

Accreditation Steering Committee
Tuesday, November 12, 2013
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in Levinson 40
Agenda

1. **Review and approve minutes**—Darren (February 12, 2013 note taker), Rachel (October 15)
There were no comments other than Kate’s comment sent via email (to change “ACJC” to “ACCJC”) and Kirk asked what was meant by the comment that Sonya thought ASC might become a part of College Council. The minutes are revised to read “As a Committee we need to clarify our relationship to College Council.”

Today’s note taker: Andrea

2. **Program Review liaison report**—Kim
PR is busy with the midterm report. PRC is getting together various items from the annual updates, such as assessment questions, etc., to send out to various entities. They are looking at piloting a three year program review with several annual reviews that the committee considered exemplary. There was discussion about PR needing to consider all courses in the degree, not just the courses from the department in question (for example, the Engineering degree requires math classes taught by the math department). There is a need for discussion between all departments. Next year we will pilot the new PR process. Clarification was requested on what that looked like. There will be a comprehensive report every 3 years, with annual updates the 2nd and 3rd years.

3. **BC’s relationship to the larger world of accreditation requirements (federal and regional)**—Nan—
tabled

4. **ASC’s charge**

The group discussed what an evolving “ASC” committee might look like, based on our discussion with Sonya at the last meeting, her big picture ideas of what we might do as a committee and the ideas below brought up at the Student Success Stewardship Team meeting last Friday.

On Friday, November 8, 2013, at the Student Success Stewardship Team meeting I summarized our meeting with Sonya, explaining that ASC was exploring whether to change its charge and become the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. We wanted their feedback.

Here are some of the questions I posed (approximately 30-40 people present):

1. What would an Institutional Effectiveness Committee look like?
2. What might it include?
3. What gaps could it help fill or bridge?
4. What needs would it meet?
5. What should the membership be?

Here are the notes Sue wrote on the board to capture the discussion:

Institutional Effectiveness—College-wide

1. Includes accreditation leadership
2. Broad participation—committee composition *will probably change*
3. Evaluate all ~~we do~~ *we do*—BC does (Rec 1, AIP 1)
4. Data

- a. Data team eg, Achieving the Dream—where do these teams fit in with Institutional Effectiveness (IE)
 - b. BC data a priority with Institutional Research concerns about access to Institutional Researchers
 - c. Need for longitudinal data—not on ODS
5. Need for more widespread understanding of what data means: need help coming up with questions to ask the Researchers; need data for lots of things these days; not everyone who needs data is statistically oriented; there is a pull to get things organized; research doesn't feel integrated
6. Gap between IR/BC faculty/staff: need venues for these groups to come together
7. Communication/Integration of all pieces of what we do
 “Adopting accreditation as a lifestyle.” A possible approach would be to have a dean-level position to oversee Institutional Effectiveness.

Discussion of what this committee should become

- It would be good to have an IE committee or some group to oversee accreditation, making it a lifestyle, linking with College Council and insuring true communication
- College Council sets the path, our newly evolved committee makes sure we stay on the path
- Change will be a process; process occurs Spring 2014, committee is rolled out Fall 2014
- Take the time to think it through before jumping
- Need some fresh eyes, as well as those established in leadership
- Need a student voice—student representative or focus group
- Sonya may need this committee to keep things on track as she brainstorms big picture
- A unique opportunity to create our mission to support the big picture Sonya is developing
- Accreditation is a lifestyle, not an event; We need a committee like ASC to get things going at the beginning of the process, and then to keep the nuts and bolts going until we arrive at the accreditation report
- Need a PR committee separate from an IE committee
- Good idea to have a rep from the Data Team
- Need group to oversee grants; need to know grant applications aren't competing with other groups on campus, affected people should know ahead of time
- Need for equity plan to level playing field for all students

Kate: we are in agreement, as long as accreditation is part of this committee's responsibilities; let's explore it; how do we get there? Sonya mentioned retreat, get co-chairs together.
 The group agreed to move forward and explore expanding our charge.

Other issues?

Next meeting: November 26 (and last meeting of semester, Dec 10) lay out plan for what to roll out next spring; can also work on items we want to get done, such as newsletter

Full Commission Report: <http://accreditation.bakersfieldcollege.edu/Files/Report.pdf>

Follow-Up Report: <http://accreditation.bakersfieldcollege.edu/>

BC Accreditation SharePoint site: <https://spt.kccd.edu/bc-accreditation/SitePages/Home.aspx>