

Nick Strobel's report to his constituents posted at <http://www2.bakersfieldcollege.edu/nstrobel/collegecouncil/mar2114.htm> will be used as the official minutes for this meeting of the College Council. These minutes were approved by College Council on April 24, 2014.

College Council -- March 21, 2014

Quick Jump to Sections: [Facilities Master Plan Update](#), [Accreditation](#), [District Consultation Council](#), [Mission Statement Review + Critical Institutional Plans](#), [Reports from Innovation 2014 Conference](#), [Other](#), [Next Meeting](#).

President Christian was up in Sacramento so she was not able to be at the meeting today and Vice President Gomez-Heitzeberg was not able to attend most of the meeting, so Information Services Director Todd Coston was asked to lead the meeting, particularly since the first big chunk of the meeting would be about the Facilities Master Plan, of which he and Jim Coggins are the Bakersfield College administrative leads.

Facilities Master Plan Update

Cambridge West gave a [presentation on the updated Facilities Master Plan](#) (select the link to download the PowerPoint slides). After consultation with various groups of faculty, classified staff, and administration over the past month, revisions have been made to the STEM area and three options are proposed for the Student Services area. At the end of the presentation, College Council took a paper survey of which of the three Student Services options we liked with rationale. Similar surveys are being taken with other groups as well.

At this stage of the process we're only looking at building footprints to see how people will flow in and through the campus. No building blueprints or figuring out where specific offices will go. Also, very long-range plans of 10-25 years (or more).

STEM Neighborhood

- Have buildings associated with STEM-Industrial Technology areas surrounding a central courtyard area where the current Science-Engineering building is. New building built in the grass area between current SE building and Student Services in phase 1 and then a new building built in the footprint of the west wing of the current SE building in phase 2.
- Current math and science offices and lab/classrooms will eventually be moved out of the current Math-Science building into the new Math-Science-Engineering buildings and Allied Health will expand into the current Math-Science building.
- Design will open up the Industrial Technology buildings and rest of Math-Science building to the rest of the campus. Will provide better access for students (including more universal access points) to those parts of the campus.
- No swing space (no portable buildings) needed.
- Agriculture - Horticulture moved to a new building next to the current Math-Science building (tear down current Ag building). New building will have an external elevator to enable everyone to make the grade difference between the staff parking area on the south side to the STEM courtyard and core of the campus.
- Entry from Mt Vernon side of campus significantly modified to improve access and flow. Also minimizes service vehicular traffic crossing pedestrian traffic.

Student Services

Trying to consolidate as much of the Student Services, Basic Skills, Career Center areas as we can. Also want to make it easier for new students to see from the parking lot the building(s) housing the various student services of the matriculation process and the library. So as the student arrives from the main entrance of the campus, they'll automatically know which building(s) they need to go to in order to enroll and get the things they need for their classes before the semester starts. All three Student Services options have a new building in the footprint of the current Business Services + Bookstore (building "B" in the Student Services options). Culinary Arts will move to that building B as we combine Culinary Arts and Food Services and gathering/meeting space for conferences will also be in building B. The conference space could include a 300-seat auditorium. Building B could have two floors, depending on the option chosen. The Archives could go into Building B.

- The presentation slides show for Option 1 of Student Services a new building area where the Levan Center is. That is a mistake in the drawing. The Levan Center will NOT be touched.
- Option 1 has administration re-located to top floor of building B. Human Resources, Foundation, and Business Services also on that top floor.
- Option 1 could have an entrance off of Panorama Drive.
- Option 1 opens up the center courtyard of the Campus Center.
- Option 1 removes current Levinson building, opening up the space for a future building.
- Option 2 consolidates all of the Student Services and Basic Skills into one building at the current Levinson building location but the building would not be visible from the main student parking areas.
- Option 2 removes current Student Services building, opening up the space for a future building.
- Current ag field at northwest corner of campus would not be touched in Option 2.
- Option 2 has a student parking area in the current soccer/athletic fields (off of Haley) and two new full-size soccer fields would be in the current southwest parking lot area.
- Option 2 has a straight visual line from the GET terminal on Panorama to the center of campus and on to the Gymnasium & stadium.
- Option 3 puts the new Student Services building north of the Library and has an entrance off of Panorama Drive.
- Option 3's new Student Services building would be easily visible from one of the big student parking areas.
- Option 3 tears down current Levinson and current Student Services so create space for new building pads.
- Option 3 also has a straight visual line from the GET terminal on Panorama to the center of campus and on to the Gymnasium & stadium.

Athletics: Field House / Club House

Creates an additional club house for the softball field and another field house just east of the current Men's Field House. The new field house would have an external elevator to provide wheelchair access to the campus core from the southeast area. Currently, there is just the long stairway south of the Gymnasium.

Slide 15 of the presentation shows what it would take to put a regulation soccer field into the stadium. It would require some reconfiguring of the the track to meet the requirements of the NCAA.

Accreditation

Kate Pluta, faculty co-chair of Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) and Program Review Committee, led us through the information we need to collect and decisions we need to make for the ACCJC annual

report and the changes proposed for ASC. Her [PowerPoint slides](#) are posted on the [College Council website](#) (see the March 21, 2014 supporting documents).

The [current DRAFT of the ACCJC Annual Report](#) is posted on the [College Council website](#) (in the March 21, 2014 supporting documents). **The report is due March 31st.** Various people or groups are working a different sections of the annual report with Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg overseeing the entire project. Janet Fulks is working on the student achievement data part of the report with Lisa Fitzgerald. The assessment committee led by John Carpenter and Bonnie Suderman and our Institutional Learning Outcomes coordinator, John Gerhold, are working on the student/program/institutional learning outcomes section.

The annual reports includes stats such as number of degrees/certificates awarded in the past year, pass rates, number of all courses, number of Gen Ed courses, etc. along with narratives of how we're assessing the learning outcomes of the various levels. The course record in Curricunet will eventually need to include an explicit mapping of a Gen Ed course's SLOs to the Gen Ed program SLOs. (We used to have such a mapping in the course record form before we moved to Curricunet.

As of 2012, all accredited institutions need to be at least at the Proficient level of the student learning outcomes assessment, so the current 2014 version of form is probing deeper to see what are the connections between the various levels of outcome assessment. We need to go beyond simple measures of completion data to what can our students DO when they complete a program. How does our assessment affect our resource allocation and what is our evidence?

As we evaluate our processes, we need to ask ourselves:

- Are we collecting information to meet compliance requirements? *We have to.*
- Are we collecting information only to meet compliance requirements? *No. We collect it because it because we want to improve what we do; improve our service to the students.*
- Are we doing our work systematically? *We're getting there. Part of that is the regular review of our mission. Whether or not we revise it, we do need to regularly (annually) review our mission. Do we have a written procedure for reviewing our mission regularly? College Council needs to be the lead on the mission review. The regular review also is done for each of processes such as human resources, finances, technology, facilities. So many of these are attached to the district office and they must evaluated according to ACCJC.*
- How do we know? *College Council minutes.*

ASC to AIQ

Latest iteration (March 19, 2014 version) of the [charge for Accreditation and Institutional Quality](#) (AIQ) was reviewed. The new charge is going through the Senate and College Council for vetting and modifications until all agree. Kate has been using the Senate's Proposal for Change form to explain the [rationale for the change](#) (see the "[Senate Proposal for Change ASC to AIQ](#)" document in the March 21, 2014 supporting documents of the College Council website). AIQ will be measuring (at least) three indicators of institutional effectiveness: planning, program review, and student learning outcomes. The particular indicators need to be created as part of a collegewide conversation---it won't be just AIQ creating the indicators, since the whole college has to own them. The indicators will include the college scorecard (student achievement) data.

AIQ will make sure a systematic evaluation of all processes occurs. In addition to improving the quality of BC, a systematic evaluation will make it much easier for us to create the accreditation self-evaluation and mid-term reports, since all of the information and evidence we need will be right at our fingerprints instead a huge massive effort we undergo every six years.

Some membership changes when ASC moves to AIQ. VP Academic Affairs currently co-chairs the committee with a faculty co-chair. Whenever we get the dean of institutional effectiveness, that person will be the admin co-chair. Both chairs will be voting members of College Council (currently ASC faculty co-chair is just a guest member). All the vice-presidents will be on AIQ as will the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) coordinator. Number of classified staff doubles to four persons and faculty membership will be ten (recall that accreditation is in the 10+1 purview of the Academic Senate). As we start up AIQ, we will stagger member terms of 2 and 3 years so that there will be continuity as member terms expire.

District Consultation Council

The scheduled March 18, 2014 DCC meeting was canceled. The next meeting of DCC will be April 22nd. That will be after the Board of Trustees votes on the proposed increase in the minimum budget reserve (from current 5% to proposed 15% districtwide plus 3% at each of the colleges). When the reserve proposal had its "first read" with the [BOT at Porterville earlier this month](#), many of the Porterville faculty spoke for the need to reinvest in the colleges as our state funding has improved and that such a reserve increase would prevent that needed reinvestment. The Bakersfield College Academic Senate will be considering its response to the reserve proposal and present it at the April 10th meeting which will be held at BC. Also, the 15% increase in the reserves removes that money from the 50% law calculation. *[Later development: The BC Academic Senate will be presenting a [resolution about the budget reserve proposal](#) that presents the multiple-point rationale for keeping the minimum reserve at the 5% level.]*

Mission Statement Review + Critical Institutional Plans

This is College Council sponsored work that will be spearheaded by the ASC/AIQ co-chairs (Kate Pluta and Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg) and begin in April. We will be looking at how the accreditation Standard IA guides our review of the mission statement and creation of critical institutional plans. Any changes in our mission statement and other plans must be in line with accreditation Standard IA.

The accreditation standards are being modified and Standard IA is about the college mission. Here is the proposed language for Standard IA:

I.A. Mission

1. The institution's mission describes its broad educational purposes, its degrees and credentials offered, its intended student population, and its commitment to student success, as reflected in student learning and student achievement. The institution's programs and services are aligned with its mission.
2. The institution uses data to determine how effectively its is accomplishing its mission, and whether the mission directs institutional priorities and educational needs of students.
3. The mission guides institutional decision-making, planning, and resource allocation and informs institutional goals for student learning and achievement.
4. The institutional mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.

The Senate and CSEA needs to appoint faculty and classified staff to be on the work group that looks at reviewing the college mission statement. The work group will publish their work on a website in much the same way that the re-org teams posted their work. President Christian would like to present the *finished work* of the work group *at the Closing Day event on May 16th*.

The college's strategic goals are through 2015, so we will need to be revising the three-year strategic goals next year. However, those must come out of the college's mission statement according to accreditation standards, so the mission statement review must be done before then. Another critical institutional plan is the district strategic plan that is in the process of being developed. There is some question of what needs to

come first: the district's strategic plan or the college strategic plan OR can they be developed in parallel? Since Bakersfield College supplies over 2/3rds of the district's FTES, it is hoped that BC can have a significant impact in setting the agenda of the district's plan. The Chancellor is wanting the district's strategic plan to be completed in May.

Reports from Innovation 2014 Conference

Ann Tatum presented a [draft of the summary document](#) about what BC people learned from the [League for Innovation's "Innovation 2014" conference](#) held March 2-5 in Anaheim. The summary document is still in draft form. Once Ann gets the rest of the people's reports from the conference, she'll finalize the document. Attendees included Tim Bohan, Pam Boyles, Victor Diaz, Regina Hukill, Kyle Loughman, Beth Rodacker, Ann Tatum, and Keri Wolf. Summarizing this multi-day conference filled with many sessions is not a trivial task! Sessions were grouped into six groups: completion agenda, pathways leading to student success, data and technology, equity, non-cognitive skills, and placement and assessment.

Ann attended the session led by Terry O'Banion about access, success, and completion. O'Banion argues the pathway a student follows in getting a degree should be the college's strategic plan instead of some abstract statements. Since we're here to help students progress to their academic goals, then that should be the college's mission/goal. At each of the steps in the pathway, the college would derive its strategic goals. She did see a lot of overlap of our current strategic goals with the various steps in the college pathway.

The pathways for student success group included workshops on accelerated classes, first year experience and summer bridge programs. Ann noted that a number of summer bridge programs are ramping incoming students up to take the placement exams, so a college has to be committed to those placement exams in order for it to be effective (see the report about 2013 DEEP Camp from Dallas County, Texas). The data and technology group included such things as math labs, use of iPads/tablet computers in classes, using data to find out where exactly the college is spending its money (see the report from Johnson County Comm Coll "Maximizing Your Institution's Resources for Student Success"). The non-cognitive skills group included workshops that mesh nicely with BC's Habits of Mind initiative.

The placement/assessment group included one eye-opening one by Long Beach CC. Long Beach CC is doing great work on alternative placement methods, including use of high school GPAs + other high school data, that have a great positive impact on students of color placements in English levels and success in subsequent classes. Long Beach looks at a subset of the students' high school courses, focusing on the academically-rigorous ones for the ones to use in placing students in college classes. The correlation of high school English course grades with success in college English courses is much stronger than that for high school math classes. Long Beach is following the students to see how well they do in other courses besides English and math. The Long Beach presenters also had the conference attendees try answering the placement test questions with clickers and most of the college-educated attendees (many with a Masters or higher) had difficulty with the placement questions. Imagine what it's like for the incoming students!

Many of the Innovations presentations are posted at www.league.org/i2014/powerpoint until April 27th. After that date, they will move to iStream at www.league.com/istreamsite.

Other

- [Jane Goodall](#) talk "[Sowing the Seeds of Hope](#)" on [April 1st](#) from 7:30 to 9:30 in the Gym. Tickets are selling fast. \$15 adults/\$10 students.
- [Conference on Equity](#) on April 3rd from 9 AM to 3 PM. Working with Achieving the Dream, how will we eliminate achievement gaps among student groups, including students of color and low income students while improving outcomes for all students? The keynote speaker is [Kati Haycock](#),

president of [Education Trust](#), a nationally-recognized organization dedicated to high academic achievement for all students pre-K through college. Attendee Outcomes:

- Participants will understand the differences in definition and application between "Equity" and "Equality".
- Participants will comprehend the Interrelation among Achieving the Dream, SSSP, and the Student Equity Plan Efforts, and how institutional efforts can be streamlined and synthesized.
- Participants will understand the next steps of transitioning from Achieving the Dream Planning Year toward an Implementation Plan (Year 2).
- Participants will appreciate the value and process of proactively developing assessment methodologies to evaluate student success interventions.
- ***After meeting development:*** on March 26th I found that the Baccalaureate legislation is not a done deal---it did not pass yet. The legislation is still in the Higher Education Committee. Also, because of politics at the state level, nursing programs will very likely NOT be part of the legislation.
- Don't forget to get your faculty medallion for the May 16th Centennial Graduation ceremony! It is going to be major event!

Next meeting

Next College Council meeting will be May 2, 2014.