

Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC)
Unapproved Minutes
December 6, 2011
3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Collins Conference Center

Attendees: Kate Pluta, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg (co-chair), Becky Mooney, Ann Morgan, (co-chair), Kirk Russell, LaMont Schiers, Rachel Vickrey, Sue Granger-Dickson, Bonnie Suderman, Renee Trujillo, Hamid Eydgahi, Danitza Romo (SGA)

Absentees: Klint Rigby, Diana Kelly, Bernadette Towns, and Billy Barnes.

1. Review and approve minutes

- Minutes have been review and corrected for the previous meetings; in the process of approval.

2. SEC Update (see handout)

Rebecca Mooney and Bonnie Suderman presented their report. All sub-committees have submitted their accreditation documents. Rebecca Mooney stated that some of the committee chairs were under the impression that this was a “draft” that was due for the editor to make additional adjustments. The two two-hour peer review sessions were not as helpful as they had hoped. The standards have been reviewed and feedback was given to the co-chairs by meetings for verbal instructions and/or with emails. They have not met with Greg Chamberlain yet. Bonnie Suderman stated they have added a folder to each standard in Share Point labeled “Editor Ready” for the document revisions. They will be added to the folders once the changes that were recommended are complete. An additional folder labeled “Edited” will be used by Jennifer Jett once she has finished each document. Co-chairs will receive an email with instructions about this process for the correct document folder placement.

Amber Chiang is working on the introductory sections for the accreditation. These documents are also located in Share Point under BC Accreditation docs. There are only two recommendations that are not complete. Rebecca Mooney and Bonnie Suderman are waiting for the College Council to convene before they finish. Bonnie is also waiting on Greg Chamberlain on Action 2012 to complete this process.

Rebecca Mooney stated Joyce Coleman will have a different student on each standard to review and add them to the list of students who are participating in the process.

Question came up about the drop dead date: if there are changes that need to be made after the sub-committees have completed their work, what happens? What about changes after the due date in April to the Board? Kirk Russell and Kate Pluta both agreed that changes after the drop dead date will be added to the evidence file. Bonnie Suderman went over the response to Accreditation Rubrics part I, II & III (*see handout*). Bonnie had concerns about the accreditation Rubrics-Part II Planning, but felt that some of the workshops attended in September and October, the information could be used in the evidence needed for the Planning piece.

3. Actionable Improvement Plans AIPs (see handout Draft X)

ASC went through the handout by each section of the standards to proof the introductions. Standard I.B had minor adjustments to the sentence structure for the second to last sentence in the paragraph. Standard II.A. Instructional Programs was approved at the last meeting and is ready for the editor as well as Standards II.B Student Support Services. A suggestion was made for some word restructuring on Standard III.B Physical Resources by taking out “hire” more people and added the “sub” to facilities Committee per LaMont Schiers. Bonnie Suderman addressed technology usage. Ann Morgan asked about addressing the Institutional Effectiveness Planning and Kate Pluta suggested that it be tabled till January. Kate Pluta is concerned that the backup documents need to go to the committees who are working on this. Bonnie Suderman wants to make sure that the AIPs submitted are included in the final document. Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg suggested that bullet points showing the contribution of the committee members be reflected in the feedback.

A question was asked, “Who evaluates the District Office with HR to ensure the services are being met under Standard III.A. and IV.B Human Resources?”

4. Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) training report- Nan

No report at this time.

5. Communication from ACCJC: newsletter and Standards review process letter (see handout from email by Kate Pluta)

6. Integrated Program Review

Should the subgroup report roll out 2013-14? Per Kate Pluta and Sue Granger-Dickson the answer is yes. Sue also stated that the IPR group has not met yet due to scheduling conflicts.

Sue Granger-Dickson stated that the Program Review Concept Diagram (*see handout*) should be presented at Opening Day this spring to explain annual planning here at Bakersfield College. Sue went on to state that student will attend to give feedback on what we have accomplished and what we still need to work on. Danitza Romo pointed out that only students who serve on SGA are allowed to attend Opening Day, so most students don’t get an opportunity to speak on matters here. Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg suggested maybe a focus group could be created to meet separately from Opening Day to give students an opportunity to give feedback.

7. ASC will need to evaluate Self Evaluation process

The timeline for finalizing Self Evaluation Study is listed at the bottom of the agenda for today’s meeting.

8. Additional items?

9. Adjourned- Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 17, 2012

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Levinson 40