are still in review but should be printed and available for faculty soon.

Articulation/Transfer

Barbara Braid reported on behalf of Sue Granger-Dickson that the state Chancellor is expecting all community colleges to offer 25 AA and AS degrees for transfer if the program is offered by 2014. It was noted that currently there are only 18 TMCs available.

OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE SENATE

There were no requests 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 with replacement of Matthew Morgan for Maritza Carlisle on the English screening committee. M/S/C: Carter/Whitney

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

13-14 & 14-15 Academic Calendars

After discussion and review of the feedback provided by the Senators at previous meetings, the Executive Board agreed to make a recommendation on the academic calendar. A motion was made to accept the 2013-14 and 2014-15 academic calendars with a modification of the fall term start date one

week later to allow for a week of instruction following the Thanksgiving holiday. M/S: Gerhold/Korcok. The motion carried with one objection and one abstention. Corny will take this recommendation to CCA and together CCA and the Academic Senate presidents will present to District Consultation Council.

Review College Mission

John Gerhold explained that the Executive Board has reviewed the mission statement and the request of College Council to reaffirm the mission until a more thorough review can be done through the strategic planning process. Based on that discussion, John made a motion for the Senate to accept the current language with the understanding that the mission statement will be more thoroughly reviewed during the strategic planning process occurring later this spring. Bill Kelly seconded the motion.

For clarification it was explained that the college did review and revise the mission in 2008 but that the mission has not been formally reviewed since that time. College Council has recommended a thorough review be done during the strategic planning process. One Senator noted that faculty will have opportunity for input later during the strategic planning process and the Senate should move this forward to that process. There was a concern that if the Senate delays taking action on this matter, it will affect the Senate's credibility. Another Senator expressed concern about the Senate's credibility when voting on an item that was not marked as a voting item on the agenda. It was then noted that the motion on the floor was out of order and was withdrawn.

A motion was made to make this topic a voting item today. M/S: Sims/Korcok. The motion carried with one abstention.

A motion was made to recommend to College Council that they incorporate language to address the Senate concern about incorporating student learning into the mission and resubmit for the Senate to approve. M/S/C: Stratton/Meier.

Common Assessment (Gerhold)

Senators were to bring feedback from their areas on what action, if any, the Senate should take. It was noted that it would be valuable for the Senate to go on record showing support for maintaining local control over cut scores. There was discussion if a motion would be sufficient or if a resolution would be more helpful in order to better arm the Senate president to address the Board of Trustees, Chancellor and during consortium discussions on the matter.

A motion was made to task the Executive Board with generating a brief resolution on this topic and present to Senate for approval at the next meeting. M/S/C: Gerhold/B.Kelly.

NEW BUSINESS

SLO Course Assessments

Course SLOs and assessment are now available through CurricUNET and there is concern about identifying individual faculty. There was a sense from the Senators that this information is already available. Senators were asked to be prepared for further discussion at the next meeting. Senators asked for clarification on what information is the college required to provide, who is accessing this information, and what will it be used for. Additionally, it was suggested that Bernadette Towns attend the next meeting and provide an example of what will be posted in CurricUNET.

Bookstore Issues

Corny reviewed the issues of concern such as book request verifications by email but books not being in the bookstore, not enough books or class packs being ordered and books for the same class being shelved in different locations. After a meeting with bookstore manager and college administration, Corny feels these issues will be resolved. The bookstore is working on an online book ordering system

for faculty. There was a request to also explore some mechanism for notifying instructors when a book is out of stock and cannot be supplied by the publisher before classes begin.

Institutional Transfer Plan

Senators were asked at the last meeting to provide feedback on the proposed Institutional Transfer Plan. It was noted that neither students at the Delano Center nor extended learning/evening students were mentioned. Questions included whether there are any plans to increase faculty as one part-time counselor does not seem adequate to meet these needs; whether BC will be hosting site visits to four-year institutions and if so, how transportation will be provided for those with disabilities; and, why there seems to be an emphasis on Cal Berkeley when most students transfer to Cal State Bakersfield?

Parking Fees

Several Senators shared feedback from their departments on the proposal to charge faculty for parking. Most areas do not support this. Specifically it was noted that the idea feels like a pay cut and that it feels insulting to pay to go to work. There were also questions of concern about how this would affect adjunct, those who use other means of transportation, parking at other district sites and if the fees would be used for parking lot maintenance or be used for other purposes. There were suggestions to have new faculty pay for parking and to raise the semester permit fee for students so the daily permit was less appealing. It was noted this is not a 10+1 issue and suggested to refer this issue to CCA to resolve through negotiations

Student Achievement Data & College Data

This topic was not addressed to a lack of time.

GOOD AND WELFARE AND CONCERNS

ADJOURNMENT at 5:03

Respectfully Submitted,
Jennifer Marden