

President Report for March 15, 2023

Interim BC President

The new permanent KCCCD Chancellor will appoint the new permanent BC President. After Chancellor Christian leaves on June 1, we will have an interim Chancellor and we'll start the search for a new permanent Chancellor. In the meantime, we will have an interim College President. Steve Watkin was appointed by the Board of Trustees to be the interim College President at their March 9 meeting. He will begin his job on May 15, 2023. His contract has not yet been posted. BP 7250 states that Educational Administrators have contracts *up to* four years in duration.

District Consultation Council February 28, 2023

Chancellor's Update:

- Chancellor Christian was appointed the new California Community Colleges Chancellor at the February 23, 2023 Board of Governor's meeting. She will begin her new job on June 1. She will establish a satellite office of the CCCCO at the Weill Center, so she will be able to do some of her Chancellor duties while still in Bakersfield.
- Faculty emeritus recognitions at the March 9 BOT meeting: Gayla Anderson, Moya Arthur, John Giertz.
- Enrollments are greater than at any time in our history, breaking pre-COVID levels.
- Teaching and Learning Exchange Festival on April 14, 2023 at BC from 10 am to 3 pm.
- A page and a half list of grants, grants, grants!

Board Policies Updates

We had first reads for chapter 4 (Academic Affairs) and chapter 5 (Student Services). The great majority of the updates were to language flow without making substantive changes to the meaning. Other changes were made as required by changes in Education Code or Title 5 regulations. Update of BP 3810 (Claims against the District and Service of Process). BP 2220 = Addition of Board of Trustees committee Student Success with Equity (DEIA)

Academic Calendars

Second reads of the 2024-25 calendar and 2025-26 calendar. These are the consolidated calendars that the individual colleges can fix their own spring breaks. All three colleges must begin and end their fall and spring semesters at the same time. Summers are flexible.

Faculty Proportion on Participatory Governance Committees

This section contains conclusions of personal research and personal opinion as allowed in the President's Report. It is not endorsed by the BC Senate, Bakersfield College or KCCD administration, State of California, etc.

There is a prevalent misconception about whether or not faculty must be the majority (vs. being a plurality) on our participatory governance committees. Having a faculty majority is a *tradition* of Bakersfield College but is not required by AB 1725. Before March 1, five of the eleven participatory governance committees at BC did not have faculty majority. On March 1, the Senate voted to increase that to six of the eleven when the faculty *proportion* was reduced in order to increase the classified staff *proportion* (faculty number increased slightly while the classified number increased greatly to bring it closer to the faculty number). Whether this was the right thing to do will be the subject of an upcoming referendum. ***We should be very clear on the reasons for how we vote on these matters because of the significant effect it will have on working relations for many years to come.***

The main argument against the new EODAC charge is that EODAC reduced the proportion of faculty from 63% to 39%. This has been the most popular argument: it was made six times and by four different people at the [February 15th meeting](#). At timepoint 00:18:15, 01:21:46, 01:25:25, 01:34:34, 01:48:42, 01:57:33. As part of that argument it was expressed three times what happened at the "Budget committee" with some of the classified siding with the administration.

The "Budget Committee" that Steven Holmes referred to is the ***Districtwide*** Budget Committee, not the local BC Budget Committee. At the ***Districtwide*** Budget Committee's October 7 meeting, *some* of the classified voted against the faculty position while other classified voted in favor of it. All of the administration on DWBC used the upcoming recession fear argument and voted against the faculty. It was the classified that deadlocked DWBC, so it could not endorse the administration position.

The local BC Budget Committee has the [same percentage of faculty as the new EODAC charge](#) and has had that percentage—approved by the Senate—since November 14, 2018. The local BC Budget Committee unanimously supported the Budget Reserve 6200/6250 resolution at their meeting on September 26, 2022. [See the minutes to September 26 meeting](#). The discussion about the resolution is on the third page. Ricardo Jimenez—a classified staff person—seconded the motion in favor of endorsing the resolution to be brought forward to the Senate. All of the classified voted in favor of endorsing the resolution, supporting the faculty position. Also see the [Budget Committee's October 19, 2022 report to the Senate](#). It states "(Note: Resolution passed Budget Committee [with] all faculty support. Overall, all Budget Committee members, except one administrator, voted in favor of the Resolution.)" The administrators in attendance abstained and the admin co-chair did not vote, so it was an unanimous vote of support. The admin assistant to the Vice President Finance + Administration, sitting right next to her boss, voted in favor of the resolution.

The argument against the drop in faculty proportion was expressed numerous times in the previous academic year as well. There was a lot of confusion of what was a “Senate Committee” in the faculty majority argument these past two years, which is why I created the [Committee term cheatsheet](#) shared with the Senate at the Feb 15 meeting to keep our definitions clear.

As part of the faculty majority argument, it has been stated that AB 1725 *requires* a faculty majority of members on committees that include 10+1 matters in their charge. That does not appear to be the case, so that argument should not be used. [AB 1725 states](#) the “right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.” This *does not* mean faculty must have majority representation on participatory governance committees. It *does* mean the Academic Senate has “final say” on curriculum and academic standards.

In fact, NONE of the reference documents put out by the ASCCC say that there must be a majority of faculty on participatory governance committees with 10+1 matters in their charge. Read the following ASCCC documents to see this for yourself:

- [Local Senates Handbook \(2020\)](#)
- [Participating Effectively in District and College Governance \(2020\)](#)
- [Scenarios to Illustrate Effective Participation in District and College Governance \(2020\)](#)
- [California Community Colleges: Principles and Leadership in the Context of Higher Education \(Spring 2009\)](#)

Our [Board Policies](#) do not say anything about the proportion of faculty on our participatory governance committees. There are other colleges that do have equal classified and faculty proportions on their participatory governance committees: West Hills (all committees), Clovis (some committees), Butte College (some committees), City College of San Francisco (all committees), Santa Barbara City College (most committees), Grossmont College (all committees), College of Alameda (all committees), and some of Cerro Coso’s committees. CCSF’s Diversity Committee, Grossmont’s Staffing Committee, and Santa Barbara’s EEO Advisory Committee have faculty/classified/administration equal proportions. CCSF has a separate faculty-only professional development committee, program review committee, and Student Learning Outcomes committee.

It is true that having a faculty majority makes it easy to ensure “rely primarily upon” for any possible 10+1 matter that might come up in a committee but even then, these committees, which can *only make recommendations*, must get approval from the Academic Senate for 10+1 matters and we have monthly reports from the participatory governance committees (now codified in our By-Laws). An EODAC made of just classified staff, administration, and students would continue to do all of its current tasks for just the classified, administration, and students. This fact may actually be an

argument for, at least in the case of the classified and students, that they should have a greater say in those tasks' effects on them than they had in the old EODAC charge.

SO: the arguments that AB 1725 requires a faculty majority on participatory governance committees and that the example of the "Budget Committee" shows what can happen with just a faculty plurality representation are based on incorrect assumptions and information. The faculty majority representation on half of our participatory governance committees is a *tradition* of Bakersfield College, *not a requirement* because of law. If you support the faculty majority argument, be clear that it is because it is a *tradition* of Bakersfield College you want to keep, not because you have to due to a legal mandate.