

**College Council**  
Meeting Minutes

**December 2, 2016**

---

[College Council Website](#)

**College Council Members Present:** Sonya Christian, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, , Zav Dadabhoy, Nicky Damania, Kimberly Bligh, Jennifer Johnson, Krista Moreland, Chris Glaser, Steven Holmes, Faith Bradham, John Hart, Isabel Stierle, Kate Pluta, Mark Staller, Jason Stratton, Janet Fulks

**Guests/Committee Chairs:** Nick Strobel, Lesley Bonds, Pam Boyles, Todd Coston, Grace Commiso, John Giertz, Bryan Hirayama, Dianthe Hoffman, Bill Moseley, Kimberly Nickell, Kristin Rabe, Bill Potter, Liz Rozell

**Next meeting:** December 16, 2016

**WELCOME & OVERVIEW of the AGENDA**

**PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

<https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/President%27s%20report%20to%20College%20Council%20Dec%202%202016.pdf>

President Christian directed the Council to her report posted to the College Council website. Christian highlighted upcoming events, particularly Opening Day and the Winter Institute.

Additionally, Christian asked Council members to familiarize themselves with the four Accreditation Standards, and to participate in the soft launch of the Self Evaluation work on December 16, 2016 and January 13, 2017.

Christian also reviewed recent reports on enrollment for fall 2016 and spring 2017, and Phase I of the 2017-18 faculty hiring list.

**STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS REPORT**

<https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/AIQ%20Strategic%20DirectionsReport%20Fall2016ver3.pdf>

Pluta began the presentation reminding everyone how the Strategic Directions process began in 2013-14 and how the initiatives, data strands and the evaluation and reporting processes have evolved.

The Strategic Direction team then provided a summary of how the Strategic Directions work is impacting Student Success

**Road Map To Institutional Effectiveness And Student Success**

- The intent is to complete the initiatives over the course of the three-year cycle.
- Each year the College will evaluate the progress it has made on each initiative.
- AIQ will report at the annual College Leadership Year-End Review & Planning Meeting.

**The Plan**

- Fall Committee Reports will update progress on the initiatives.
- The committees and other reporters will share their progress.

- Following its charge, AIQ will “review and monitor evaluation activities to ensure they result in integrated, meaningful, and sustained college improvement.”
- AIQ will analyze the Strategic Directions Reports, create a summary, and present the information to College Council in early December.

### Scoring Our Work, 2015--

- Green means an initiative has been completed.
- Green and yellow together represent work perpetually in progress.
- Yellow indicates the work is in progress.
- Red shows that work has not yet begun.
- Initiatives with yellow or red icons will need to include action plans for completion.

### The Results

The raw data reports of each group are posted as well as the collective scoring of each initiative can be found here: <https://www.bakersfieldcollege.edu/scorecard/strategic-directions>

### Key Facts

- Second year of the three-year cycle.
- Fall report is an update with action plans.
- Evidence will be submitted with year-end report.
- Reports are posted on AIQ page and Scorecard.

#### *Sustainable Continuous Quality Improvement*

#### Submission Rates

Fall 2015	37%
Spring 2016	83%
Fall 2016	84.9%

### Things We Have Learned

- This is a process.
- Wording of the initiatives matters.
- It is good when a committee works as a group to complete the report.
- It is good when multiple committees, individuals, or groups work together on initiatives.
- There is a lot of good in these reports, but we aren’t getting back what we expected.
- The process for reporting out the work has not yet been embedded in the work of committees and groups.
- The work of the initiatives appears to be embedded in the work of the college—but we’re not sure.

### Next Steps

- We need to continue to do training workshops.
- We all need to read the analysis of these reports.
- Are we duplicating work?
- Are we working in silos?
- Could we be working together more productively?
- We need to assess both the progress on the initiatives and the reporting process.
- We need to evaluate our scoring process: Is “perpetually in progress” a realistic assessment?

The Strategic Directions team asked the group to provide input on how to improve the process to ensure the information we need is provided.

## **PROGRAM REVIEW**

<https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/Program%20Review%20Annual%20Summary%202016.pdf>

### **Purpose of Annual Report**

- To summarize themes and issues that emerged in the program reviews
- To assess the Program Review processes and make recommendations for further improvement
- To provide information for decision-making, recommending bodies
- PRC reviewed 70 instructional programs including the baccalaureate, 8 “other” programs, 10 administrative units, 8 student affairs units, and 12 academic affairs units across the College. 1 admin unit, 2 student and academic affairs programs did not submit a review
- Of the completed reviews, 83 were Annual Updates and 21 were Comprehensive Reviews

### **Findings**

- We created a single naming convention for all documents, this worked better but not ideal
- Increased number of Facilities Requests (96) Over 1/3 are being addressed as work orders
- Began new request process for “other” technology/equipment. Debut has 48 requests
- Increased number of Technology requests (66) 16 of which were Hardware Replacement or Resolved.
- 39 Professional Development Requests
- 86 Best Practices!
- **We are working more effectively with other committees.**
- List of programs is still not conclusive
- Assessment Process Form not easily understood

### **Concerns**

- Some programs submitted annual updates without submitting resource requests (staff, technology, Facilities, other)
- Programs did not submit the right form for their resource request
- There were very few assessments for technology, facilities and other equipment.
- Many conclusions were superficial
- Some programs did not submit an annual update
- This is the one opportunity each program, service and office has to spotlight themselves

### **Recommendations**

- Continue to track the connection between the program review process and resource allocations
- Develop an accurate master list of programs and verify each program prior to the process beginning
- Provide more training for administrators, current and incoming department chairs, and interested employees
- Meet with each area dean/department chair

## **ACCREDITATION**

<https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/Self%20Evaluation%20Team%202018ver2.pdf>

Pluta reviewed the leads, teams and committees that have been assigned to work on each standard as of December 1, 2016. This matrix will continue to be filled in with additional names as they are confirmed. It was noted that chairs and members of assigned committees should consider being leads or team members for the standard.

Pluta shared the draft job description for the self-evaluation team faculty chair. <https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/SelfEval%20faculty%20co-chair%20job%20description%202016%20Draft%202.pdf> College Council reviewed the document and compared changes from the previous job description.

A motion was made by Stratton and seconded by Gomez-Heitzeberg to approve the self-evaluation co-chair job description as presented.

### **DISTRICT CONSULTATION COUNCIL**

<https://committees.kccd.edu/committee/district-consultation-council>

District Consultation Council (DCC) met for the second time this semester on November 22, 2016.

- BAM Evaluation was discussed and was sent to the Chancellor for approval. There was an objection to a district wide budget committee from one college's Academic Senate.
- CCLC Board Policy chapters have been posted for review. All constituents are encouraged to review and provide feedback to DCC representatives.

### **COMMITTEE CHARGE REVISIONS**

- **Curriculum Committee**

[https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/Curriculum%20Charge%202016-proposed%20change\\_1.pdf](https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/Curriculum%20Charge%202016-proposed%20change_1.pdf)

A motion was made by Damania and seconded by Staller to approve the revised committee charge as presented. The motion carried without objection.

- **Program Review Committee Charge**

[https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/Program%20Review%20Charge%202016-proposed%20change\\_1.pdf](https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/Program%20Review%20Charge%202016-proposed%20change_1.pdf)

A motion was made by Holmes and seconded by Johnson to approve the revised committee charge as presented. The motion carried without objection.

- **Student Conduct Committee**

[https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/Student%20Conduct%20Committee%20Charge%202016-proposed%20change\\_1.pdf](https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/Student%20Conduct%20Committee%20Charge%202016-proposed%20change_1.pdf)

A motion was made by Holmes and seconded by Damania to approve the revised committee charge as presented. The motion carried without objection.

- **Professional Development Committee**

[https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/Professional%20Dev%20Charge%202016-proposed%20change\\_1.pdf](https://committees.kccd.edu/sites/committees.kccd.edu/files/Professional%20Dev%20Charge%202016-proposed%20change_1.pdf)

A motion was made by Staller and seconded by Johnson to approve the revised committee charge as presented. The motion carried without objection.

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

- AIQ
- Dates to Calendar