

Bakersfield College

Annual Accreditation Report

October 14, 2010



Kern Community College District

Bakersfield College

Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

Part I: Program Review

Bakersfield College has an established, in-depth program review process. Program reviews are scheduled on a six year basis. Each college unit also completes an annual update to their unit plan, which becomes part of the Educational Master Plan. The in-depth program review process provides an opportunity for focused dialogue among members of the program and for peer feedback from members of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC). The IEC develops commendations and recommendations, which are included in the program review presentation to the College Council.

The IEC is charged with evaluating the program review process, revising materials as appropriate and conducting training for programs scheduled for review. Training and support are provided to programs undergoing review. In fall of 2010, training was expanded to include members of IEC. The training is designed to enhance their understanding of the review process and its importance in maintaining quality programs and services.

The Institutional Research and Planning Office regularly provide longitudinal data for both the program review process and the annual unit plans. The unit plans and data are used to request staffing. The use of data is one of the ways the college demonstrates an established culture of evidence.

Two areas have been identified for improvement relative to program review and linking program review and budget allocations. The link between the annual unit plans and program review documents is not defined and the link between program review and budget allocations is not established. The IEC and Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) will work to clarify these linkages in processes. In spring 2010, the College Council established a Budget Taskforce to recommend the charge, membership, scope and authority of a standing governance budget committee. The Budget Taskforce recommendation to establish a Budget Committee is moving forward thorough the governance review process. It is expected that with this committee in place the processes for program review and budget allocation will be defined and implemented.

Summary Statement

Part I: Program Review

Bakersfield College is moving out of the development level with multiple elements of proficiency.

Bakersfield College

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness Part I: Program Review

Levels of Implementation	Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Program Review
<p>Awareness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is preliminary investigative dialogue at the institution or within some departments about what data or process should be used for program review. • There is recognition of existing practices and models in program review that make use of institutional research. • There is exploration of program review models by various departments or individuals. • The college is implementing pilot program review models in a few programs/operational units.
<p><i>Primarily</i> <i>Development</i> <i>Fall 2009</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program review is embedded in practice across the institution using qualitative and quantitative data to improve program effectiveness. • Dialogue about the results of program review is evident within the program as part of discussion of program effectiveness. • Leadership groups throughout the institution accept responsibility for program review framework development (Senate, Admin. Etc.) • Appropriate resources are allocated to conducting program review of meaningful quality. • Development of a framework for linking results of program review to planning for improvement. • Development of a framework to align results of program review to resource allocation.
<p>Elements of Proficiency Fall 2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program review processes are in place and implemented regularly. Yes • Results of all program reviews are integrated into institution-wide planning for improvement and informed decision-making. In process • The program review framework is established and implemented. Yes • Dialogue about the results of all program reviews is evident throughout the institution as part of discussion of institutional effectiveness. In process • Results of program review are clearly and consistently linked to institutional planning processes and resource allocation processes; college can demonstrate or provide specific examples. In process • The institution evaluates the effectiveness of its program review processes in supporting and improving student achievement and student learning outcomes. Yes

Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Program review processes are ongoing, systematic and used to assess and improve student learning and achievement.• The institution reviews and refines its program review processes to improve institutional effectiveness. Yes.• The results of program review are used to continually refine and improve program practices resulting in appropriate improvements in student achievement and learning.
---	--

Planning is an ongoing, continuous improvement process at the College. The primary planning document is the Educational Master Plan, which includes assessment and instructional technology components. It is updated on an annual basis. Unit plans are expected to be based on demonstrated needs, the college mission, and longitudinal data, provided by the Institutional Research and Planning Office. The Unit Plans are the basis for making faculty and equipment requests each year.

Faculty chairs and administrators are responsible for developing plans, and governance committees are responsible for reviewing documents. The planning process is well established at Bakersfield College. However, the link between planning processes and budget decisions is not clear to campus constituents.

In 2009 – 2010 the College Council established two taskforce committees to clarify the decision making process at the college and make recommendations for a standing governance budget committee. Both the Decision Making Taskforce and Budget Taskforce (DMTF) are made up of representatives from classified staff, faculty, and administration. The DMTF has developed a document that outlines the roles of the college governance committees, constituent groups, and college decision making processes. The document is now going through the governance review process. The Budget Taskforce first met in spring of 2010 and completed its work in fall 2010. The Budget Taskforce recommendations will be reviewed by the College Council, Academic Senate, and Administration Council as a part of the governance review process.

The campus community participated in an extensive strategic planning process in 2007-2008. The process resulted in a plan, *Renegade 2012*, which was aligned with district initiatives and became *Action 2012*. The *Action 2012* strategic initiatives were integrated with the annual college goals in 2009 – 2010. In spring of 2010, a College Council sub-committee was charged with conducting a survey to review the annual goals and recommend goals for 2010 – 2011. Recommendations to improve that process have been considered by the College Council with the goal of an earlier adoption date for the annual goals.

Bakersfield College faculty and administrative leadership determined that a standing governance committee was needed to support accreditation as an integral part of the culture rather than an event and to *establish cultural values that demonstrate on-going sustainable continuous quality improvement*. Faculty and administrative co-chairs were identified and the committee met in the spring of 2010. The charge of the committee is to institutionalize a dynamic accreditation process,

establish the structure of the accreditation self evaluation, develop a structure to collect evidence, and to implement an ongoing accreditation process.

Over the summer, key committee co-chairs, faculty and administrators, met to discuss ways in which current planning and evaluative processes could be better articulated and aligned. The implementation of CurricUNET served as a catalyst for Bakersfield College to assess and better support linkages between the processes for program review, SLOs, assessment, curriculum development and revision, and the on-going work of accreditation. A plan was established to provide professional development activities related to CurricUNET and also bring together committee members from the Accreditation Steering, Assessment, Curriculum, General Education, Extended Learning and Institutional Effectiveness to discuss how their work can be aligned with the goals for sustainable continuous quality improvement. Fall 2010 opening day session included an overview about accreditation and “Weaving together the Fabric of the College” and the implementation of CurricUNET and the essential role of curriculum in sustaining quality programs and services.

The college has also made progress toward achieving accreditation recommendations. With an earlier adoption date for college goals; the use of the decision making document; and the implementation of the Budget Committee, the college is expected to make significant progress toward linking planning and budget allocation.

Summary Statement

Part II: Planning

Bakersfield College is leaving the development level and nearing the proficiency level.

Bakersfield College

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness

Part II: Planning

<p>Levels of Implementation</p>	<p>Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Planning</p>
<p>Awareness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The college has preliminary investigative dialogue about planning processes. • There is recognition of case need for quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in planning. • The college has initiated pilot projects and efforts in developing systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning and implementation (e.g. in human or physical resources). • Planning found in only some areas of college operations. • There is exploration of models and definitions and issues related to planning. • There is minimal linkage between plans and a resource allocation process, perhaps planning for use of "new money" • The college may have a consultant-supported plan for facilities, or a strategic plan.
<p><i>Primarily Development</i></p> <p><i>Fall 2009</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Institution has defined a planning process and assigned responsibility for implementing it. • The Institution has identified quantitative and qualitative data and is using it. • Planning efforts are specifically linked to institutional mission and goals. • The Institution uses applicable quantitative data to improve institutional effectiveness in some areas of operation. • Governance and decision-making processes incorporate review of institutional effectiveness in mission and plans for improvement. • Planning processes reflect the participation of a broad constituent base.

<p style="text-align: center;">Increased Elements of Proficiency</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Fall 2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The college has a well documented, ongoing process for evaluating itself in all areas of operation, analyzing and publishing the results and planning and implementing improvements. <i>In progress</i> • The institution's component plans are integrated into a comprehensive plan to achieve broad educational purposes and improve institutional effectiveness Yes • The institution effectively uses its human, physical, technology, and financial resources to achieve its broad educational purposes, including stated student learning outcomes. Yes • The college has documented assessment results and communicated matters of quality assurance to appropriate constituencies (documents data and analysis of achievement of its educational mission). <i>Not complete.</i> • The institution assesses progress toward achieving its education goals over time (uses longitudinal data and analyses). Yes • The institution plans and effectively incorporates results of program review in all areas of educational services: instruction, support services, library and learning resources. No
<p style="text-align: center;">Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institution uses ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning to refine its key processes and improve student learning. • There is dialogue about institutional effectiveness that is ongoing, robust and pervasive; data and analyses are widely distributed and used throughout the institution. • There is ongoing review and adaptation of evaluation and planning processes. • There is consistent and continuous commitment to improving student learning; and educational effectiveness is a demonstrable priority in all planning structures and processes.

Student learning outcomes assessment at Bakersfield College is embedded in several existing campus processes. Course level student learning outcomes (SLOs) are developed by faculty experts who teach the course sections. All new and revised courses contain student learning outcomes. The majority of the faculty include student learning outcomes on their syllabi now. The SLOs and Assessment Plans are included in the curriculum review process. A curriculum review master schedule is aligned with the program review master schedule to ensure that curriculum continues to be updated with SLOs and assessment.

In 2009 – 2010 an Assessment Steering Committee was formed and operates as a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee. Assessment plans are evaluated by the members of the Assessment Steering Committee who are also part of the Curriculum Committee. Program Level Assessment Plans are developed annually in the spring by department chairs and deans and then reviewed by the Assessment Committee co-chairs. Results from these Assessment Plans are incorporated in the Unit Plan, which is due the subsequent fall. Unit plan authors are asked to describe changes made as a result of their assessment process and to request additional funding to support improvement plans if necessary.

Student learning outcomes and assessment have been the topics of numerous professional development activities on campus. This fall the Assessment Committee established another website to supplement the Bakersfield College Assessment webpage and to encourage dialogue across a wide-range of disciplines and areas.

The Educational Master Plan contains assessment results.

Copies of the 2009/10 Program Level Assessment Plans can be found at
<http://www2.bakersfieldcollege.edu/assessment/BC%20resources%20data.html>

The Accreditation Steering Committee has recently identified an area for development related to assessment which is to establish a link between the results of assessment and college decision-making processes.

Summary Statement

Part III: Student Learning Outcomes

Bakersfield College is at the proficiency level with plans for further improvements.

Bakersfield College

Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness Part I: Student Learning Outcomes

Levels of Implementation	Characteristics of Institutional Effectiveness in Student Learning Outcomes
Awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is preliminary, investigative dialogue about student learning outcomes. • There is recognition of existing practices such as course objectives and how they relate to student learning outcomes. • There is exploration of models, definitions, and issues taking place by a few people. • Pilot projects and efforts may be in progress. • The college has discussed whether to define student learning outcomes at the level of some courses or programs or degrees; where to begin.
Development <i>Fall 2009</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College has established an institutional framework for definition of student learning outcomes (where to start), how to extend, and timeline. • College has established authentic assessment strategies for assessing student learning outcomes as appropriate to intended course, program, and degree learning outcomes. • Existing organizational structures (e.g. Senate, Curriculum Committee) are supporting strategies for student learning outcomes definition and assessment. • Leadership groups (e.g. Academic Senate and administration), have accepted responsibility for student learning outcomes implementation. • Appropriate resources are being allocated to support student learning outcomes and assessment. • Faculty and staff are fully engaged in student learning outcome development.

<p>Proficiency</p> <p>Fall 2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student learning outcomes and authentic assessment are in place for courses, programs and degrees. Yes • Results of assessment are being used for improvement and further alignment of institution-wide practices. Yes • There is widespread institutional dialogue about the results. No • Decision-making includes dialogue on the results of assessment and is purposefully directed toward improving student learning. Yes • Appropriate resources continue to be allocated and fine-tuned. No • Comprehensive assessment reports exist and are completed on a regular basis. Yes • Course student learning outcomes are aligned with degree student learning outcomes. Yes • Students demonstrate awareness of goals and purposes of courses and programs in which they are enrolled. Yes
<p>Sustainable</p> <p>Continuous</p> <p>Quality</p> <p>Improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student learning outcomes and assessment are ongoing, systematic and used for continuous quality improvement. Yes • Dialogue about student learning is ongoing, pervasive and robust. • Evaluation and fine-tuning of organizational structures to support student learning is ongoing. • Student learning improvement is a visible priority in all practices and structures across the college. • Learning outcomes are specifically linked to program reviews.

October 14, 2010