

Nick Strobel's report to his constituents posted at <http://www2.bakersfieldcollege.edu/nstrobel/collegecouncil/dec0613.htm> will be used as the official minutes for this meeting of the College Council. These minutes were approved by College Council on February 7, 2014.

College Council -- December 6, 2013

Quick Jump to Sections: [Collegewide Reorganization](#), [Institutional Scorecard](#), [Student Success Legislation](#), [AB 86 Adult Education](#), [Other](#), [Program Review and Closing the Loop](#), [Next Meeting](#).

A couple of corrections were made to my November 15th report: (1) ASC is not currently planning forums on how it can work on institutional effectiveness, but they will be going to various committee meetings to discuss future directions with those committees and (2) the November 14th reorg proposal did not contain the department listings. The [corrected November 15th report](#) is now posted.

Collegewide Reorganization

The [Reorg task force](#) presented the [final final versions of their three proposals](#). For all of the proposals, the key guiding principles were to create workload equity for the administrators and increase collaboration across the areas. The org charts in the document are of just the administrative level but the [December 6th proposal draft's narrative](#) contains the information about where the departments fit in for team A's and C's proposals. Team B's department placement was lost in the collation but will be put in by next week (so that will be the final final final draft). College Council accepted the report so the Reorg task force's work is now done. The document is an impressive piece of work with far greater depth than we expected and somehow the task force members got it all done while keeping up with all of their other regular job duties. Just another example of the quality of people we have here who really care about this place! Sonya Christian looks forward to sharing the document with the Board of Trustees at their December meeting.

The next steps for the proposals are detailed on page 24 of the December 6th draft. Sonya Christian has identified ten areas of need and potential administrative positions identified by all three teams: institutional effectiveness/data, student success, academic technologies/distance learning, culinary and food services, athletics, grants, events, facilities and maintenance & operations, public safety, and deans scope of work. She will work with College Council and the President's Cabinet to determine which of the ten areas will be filled by new administrators and which will be done by faculty and classified staff. Some of the areas of need that are filled by faculty and classified staff might have limited terms that a person has to commit to and then they would return to their original position while another person comes forward to take leadership in that area like what happens with our committee chairs.

At the very least we know that we have go out and hire the dean positions held by Leah Carter and Liz Rozell as they were temporary appointments during the 18-month transition period of BCATT that ends at the end of Spring 2014. With whatever other positions that are determined we need to fill with an administrator, the hiring process will be done in phases over the next two to three years to spread out the financial impact to the college. A subgroup of College Council, comprised of seven members from the Reorg task force will annually review the administrative structure of the college and make recommendations of how to proceed in the following phases.

Institutional Scorecard Update

Sonya Christian and Janet Fulks gave us an [overview of the work going on in the development of our college scorecard](#). Two new accreditation standards have been developed by our accrediting body, ACCJC.

Standard 3 was highlighted; it says "The institution establishes and publishes its own standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, and assesses how well it is achieving its institutionally defined standards." Over the next few years, we (the college) will be moving from getting statistical reports filled with all sorts of numbers to a scorecard that we own. A scorecard is analogous to the "vital signs" you get with a medical physical (blood pressure, cholesterol count, etc.). We will ask ourselves to evaluate what those numbers in the student success reports (completion and persistence for the various student groups) mean. Is a metric's number for BC mean we're doing well, so-so, or poorly for a given student group? Such discussions among faculty, classified staff, and administration give a social meaning to the number or shared standards.

After that initial evaluation, we'll work on developing reasonable/realistic targets for improvement as well as bottom level thresholds we cannot go below. As we shoot for a target that will push us to a new level, we also need to be smart in setting the target that is not impossibly high. But we can't have a target so low that it could be achieved with the usual statistical fluctuation from the status quo. An example target given in the [overview presentation slides](#) is the highest level BC achieved in the past 10 years.

We also need to figure out which group or groups of students upon whom we should focus our effort in order to have the biggest impact on the overall college student success metric. For example, the completion rate among our college-prepared students is actually quite high (better than the statewide average for college-prepared students) but the completion rate among our underprepared students (who make up 80% of the student population) is below the state average. We know that the underprepared students who complete their educational plans are 100% more successful than their peers who do not.

Besides being an accreditation standard, all this work is also critical to our future state funding that is shifting from access (number of students on census date) to completion (how many actually complete their degrees or certificates). The state apportionment (\$\$\$) will NOT take into account the socioeconomic levels/demographics of our students: i.e., it will not differentiate on student preparation.

One of the pieces of data we will be gathering in Spring 2014 is the [CCSSE](#) ("sessie"), a national survey that measures the levels of community college student engagement in their education---how they spend their time; what they feel they have gained from their classes; how they assess their relationships and interactions with faculty, counselors, and peers; what kinds of work they are challenged to do; how the college supports their learning; and so on. We administered the CCSSE in spring 2011, so we have that as a benchmark with which to compare ourselves.

[One sidenote brought up in the discussion is that the screening of the [film "First Generation"](#) originally scheduled for finals week has been moved to sometime in February so that we have time to push for broader engagement of students and faculty.]

Student Success Legislation

Sonya Christian did a brief overview of the Student Success Legislation in the absence of Zav Dadbhoy, Manny Mourtzanos, and Sue Granger-Dickson who attended the [state-wide meeting on implementing the student success legislation](#). Here are the main points made by Christian:

- The matriculation funding has been shifted to student success funding with allocations emphasizing front end services like orientation, advising, assessment/placement, and educational planning. The focus will be on front end services to our students: getting them on the right track from the get go, so they don't wander around aimlessly and rack up a lot of units that are not focused on a program of study and/or drop out because they have no goals.
- The student success legislation is much more prescriptive of the types of plans we have to make in developing the mandatory services. The focus on front end services is one reason why three of the four faculty positions already approved for hiring (for a total cost of the four of \$350,840) are

counselors: one who will focus on students placed into pre-collegiate level classes, one with technology expertise to advance orientation and advising, and another focusing on EOP&S. Three of the four classified positions already approved for hiring (for a total cost of the four of \$169,266) will be two educational advisors and a department assistant in counseling.

- In order to comply with the legislation, there is quite a bit of work that needs to be done in Banner coding to generate the reports the state will be requiring of us as part of the student success legislation.
- Generally with the whole national focus on the completion agenda, there is an interest here in California to partially shift our apportionment (money from the state) to a completion model: i.e., funding will be attached to the students who complete their programs of study.

AB 86 Adult Education

Leah Carter and Ann Tatum reported that [Assembly Bill 86 about shifting adult education \(high school GED, etc.\) to the community colleges](#) is continuing forward with implementation. A first step in that is \$25 million in the state budget for community colleges to develop regional plans for adult education. We will be going out for a piece of that \$25 million so that we can find the gaps between what we already provide and what Kern High School District provides with the [Bakersfield Adult School](#) in the following five areas: (1) elementary and basic skills; (2) classes for immigrants (ESL, citizenship, and workforce preparation); (3) programs for adults with disabilities; (4) Short term CTE programs with high employment potential; and (5) programs for apprentices. A group consisting of Leah Carter, Ann Tatum, Sue Granger-Dickson, Bonita Steele (director of grants and resources development at the district office), Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, and Sonya Christian will be working on the college's plan for adult education.

Other

- Items from the districtwide consultation council held on November 26th include [the 2015-16 academic calendar](#), [the 2016-17 academic calendar](#), and the [Fall 2013 decision making survey results](#). The board policy language on effective student contact for distance education was approved with our (ISIT and Academic Senate) recommendations, including the 72 hour time limit to respond back to student queries/requests. Also, the wellness requirement for graduation that was mysteriously deleted from board policy is now back in so that campuses can vet the proposal to delete the requirement through the proper channels. The December 9th districtwide consultation council meeting will take up the Tobacco Free campus policies.
- Faculty MUST submit their semester grades within three working days of the final exam for a given class. "RD" (report delayed) grades will be put on the students transcripts on December 19th if an instructor hasn't submitted grades for their students. This can very negatively impact a student's financial aid or being able to get into a class with prerequisite courses.
- The SAM building remodel/opening dedication is scheduled for October 2014.
- Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg has some interesting new fundraiser ideas you need to ask her about.

Program Review and Closing the Loop

College Council concluded its regular business meeting and joined with FCDC, Committee Co-Chairs, and President's Cabinet to hear the presentations from the program review committee and the groups who put together the [Mid-Year Closing the Loop Report](#). Manny Mourtzanos gave the [PRC annual report presentation](#) based on Kate Pluta's [narrative version of the PRC annual report](#). The purposes of the PRC annual report are to summarize common themes/issues from the annual updates, to assess the annual update process, and to provide the information needed for allocating resources. The [PRC annual report presentation](#) gives a high level overview, and the [narrative version of the PRC annual report](#) gives the details. The "technology disparity in facilities" phrase in the PRC annual report means that our classrooms

have varying degree of multimedia capabilities and wireless access is not uniform across the campus. All of the individual annual updates, best practice forms, program requests (personnel, ISIT, M&O/facilities), and list of model (exceptional program) annual updates are posted on the [Program Review Committee website](#). Four departments will be piloting the comprehensive three-year program review form: Vocational Nursing (CTE), Information Services & Media Services (Admin Svcs), Counseling (Student Services), and American Sign Language (Instructional).

The [Mid-Year Closing the Loop Report](#) shows how the resource allocation is connected to the strategic goals of the college. The college operates with a general fund budget (funds not restricted by the state to specific purposes) of about \$51 million, with 85% allotted to salaries & benefits and 14% to other non-operational expenses. We also receive about \$9.4 million in state and federal grants. The [Mid-Year Closing the Loop Report](#) is organized in three sections: Section A on Personnel including the administrative reorganization and faculty & classified staff positions we'll be hiring; Section B on Technology including what was done over the summer 2013 and the [ISIT Committee's ranking of technology requests](#); and Section C on Facilities including what was done over the summer 2013, current projects, and the prioritization of facilities requests.

Next meeting

Next College Council meeting will be February 7, 2014.