

DEC 13 2007

Progress Visit Report

Bakersfield College
1801 Panorama Drive
Bakersfield, California 93305

A Confidential Report Prepared for the
Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
Bakersfield College on November 8-9, 2007

Team Chair: Jerome Hunter, Chancellor
North Orange County Community College District

Team Member: Tony Cantu, Dean of Instruction
Fresno City College

Introduction and Overview

A ten-member accreditation team visited Bakersfield College from October 23-26, 2006, for the purposes of determining whether the institution continued to meet accreditation standards. The team evaluated how well the college was achieving its stated purposes, analyzed how the college was meeting the commission standards, provided recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitted recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the accredited status of the college.

The report from the team provided an overview of how Bakersfield College met its unique challenges, with a focus on areas leading to commendations for significant accomplishment as well as to recommendations to fulfill the standards of accreditation.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting on January 10-12, 2007, reviewed the institutional self-study report and the report of the evaluation team. The Commission took action to reaffirm accreditation with a requirement that the college complete a Progress Report. The report was to be followed by a visit by Commission representatives. The Commission asked that a Progress Report be submitted that would focus on the institution's resolution of the recommendations and concerns as noted below:

District 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, and II.C).

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 (Standards III.A.1.b).

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).

Recommendation 11: In order to meet the standard, the team recommends that the colleges, working with appropriate district-wide 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 (Standards III.D.1.a-d and III.D.3).

Recommendation 13: In order to meet the 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 violations of the policy (Standards IV.B.1.g and IV.B.1.h).

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).

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 time line that ensures completion of a full cycle of planning and broad-based evaluation (Standards 1.B.6 and 1.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 (Standards II.A, II.B, II.B.1, II.B.3, II.C, II.C.1.c, and Standard III.D).

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, and III.A.4.b).

District Recommendations

Institutional Response to Team 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 and II.C).

Team Observations:

The Kern Community College District's (KCCD) Strategic Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees on September 7, 2006. Since then, KCCD distributed a brochure with the District's Vision, Mission, Values, Initiatives and Strategies to all district employees. The district also held a district-wide workshop on Management and Strategic Development for all district managers. The workshop included addressing Kern Community College District strategic initiatives, forming teams, and creating action plans. As a result of the workshop, initiative teams composed of faculty, staff, and administration were formed for each of the six KCCD initiatives. The initiative teams have been meeting since spring 2007.

As stated in the progress report submitted to the Commission, the Bakersfield College President made a purposeful decision to delay the creation of a Bakersfield College Strategic Plan because the college was engaged in two significant studies: the "Foundations of Excellence", a national collaborative which focuses on students' first-year experience and a comprehensive study by the National Center for Developmental Education (NCDE), which was distributed at a college-wide meeting held on October 5, 2007. These studies have been completed, and the college will use the results to set priorities and provide direction in the strategic-planning process.

The college has developed a planning time line that includes the development of its strategic plan. In fact, during the team's visit, the college strategic-planning process had been initiated under the leadership of the director of institutional research and planning with broad campus participation. The time line calls for the Bakersfield College Strategic Plan Draft to be completed and distributed to the various constituent groups for review in March 2008. The College Council will finalize the strategic plan in April 2008. The college will then submit the Bakersfield College Strategic Plan to the KCCD Board of Trustees for approval in May 2008.

Included in the college's 2006-2007 Educational Master Plan Update are mission and strategic goals, planning assumptions, and strategic initiatives. Once the 2008 Bakersfield College Strategic Plan is approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2008, the update will clearly link to the district strategic plan.

Conclusion:

Bakersfield College has made significant progress in addressing this recommendation. The constituent leadership is confident that the college will be able to meet the timeline it has established and have the Board of Trustees approve its strategic plan in May 2008.

The evidence provided to the visiting team also suggests that the 2008 Bakersfield College Strategic Plan will link to the KCCCD Strategic Plan. Moreover, the priorities presented in the district strategic plan will be reflected in the strategic initiatives section of the Bakersfield College Educational Master Plan Update.

Although the college has made significant progress in responding to this recommendation, in order for the standards to be fully met, the college will need to provide evidence that the KCCCD Board of Trustees has approved its strategic plan and that its Education Master Plan Update is linked to the district strategic plan.

Institutional Response to Team 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).

Team Observations:

The Public Employees Relations Board (PERB) ruled that as of April 4, 2007, adjunct faculty are represented by the full-time faculty association (CCA/CTA/NEA). Additionally, the Kern Community College District and CCA mutually agreed that Board Policy 7D would be followed for the remainder of the current contract (through June 30, 2008) while negotiations on a successor contract take place.

During spring 2007, Board Policy 7D was reviewed at the colleges and efforts were made to increase the number of hourly faculty evaluations taking place. The goal of administration was to evaluate all first-time adjunct faculty with the assistance of faculty chairs. However, the college fell short of that goal and evaluated only a small percentage of adjunct faculty.

Based on the information provided by the vice chancellor of educational services, deans and faculty chairs are in the process of evaluating all newly hired adjunct faculty, approximately 22 at Bakersfield College. In spring 2008, any additional new adjunct hires and all 6th semester adjunct faculty will be evaluated, approximately 55 at Bakersfield College. This is consistent with Board Policy 7D and is the process that is being used to bring all adjunct faculty evaluations up to date.

Conclusion:

The college has made progress in addressing this recommendation. However, in order to meet the standard fully, those adjunct faculty evaluations that are in arrears should be completed in accordance with Board Policy 7D. Since the college fell short of its goal of evaluating all newly hired adjunct faculty in spring 2007, evidence should be provided that it was able to complete the evaluation schedule established for fall 2007 and spring 2008.

Institutional Response to Team 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).

Team Observations:

The visiting team validated that considerable opportunity for discussion and input is taking place in regards to the employee code of ethics. The draft Proposed Revision to Board Policy 11E – Code of Ethics was submitted to the chancellor in July 2007, and introduced at the Chancellor's Cabinet at its meeting of September 18, 2007. The cabinet includes faculty, classified staff, management, and students from each of the three colleges. Cabinet members were directed to present and discuss the draft with members of their constituencies and to collect comments and recommendations. At Bakersfield College, the proposed revision was distributed to the Bakersfield College Council on September 21, 2007, for communication to the college's constituent groups. It was discussed again at the College Council on October 19, 2007. The Academic Senate reviewed the proposed revision at its meeting on September 26, 2007. It is expected that the revision to Board Policy 11E will be presented to the governing board in March 2008 and adopted in May 2008.

At the time of the team's visit, the faculty association and the classified bargaining unit were reviewing the proposed revision. They have expressed concerns about enforcement of the policy, progressive discipline, nepotism, and other areas related to what both groups consider working conditions.

Conclusion:

The district has made significant progress in addressing this recommendation. The visiting team was able to validate that there has been considerable constituent discussion and participation in revising the existing board policy on ethics. In order to fully address this recommendation, the governing board will need to adopt the revised policy in May 2008 according to the timeline.

Institutional Response to Team Recommendation #11

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

Team Observations:

The Kern Community College District began the development of a new allocation model for its unrestricted general funds in fall 2006, completed the development of the model in March 2007, and adopted it in April 2007. The model, which closely follows the new State

allocation model resulting from the passage of Senate Bill 361, was implemented in the development of the 2007-2008 budget.

The evidence provided to the visiting team outlines the budget allocation model. Among the components are the allocation model parameters and definitions, the different steps in the allocation process, and recommendations for critical support components. Included in the critical support components are a process to fund strategic initiatives and a process to evaluate the budget allocation model annually.

During the site visit, the team met with some members of the district Budget Allocation Model Committee. The members present were generally positive of the new allocation model and the manner in which it was developed and implemented. There was also evidence that the information regarding the budget allocation and development process was widely communicated in the district.

At the time of the team's visit, the district had begun identifying the process and time line for the evaluation of the budget allocation model as used in the development of the 2007-2008 budget.

Conclusion:

The district is to be commended for the work it has done in a relatively short time to address this recommendation. The district has completed and implemented a budget allocation model. A review of the evidence and interviews with faculty and staff validate that there has been broad constituent participation in the process and that the budget process is becoming more transparent and widely understood. Once the district completes the evaluation of the model, it will fully meet the standards.

Institutional Response to Team 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 violations of the policy (Standards IV.B.1.g & IV.B.1.h).

Team Observations:

The Kern Community College District Board of Trustees committed to conducting an annual self-evaluation at its annual retreat in January 2006. 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. The Board of Trustees approved Board Policy 2E—Board Self-Evaluation and Board Policy 2F—Standard of Good Practice at its October 4, 2007, meeting.

At the time of the team visit, board members had already completed the self-evaluation and the information was being tabulated for review and discussion at their next annual retreat in January 2008. The results will be used to determine needs for board training.

The Board of Trustees also revised its statement of ethics (Board Policy 2G) to include a procedure to address any violations of the standards of practice (Board Policy 2G1 and Board Policy 2G2). The revised policy was also approved at the October 4, 2007, board meeting.

The board members that the visiting team interviewed are committed to ensuring that the board self-evaluation process is completed on a regular basis. Furthermore, since September 2007, the policy on ethical expectations is provided to all trustees at each meeting to ensure a continuing awareness of ethical expectations of board members.

Conclusion:

As a result of the review of the evidence provided to the team and interviews with members of the Board of Trustees and the chancellor, the team has validated that the district has fully addressed this recommendation and thus meets the standard.

Institutional Response to Team 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).

Team Observations:

The visiting team reviewed *A Process of Decision Making*, which was developed to clarify the governance and decision-making process at Kern Community College District. It includes an introduction and describes the process for creating or revising governing board policy and procedure and identifies the district-wide committee structure for participatory governance in decision making. In order to address this recommendation, the district reviewed several organizational/functional maps from other colleges and districts. The district adapted the model from West Hills Community College District in developing its own functional mapping document.

The district's executive council created a draft functional map for decision making in the Kern Community College District in July 2007, and began the consultation process in September 2007. The map identifies a function as centralized, decentralized, or decentralized with coordination from the district office, the service providers (i.e., district, Bakersfield College, Porterville College, or Cerro Coso Community College), and the name and title of the person responsible (lead) at each location. Although the matrix appears to delineate roles and responsibilities of the different functions, an evaluation process is not identified.

The team did validate that the constituent groups are currently reviewing the document. The goal is to have a final document ready for district-wide dissemination by spring 2008.

Bakersfield College has a college governance and committee matrix that identifies college committees, their purposes, their memberships, their reporting structures, and the associated district committees, if any. The committees consist of primary governance recommending committees, college council committees, academic senate committees, operational advisory committees, and administrative advisory councils. The extent to which this matrix will be modified once the district functional map is completed remains to be seen.

Conclusion:

The district and college have made progress in addressing this recommendation. However, in order to meet the requirements of the standard, the functional map will need to be completed and adopted by the constituent groups. Additionally, an evaluation process needs to be identified.

College Recommendations

Institutional Response to Team 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 time line that insures completion of a full cycle of planning and broad-based evaluation (Standards I.B.6 and I.B.7).

Team Observations:

Bakersfield College has several planning processes and committees that address annual goal development, unit plan development with educational master plan update, budget development, program review, faculty and classified staff position request prioritization, implementation of the Student Learning Outcomes Plan, class schedule development, and enrollment management. The college spent considerable time during the summer of 2007 developing a college-wide training plan on the various planning processes. This activity resulted in the development and implementation of the 2007-08 planning and evaluation implementation time line to ensure completion of a full cycle of planning, training, and broad-based evaluation.

The visiting team reviewed several documents and met with the director of institutional research and planning and others to discuss the time line and the training activities that have taken place. The team validated that training is taking place. Surveys have been distributed to evaluate some of the existing planning processes and to gather input on training needs of the end users. This approach has been positive and is reflected in the evaluations of the training sessions that have thus far been conducted. It has also resulted in a change in the unit plan template. The revised unit plan template now aligns unit needs and outcomes with Bakersfield College processes and the district strategic initiatives. The template also 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. The training for faculty chairs and directors includes incorporating institutional unit data and assessment into unit plans and incorporating unit plans into the program review process and the new budget development time line.

Similar training activities are taking place for program review, student learning outcomes, assessment, and other planning processes. The Bakersfield College Institutional Research and Planning webpage is also a valuable resource for training.

Evaluation of the 2007-08 planning and evaluation implementation time line will be coordinated by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning to measure the effectiveness of the training and identify areas that might need improvement. Planning process evaluations will be submitted and reviewed by the College Council in April before they are communicated campus-wide in May.

Conclusion:

The college has made significant progress in addressing this recommendation. The evidence provided demonstrates a commitment by the college to provide the necessary training to ensure that its planning processes are integrated and effective. It will have fully addressed this recommendation and will meet the requirements of the standards with the completion of the evaluation process in late spring 2008.

Institutional Response to Team 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).

Team Observations:

As stated in the team's observations under district Recommendation 3, the Bakersfield College President made a purposeful decision to delay the creation of a Bakersfield College Strategic Plan because the college was engaged in two significant studies: the "Foundations of Excellence", a national collaborative which focuses on students' first-year experience and a comprehensive study by the National Center for Developmental Education (NCDE), which was distributed at a college-wide meeting held on October 5, 2007. These studies have been completed, and the college will use the results to set priorities and provide direction in the strategic-planning process.

The college has developed a planning timeline that includes the development of its strategic plan. In fact, during the team's visit, the college strategic-planning process had been initiated with broad campus participation. The time line calls for the Bakersfield College Strategic Plan Draft to be completed and distributed to the various constituent groups for review in March 2008. The College Council will finalize the strategic plan in April 2008. The college will then submit the Bakersfield College Strategic Plan to the KCCD Board of Trustees for approval in May 2008.

Included in the college's 2006-2007 Educational Master Plan Update are mission and strategic goals, planning assumptions, and strategic initiatives. It includes an annual review and update through the budget and unit plan processes. Once the 2008 Bakersfield College Strategic Plan is approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2008, the update will clearly link to the district strategic plan.

A review of the following three documents suggests that the Educational Master Plan, and not an institutional strategic plan, currently drives the planning process: Bakersfield College

Budget Process Flow Chart, the Organizing a Process to Link Outcomes and Evidence to Planning and Budgeting document, and the Bakersfield College Institutional Planning Process documents. The college Educational Master Plan includes what the college refers to as its "Three-Year Strategic Roadmap", which provides the strategic direction for the college and aligns with the Kern Community College District Strategic Plan.

Interviews with staff and a review of additional documents provided during the visit demonstrate that the college has well-defined processes that appear to be integrated: assessment, program review, curriculum, unit planning and updating, and budgeting. These planning processes were used when the new Budget Allocation Model was applied to develop the 2007-08 budget. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the college has yet to develop an institutional strategic plan as required by the standards.

During the team's visit, the college president had received a proposal from the Academic Senate to hire a consultant, a former employee of the college, to assist in the development of the strategic plan. It appeared at the time of the visit that the college would in fact be working with a consultant. All indications are that the planning time line that the college adopted in September will be met and a college strategic plan will be ready for board approval in May 2008.

The planning process has broad constituent participation, and information is disseminated campus-wide through a variety of means. The most readily available access to information is the campus e-mail system. A record of the work by each committee is stored electronically in public folders in Microsoft Outlook, and since all employees are subscribers, everyone has access to the progress and status of the planning processes.

Conclusion:

The college has made significant progress in addressing this recommendation. The visiting team validated that there are various planning processes in place that appear to be integrated. To meet the standards and fully address this recommendation, however, the college must complete its institutional strategic plan that clearly links these processes. Moreover, the strategic plan should be completed within the time line that the college has established.

Institutional Response to Team 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 and III.A.4.b).

Team Observations:

In August 2007, the college developed and implemented an action plan that linked to the college's existing planning processes and time line (i.e., Faculty Position Request Process and Timeline) to address this recommendation. The college has gathered information

regarding anticipated retirements and compiled demographic data for each department. Once the number of new hires is determined, selection committees will review department, student, and service area demographic data. The expected outcome is to increase awareness of the changing demographics of students and the college's service area in the selection process.

Recruitment efforts will also be enhanced. As stated in the Progress Report, the Administration, Department of Marketing and Public Relations, and Human Resources Offices are beginning to recruit applicants from non-traditional sources (e.g., 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.

The college hiring process includes a diversity representative on selection committees to ensure confidentiality, equitable treatment of all candidates, and inclusive hiring practices. The diversity representatives are appointed by the Equal Opportunity Advisory Committee, and annual training is provided to the diversity representatives to ensure consistency of practice and support. Representatives of the advisory committee indicated that training has increased by approximately 25% and that the number of diversity representatives has increased by 10%-20%.

The college is also continuing the dialog on diversity to broaden the discussion of the importance and power of acknowledging diversity in the classroom and the college workplace. Recent discussions have taken place regarding retention strategies for Latino/a students and strategies to foster inclusion and engagement in the classroom.

At the conclusion of the next hiring cycle, the college intends to analyze and discuss the effect of these endeavors on the demographics of the regular employees. The findings will be reported to the college community through the College Council and the Faculty Chairs and Directors Council.

Conclusions:

The visiting team found that the college has taken a proactive approach in addressing this recommendation and thus fully meets the requirements of the standard.