

ACCREDITATION SPECIAL REPORT

SUBMITTED TO THE

**ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES
OF THE
WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES**

OCTOBER 15, 2009

BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE

**1801 PANORAMA DRIVE
BAKERSFIELD, CA 93305**

CERTIFICATION OF THE SPECIAL REPORT

DATE: October 15, 2009

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

FROM: Bakersfield College

This Special Report is submitted as required by the terms of Bakersfield College's 2006 accreditation site visit. We certify that there was broad participation by the campus community and we believe the Special Report accurately reflects the nature and substance of this institution.

Mr. Stuart O. Witt, President, Kern Community College District Board of Trustees

Ms. Sandra Serrano, Chancellor, Kern Community College District

Dr. Greg A. Chamberlain, President, Bakersfield College

Dr. John Gerhold, President, Academic Senate

Mr. Marco Sifuentes, President, California Schools Employees Association Chapter

Ms. Kristi Newsom, President, Student Government Association

STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

This Special Report is submitted in response to the requirement by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges that Bakersfield College submit a report on three special recommendations in the third year after evaluation. Bakersfield College was visited for a full study in September 2006. The College was notified of the reaffirmation of its accreditation in a letter dated January 31, 2007, which required Bakersfield College to provide a Special Report by October 2009.

In January 2009, Bakersfield College assembled a Task Force to begin the process of compiling evidence and writing responses to the recommendations in the Accreditation Commission's letter to the College. The team, comprised of representatives from administration, faculty, and classified constituencies, met weekly through the end of May 2009 to gather evidence to compile into the following pages of the Special Report. During these meetings, the task of gathering information and evidence to address the recommendations and planning agendas was distributed among the participants, who in turn worked with their constituencies to gather evidence which helped to develop this Special Report.

The narrative was developed based on the information and evidence gathered, and was passed to Bakersfield College's president for review in June 2009. After receiving guidance from the College president, the Special Report was presented to the campus in July 2009.

A draft report was presented to the KCCD Board of Trustees Evaluation/Accreditation Committee at their August 2009 meeting. Based on their input, a revised report was submitted to the California State Employees Association and the Academic Senate for their review in September 2009. The Special Report was also discussed in the Administration Council and President's Cabinet meetings in August 2009. Following these internal constituency reviews, the completed draft report was distributed for review and input to the entire campus community in September 2009. Suggested revisions were evaluated and incorporated and the final report was submitted to the KCCD Board of Trustees for ratification at their October 2009 meeting.

The Special Report on the following pages illustrates Bakersfield College's efforts in addressing the Accreditation Commission's recommendations.



Dr. Greg A. Chamberlain

President

Bakersfield College

BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE SPECIAL REPORT TASK FORCE

THE ACCREDITATION SPECIAL REPORT TASK FORCE WAS COMPRISED OF:

- Anna Agenjo, Chair, Library
- Amber Chiang, APR, Director, Marketing and Public Relations
- Marilyn Davidson, Administrative Assistant, Office of Academic Affairs
- Marissa Gonzales, Director of Human Resources
- Jennifer Johnson, Faculty, Allied Health/Nursing
- Ed Knudson, former Vice President of Academic Affairs
- Mildred Lovato, Ed.D., Vice President of Student Services
- Jim McGee, Director of Information Services
- Susan McQuerrey, Faculty, English Department
- Ann Morgan, Ed.D., Director of Institutional Research and Planning
- Patti Ross, Dean of Instruction
- LaMont Schiers, Executive Director, Institutional Planning
- Sandra Sierra, Chair, Counseling Department
- Bonnie Suderman, Ed.D., Dean of Learning Resources and Information Technology
- Vickie Turney, Administrative Assistant, Office of Academic Affairs
- Rachel Vickrey, Faculty, Mathematics Department

OTHERS WHO PROVIDED INFORMATION TO THE TASK FORCE INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

- Sharon Adams, Ed.D., Dean of Learning Support Services
- Primavera Arvizu, Director of Extended Opportunity Programs and Services
- Janie Budy, Program Manager, Career and Technical Education
- Greg A. Chamberlain, Ph.D., President
- Adie Geiser, Assistive Technology Specialist

- John Gerhold, DMA, Performing Arts Department
- Angelica Gomez, Director, Disabled Students Programs and Services
- Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs
- Christine Hitchcock, Office Supervisor, Admissions and Records
- A.Todd Jones, Faculty, Communication Department
- Michael McNellis, Faculty, Philosophy Department
- Thomas Moran, Faculty, Foreign Languages/ASL Department
- Clark Parsons, Faculty, Academic Development Department
- Kristin Rabe, Media Services Coordinator
- Carla Reyes, Department Assistant III, Student Activities Office
- Nick Strobel, Ph.D., Faculty, Physical Science Department
- Sue Vaughn, Director, Enrollment Services

RESPONSES TO 2006 SPECIAL REPORT ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Progress Made on Special Report Accreditation Recommendations.....7
Recommendation 88
Recommendation 910
Recommendation 1412
Evidence List14

SUMMARY OF PROGRESS MADE ON ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a brief evaluation of Bakersfield College's progress on the three recommendations of the Special Report required by the Accreditation Commission.

RECOMMENDATION 8

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the colleges follow 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).

Status: Fully Met

RECOMMENDATION 9

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the colleges, with appropriate district-wide input, develop a written code of ethics for all employees (Standard III.A.1.d).

Status: Fully Met

RECOMMENDATION 14

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the colleges, in conjunction with district-wide 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).

Status: Fully Met

RECOMMENDATION 8 – ADJUNCT FACULTY EVALUATION

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the colleges follow 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).

SUMMARY OF PROGRESS

There are several factors that currently impact adjunct faculty evaluations within the Kern Community College District.

- Based on a petition submitted by the Community College Association/National Education Association to modify the existing bargaining unit, the Public Employees Relations Board ruled that as of April 4, 2007, adjunct faculty are represented by the Community College Association [8.001]. As a result of that decision, the KCCD and the Community College Association recognized that the evaluation procedure is a negotiable item that must be addressed as part of the faculty contract negotiations which commenced in Fall 2007. The previous collective bargaining agreement expired on June 30, 2008, and the KCCD and the Community College Association used an interest-based bargaining process to seek mutual agreement on a successor agreement prior to that date. That document was ratified by both the Community College Association and the KCCD Board of Trustees in April 2009 [8.002].
- In July 2007, the KCCD and the Community College Association conducted several discussions regarding the applicability of the current collective bargaining agreement in regard to evaluation procedures to adjunct faculty based upon the Public Employees Relations Board ruling from April 2007. Discussions resulted in the mutual agreement that current KCCD Board Policy would be followed for the remainder of the contract, through June 30, 2008, as negotiations on a successor contract took place.
- KCCD Human Resources has secured an outside consultant to facilitate the reimplementation of the Human Resources module of our Enterprise Resource Planning system, known as Banner. 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 [8.003]. These lists will help deans and chairs better monitor adjunct evaluations.
- During Spring 2007, the current KCCD Board Policy Manual section 7D [8.004] was reviewed with vice presidents from Bakersfield, Cerro Coso Community and Porterville colleges, and efforts were made to increase the number of faculty evaluations taking place each semester. Part of this process was to ensure that new adjunct faculty members are evaluated in their first semester as well as every sixth semester thereafter.

As per the KCCD Board Policy Manual, Human Resources provides notice to new adjunct faculty of the evaluation process applicable to their employment. In addition, Human Resources identified additional adjunct faculty who were not evaluated in Spring 2007, and those faculty were subsequently evaluated in accordance with KCCD Board Policy.

The presidents of Bakersfield, Cerro Coso Community and Porterville colleges were charged by the KCCD chancellor with ensuring all adjunct faculty were properly evaluated during the 2007-2009 timeline. Human Resources collected all adjunct faculty evaluations and monitored the process.

At Bakersfield College, 48 adjunct evaluations were fully completed in 2008-2009; another 39 evaluations are being finalized as new forms and required signatures are being processed [8.005]. Each evaluation includes peer observation, materials review, student surveys, and an administrative review. Evaluation feedback is shared face-to-face with the adjunct faculty member being reviewed. As per board policy, Human Resources will provide notice to new faculty of the evaluation forms and procedures that apply to them. In 2009-2010, using updated forms and procedures, all departments are establishing appropriate evaluation cycles for all adjunct faculty.

COMPLETION PROGRESS

Bakersfield College considers Recommendation Eight “Fully Met.”

FUTURE PLANS

At Bakersfield College, academic deans work with department chairs each semester to coordinate the timely evaluation of adjunct faculty. The offices of the vice presidents of academic affairs and student services will monitor this ongoing process to ensure compliance. Campus evaluation lists will be maintained in conjunction with Human Resources. Timelines and forms used are stipulated through the KCCD/ Community College Association agreement.

EVIDENCE

[8.001] – CCA Agreement Article for Adjunct Faculty Evaluation

[8.002] – KCCD/Community College Association Interest-Based Bargaining Agreement, KCCD Board of Trustees Meeting, April 2009

[8.003] – KCCD Human Resources Evaluation List

[8.004] – KCCD Board of Trustees Board Policy Manual, 7D

[8.005] – Bakersfield College Adjunct Evaluation Lists

RECOMMENDATION 9 – EMPLOYEE CODE OF ETHICS

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the colleges, with appropriate district-wide input, develop a written code of ethics for all employees (Standard III.A.1.d).

SUMMARY OF PROGRESS

A draft employee code of ethics was developed with the assistance of a Cerro Coso Community College faculty member. This faculty member expressed interest in taking the lead to develop a district employee ethics policy in 2004-2005, and was contracted to lead the effort to conduct research and develop a draft policy following the 2006 accreditation team recommendation.

Beginning in December 2006, a review of books, articles and other references was conducted by the KCCD chancellor and the Cerro Coso Community College faculty member contracted to lead the development of the employee code of ethics. In addition, area agency chief executive officers were interviewed and higher education ethics policies were studied. Based on this research, a draft Code of Ethics was written for the KCCD.

The next step in the process was to take the draft code through the consultation process. The consultation process began in September 2007 when the draft was introduced to the KCCD Consultation Council (formerly Chancellor's Cabinet). The KCCD Consultation Council is comprised of faculty, classified staff, management and students from Bakersfield, Cerro Coso Community and Porterville colleges and the KCCD district office. This group was directed to present to and discuss the draft with members of their constituency groups and to collect comments and recommendations.

For the next eight months, the draft Code of Ethics was discussed, challenged, revised and vetted before being recommended to the KCCD Board of Trustees for adoption. The initial vetting process illustrated the need to discuss the KCCD Code of Ethics in additional venues in order to refine the code. The Code of Ethics [9.001], with appropriate sanctions for violations, was presented to the governing board in May 2008 and adopted in June 2008 [9.002]. The KCCD Code of Ethics includes a general introduction and sections on Respect for Persons and Academic Freedom, Fairness and Honesty, and Competence.

The development of a draft Code of Ethics underscored the value of dialogue to affect acceptance of standards of behavior without fear of reprisal. Additional policies, processes and training were developed to help introduce the Code of Ethics to district employees [9.003]. Training will be essential to developing employee and student understanding of ethical expectations, prohibitions and consequences of actions associated with violations of the KCCD Code of Ethics. The process of developing a Code of Ethics also provided the opportunity to define individual responsibility for creating a safe environment for learning and working as members of a college community.

COMPLETION PROGRESS

Bakersfield College considers Recommendation Nine “Fully Met.”

FUTURE PLANS

At the beginning of every academic year, starting with 2009-2010, the Bakersfield College president will send an email across campus, thanking all employees for maintaining high ethical and professional standards as they serve students and community [9.004]. In addition, at least once each academic year, the Bakersfield College human resources director in collaboration with the KCCD Human Resources will present a training workshop designed to promote understanding of ethical expectations associated with the KCCD Code of Ethics.

EVIDENCE

[9.001] – KCCD Board Policy Manual, Section Eleven, Code of Ethics

[9.002] – KCCD Board of Trustee Minutes, June 2008

[9.003] – Additional Policies and Training

[9.004] – Bakersfield College President’s Message, Fall 2009

RECOMMENDATION 14 – ORGANIZATION DECISION MAKING MAP

In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the colleges, in conjunction with district-wide 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).

SUMMARY OF PROGRESS

For the purposes of clarifying the governance and decision-making process for the KCCD, *A Process of Decision Making* [14.001] was developed in 2006. This document describes the process for creating or revising governing board policy and procedure for participatory governance in decision making. Included in the document is a diagram of the KCCD governance process.

Subsequent to the 2006 accreditation site visit, the KCCD searched for an existing, effective district model for an organizational map for decision making. After reviewing several models as examples, the West Hills Community College District model was identified as being the most relevant to the needs of the KCCD. Its matrix for decision making was adapted for the KCCD.

KCCD's draft functional organizational map for decision making was created in June 2007. The draft was introduced into the consultation process in September 2007 and input was sought to finalize the document in December 2007. The consultation process commenced with the KCCD Consultation Council (formerly the Chancellor's Cabinet). The membership of the KCCD Consultation Council includes faculty, staff, students and administrators representing all constituent groups at Bakersfield, Cerro Coso Community and Porterville colleges and the KCCD district office.

Each constituent group examined the KCCD process of decision making document through their respective governance groups and provided input to the final version. Recommendations were directed to the KCCD Consultation Council for further discussion, and the final document was approved by the KCCD Board of Trustees in December 2007 [14.002]. The map is broad-based and identifies which functions are centralized, decentralized or decentralized with coordination based at the KCCD district office. It also names the specific positions, by title, which have direct or lead responsibilities at each entity.

The KCCD Process and Functional Map for Decision Making was reviewed and revised by the KCCD Chancellor's Cabinet and the KCCD Consultation Council in May 2008 [14.003] and again in November 2008 [14.004]. In 2008, it was determined that the KCCD Functional Map for Decision Making would be evaluated annually for the first two years and every three years thereafter. The evaluation is conducted by the KCCD chancellor and the college presidents in consultation with the KCCD district office and constituencies from Bakersfield, Cerro Coso Community and Porterville colleges.

The district's decision-making map establishes the foundation upon which Bakersfield College is developing its own decision-making model [14.005]. College Council established a Decision Making Task Force that began meeting throughout Summer 2009 to develop a working draft; as the work progresses, updates will be shared through College Council. The final document will follow the structure of the KCCD document and clearly delineate the separation of roles and responsibilities on campus as well as clarify participatory governance roles in the process. Once finalized by Spring 2010, the Bakersfield College decision-making map will be reviewed and updated annually by the College Council for review and approval.

COMPLETION PROGRESS

Bakersfield College considers Recommendation Fourteen "Fully Met."

FUTURE PLANS

In March 2009, the KCCD chancellor commenced another review of the governance and decision making documents describing the KCCD process in order to provide clarity on the roles of executive leadership. A draft of recommended changes will be presented to the KCCD Chancellor's Cabinet and the KCCD Consultation Council by October 2009 for vetting.

The KCCD chancellor through the KCCD Consultation Council will annually review the organizational map for decision making in the KCCD to ensure the document is effectively serving the needs of the district. The results of the evaluation and any subsequent revisions to the organizational map will be presented to the Board of Trustees at the January 2010 board meeting. Bakersfield College will review its decision-making organizational map annually as part of its strategic planning process. Effective integration with the district's organizational map will be part of this review.

EVIDENCE

[14.001] – KCCD's *A Process of Decision Making*, 2006

[14.002] – KCCD Organizational Map and KCCD Board of Trustees Minutes, Fall 2008

[14.003] – KCCD Consultation Council Minutes, May 2008

[14.004] – KCCD Consultation Council Minutes, November 2008

[14.005] – Decision Making Task Force, College Council Minutes, Summer 2009

EVIDENCE LIST

Immediately following this list of evidence is a compact disc containing all evidence referenced in Bakersfield College's Accreditation Special Report.

RECOMMENDATION 8

[8.001] – CCA Agreement Article for Adjunct Faculty Evaluation

[8.002] – KCCD/Community College Association Interest-Based Bargaining Agreement, KCCD Board of Trustees Meeting, April 2009

[8.003] – KCCD Human Resources Evaluation List

[8.004] – KCCD Board of Trustees Board Policy Manual, 7D

[8.005] – Bakersfield College Adjunct Evaluation Lists

RECOMMENDATION 9

[9.001] – KCCD Board Policy Manual, Section Eleven, Code of Ethics

[9.002] – KCCD Board of Trustee Minutes, June 2008

[9.003] – Additional Policies and Training

[9.004] – Bakersfield College President's Message, Fall 2009

RECOMMENDATION 14

[14.001] – KCCD's *A Process of Decision Making*, 2006

[14.002] – KCCD Organizational Map and KCCD Board of Trustees Minutes, Fall 2008

[14.003] – KCCD Consultation Council Minutes, May 2008

[14.004] – KCCD Consultation Council Minutes, November 2008

[14.005] – Decision Making Task Force, College Council Minutes, Summer 2009