Standards and sub-groups (The Eleven Committees)
Summary of Activities

I. A. Mission

May 2011—Packets were sent out to committee members informing them of their duties and asking them to review the fourteen recommendations.

August 2011—Two additional committee members were recruited: FT faculty Shohreh Rahman and Classified Employee Judy Romanini to serve on the committee. We are still trying to recruit a student member. We have forwarded to committee members information on "Deconstructing a Mission Statement" based on a workshop presentation at the state level. Committee member Sue Granger Dickson attended training on Sharepoint as a committee representative.

September 6, 2011—First committee meeting has been set

I. B. Institutional Effectiveness

SEC I.B. held its first meeting May 10 and set a meeting schedule for fall 2011. We began the discussion of institutional effectiveness from page 5 of "Inquiry Guide: Assessing and Planning for Institutional Effectiveness," which is one of the reading resources for this committee. We reviewed the Standard I.B. ACCJC guides prepared for this committee by the Accreditation Steering Committee. Another handout from the Accreditation Steering Committee was a list of the I.B. Planning Agenda items from the October 2009 Mid-Term, but we did not discuss these. We discussed a handout prepared by the SEC I.B. do-chairs listing relevant resources and links. We agreed the resources and examples would be summer reading homework. We discussed committee tasks including development of survey questions about institutional effectiveness as part of a campuswide accreditation survey, gathering evidence that supports institutional effectiveness, and possibly holding a focus group. Bernadette offered to set up a "Wiki" space to facilitate collaborative work on the questions. Ann sent some sample questions to Bernadette for getting started, and Bernadette sent email invitations later in the summer.

SEC I.B. held its second meeting August 18 to discuss progress over the summer. We agreed that most of the committee took a true mental vacation and did little or no reading, although two members read some of the material prior to the meeting. We reviewed the timeline from SEC Co-chairs, and Ann put the due dates on the minutes along with the meeting dates to help with our timeline. We noted that there is a new Manual for Institutional Self Evaluation (June 11) replaces manual in resources emailed June 2 We discussed committee Tasks, the timeline, and organization of responsibilities. For "Response to Recommendations" due September 23, for which SEC I.B. is responsible for addressing Recommendation 1 (Standards I.B.6—I.B.7) from the previous Self-Study, Ann will get clarification about the time frame, i.e., is it since fall 2010 when the update was reported. For the I.B.1 – I.B.7 Descriptive Summary, each of us will read the I.B. examples from West Hills Coalinga, Cabrillo, and Columbia and begin our lists of relevant BC processes that support institutional effectiveness, including relevant evidence, and take them to the September 9 meeting. For survey questions, during the

summer Ann sent some sample questions based on another college's accreditation survey to Bernadette who set up Wikispaces, however we agreed to discuss questions at the next meeting when Bernadette returns. With regard to focus groups, David is interested in conducting focus groups if needed.

II. A. Instructional Programs

The committee writing on Standard II.A has addressed 9 of the 28 areas contained in this Standard. Specific evidence has not been included in the narrative at this time, but the gathering of that evidence will begin once committee members are back on campus.

This committee will be addressing the following recommendations in the following manner:

Recommendation 2 – Program level outcome plans were turned in last Spring.   100% of non-instructional departments turned in a plan. 87% of Instructional areas turned in a plan. Plans were reviewed by the Assessment Committee and improvement themes were determined. "Student Engagement" was the foremost theme, and a think tank is scheduled for 2011/12 to develop action plans with financial support from SDCC. Course level and program level assessment plans are due to be added into the CurricUnet module this year.
Institutional level SLOs are developed. Next week we will be working with the English Department to assess their GE SLOs and assessment results to complete the Institutional Level Plan this year. We will assess how this process worked and continue on to next year.

Recommendation 3 – This is difficult to respond to as a new/revitalized District Strategic Plan is just now being finalized which will shortly guide the creation of a new BC Strategic Plan. However, with the focus on basic skills and transfer readiness, evidence exists that the College is addressing these issues by maintaining transfer articulation agreements, participating in SB 1440, establishing three transfer degrees, investigating new delivery methods for math basic skills, and the opening of a Writing Center.

Recommendation 4 – The newly reorganized Program Review Committee is adopting an annual program review template to assure that academic departments are assessing current practices, reviewing curriculum currency/viability, providing evidence that programs are aligned with the College's mission, vision, and strategic plan, and aligning budgetary requests with criteria established by the Budget Committee.

II. B. Student Support Services

Standard IIb committee met at the end of Spring 2011. The committee reviewed the relevant documents and developed a meeting schedule for Fall. The committee will be meeting on Sept 1, 2011.

II. C. Library and Learning Support

The Standard IIC Committee met on April 27, 2011 to review our charge, and assign group members sections of the standard to work on. In addition, each committee member received a packet that contained key documents including a timeline, important web links, a copy of the Standard IIC section of the 2009 Midterm Report, handouts 1-4 from the Co-chairs training session, etc. On August 18, 2011, co-chairs, Bonnie Suderman and Nancy Guidry, attended the training sessions on SharePoint and Focus Groups. In late August, Nancy Guidry began entering documents related to the library sections of Standard IIC into the "Evidence" folder in SharePoint. Bonnie and Nancy will meet with the committee on August 29 to train them on SharePoint , review an internal list of deadlines for our standard, and discuss other matters.

III. A. Human Resources Accreditation Sub-Committee

There are several members who have been recently added to the group. The group needed additional assistance (due to resignations from existing members) and several volunteered. The group met at the tail end of Spring 2011 semester before the summer to spread the assignments of research and data gathering. The group met again this Monday, August 22, 2011. The group is now in the process of drafting a survey. Once the survey questions are finalized it will be emailed to the Accreditation Steering Committee for review and approval. Research, data and evidence gathering is still occurring. Calendar dates are being set up throughout the semester to meet deadlines. Also, there will be another meeting with the group members who did not attend the share point workshop. A lab is going to be reserved and one of the co-chairs will go through the share point training with the others. The group is well on its way.

III. B. Physical Resources

Update on BC's CMMS (Computerized Maintenance Management System) aka Work order software
At Bakersfield College, we have been using MPulse work order system for a number of years. The software is old and archaic. It is in need of replacement. Porterville College and Cerro Coso College are now in need of a work order system. The M&O departments of the three colleges worked with the District IT staff to identify possible systems. The work order system used by our IT staff is called IssueTrak. We reviewed that system but found it would not work for M&O. We reviewed three other Work Order systems and decided that we would proceed with a CMMS named: SchoolDude. Soon after the decision was made to go with SchoolDude, our new Director of Construction wanted to verify that the Work Order Software that we use will work with the Construction Software that the District group will be using. The recommendation was that we should use software called Megamation. This suggestion was reviewed and the decision has been made to proceed with SchoolDude.

Once we have the software installed, we will need to populate the system with data about our facilities and equipment. We will set up training sessions for the faculty and staff on campus.

III.C. Technology Resources

The Standard III.C. Self-Evaluation Committee met on April 26th before the end of the Spring Semester. The committee is made up of a diverse group of members of the college community, but we look forward to the addition of a student representative in the near future. At our April 26th meeting, we distributed information and discussed how best to complete the tasks required to evaluate Standard III.C. Our goal is to have Standard III.C completed by the middle of November. The group has been working on a list of questions that will be included in the SEC Survey Questionnaire that will be distributed this fall. Like the other SEC committees, the III.C committee received training, has access, and is actively using Share Point to post information to help facilitate and collaborate our communication needs as we discuss questions and evidence related to the self-evaluation process. Each member of our committee is currently gathering general information and ideas for supporting evidence for the questions related to Standard III.C. The committee will have this portion completed by September 9th. There are no recommendations for Standard III. C to address.

III. D Financial Resources

The Finance Standard Subcommittee has met four times. We met twice during the spring semester and once over the summer. Our most recent meeting was on Thursday, August 25. Our next scheduled meeting is for Friday, September 23.
We are taking a top-down approach to writing our report. Sue Vaughn asked Tom Burke from the district office to answer questions found in handout 3 for Standard III D. He answered as many as he could. His answers provided a district perspective. He also directed us to sources on campus where we could find information and evidence for our report.
Currently, each member of the committee is working on assigned sections from handout 3, gathering information and evidence from campus sources. Committee members have already conducted interviews and requested information from key members of the administration who are responsible for the school's budgetary and financial needs.
The Finance Standard Subcommittee is partially responsible for Recommendation 4 and 11. We have not yet addressed these recommendations in our committee meetings. However, it seems as though recommendations have at least been partially met with the newly formed Budget Committee, which is charged with "[Developing] a communication plan to keep the college apprised of information that impacts the budget" (Recommendation 4), and [Providing] a represerentative to participate in the district's Budget Allocation Model review group" (Recommendation 11).

IV. A. Decision Making Roles

The Sub-Committee for Standard IV A Decision-Making Roles and processes. Composition and work of the committee is outlined in the attached project management plan. Significant progress includes a reviewing of pertinent documents, developing an outline of components to be included in the draft, and insertion of evidence documents in the SharePoint format. The committee will be meeting on Wednesday, August 31 to craft the initial draft of the standard responses.

IV. B. Board and Admin Organization

A new co-chair to this subcommittee was appointed at the end of the spring 2011 semester. BC President Greg Chamberlain and Faculty member Mark Staller are now co-chairing this subcommittee. Mark Staller met with Bonnie Suderman on August 23 to receive initial training for the accreditation subcommittee work. Mark Staller and Greg Chamberlain had their first meeting on August 25 to decide on how to proceed as a subcommittee. It was decided that the subcommittee will divvy up sections of the report and each member will have some responsibility for writing the Sharepoint document for Standard 4b. A second subcommittee meeting was held on August 26, with Mark Staller and Kate Pluta present. It was decided that this subcommittee will not need to schedule a focus group, but we will need to meet with the KCCD Board of Trustees in order to complete our task. Mark Staller is currently dividing up the questions that need to be answered, and he will be distributing these questions and topic areas to the subcommittee members.