BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE

1801 Panorama Drive
Bakersfield, California  93305

PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the
Accrediting Commission for
Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 15, 2007
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Certification of the Progress Report 3

Statement of Progress Report Preparation 4

Accreditation Recommendations Implementation Teams 5

Response to the Request of the Commission

  Districtwide Recommendations

    Recommendation 3 7
    Recommendation 8 8
    Recommendation 9 9
    Recommendation 11 11
    Recommendation 13 12
    Recommendation 14 13

  College Recommendations

    Recommendation 1 14
    Recommendation 4 16
    Recommendation 6 19
CERTIFICATION OF THE PROGRESS REPORT
OCTOBER 15, 2007

To: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

From: Bakersfield College
1801 Panorama Drive
Bakersfield CA 93305

This Progress Report is submitted per the requirements of the Accrediting Commission.

We certify that this Progress Report accurately reflects our progress to date in meeting Recommendations 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, and 14, as required by the Accrediting Commission in their corrected letter received March 22, 2007.

Signed:

Kay Meek, President
Board of Trustees
Kern Community College District

Sandra Serrano, Chancellor
Kern Community College District

William Andrews, President
Bakersfield College

Ed Knudson, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Accreditation Liaison Officer
Bakersfield College

John Gerhold, President
Academic Senate
Bakersfield College

Jennifer Marden
Classified Staff Representative
Bakersfield College

John Lopez, President
Student Government Association
Bakersfield College
Statement of Progress Report Preparation

On January 31, 2007, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges informed Bakersfield College that at its meeting on January 10-12, 2007, Bakersfield College's institutional self study report and the report of the October 23-26, 2006 visiting team were reviewed. Subsequently, the Commission reaffirmed Bakersfield College's accreditation with a requirement that the College complete a Progress Report which would be followed by a visit from Commission representatives. The Commission requested that the Progress Report be submitted by October 15, 2007. The Commission letter of January 31 listed only districtwide recommendations and no college recommendations. On March 22, 2007, Bakersfield College received a "Corrected Letter" listing additional College recommendations and concerns that should be addressed in the Progress Report. With only six weeks to initiate work on the College Recommendations it was decided that the College Council would assign responsibility for each Recommendation, but work would commence when faculty returned for the Fall 2007 semester in late August.

This Progress Report was sent electronically to all college faculty, staff, and administrators and was also made available on the college’s Accreditation website. Key committee members and constituency group leaders were provided hard copies. The Board of Trustees formally accepted the Progress Report at their October 4, 2007, meeting.


Signed:

[Signature]

William M. Andrews, President
Bakersfield College

October 15, 2007
Accreditation Recommendations Implementation Teams

Districtwide Recommendations

Recommendation 3: District’s Strategic Plan should direct college’s strategic focus
William Andrews, Bakersfield College President
College Council

Recommendation 8: College follow District Policy in evaluating adjunct faculty
Victor Collins, Interim Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Gregory Chamberlain, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services

Recommendation 9: Develop a written code of ethics for all employees
KCCD Board of Trustees
KCCD Chancellor’s Cabinet

Recommendation 11: Complete development, implementation and assessment of budget allocation model
KCCD Chancellor’s Cabinet

Budget Allocation Model Subcommittee:
Thomas Burke, Chief Financial Officer
Sean James, Internal Auditor
Janet Fulks, Professor, Bakersfield College
Marissa Schiffman, Classified Staff, Bakersfield College
John Griffith, Director of Business Services, Bakersfield College
Gale Lebsock, Director of Business Services, Cerro Coso Community College
Lisa Fuller, Professor, Cerro Coso Community College
Lia Bement, Classified Staff, Cerro Coso Community College
Mary O’Neal, CCA representative
Donna Berry, Director of Business Services, Porterville College
Anne Marie Wagstaff, Professor, Porterville College
Tom Bethurum, Classified Staff, Porterville College

Recommendation 13: Board implement self-evaluation process and revise ethics policy to include procedure for dealing with violation of the policy
KCCD Board of Trustees
Sandra Serrano, KCCD Chancellor

Recommendation 14: Complete an organizational map that delineates roles and responsibilities between entities and identifies an evaluation process
KCCD Chancellor’s Cabinet
Accreditation Recommendations Implementation Teams

**College Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1: College provide training on various planning processes**
William Andrews, President
Ann Morgan, Director of Institutional Research and Planning
Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Ann Morgan and Rachel Vickrey, Co-Chairs
Mildred Lovato, Vice President of Student Services
Sheryl Barbich, Interim Director, Foundation and Institutional Development
Patti Ross, Dean of Learning
Christine Hitchcock, Admissions and Records Supervisor
Mark Staller, Professor, Communication

**Recommendation 4: College develop and articulate an institutional strategic planning framework with links between campus planning, assessment, program review, curriculum, and budget processes**
Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Ann Morgan and Rachel Vickrey, Co-Chairs
Ed Knudson, Vice President of Academic Affairs
Bonnie Suderman, Dean of Learning Resources and Information Technology
Anna Agenjo, Professor and Library Director
Wanda Boardman, Department Assistant, Academic Development
Rachel Vickrey, Professor of Mathematics, Co-Chair of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee

**Recommendation 6: College develop a planning agenda to respond to anticipated staffing needs that reflects changing demographics of the service area**
William Andrew, President
Dan O’Connor, Dean of Learning
James McGee, Director of Information Technology Services
Gay Gardella, Professor, Agriculture
Clark Parsons, Professor, Academic Development
Janie Budy, Program Manager, Career and Technical Education
Responses to the Request of the Commission

Districtwide Recommendations

Recommendation 3: In order to meet the standard and ensure a coordinated and integrated approach to achieving the goals and priorities adopted by the governing board, the team recommends the District Strategic Plan be used to direct the college’s strategic focus and Educational Master Plan (Standards II.A, II. B, & II.C).

Progress and Analysis

The President made a purposeful decision to delay the creation of a Bakersfield College Strategic Plan during the 2006-07 year because the College engaged in two significant studies. One is a national collaborative called the “Foundations of Excellence” which focuses on students’ first year experience. The other is a comprehensive study by the National Center for Developmental Education (NCDE) that will be full distributed at a collegewide meeting held on October 5, 2007. This report analyzes the College’s methods for providing basic skills instruction and services. The results of both of these studies will play an important role in guiding college priorities and direction in the near term, and they will be included in the strategic planning processes as they are tied to the budget.

The College will develop and adopt a formal Strategic Plan during the 2007-08 academic year. This process will be an inclusive participatory activity led by Ann Morgan, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, with the goal of adoption by the Academic Senate, College Council and the District Board of Trustees.

The Kern Community College District’s (KCCD) Strategic Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees on September 7, 2006. In April 2007, every employee in the district was sent a brochure stating the Vision, Mission, Values, Initiatives and Strategies. In December 2006, members of the districtwide management team participated in a workshop on Management and Strategic Development. The workshop included addressing Kern Community College District strategic initiatives, forming teams, and creating action plans. Initiative teams composed of faculty, staff and administration have been formed for each of the six KCCD initiatives. The initiative teams began holding meetings during Spring 2007.

Bakersfield College completed and implemented a strategic plan in 2000. The 2008 Bakersfield College Strategic Plan will clearly link to the KCCD Strategic Plan. The Unit Plans, which are the most significant part of the Educational Master Plan, are being updated with a projected completion date of November 2007. The Strategic Initiatives of the Bakersfield College Educational Master Plan Update will reflect the priorities presented in the District Strategic Plan.

The President of Bakersfield College, with the assistance of the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, is accountable for successfully addressing this recommendation.
Evidence

- KCCD Management Workshop Agenda 12-06
- KCCD Board of Trustees Letter to All Employees re: Vision, Mission, Goals 4-07
- KCCD Strategic Plan
- Bakersfield College Strategic Plan 2000

Recommendation 8: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the colleges follow the Kern Community College District Policy 7D by evaluating adjunct faculty in a consistent, timely manner with procedures that assess current performance and promote improvement (Standard III.A.1.b).

Progress and Analysis

There are several factors that are currently impacting adjunct faculty evaluations within the Kern Community College District and at Bakersfield College.

- Based on a petition submitted by the full-time faculty association (CCA/CTA/NEA) to modify the existing bargaining unit, the Public Employees Relations Board (PERB) ruled that as of April 4, 2007, adjunct faculty are represented by CCA. As a result of that decision, the District and CCA recognize that the evaluation procedure is a negotiable item and it must be addressed as part of the full faculty contract negotiations scheduled to commence in Fall 2007. While the current collective bargaining agreement expires on June 30, 2008, the District and CCA will use an interest-based-bargaining process to seek mutual agreement on a successor agreement prior to that date.

- In July 2007, Kern Community College District and CCA conducted several discussions regarding the applicability of the current collective bargaining agreement to hourly, adjunct faculty based upon the PERB ruling. Among the topics discussed between the parties was the topic of evaluation procedures. The discussions culminated in mutual agreement between the Kern Community College District and CCA that current board policy will be followed for the remainder of the current contract (through June 30, 2008) while negotiations on a successor contract take place.

- Kern Community College District Human Resources has secured an outside consultant to facilitate the re-implementation of the HR module of our integrated management information system. One of the identified outcomes of that project is the tracking of all evaluations within the system of record and the automated generation of evaluation lists. This process will help implement the hourly, adjunct evaluation procedure.

- During Spring 2007, the current Kern Community College District Board Policy 7D was emphasized with each College Vice President and efforts were made to increase the number of hourly faculty evaluations taking place.
In accordance with board policy, Human Resources will provide notice to new hourly faculty of the evaluation process that will be applicable to them during Fall 2007 or Spring 2008. In addition, Kern Community College District Human Resources identified additional hourly faculty that should have been evaluated in Spring 2007 and who will be added to the list to be evaluated Fall 2007. Those evaluations will be conducted in accordance with Board policy criteria of the first year of employment.

In the 2006-07 academic year, it was the goal of the administration, in concert with Faculty Chairs, to evaluate all first time adjunct faculty. In fact, we fell short of that goal, evaluating only a small percentage of adjunct faculty.

For the 2007-08 year, again, Deans and Faculty chairs will evaluate all newly hired adjunct faculty, and will add those adjuncts who are in their sixth semester of work with the college. This is consistent with Board Policy. We will continue to follow Board Policy until we have evaluated all adjunct faculty, or there is a procedural change through the negotiations process.

The Bakersfield College Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs and Student Services are accountable for successfully addressing this recommendation.

**Evidence**

- Kern Community College District Board Policy 7D
- Memorandum of Understanding re: adjunct evaluations
- Notice from Human Resources to new hourly faculty
- PERB Ruling Regarding Adjunct Faculty 7-07Z

**Recommendation 9:** In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the colleges, with appropriate districtwide input, develop a written code of ethics for all employees (Standard III.A.1.d).

**Progress and Analysis**

Two years ago, a faculty member from Cerro Coso College, one of three colleges in the Kern Community College District, expressed interest in taking the lead to develop a districtwide employee ethics policy. Following receipt of the accreditation recommendation, the faculty member was contacted in December 2006 to lead the effort to conduct research and to develop a draft policy.

Commencing in February 2007, a review of books, articles and other references was conducted, agency chief executive officers were interviewed, and higher education ethics policies were studied. Based on the research, a draft code of ethics was written for the Kern Community College District. The draft Employee Code of Ethical Conduct was submitted to the Chancellor in July 2007.
The next step in the process is to take the draft code through the governance consultation process. The consultation process commenced when the draft was introduced at the Chancellor’s Cabinet at its meeting of September 18, 2007. The constituent group members of the cabinet, which includes faculty, classified staff, management and students from each of the three colleges and district office, were directed to present and discuss the draft with members of their constituency and to collect comments and recommendations. Depending on the response to the initial vetting of the Employee Code of Ethical Conduct, additional venues for discussion and input will be established in order to foster understanding and refine the code before forwarding the code as policy to the Board of Trustees for its consideration and ultimate approval. It is expected that the Employee Code of Ethical Conduct will be presented to the governing board by March 2008 and adopted by May 2008.

The development of a draft Code of Ethics has uncovered the need to develop additional policies, processes, and training. Other possible policies to develop include areas such as nepotism, progressive discipline, and fitness for duty. Training will be essential to developing employee and student understanding of ethical expectations, prohibitions, and consequences of actions associated with the Kern Community College District Code of Ethical Conduct.

The Proposed Revision to Board Policy 11E – Code of Ethics was distributed for information to the Bakersfield College Council on September 21, 2007 and to the Academic Senate on September 26, 2007, for communication to the college community’s constituent groups with an expectation that further discussion will take place at the October 19, 2007 meeting.

The President of Bakersfield College, with the assistance of the President of the Academic Senate, is accountable for successfully addressing this recommendation.

Evidence

- KCCD Chancellor’s Cabinet Minutes of September 18, 2007
- Bakersfield College Council meeting minutes of September 21, 2007
**Recommendation 11**: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the colleges, working with appropriate districtwide leadership and in consideration of the special conditions of the individual colleges within the district, complete the development, implementation, and assessment of the budget allocation model (Standard III.D.1.a-d, and III.D.3).

**Progress and Analysis**

The Kern Community College District's Chancellor's Cabinet undertook the task of creating a new allocation model for its unrestricted general funds in Fall 2006. A task force of the cabinet, consisting of faculty, classified staff, and administrative representation from each of the district's colleges and collective bargaining units, was formed to develop proposals for a new model to be utilized for the 2007-08 budget. The task force completed the development of a new districtwide unrestricted fund allocation model in March 2007, forwarding its recommendations to the Chancellor. The model closely follows the new State allocation model resulting from the passage of SB 361. The model development included a period for feedback and forums for comment/input from all district faculty and staff.

The model was adopted April 13, 2007, and utilized to allocate projected unrestricted income for the district office and the three colleges’ 2007-08 budgets. Chancellor's Cabinet will evaluate the impact the allocation model has on the district office and college operations, as well as budget development in 2007-08, prior to the development of the budget for 2008-09.

Bakersfield College has four representatives serving on the Chancellor’s Cabinet: College President, Academic Senate President, CSEA Chapter President, and Student Government Association President. The 2007-08 District Budget, created using the new Allocation Model, was distributed at the Chancellor’s Cabinet meeting of September 18, 2007 and, subsequently, at the September 21, 2007 meeting of the Bakersfield College Council. The Bakersfield College Budget Allocation Model was used to allocate increased unrestricted revenue. The final Bakersfield College 2007-08 budget was presented to the Board of Trustees for approval at its meeting of October 4, 2007.

The President of Bakersfield College, with the assistance of the President of the Academic Senate, is accountable for successfully addressing this recommendation.

**Evidence**

- KCCD Budget Allocation Task Force Roster (see page 5 of this Report)
- KCCD Chancellor’s Cabinet Minutes 9-18-07
- KCCD Board of Trustees Minutes 6-14-07 (work session)
- KCCD Budget Allocation Model
Recommendation 13: In order to meet this standard, the team recommends that the district board of trustees adopt and implement the self-evaluation process being developed and routinely administer the process. In addition, the Board should revise the current ethics policy to include a procedure for dealing with violation of the policy (Standards IV.B.1.g & IV.B.1.h).

Progress and Analysis

The Kern Community College District Board Policy, Statement of Ethics, was added in April 1995. The governing board uses the standards in their Statement on Ethics as criteria in the board self evaluation process. As of September 2007, the district policy on ethical expectations is provided to all trustees at each board meeting as a means of fostering an awareness of ethical expectations.

In January 2006, at the annual retreat of the governing board, the members of the board committed themselves to conducting an annual self evaluation process. The chancellor was charged with developing an evaluation instrument, which was completed in October 2006.

The instrument includes statements of 34 standards of expected knowledge and behavior, which are rated on a scale of 1 to 5; a rating of 1 being minimal and a rating of 5 being exceptional. The Trustee Evaluation Procedure allows each individual board member to self evaluate a particular factor of board knowledge or behavior. It also provides the board member an opportunity to evaluate the perception of the knowledge or behavior of the board as a whole. Additionally, the instrument includes two open ended questions: (1) “What does our board do well?” and (2) “What could our board improve upon?” The board’s own Code of Conduct and Code of Ethics are used as the basis of the evaluation.

The members of the governing board responded to the evaluation instrument in December 2006 and the tabulated results were reviewed and discussed in January 2007 at the governing board’s annual retreat. The members of the governing board will complete the self evaluation instrument annually in December and review and discuss the results each January. The results are used to determine needs for board training.

The Chancellor was charged with revising the existing board ethics statement to include consequences for infraction. The Community College League of California, Board Focus, Volume 8, No. 1, winter 2006, was utilized as a resource to revise the current board’s statement of ethics policy. The board’s president or vice president will ensure that allegations of ethical violations are examined and appropriate sanctions are imposed. The draft revisions were presented to the governing board in September and adoption is expected by December 2007. This timeframe will provide for appropriate study, review, and consultation.

The Proposed Revision to Board Policy 11E – Code of Ethics, distributed at the September 18th Chancellor’s Cabinet, was distributed for information to the Bakersfield College Council on September 21, 2007, for communication to the college community’s constituent groups with an expectation that further discussion will take place at the October 19, 2007, meeting.
The President of Bakersfield College, in coordination with the Chancellor of the Kern Community College District and the President of the Board of Trustees, is accountable for successfully addressing this recommendation.

Evidence

- Proposed Revisions to Board Policy 2E, Board Self Evaluation
- KCCD Chancellor’s Cabinet Minutes of September 18, 2007
- Bakersfield College Council meeting minutes of September 21, 2007

**Recommendation 14**: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the colleges, in conjunction with districtwide leaders, complete an organizational map that clearly delineates the roles and responsibilities between the entities and identifies an evaluation process that will provide for ongoing improvement (Standard IV.B.3).

**Progress and Analysis**

For the purposes of clarifying the governance and decision making process for the Kern Community College District, a document entitled A Process of Decision Making was developed in 2006. This document includes an introduction and describes the process for creating or revising governing board policy and procedure and identifies the districtwide committee structure for participatory governance in decision making. Included in the document is a diagram of the Kern Community College District governance process.

Based on the recommendation of the accreditation teams, the district office searched for an existing, effective district model for an organizational map for decision making. Only two models were identified, one for the West Hills Community College District and another for the Ventura Community College District. The matrix for decision making developed by West Hills CCD was adapted for the Kern Community College District.

The draft organization map for decision making in the Kern Community College District was created in July 2007, by the district’s Executive Council, which includes the three college presidents. The draft was introduced into the consultation process in September 2007, and input will be sought to finalize the document by February 2008. The consultation process will commence with the KCCD Chancellor’s Cabinet. The membership of the Chancellor’s Cabinet includes faculty, staff, students and administrators representing all constituent groups at each college and the district office. Each constituent group will examine the document through their respective governance groups and provide input to the final document. Recommendations will be directed to the Chancellor’s Cabinet for further discussion until a final document is prepared for dissemination districtwide by Spring 2008.

The President of Bakersfield College, in coordination with the Chancellor of the Kern Community College District, is accountable for successfully addressing this recommendation.
Evidence

- KCCD Process for Decision Making document
- KCCD Organizational Mapping draft document 7-07
- Bakersfield College Governance Process Chart

College Recommendations

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 insures completion of a full cycle of planning and broad-based evaluation (Standards I.B.6 and I.B.7).

Progress and Analysis

During Summer 2007, the Bakersfield College President’s Cabinet identified all known planning processes which are: (1) Annual Goal development process, (2) Unit Plan development with Educational Master Plan update process, (3) Budget Development Process, (4) Program Review Process, (5) Faculty and Classified Staff Position Requests Prioritization Process, (6) the Student Learning Outcomes Implementation Plan, (7) Class Schedule Development Process, and (8) Enrollment Management Plan.

Members of the Standard I Steering Committee met during Summer 2007 to initiate discussion on how best to provide collegewide training on the above listed planning processes and considered a tentative implementation timeline to insure completion of a full cycle of planning, training, and broad-based evaluation. The final implementation timeline will be reviewed by the College Council at its meeting on October 19, 2007, and implemented immediately thereafter.

Members of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and Institutional Research and Planning Office met during spring and summer 2007 to develop new Unit Plan templates, and the Academic Senate approved the templates in September 2007. Implementation of the templates will be over a two-year period, optional in 2007 and required in 2008. The template incorporates feedback from departments who expressed dissatisfaction with previous unit plan outlines, as well as suggestions for demonstrating alignment of unit needs and outcomes with Bakersfield College processes and the district strategic initiatives. The template includes a revised outline, directions, and tables for units to use in demonstrating how their mission and outcomes support strategic initiatives, as well as institutional level and general education outcomes.

Planning Process training needs for Department Faculty Chairs and Unit Directors were discussed at the first Faculty Chairs and Directors Council meeting in September. At that meeting, new timelines and expectations for developing Unit Plans were introduced. The new timeline emphasizes a two-month period this year for incorporating institutional unit data into Unit Plans. Additionally, they were asked what will be most helpful for training, as well as to complete a short needs assessment form during the meeting. The new annual planning and evaluation timeline will
address: (a) incorporation of the Unit Plans into the Program Review process, (b) the new budget development timeline, and (c) references to assessment data.

One campus-wide flex activity was held on August 23, 2007. Its purpose was to solicit input concerning the new annual planning and evaluation timeline so that revisions might be made prior to initiation of this activity. The 2007-08 Planning and Evaluation Implementation Timeline is currently in use.

Evaluation of planning process training and annual planning timeline will be accomplished via a questionnaire, managed by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, to ascertain training helpfulness and need for improvement. Participant feedback in the questionnaire will inform and improve future trainings and materials.

The President of Bakersfield College, with the assistance of the Director of Institutional Research and Planning, is accountable for successfully addressing this recommendation.

Evidence

- 2007-08 Planning and Evaluation Implementation Timeline
- Program Review Process
- Student Learning Outcomes Implementation Plan
- Budget Development Process and Flow Chart
- Bakersfield College Governance Process Chart
- Bakersfield College Institutional Planning Process
- Program Review Process
- Faculty and Classified Staff Position Requests Prioritization Process
- Bakersfield College – Educational Master Plan – Three-Year Calendar
- Unit Plan Template 2007
- Faculty Chairs and Directors Council Process Training Needs Assessment Survey Results
- Faculty Chairs and Directors Council Process Training Needs Assessment Form
**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 (Standards II.A, II.B, II.B.1, II.B.3, II.C, II.C.1.c, and Standard III.D).

**Progress and Analysis**

The College will develop and adopt a formal Strategic Plan during the 2007-08 academic year. This process will be an inclusive governance activity, with the goal of adoption by the Academic Senate, College Council and the District Board of Trustees.

The President made a purposeful decision to delay the creation of a Strategic Plan during the 2006-07 year because the college was engaged in two studies; one a national collaborative called the “Foundations of Excellence” which focuses on the student first year experience. The other is a study by the National Center for Developmental Education that examined the College’s methods for providing basic skills instruction and services. The results of both of these studies will play an important role in guiding college priorities and direction in the near term and should be included in the strategic planning processes as they are tied to the budget.

- Foundations of Excellence was undertaken during the 2006-07 academic year as a collaborative in conjunction with California State University, Bakersfield. After training on the nine dimensions of excellence, campus committees generated a detailed self study resulting in action plans for initial implementation in 2007-08. The action plans were initially presented at an open campus meeting in May 2007 and were widely distributed in Fall 2007 so prioritization and budget support could be assigned.

- The National Center for Developmental Education completed three campus visits throughout Spring and Summer 2007 to investigate the College’s developmental education program. The visits focused in turn on instructional offerings, student service support and administrative support. The final reports will be distributed to the campus by the end of October 2007 with a concise review of commendations and recommendations. The most directly impacted departments will help confirm campus implementation priorities. Part of the review process includes training. The first training took place on September 21 and the rest will be conducted based on campus priorities throughout the end of Fall 2007 as well as in January 2008.

Further, the college has a fully developed Educational Master Plan with annual review and updates through the budget and unit plan processes. The Strategic Plan’s effectiveness will be enhanced through the incorporation of the studies and action items developed through the Foundations of Excellence report and the action items developed from the study of the NCDE. These will be planned and budgeted for through this year’s unit plan updates and Program Review cycle.

The following activities were completed during the 2006-07 academic year and will directly impact the development of the Bakersfield College Strategic Plan:
• The assessment process moved from the development of class level student learning outcomes to course level and production of program level outcomes for most programs. Institutional Level Outcomes were also developed by the Assessment Committee and approved by the Academic Senate with the provision that the General Education Outcomes drive the process.

• The assessment plan called for faculty to begin collecting evidence at the class level of outcomes, and the assessment committee formalized a full plan for outcomes assessment.

• The General Education Subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee completed a proposal on general education categories, category definitions and student learning outcomes for each category in 2006-07. This proposal has been approved by the Curriculum Committee and is awaiting action by the full Academic Senate.

• The goal for 2007-08 is to complete the general education program outcomes by developing criteria for determining course inclusion in the general education program, by receiving Academic Senate approval of the entire program, and by developing an assessment plan and cycle for assessing general education outcomes.

• The Institutional Effectiveness Committee formalized a new process for program review. For academic units, the new process improves linkage between curriculum review and program review, whereby a full curriculum review precedes each program review. This ties curriculum to planning and budget processes.
  
  • The program review process is formally conducted by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee every six years for each program. For its purposes, programs are defined as academic and service departments as presented in the Unit Plans. Each Unit Plan is being closely aligned with the Program Review process to ensure that the budget building process is informed by the program review effort and that it is a dynamic, cumulative process rather than episodic. A process for reporting budget priorities exposed through the program review process and sharing budget decisions made in support of requests via program review is being developed. This step will help make the links of review to budget more visible to all on campus.

  • The new program review process will begin to incorporate an Appreciative Inquiry activity in its formal process. Appreciative Inquiry also served as the catalyst for a revision of the Unit Plan format. This format requires the inclusion of data from outcomes assessment, previous budget data, and a detailed discussion of future goals directly relating to budget resource requirements. In this planning process of the Unit Plan, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee is asking that faculty and classified positions be treated as budget requests and be driven by curricular changes, expansion of offerings, retirements, etc.
The Institutional Effectiveness Committee review is reported to College Council which will endorse or reject it, based on budget priorities, as part of the budget building process. College Council recommendations are forwarded to the President.

A budget building process was adopted by the College Council after its submission by its Budget Subcommittee. The process begins in October 2007, which allows for consideration of the Board of Trustees Goals for the coming year (submitted each spring), and the College’s annual goals. It is then finalized in the spring and early fall. Additionally, Unit Plans are finalized in November in order to incorporate the data from the previous year which is consolidated over the summer and given to units in October. Further, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee presents recommendations to the College Council over the course of the year. These recommendations may be incorporated into developing coming year College Goals, annual Unit Plan updates, and budget development.

The Faculty Chairs and Directors Council, an operational committee comprised of instructional department chairs, student services directors, all college deans, and co-chaired by both Vice Presidents, develops a prioritized recommendation list for faculty position hiring that is presented to the College President. This process precedes budget development. Further, the Faculty Chairs and Directors Council including representatives from the classified staff develops a similar list for the hiring of new classified positions. This has been parallel to budget development in the past year, but will be altered to precede budget development in the future. The unit plans are directly developed by the faculty and the chairs and directors in collaboration with their deans. Therefore, this committee helps set budget recommendations based upon this front-line planning mechanism.

The results at each stage of the process are communicated by the subcommittee or task force to College Council or appropriate Senate committee for wider distribution. A record of the work by each group is stored electronically in “public” folders in Microsoft Outlook (the campus e-mail mechanism). All employees are subscribers to this mechanism; therefore everyone has access to the progress and status of the work at each stage of the process.

Hard copies of minutes, agendas, reports, resolutions and actions of each committee or task force are available through the co-chairs of each group.

Further, the meetings of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, College Council, Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Chairs and Directors Council are digitally recorded and stored electronically. A link to these digital recordings is published via electronic mail to the campus community.

These activities have been in the development stage for the past two years. As they have been implemented through pilot processes, the forms, timelines and reporting requirements at each stage have been analyzed and revised. Academic year 2007-08 will be the first year that an entire budget and planning cycle will be conducted as set forth in the foregoing.
The President of Bakersfield College is accountable for successfully addressing this recommendation.

Evidence

- DRAFT Reports from the National Center for Developmental Education 10-07
- Institutional Effectiveness Committee minutes and forms
- Assessment Committee minutes 2-7-07
- The Kern Community College District Strategic Plan
- Strategic Initiatives of the Board of Trustees
- Bakersfield College Goals
- General Education Subcommittee minutes 3-29-07
- Curriculum Committee minutes 4-12-07
- Academic Senate minutes, agendas and resolutions 10-11-06, 10-25-06, 11-8-06
- Faculty Chairs and Directors Council minutes

Recommendation 6: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the college develop a planning agenda that will respond to anticipated staffing needs and reflect the changing demographics of the service area (Standard III.A, III.A.4.b).

Progress and Analysis

After classes began on August 27, 2007, a meeting of the Equal Opportunity Advisory Committee was called by the President. At this meeting the committee was charged to develop a planning agenda that would be implemented for the 2007-08 faculty and staff prioritization/hiring cycle. The Committee will take leadership in implementation of an action plan for the planning agenda. The following points, developed by the President’s Cabinet in Summer 2007, were provided as guidance.

- The regular faculty hiring cycle begins in November of each year. Faculty members who submit their letter of resignation by October 1 receive financial remuneration. During the same time period, the college is notified of its fulltime faculty obligation for the next Fall. With these two sources of information combined with academic unit plans, the Faculty Chairs and Directors Council implements the Faculty Position Request Process and Timeline.

- The regular new classified staff positions hiring cycle begins in the spring of the year with a final decision made during the summer months or after the State budget is signed by the Governor. Replacement classified staff hiring, as appropriate, occurs throughout the year.

- In January 2007 the President submitted an initial Bakersfield College Staffing Plan to the Chancellor. It includes all permanent, regular employees of the college. During the Fall 2007 semester administrators are talking with every employee, in an effort to determine future retirement dates, gender and ethnicity to add to the Plan demographics.
As described above, determination of faculty staffing needs across the college will occur in early Fall as a precursor to formal budget building. This will enable the College to scrutinize its needs, and be on the leading edge of the recruiting process which will hopefully yield more diverse applicant pools. Further, the Administration, the Department of Marketing and Public Relations, and the Human Resource office are beginning to recruit applicants from non-traditional sources (Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and Kern County Black Chamber of Commerce) in an effort to broaden applicant pools, and draw from across the local and regional population.

In October 2007, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning gathered student and service area demographic data.

As selection committees hold their initial meetings, unit or department employee gender and ethnicity data, student gender and ethnicity data, and service area gender and ethnicity data will be reviewed. Selection committees will be encouraged to be mindful of gender and ethnic imbalances, and, while always forwarding as finalists the most highly qualified candidates, make a conscious effort to ensure that college department and unit personnel reflect the gender and ethnicity of both the student and service area populations.

Each selection committee has a diversity representative to ensure confidentiality, equitable treatment of all candidates, and inclusive hiring practices. The diversity representatives are appointed by the Equal Opportunity Advisory Committee, not by the selection committee chairs. Annual training is provided to the diversity representatives to ensure consistency of practice and support.

In addition to the priority of clarifying campus staffing needs to ensure a diverse faculty and staff, the campus is also broadening its discussion of diversity as a concept worthy of ongoing dialog and training. Training opportunities are being provided with funding from Staff Development Coordinating Council, Title V and Basic Skills Re-Allocation dollars that broaden the discussion of the importance and power of acknowledging diversity in the classroom and the college workplace. For example, several faculty shared lessons learned about strategies to increase Latino/Latina retention at a Fall 2007 flex inservice session. A faculty learning cohort is working throughout the fall to explore better ways to foster inclusion and engagement in the classroom, especially given the diverse students in our classes. More training sessions on understanding Generation X and Generation Y students are being planned.

The President of Bakersfield College is accountable for successfully addressing this recommendation.

Evidence

- Faculty Position Request Process and Timeline
- Procedure for Hiring Classified Staff