

# BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE

## Accreditation and Institutional Quality (AIQ) Committee

December 2, 2025

3:00 to 4:30 CC 231

### AIQ Membership:

Role	Member		Attendance
Co-Chairs	Grace Commiso (Faculty Chair)		X
	Ximena Ortega (Classified Chair)		X
	Jessica Wojtysiak (Admin Chair)		X
Admin Rep	Kim Arbolante		X
	Leo Ocampo		X
	Sooyeon Kim		X
	Kristin Rabe		X
	Kalina Hill		X
Classified Rep	Maria Arias		
	Robert Dean		x
	Tanisha Gonzalez		
	Ali Nikmanesh		
	Rima Bhakta		X
Strategic Directions Co-Chair, or Designee	Sooyeon Kim		X
Faculty Rep	Ricardo Garza	<i>Assessment Committee</i>	
	Kimberly Nickell	<i>Program Review</i>	X
	Sondra Keckley	<i>Library</i>	X
	Grace Commiso	<i>Counselor</i>	X
	Laura Boots-Haupt	<i>Agriculture, Nutrition &amp; Culinary Arts</i>	X
	Laura Miller	<i>Agriculture, Nutrition &amp; Culinary Arts</i>	X
	Talita Pruett	<i>Arts, Communication &amp; Humanities</i>	x
	Ricardo Garza	<i>STEM</i>	
	John Hart	<i>Arts, Communication &amp; Humanities</i>	X
Student Reps	Khalfani Mackey	SGA, President	x

	Aydin Garcia	SGA, Rep	
<b>Members At-Large</b>	Lysander Ramos	OIE	x
	Ginger LeBlanc	RSI Rep	X
	Alex Rocky	RSI Rep	x

## Agenda

<b>I. Minutes Review</b>	<b>5 minutes</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AIQ Unapproved Minutes 11/18/2025 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Motion to approve: Sondra, 2<sup>nd</sup> Talita Revised: motion and vote tabled until 1/27/26.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Notes- Kim Arbolante</li> </ol>	
<b>II. Chairs Report:</b>	<b>15 minutes</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ACCJC Visit 12/10/2025 (Jessica) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kevin will visit a substantial number of sites offering 50% of programs: Arvin, Delano, and BCSW.</li> <li>Preparations: just be there and do your thing, faculty. Resources, facilities and support structures are the larger focus</li> <li>VPI Jessica assures Kevin will understand that it is finals week, so operation hours, staffing, and student traffic will vary.</li> <li>Report will come out in January 2026</li> </ul> </li> <li>Grace wants to finish our RSI review so she can show it to the Academic Senate and upcoming faculty workshops. Wants AIQ to vote to approve its rubric for this purpose. VPI Jessica and Rural et. al. Director Leo will dismiss themselves during this portion of AIQ. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When it is presented at Senate, it will be shown as a tool, how it has gone trying out the rubric, and Grace will remind that it needs presidential approval before being used. If the College doesn't use it, whatever will be used will be similar.</li> <li>Grace will make a shared KCCD AIQ folder with naming conventions. Review groups will upload into that shared folder. Grace will also go through each review document and synthesize the feedback.</li> <li>Grace clarified the 85% assessment lens. Some folks found that to be a scavenger hunt or difficult to assess with accuracy to the specific percentage. Some AIQ members think 75% would make for easier math, but do we count self-graded quizzes too? Self-graded or publisher provided assessments and feedback do not count. Some folks think we should count self-graded content; others do not. It was pointed out that self-graded quizzes can be set up to automatically provide feedback, too. ACCJC's rubric uses the term "assessments." VPI Jessica recommends nixing "assessments" in favor of "assignments."</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After discussing, should we vote on whether to go with 85% or 75% for feedback? Otherwise, Alex suggests perhaps breaking these rubric criteria into two sections to make it easier for the reviewer to determine. And did the instructor explain how students should expect to see/receive feedback. Grace thinks it is too late in the review process for that change, but we can try it perhaps in spring. Another lens: do students receive feedback at least once a week? Some feedback occurs before turning in the assignment like in emails. Some courses lend themselves to much more feedback than others, so how do we think of this across the curriculum?</li> <li>Faculty get to choose how they will give this feedback. They could meet C &amp; D but not B. Essentially, the faculty have the freedom to not lean on B to pass in favor of C &amp; D to pass. This can be explained in the rubric discussion. Instructors only have to meet 2 of the 4 criteria.</li> <li>We have to not feel bad about “failing” someone because it is better for us to do it than ACCJC. Then at least we address it departmentally—discipline to discipline.</li> </ul>		
<b>III. Committee Reports:</b>		10 minutes
A. Program Review Report (Nickell) – reviews in progress, due in Feb. 2026. B. Assessment Report (Garza) – not present		
<b>IV. New Business:</b>		1 hour
Time is allotted for group breakouts (15 mins) then the group will reconvene. All reviews are due in the shared folder by EOD 12/3. Grace will send the folder by 12:00 pm on 12/3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Motion to share the pilot review with the Academic Senate</li> <li>Laura motioned, Kim N. 2<sup>nd</sup>. Unanimously passed, no nays, no abstentions.</li> </ul>		
<b>V. Unfinished Business:</b>		
A. Still need to review prior minutes from the last 2 meetings when we reconvene in January 2026.		
<b>Review of Mission &amp; Vision:</b> Mission Statement Vision Statement	<b>Date:</b>	<b>Review of Core Values:</b> Learning Diversity Integrity Community Wellness Sustainability
		<b>Date:</b>