The documents in this packet will describe the change in Bakersfield College's program review process and the committee that is responsible for that, the Program Review Committee, that was approved in Spring 2011. All of the following documents are from the April 13th and May 4th meetings of the Academic Senate.

Documents are presented in chronological order as they were reviewed and approved by the Academic Senate. The minutes for the Senate meetings where they were formally approved are also included in this packet.

NAME OF COMMITTEE	*PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC)*
COMMITTEE CHARGE	The Program Review Committee (PRC) will help ensure the institution has a systematic way of reviewing effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student services and administrative/operational areas, act as a resource and provide training to programs scheduled for review and provide recommendations, commendations and budget implications in response to reviews completed. Programs at Bakersfield College will be scheduled for review on a six-year cycle to correspond with the Accreditation cycle with instructional programs scheduled the year following curriculum review. Committee members: - Attend meetings regularly. - Participate in committee training. - Provide training for programs undergoing Program Review. - Review each program's document, verify the validity and complete the recommendation form. - Evaluate the processes used for Program Review annually and modify as necessary to meet the needs of the institution. - Participation in the Accreditation Standard Subcommittees is encouraged.
SCOPE OF AUTHORITY	Program Review recommendations will be the primary source of information to develop institutional planning as related to enhancing student learning and administrative unit outcomes.
COMMUNICATES WITH	College President, College Council, Curriculum Committee and Assessment Committee
COMPOSITION	- Administrative Co-chair - Faculty Co-chair Committee composition will include 50% full-time faculty (appointed by the Academic Senate), 25% classified staff (appointed by CSEA) and 25% administrators (appointed by the College President). Individuals are encouraged to serve for at least a period of two years.

March 24, 2011

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE (IEC)

Senate Proposal for Change

IEC submits this proposal for change to the Purpose and Procedures document of this committee last revised March 8, 2006 with the Bakersfield College Academic Senate. The following are the major changes to this document:

Issue: The name of this committee does not represent its purpose. Particularly in preparation for accreditation, the term 'institutional effectiveness' is used in a more comprehensive sense, causing confusion about the mission of this committee by many.

Rationale: This change more adequately represents the primary purpose of this committee. The committee has program review as its primary mission and is not specifically involved in all matters of institutional effectiveness.

Background/Institutional History: Upon the dissolution and split into separate committees of the Budget and Program Review Committee, it was decided to institute a completely different name to avoid confusion between the new committee and the previous, combined committee.

Opposition: Members have heard no opposition to this name change.

Solution: Change the name of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) to the Program Review Committee (PRC).

Issue: Committee member liaisons are required by the current procedure to be appointed to programs completing program review. Often there are not enough members willing or able to volunteer as liaisons. Members performing this duty in the past are not all convinced of its value to the process.

Rationale: Members of IEC offer workshops and individual training sessions to those leading the program review process. Evaluations are provided upon the conclusion of the process. IEC would like to remain flexible in considering the evaluations and meeting needs of those producing documents.

Background/Institutional History: Earlier in history, committees were formed for each program review. The transition to the entire committee reading all documents lent itself to liaisons at the time.

Opposition: Program leaders (chairs, directors, etc.) may prefer a liaison member from IEC.

March 24, 2011

Solution: Remove the requirement to appoint liaisons from the procedures document and allow the committee to remain flexible. If we find that liaisons are needed and available, such a move could take place as one of our modes of training.

Issue: The procedure document for IEC states that this committee reports to the Curriculum Committee. There appears to be no reason to do so, although the two committees must work together so curriculum review is an integral part of program review.

Rationale: The procedure document for IEC needs to reflect the working process of the committee. IEC needs to stay connected to the Curriculum Committee in order to work in conjunction to ensure programs are evaluated completely. IEC does not need to report to the Curriculum Committee.

Background/Institutional History: At the time that the IEC was created, it was anticipated that some of the recommendations based on program review would affect curriculum. This has not been the case.

Opposition: No opposition is expected.

Solution: Omit the requirement for IEC to report to the Curriculum Committee and add the process step that notifies departments to complete curriculum review prior to completing program review. Curriculum Committee will notify the Program Review Committee when programs complete curriculum review.

Issue: The table giving examples of membership for years one, two and three in the current procedures document is confusing and unnecessary.

Rationale: The current documents state that IEC will be comprised of at least 17 members. This number has not been met in some time. The explanation of the percentages involved is also very confusing (see table in the 'Composition' portion of the document). The issue of the essential involvement of faculty members is lost in the confusion.

Background/Institutional History: The chart was intended to assist in creating the new committee. This is no longer needed.

Opposition: As the percentages will remain the same, no opposition is anticipated.

Solution: Remove the table used for examples of membership numbers from the IEC Purpose and Procedures document and reword to reflect the current membership needs of the committee.

March 24, 2011

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
~~Institutional Effectiveness Committee~~
PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES

PURPOSE:

~~Institutional Effectiveness Committee: The Institutional Effectiveness Committee will oversee assessment and evaluation of programs. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee will act as a resource to instructional and student services programs to develop their assessment plan. All programs at Bakersfield College will be scheduled for review on a six-year cycle to correspond with the Accreditation cycle. Members are encouraged to participate in the Accreditation Standard Subcommittees.~~
~~The Institutional Effectiveness Committee will be responsible for all program reviews (Instructional, Student Services and Administrative/Operational).~~

The Program Review Committee (PRC) will help ensure the institution has a systemic way of reviewing effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student services and administrative/operational areas, act as a resource and provide training to programs scheduled for review and provide recommendations, commendations and budget implications in response to reviews completed. Programs at Bakersfield College will be scheduled for review on a six-year cycle to correspond with the accreditation cycle *with instructional programs scheduled the year following curriculum review.*

~~The p~~Program review recommendations will be the primary source of information ~~for College Council~~ to develop ~~the institutional master plan~~ *institutional planning* as related to enhancing student learning and *administrative unit* outcomes. The ~~Institutional Effectiveness~~ *Program Review* Committee reports the Program Review results to College Council~~, Curriculum Committee~~ and the College President. *The Program Review Committee will collaborate with the Assessment and Curriculum Committees to ensure overall institutional effectiveness.*

PROCEDURES:

Program evaluation is a process which examines instructional, student services, and administrative/operational programs, and assesses them in terms of the mission and goals of the college and district, the needs of the community, and provision of service to students. The program review process will ~~focus on student learning outcomes assessment to~~ align with the theme*s* of the Accreditation Standards developed by the Accreditation Commission of Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC). The programs will engage in conversations about their goals, measuring and demonstrating that goals are being achieved. This evaluation will lead to improvement of specific programs as well as overall institutional effectiveness.

March 24, 2011

The process of evaluation will take place on a six-year cycle. This includes evaluating and updating the ~~self-study~~ program review to reflect the implementation of recommendations and address ongoing assessment. The format and criteria for these studies will include both descriptive and evaluative information, (program's mission statement, goals, etc.) with an emphasis on student achievement and improving student learning for instructional, student services and administrative/operational programs.

Program Review Process:

1. ~~Institutional Effectiveness~~ *Program Review* Committee will notify program managers, department chairs, etc., about the timeline for completing the review process.
2. *As Curriculum Review is an integral part of Program Review, if Curriculum Review for instructional units has not been completed when due, departments will be notified that the committee will not accept program review documents until Curriculum Review is complete.*
3. *Program Review Committee will provide training to departments scheduled to complete a review.*
4. *Program Review Committee will indicate a due date for the completion of the program review draft that is no sooner than 6 weeks following the beginning of each semester.*
5. *Faculty and staff of the programs scheduled will complete a draft program review using forms provided by the Program Review Committee and provide the completed review to the committee by the due date.*
6. *Program Review Committee will examine the draft document and provide commendations and recommendations to the program, providing a new due date for the revised final document.*
7. *Programs will not be required to complete more than one revision of the document during their scheduled cycle.*
8. *Faculty and staff of the programs receiving commendations and recommendations from the committee complete a revised final document and provide to the committee by the due date.*
9. *Program Review Committee will vote on and provide final commendations, recommendations (if needed), a summary of the document and budget implications (evaluation of requests).* Documented justifications present in the program review are noted as budget implications.
10. *Program Review Committee will report conclusions to the program, College Council and the College President. As the institution continues to strengthen links of planning to budget, other committees may receive documents and conclusions as approved by the Academic Senate and Administrative Council.*
11. *Faculty and staff will present highlights of the program review to College Council and other committees as approved by the Academic Senate and Administrative Council to strengthen links of planning to budget.*

March 24, 2011

12. ~~Institutional Effectiveness Committee will recommend at least one committee member, external to the program under review, who would act as a liaison to the faculty and staff of the program.~~
13. ~~Faculty and staff of the program, in consultation with the liaison will complete the self-study using the "Program Evaluation" format.~~
14. ~~The self-study will be submitted to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee 4-6 weeks before it is scheduled to be presented at an Institutional Effectiveness Committee meeting.~~
15. ~~Institutional Effectiveness Committee will review the self-study and recommendations prior to the program making its presentation.~~
16. ~~Institutional Effectiveness Committee will vote on the recommendations and report the findings and conclusions to the College Council, the Curriculum Committee and the College President.~~
17. ~~If recommendations indicate that follow-up is needed, the program area will have to submit a follow-up report as requested by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee on the progress made on the recommendations. Reports may be due in six-month increments, up to three years.~~

12. In order to link the budget and planning processes at Bakersfield College, ~~Institutional Effectiveness~~ Program Review Committee makes recommendations to the College President, College Council and other committees based on the following criteria:

a) ~~The Curriculum Review (if required) and the~~ Program Review documents were completed and turned into the ~~appropriate~~ committee on time.
b) The documents show the program has been self-reflective.
c) ~~The budgetary needs including dollar amounts have been documented in Unit Plan and Program Review documents over a period of time.~~
d) Budgetary requests for additional resources must provide evidence of one or more of the following:
   - Impacting students and community.
   - Impacting core classes or transfer classes.
   - Enabling innovation in the program.
   - Enabling assessment of learning outcomes.
   - Bringing program to industry standards.
   - Making program more competitive with other educational options.

~~Recommendations are made for the following three –year budget cycle for equipment, faculty, and staff as well as recommendations for one-time purchases in the current budget year. Dollars will be distributed based on institutional priorities.~~

COMPOSITION:

The composition of the *Program Review* ~~Institutional Effectiveness~~ Committee:

~~This committee will be comprised of at least 17 individuals from the Bakersfield College employee group (50% full-time faculty, 25% classified and 25% administrators)~~ *The*

Program Review Committee(PRC) will have one Faculty Co-Chair and one Administrative Co-Chair. Committee composition will include up to 7 full-time faculty (appointed by the Academic Senate), 3 classified staff (appointed by CSEA) and 3 administrators (appointed by the College President), in order to achieve the ideal composition of at least 50% faculty and no more than 25% each of classified staff and administrators. If the Academic Senate deems more (or fewer) faculty are necessary to the operation of the committee, the composition percentage must apply and classified and administrative membership adjusted accordingly. Training in the process of *program review at Bakersfield College will be provided for committee members.* ~~These individuals will serve as liaisons to the programs. Each individual will serve for a period of two years.~~ Members are *encouraged* to serve for a term of at least two years and may serve more than one term.

~~(if 17 members = 9 faculty, 4 administrators, 4 classified)~~

~~Year 1~~	~~Year 2~~	~~Year 3~~
~~(9) members for a two-year term:~~ ~~(5) faculty~~ ~~(2) classified~~ ~~(2) administrators~~ ~~(8) members for a one-year term:~~ ~~(4) faculty~~ ~~(2) classified~~ ~~(2) administrators~~	~~(8) members for a two-year term:~~ ~~(4) faculty~~ ~~(2) classified~~ ~~(2) administrators~~	~~(9) members for a two-year term:~~ ~~(5) faculty~~ ~~(2) classified~~ ~~(2) administrators~~

~~If the committee has 17 members the Academic Senate will appoint the 9 full-time faculty members, the CSEA will appoint the 4 classified members and the College President will appoint the 4 administrators.~~

~~Institutional Effectiveness~~ *Program Review* Committee Members:

Responsibilities:

- *Attend meetings regularly.*
- Participate in program review training.
- Provide training for programs undergoing program review.
- Review ~~the self-study~~ each program's document~~, verify the validity of the self-study~~ and complete the recommendation form.
- Evaluate the processes used for program review annually and modify as necessary to meet the needs of the institution.
- *Participation in the Accreditation Standard Subcommittees is encouraged.*

~~Regular attendance at Committee meetings is expected of all members; however, committee meetings and voting on all issues (including program presentations) will take place with a 51% attendance. Absentee voting on program recommendations will not be~~

March 24, 2011

~~allowed.~~ *When at least 51% of members are present, adequately reflecting the three employee groups, voting will be allowed.* After three consecutive absences the Chair ~~will~~ may request the appropriate body to appoint another member.

The purpose, composition, or procedures of the ~~Institutional Effectiveness~~ Program Review Committee can be altered only upon mutual agreement of the Academic Senate and College President.

Bakersfield College's Academic Senate derives its authorization fundamentally from Assembly Bill 1725 (AB1725) as it affects the provisions governing the California Community Colleges in the *Education Code,* specifically from **SEC. 4(s)(1), (s)(3), (t), (t)(1), (t)(3), and (t)(8);** and *Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations,* specifically from **Article 2, Sections 53200, 53201,** and **53203.** Based on these references in the *Education Code* and *Title 5,* Kern Community College District, in its ***Board Policy and Procedure Manual* – Sections 6A, 6B, and 6G-** recognizes the Academic Senates of the district's colleges as the representatives of the faculty charged with making recommendations with respect to academic and professional matters to the presidents and management teams of each college, to the District Chancellor, and to the Board of Trustees. By extension – as provided by *Title* 5, **Article 2, Section 53203 –** this recognition applies to any designees of an academic senate, in this case the faculty members of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee at Bakersfield College. Pertaining to the issues that are the concern of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, the faculty members on the Committee will serve as representatives of the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate will intervene only if the procedures in this document are changed or violated, or if the Committee exceeds its authority as defined in this document.

Pertaining to district and college policies and procedures that have a significant impact on classified staff, CSEA representatives are authorized to jointly develop these processes pursuant to specifications outlined in Classified Participation in Governance, SEC 51023.5, (a)(4), (a)(5), et al, of subchapter 1 of chapter 2 of division 6 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations**.**

March 24, 2011

Program Review: Senate Proposal for Change

Issue: Program Review must be linked to institutional planning and resource allocation processes.

Rationale:
1. 	To make Program Review a meaningful process.
2. 	To meet Accreditation requirements: "Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples" (*Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness—Part I: Program Review* available at 	http://www.accjc.org/all-commission-publications-policies).
3. To meet Recommendations 1 and 4 from the Accrediting Commission (based on the 2006 Self Study and available at http://www.bakersfieldcollege.edu/about/accreditation/)

- **RECOMMENDATION 1**
  In order to meet the standard and fully implement the planning processes that the college has put into place, the team recommends that the college provide training on the various planning processes, including use of data in unit planning and program review, and set an implementation timeline that ensures completion of a full cycle of planning and broad-based evaluation **(Standards I.B.6 and I.B.7).**
- **RECOMMENDATION 4**
  In order to meet the standards, the team recommends the college develop and articulate an
  institutional strategic planning framework with links between campus planning, assessment,
  program review, curriculum and budget processes. In addition, the college should develop a system to provide information on programs, finances and these processes on a continuous basis to planning participants **(Standard II.A, II.B, II.B.1, II.B.3, II.C, II.C.1.c and III.D).**

Background/Institutional History: The college has struggled to link planning, program review, and resource allocation. Many attempts have been made to solve this problem. The Budget & Program Review Committee (B&PR) was split into several parts: Faculty Chairs and Directors Council (FCDC), College Council, and Budget Committee. While FCDC and College Council continue to function, the budget committee has, until this semester, been an ad hoc committee with different charges and membership from year to year. College presidents have typically relied on unit plans and not program reviews as they made budget allocations. Now the Budget Committee is a standing committee with a specific charge. However, the connection between unit plans and programs reviews is still unclear. Program Reviews are reported to College Council but not connected to the budget or planning process.

The 2006 visiting accreditation team from ACCJC recognized the problem and issued Recommendations 1 and 4 to address it. In response, the college stated the following in its 2009 Midterm Report: "By the end of Spring 2010, Program Review forms will have undergone a major revision to align the content and terminology with its corresponding elements in the unit plan. After changing the content and formatting, the next step will be to put all the forms and materials online (*2009 Bakersfield College Midterm Report*, page 15, available at http://www.bakersfieldcollege.edu/about/accreditation/).

At the end of fall 2010, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) asked the Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) to work on aligning the unit plan and program review processes. Current and past co-chairs of IEC serve on ASC, as do other IEC members.

Kate Pluta, Accreditation Steering Committee Co-chair, April 13, 2011

Drafts of the proposal have been presented to the Academic Senate, College Council, IEC, and the Budget Committee. College Council has representatives from FCDC. The proposal will go to FCDC soon, with a presentation at the meeting on April 29.

Opposing Views: (for illustrative purposes only—there may be others)

Why do we have to change?
Why does the unit plan have to change?
Why does the program review process have to change?

Response:
The college needs to link planning, program review, and resource allocation.

The unit plan, with a few additional questions and a change in how it is reviewed and responded to, meets the requirements of program review.

Every year, one of the following clusters (Basic Skills, Gen Ed/Transfer, CTE, Library and Student Support Services, and Administrative Services) would meet to work on Integrated Program Review (IPR) to discuss how they fit together to improve institutional effectiveness and to "refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning" (*Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness—Part I: Program Review* available at http://www.accjc.org/all-commission-publications-policies).

Solution: Please see the attached FAQ's, which detail the Annual Program Review proposal.

Kate Pluta, Accreditation Steering Committee Co-chair, April 13, 2011

ACADEMIC SENATE
April 13, 2011, 3:30 P.M.
COLLINS CONFERENCE CENTER

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Corny Rodriguez (EB); Bill Moseley (EB); Diana Kelly (EB); Natalie Bursztyn (EB); Kate Pluta (EB); Rachel Vickrey; (EB); Matthew Morgan (EB); Michael Korcok (EB); Leah Carter (EB); Phil Whitney; Christian Zoller; Kathy Rosellini; Nancy Guidry; Maria Perrone; Reggie Bolton; Bill Kelly; Debbie Kennedy; Klint Rigby; Sue Granger-Dickson; Rick Brantley; Melinda Fogle-Oliver; Diana Jackson; Jeannie Parent; Gayla Anderson; Anna Poetker;

ABSENT: John Gerhold (EB); Janet Fulks (EB); Luis Guajardo; Adel Shafik; Kathy Freeman; Richard Marquez; Jason Stratton; Terry Meier; Shane Jett; Wesley Sims; Kimberly Hurd; Marsha Eggman;

GUESTS: Nick Strobel

_____

CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 3:42

REVIEW OF THE MINUTES
A motion was made to approve the minutes as presented. M/S/C: B.Kelly/Rosellini

REPORTS
President's Report (Rodriguez)
- Corny asked for feedback as soon as possible on the KCCD Strategic Plan.
- Corny announced and congratulated the 2011-12 Senate Officers and Senators:

- At the request of the Executive Board, Dr. Chamberlain has increased the Senate reassigned time from 1.200 to 1.400 in total. The Executive Board has determined that it will be distributed in the following manner: Senate President, .400; Accreditation Co-chair, .200; Curriculum Co-chair, .200; EODAC Co-chair, .100; Program Review Co-chair, .200; ISIT Co-chair, .200; and SDCC Co-chair, .100. The Executive Board will continue to advocate for additional reassigned time as the Executive Board identifies the work involved with each of the positions.
- The Senate approved a motion reverting catalog language related to cheating and plagiarism back the 09-10 catalog language. This motion was communicated to Executive Vice President, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg and she also attended the Executive Board meeting to discuss. Nan provided her concerns with not following the legal opinion and further clarified her position that cheating is conduct and is not a measurement of academic performance. Executive Board members felt the two could not be separated.

Co-Chair Reports
There were no committee reports.

Correspondence
Natalie Bursztyn reported that a get well card had been sent to A. Todd Jones and that a card will be sent to Kenward Vaughn.

Treasurer
There was no report

CCA Report
Kathy Rosellini reported that CCA will conduct officer elections on April 13 and 14 and encouraged faculty to vote. Kathy also reported on an email sent by Andrea Garrison that includes topics being addressed in contract negotiations today, April 13. Faculty should look for an update from Andrea about this session.
SGA (Student Government Association)
There was no student report.

Budget Committee (status update)
Budget documents have been added to the committee's website, which can be found at
http://www.bakersfieldcollege.edu/collegecouncil/budget/index.asp.   Of particular interest will be a detailed account of how
the college carryover has been spent year to date. Based on information provided during the CCLC's weekly budget call,
there is still a small amount of hope that the tax extension measure will be put on the ballot by June 15.

Enrollment Management
There was no report from the Enrollment Management committee.

BILT
This group has met and recommends that TMC classes should not be cut and should receive priority for staffing.
Discussion will continue on priority registration for students with 90+ units; determining which courses below transfer level
will be taught; identifying faculty to champion the technology training needs of faculty and developing policy related to
raising success rates of online courses.

ASCCC
There was no report on ASCCC activities.

OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE SENATE

ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA *(must be added with a 2/3 vote of members present)*
A motion was made to add as New Business C, Academic Senate Reassigned Time and as New Business Item D, Grade
Change. M/S/C: Bursztyn/Rosellini

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS
A motion was made to approve the committee appointments as presented. M/S/C: Bursztyn/Rosellini

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
IEC Change Proposal
A motion was made to approve the proposal as presented. M/S/C: Bursztyn/Rosellini. Diana Kelly noted that there may be
additional modifications as the Accreditation Steering Committee continues to work on linking budget and planning.

Senate Proposed Budget
A motion was made to approve five student scholarships at $800 each; a $350 contribution to the Levinson Award and $600
for faculty retiree gifts. M/S/C: Bursztyn/Rosellini

Policy For Online Student Drops.
Phil Whitney has served on a pilot project related to the implementation of Luminis. Last fall, Phil identified 10+1 issues
related to the pilot that impacted curriculum that he then shared with the Executive Board. Phil expressed concern with
those issues not being resolved before Luminis is launched this summer and asked for information on the status of those
issues.

Bill Moseley shared a proposal of Senate recommendations related to the implementation of Luminis and integration of
Moodle. Bill explained that as Moodle is linked to Luminis, some of the features faculty use and how faculty teach using
Moodle with be changing. Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg has agreed that these issues fall within the 10+1 purview. Nan, along
with the other college Vice Presidents have been charged with developing the policy related to issue with faculty input. Bill
reviewed the proposed recommendations that Nan has agreed to take forward. For clarification, Moodle is available this
summer but the waitlisted students will not be allowed in the class until they are registered. It was suggested that this be
communicated not only to those who teach online but all faculty who use Moodle. It was also noted that Moodle and
Luminis can operate separately. It seems the integration is being pushed through without all of the instructional issues
being worked out.

A motion was made to move the recommendations forward to Nan Gomez Heitzeberg, Greg Chamberlain, Sean James and College Council members with the understanding that they be implemented for fall and that Moodle users be notified about the impact to their classes. M/S: Vickrey/Whitney. A friendly amendment was made by Bursztyn that the recommendations be implemented for the summer term. A second friendly amendment was made by Carter adding that if the issues stated below are not resolved that the integration will not take place until they are resolved.   Both friendly amendments were accepted and the motion carried unanimously.

Related to this issue, it was noted that the Distance Education committee will meet soon to develop the online waitlist policy.

Budget Impact By Discipline
Senators shared from their departments strategies they are using to address the budget situation. Many expressed reductions in sections as the primary response.   Others described an ongoing loss of adjuncts, reduction of lab hours, and many departments are eliminating entire course and program offerings.

NEW BUSINESS
Program Review Process
Kate distributed FAQ and Change Proposal documents for the Senate to review. Kate pointed out that the proposal eliminates the current program review that is done every six years and changes the unit plan process to the annual program review process. The new annual program review process will include additional questions and would link to the college goals, among other things, proving a link to budget and planning. PRC membership would change slightly to allow for more broad representation. There will be rubric to evaluate the program reviews. Kate explained that an FAQ document is being developed for the integrated program review and curriculum review. Senators should be prepared to vote on this item at the next meeting.

**A motion was made to suspend the agenda, moving to New Business Item C, Reassigned Time. M/S/C: Bursztyn/Korcok

A motion was made to have an emergency vote on New Business Item C, Reassigned Time. M/S/C: Bursztyn/Vickrey
A motion was made to approve the reassigned time presented. M/S/C: Rosellini/Bursztyn

Catalog Committee
Corny asked for volunteers to serve on a committee that will review and update as needed the catalog.

**A motion was made to suspend the agenda, moving to New Business Item D, Cheating and Plagiarism. M/S/C: Bursztyn/Korcok

Cheating and plagiarism
Corny explained the current situation where an administrator has changed a grade assigned by an instructor based on an appeal from the student. Corny asked for discussion and input from Senators on how to respond. Senators clearly feel that grades are within their purview and expressed concern with giving a student a passing grade when the course had not been completed. A motion was made requesting that the Executive Vice President, Nan Gomez Heitzeberg, provide in writing and citing Education Code, the rationale for changing the grade. M/S/C: Bursztyn/ Whitney.

GOOD AND WELFARE AND CONCERNS

ADJOURNMENT at 5:17

Annual Program Review (APR)

Who prepares it?
The department/unit

What does the APR look like?
- Includes a trigger to ensure curriculum review occurs at least every six years for every course (currently curriculum review occurs prior to program review (every six years).

- Uses current unit plan format with limited additional questions (examples):
    - What curricular changes has the department/unit made including adding or deleting courses; adding prerequisites; changing units; and modifying, adding, or deleting degrees and certificates?
    - What curricular changes has the department/unit made in online and distance education?
    - What department/unit best practices might help other college departments/units? Include contact information.
    - How do the Retention/Success rates of Face-to-Face courses vs. Online/Distance Ed courses compare?
    - How do the Retention/Success rates of large classes vs. small classes compare?
    - How do the Retention/Success rates of Basic Skills Courses vs. essential transfer courses (i.e. Engl-2, Phil-9…) compare?
- Includes hiring requests (faculty and new and replacement classified staff).
- Examines department/unit effectiveness and possible improvements if needed, based on assessment data, including student success and retention rates, as well as other Student Success Indicators.
- **Evaluates the APR Process:**
    - What is good about this APR process?
    - How can we improve the process?

What must the APR reference?
- College goals (developed by College Council)
- Budget criteria (developed by Budget Committee)
- Assessment data (includes student success indicators and SLOs data)
- Improvements or changes as a result of completing the cycle by documenting the changes made in the department/unit due to the department's evaluation process.

Who receives and responds to it?
- Department/Unit Administrators

- Program Review Committee (PRC)
  - 2 Co-Chairs: Institutional Researcher and Faculty (will also serve on Academic Senate Exec Board)
  - 4 Administrators: selected from Student Services, Instruction, Facilities, and IT
  - 4 Classified Representatives: appointed by CSEA
  - 8 Faculty: appointed by the Academic Senate--Assessment Co-Chair; FCDC Representative; five (5) from areas directly related to one or more of the accreditation standards (Library, CTE, General Education, Basic Skills, Student Support Services), and one (1) at-large member. The initial term for faculty shall be three (3) years, ending May 2014.
  - 1 student

How do they respond to it?

- Rubric based on college goals, budget criteria, assessment data, and improvements as a result of completing the cycle by documenting the changes made in the department/unit due to the department's evaluation process.
- Summary response to all APRs which synthesizes common themes and issues.
- Summary response includes Appendix of Best Practices, with contact information.

Who gets the Rubric Response?

The department/unit

Who gets the Summary Response?

- The Senate President, who informs the Academic Senate
- The College President, who informs Administrative Council
- College Council, which represents all groups, including classified staff.

How else is the Summary Response reported to the college community?

In writing via

- Public folders
- Website
- College Committees

Who responds to the Summary Response?

The College President and College Council

Who receives the College President's response?

The college community.

How does the APR link to the budget?

Through the use of the budget criteria.

What is the timeline?

The APR must be integrated in the budget cycle.

Fall: APR

Spring: Integrated Program Review (IPR), beginning 2012-13

Who conducts training?

Program Review Committee

COMPOSITION:

The composition of the Program Review Committee:

The Program Review Committee (PRC) will have one Faculty Co-Chair and one Administrative Co-Chair. Committee composition will include:

8 full-time faculty, appointed by the Academic Senate, with representation in the following areas:

> 1 Career and Technical Education (CTE)
> 1 General Education (GE)
> 1 Basic Skills
> 1 Student Services
> 1 Library
> 1 Faculty Chair and Directors Council (FCDC)
> 1 Assessment Committee liaison
> 1 at-large

Up to 4 classified staff appointed by CSEA. CSEA recommends the following representation:

> 1 Student Services
> 1 Instructional
> 1 Administrative
> 1 CSEA President or designee

Up to 4 administrators appointed by the College President. The committee recommends the following representation:

> 1 Student Services
> 1 Instructional
> 1 Facilities
> 1 Information Technology

1 Student representative appointed by the Student Government Association (SGA).

This will achieve the ideal composition of at least 50% faculty and no more than 25% each of classified staff and administrators. If the Academic Senate deems more (or fewer) faculty are necessary to the operation of the committee, the composition percentage must apply and classified and administrative membership adjusted accordingly. Training in the process of program review at Bakersfield College will be provided for committee members. Members are encouraged to serve for a term of at least three years and may serve more than one term.

ACADEMIC SENATE
May 4, 2011, 3:30 P.M.
COLLINS CONFERENCE CENTER

APPROVED MINUTES

PRESENT: Corny Rodriguez (EB); Bill Moseley (EB); Diana Kelly (EB); Natalie Bursztyn (EB); Kate Pluta (EB); Rachel Vickrey; (EB); John Gerhold (EB); Janet Fulks (EB); Michael Korcok (EB); Leah Carter (EB); Phil Whitney; Christian Zoller; Kathy Rosellini; Nancy Guidry; Kimberly Hurd; Maria Perrone; Reggie Bolton; Bill Kelly; Debbie Kennedy; Marsha Eggman; Klint Rigby; Sue Granger-Dickson; Rick Brantley; Melinda Fogle-Oliver; Diana Jackson; Jeannie Parent; Gayla Anderson; Nick Strobel; Terry Meier; Shane Jett; Anna Poetker; Wesley Sims;

ABSENT: Matthew Morgan (EB); Luis Guajardo; Adel Shafik; Kathy Freeman; Richard Marquez; Jason Stratton;

GUESTS: Michael Moretti; Tom Greenwood

CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 3:36

REVIEW OF THE MINUTES
A motion was made to approve the minutes as presented. M/S/C: Rosellini/Gerhold

REPORTS
President's Report (Rodriguez)
- From District Consultation Council, Corny reported the following: There will be Luminis training on May 17, August 16 and 17; Barnes and Noble has been awarded the bookstore contract; Help Desk contractor is not meeting the agreed upon response time but there is an increased call volume; the Senate needs to provide feedback on the Strategic Plan today.

- As other campuses have reviewed the unit restriction for priority registration policy approved by the BC Senate, there has been a request to consider 15 units. The Senate needs to consider the change.

- Interviews for EODAC, SDCC and PRC Co-Chairs will be next week. There has not been any interest expressed for the Curriculum Co-chair.

Co-Chair Reports
ASC This report was deferred to Unfinished Business Item B, Program Review Process.

Curriculum (Fulks)
- At the state level there is movement toward losing all repetition for activity courses—this will affect multiple disciplines. The legislature and LAO are pushing this issue. External requirements for vocational classes will not be affected. This issue seems to be with the term "activity."   Faculty should consider crafting curriculum to show different learning outcomes and may need to stay with latest version. Since intercollegiate athletics is on the table then it would be a good idea to have Football A, B and C.

- The Curriculum Committee is suggesting two faculty co-chairs, but seems to have been rejected by the Executive Board. Janet suggested that the job could not be done with only .200 reassigned time. It was clarified that the Executive Board is in support of the idea of two co-chairs but that the college president did not allocate enough total reassigned time to the Senate that could be distributed in a way to support two co-chairs.

- TMC is moving quickly and changes are occurring every day, such as changes to names. There may need to be some re-massaging of psychology and communication curriculum.

IEC/PRC
Diana Kelly directed Senators to the composition document and explained that the PRC is recommending further changes to the committee composition than those that were approved at the April 13 Senate meeting. The changes represent broader representation and rather than listing the number of faculty, classified and admin the composition now lists how each member will be selected. Diana would like the Senate to approve these changes.

ISIT
In regards to the ongoing Luminis/Moodle integration, Bill Moseley has been pushing for a quick decision. Bill will be meeting with Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg and Bonnie Suderman to continue this discussion.

ASCCC
John Gerhold reported that several resolution related to repeatability were addressed at Plenary. This biggest impact being the vote to eliminate the category of activity courses form Title 5. ASCCC will identify repeatability for each discipline with some proposals moving forward to the Board of Governors by the end of May.

AB 515 would establish a mirror of the extension university components that are offered with CSU and US at the Community College. If the law passes colleges would be authorized to offer regular courses, but also offer them on a fee based system so that those that could pay could demand an additional section of course X. On the surface that sounds creative but general response to that is it is creating a two-tiered system and those with resources have an advantage over those without financial resources. There is no fee limit. ASCCC voted not to support the legislation.

Correspondence
Natalie Bursztyn reported on student scholarships that were awarded from Senate-- five scholarships were awarded and one of those recipients has already sent a thank you note. Natalie also reported that a sympathy card was sent to Becki Whitson and notes of congratulations were sent to Matthew Morgan and Bill Moseley.

Treasurer
There was no treasurer's report.

CCA Report
Kathy Rosellini reported that faculty should have received an email from Mary O'Neal reporting the CCA elections results.

SGA (Student Government Association)
There was no SGA report.

Budget Committee (status update)
Budget criteria will be available soon. It is the intent the criteria will be sent to College Council, Friday, May 6, 2011; however, the Senate will have an opportunity to review and give input.

OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE SENATE
Sue Granger-Dickson: Resolution to Declare Transfer in September
Sue asked the Senate to consider a resolve to create and recognize a BC Transfer Week. There is currently a Transfer Day and this week would coincide with that event. Sue suggested that faculty could wear their college paraphernalia and share their own college experiences with students.

ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA *(must be added with a 2/3 vote of members present)*
A motion was made to add New Business E, Resolution for Transfer M/S/C: Gerhold/Bursztyn

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS
A motion was made to approve the committee appointments as presented. M/S/C: Bursztyn/Granger-Dickson

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
Distance Education Participation Policy
Nancy Guidry introduced the policy and explained that the Distance Education Committee looked at policy from around the country and asked for input from Bill Moseley and Leah Carter. The proposed policy has been written to be as close to face-to-face courses. There were differing opinions on whether instructors should be expected to drop students or they should have the option to drop them. It was suggested to add Education Code or Title 5 language that requires dropping students Also there was a suggestion not to move forward with this policy until the Luminis/Moodle issue is resolved, but others felt it was important to strengthen language for all classes, as we move from access model to success model.

A motion was to have an emergency vote on this item. M/S/C: Gerhold/Bursztyn

A point was made that by giving instructors the option of dropping students, this also give students the opportunity to receive financial aid. Another suggestion was made to make the two weeks statement rewritten in a way to allow for shorter term courses.

A motion was made to approve the policy as written using the existing catalog language. Using "may" to allow instructors the option to drop and modifying the two week language.   M/S/C: Bursztyn/Carter

Bakersfield College
Distance Education Attendance and Non-Participation Policy
All students enrolled in Distance Education courses must log in to the course(s) and complete any assignment(s) or other activities, to be determined by the instructor, that are required during the first week. Students who fail to complete first-week assignments/activities within the instructor's deadline will be dropped.
After the first week and during the time period before the final withdrawal date, "students are responsible for officially withdrawing from any class or classes in which they no longer wish to be enrolled," as stated in the Bakersfield College Catalog. (See the catalog section "Withdrawing from Classes" for additional details.)
The Bakersfield College "Attendance Policies: Class Attendance" (see the BC catalog) states that "instructors may drop a student from a course when absences number the equivalent of two weeks of class recorded from the first day of instruction." In the case of Distance Education, "absences" shall be defined as "non-participation." Instructors may drop students after the equivalent of two weeks of non-participation from the first day of class. Non-participation shall be defined as, but is not limited to:
  * *Not following the instructor's participation guidelines as stated in the syllabus*
  * *Not submitting required assignments*
  * *Not contributing meaningful discussion in required chat rooms, discussion boards, or other online forums*
  * *Not participating in scheduled activities*
  * *Failure to communicate with the instructor as required*

It should be noted that simply logging into the course, does not constitute participation. Students must demonstrate that they are actively participating in the course by submitting required assignments, contributing to discussion forums, etc. as outlined above.

Syllabus statement:

Instructors may drop students after the equivalent of two weeks of non-participation in accordance with "Distance Education Attendance and Non-Participation Policy." (Instructors must provide a link to this policy with this statement in their syllabus.)

Program Review Process

Kate Pluta introduced draft 12 and explained how the annual program review (APR) will be modified from the existing annual unit plan process.   This change is intended to make sure the process is meaningful. The current process will look at the annual program reviews and will write a summary that includes a summary of themes and issues that need to be addressed – this will go the Senate president, College Council and college president. The college president would then respond to the college community.   The integrated program review (IPR) will be postponed one year and will use the annual program reviews to guide the IPR process. APRs will have additional questions from unit plans and may be different for administrative, student services and instructional areas.

 A motion was made to approve the process as presented. M/S/C: B.Kelly/Granger-Dickson. The motion carried with one abstention

Catalog Committee

Corny asked for volunteers to review the front part of the college catalog each spring. There was a motion to table this decision until Janna Oldham was consulted about an appropriate timeline for this review. M/S/C: Vickrey/Bursztyn.

Grade Change

Natalie Bursztyn presented a resolution related to the issue of an administrator changing a grade that was previously assigned by an instructor.   This resolution is in support of the faculty member's decision of the grade assignment and resolves that the grade be changed.

Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg has not yet responded to the Senate request for a written response. There was a suggestion that Corny follow up with that request from Nan.

A motion was made to have an emergency vote on this item. M/S/C: Gerhold/B.Kelly

Discussion continued with suggestions for changes to the resolution so that it reads as follows:

Whereas Title 5 §55025 states in part, "In any course of instruction in a community college district for which grades are awarded, the instructor of the course shall determine the grade to be awarded each student in accordance with this article;" and Kern Community College Board Policy Section 4C4C states that the "instructor shall determine the grade to be awarded each student… [which] shall be final in the absence of mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetence;" and

Whereas a failing grade assigned by an instructor that was contested by a student was changed to a B on or around April 1, 2011 without the instructor's approval and no compelling case for "mistake, fraud, bad faith, or incompetence was made to justify this grade change; and

Whereas the records concerning this failing grade indicate a total of 314 points completed by the student out of 455 possible points; which equates to the student earning 69% of the possible points; which is a D per the course syllabus; this includes a grade of 0 for exam 3 on which the student was found to have cheated; and
Whereas the remaining 2.5 weeks of that semester constituted an additional 240 points possible, including the final exam, that the student did not attempt, totaling 695 total course points possible, reducing the student's total earned points for that course to 314 out of 695 (= 45%); therefore, the student's true grade, based on the course syllabus, is an F; and

*Whereas Title 5 §55002 states that "The course provides for measurement of student performance in terms of the stated course objectives and culminates in a formal, permanently recorded grade based upon **uniform standards** in accordance with section 55023. The **grade is based on demonstrated proficiency in subject matter** and the ability to demonstrate that proficiency…" Assigning a grade of a D is generous, considering the student failed to complete the last 2.5 weeks of the semester and the associated work during that time. As noted above, the student's grade should truly be based on the entire semester's work. The student should still be required to complete the missed work; and*

Whereas other students in the course took the final exam and earned A, B, C, D and F grades based upon completing all the course requirements; therefore, the assigning of a grade of "B" to this student violates the aforementioned Title 5 section based on uniform standards; and

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate of Bakersfield College demands that the inappropriately and administratively assigned grade of "B" be changed to the instructor recommended grade of "D," which reflects the grade earned by the student up to the date the student stopped attending class for this course; and

Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate of Bakersfield College takes this action not simply in support of an individual faculty member, but in defense of Title 5 and KCCD Board Policy sections as outlined above which stipulate that the grade assigned by a faculty member "shall be final in the absence of [instructor] mistake, fraud, bad faith or incompetence."

A motion was made to approve the resolution as presented with suggested changes. M/S: Gerhold/Rosellini. The motion carried with one abstention.

**A motion was made to extend the meeting time by 15 minutes. M/S/C: B. Kelly/Rosellini

Emeriti
A motion was made to approve reinstating those that were previously listed as emeriti in the college catalog, prior to the policy implemented in May 2010 that removed the names, be grandfathered and once again listed in future college catalogs. M/S/C: Brantley/Rosellini

NEW BUSINESS
KCCD Strategic Plan
There were no suggestions for changes to the Strategic Plan.

BC General Education Pattern
Bakersfield College has approved General Education, which is different than CSU, by requiring units from each subcategory rather than a total from each category.   It was suggested that Curriculum look at the need for general education next year.

A motion was made to make this a voting item. M/S/C: Gerhold/Korcok

A motion was made to modify the general education pattern in Area D such that the student must complete 9 total units from two different disciplines. M/S/C: Gerhold/Whitney

**A motion was made to suspend the agenda and move to New Business Item D, 2011-12 Academic Senate and Executive Board Meeting Schedule. M/S/C: Rosellini/Meier

Assess Senate Goals
This topic was tabled.

2011-12 Academic Senate and Executive Board Meeting Schedule
A motion was made to approve the 2011-12 meeting schedule. M/S/C: Bursztyn/Rosellini

Resolution to have transfer week
A motion was made to approve the creation of Transfer Week at Bakersfield College to coincide each year with the existing Bakersfield College Transfer Day. M/S/C: Gerhold/Burstyn

GOOD AND WELFARE AND CONCERNS

ADJOURNMENT at 5:21