April 16, 2013

Attendees: Kim Nickell, Manny Mourtzanos, Kristin Rabe, Mike Carley, Kate Pluta, Meg Stidham, Liz Rozell Absent: Bill Barnes

4/2 Meeting notes approved

District-wide recommendation (4) John Means is handling the district-wide recommendations (clarity was requested at the previous PRC meeting). John Means and Tom Burke will come to BC to talk about the district charge backs, historical data, and perspective as President Christian wanted to explore this further. District charge backs is the charge that the DO makes for services provided to the colleges as part of the district services functional map.

District recommendation 4 speaks to the planning process and specifically the decision making process and other services. They will be evaluating how well the functional map works –both services and decision making. The DO is taking a centralized approach at looking at the functional map. We are taking a localized approach at the services received. VP's are meeting 4/17 and should make it a priority to review this.

PRC recommends a plan to evaluate the services offered by the DO to the college. (recommendation #1) How should we evidence the fact of what services are offered? (Bullet 3 of Recommendation 1). What evidence should we provide to the AAJC to support the resources? Initiate a program review process for DO services on a 3-year cycle timeline. Develop this process over the summer of 2013. Program Review would look at how each service plans, budgets ahead and has a structure to the service they offer. Chancellor will need to support this. A form should be created at the district level preferably by the Institutional researchers. The functional areas to be reviewed/evaluated are:

Currently the BAM (Budget Allocation Model) is the only district-wide service that has been evaluated.

<mark>PRC PROPOSAL:</mark> Bakersfield College Program Review Committee recommends to the KCCD that there be a standardized model for evaluating (such as program review) their processes on a timeline such as a 3-year cycle. If this is approved – Institutional Research and Planning will create a form. Those areas asked to be reviewed are: Finance(Construction, bonds, CFO, Business services), Human Resources, Ops Management (IT), Vice Chancellor of Ed Services (even though empty position – has other functions under it that are still being handled), General Council, Associate Chancellor of Gov't. & External Relations, Institutional research and Planning.

Rationale: Building a system of accountability – the Chancellor probably already has something like this in place where each of those service areas self-evaluate and provide a report to the Chancellor. Survey, focus groups, annual report – some method probably is already in place. Evaluating employees is not a satisfactory method of evaluation for this purpose. Annual reports are probably not sufficient data for the ACCJC to have in this process. They want to know how you are assessing what you do is effective. There should be a formal process – effective and effectively organized the way it is set up. The

evaluation process will show what is working and what is not. DO data collection should be on a 3-year cycle with a report to the Chancellor's Consultation Council. The reply should then come back to the groups from the Chancellor to close the loop.

<mark>PRC PROPOSAL:</mark> Each of the colleges in the KCCD should figure out via focus group or survey that the results would then go to the Chancellor's Consultation Council for review and then feedback reporting back to the college. The survey or results of a focus group should be shared with each of the constituency groups before going to Consultation Council then report back to the colleges.

Bullet 2: SLO/PLO Reinstatement of assessment back to the APR process. Link APR to college goals/strategic goals. Modifying APR will make it more effective in evaluating each of the individual programs.

Relate SLO's to budget information – possible report out of curricunet.

SLO/PLO's reviewed annually – PLO's into APR's and budget requests and then the President responds to these – thus closing the loop and completing the cycle. Currently there is no report back.

Budget criteria – Link between SLO's and budget criteria currently not explicit.

The reason the APR process is beneficial is that it meets budget criteria and planning process timelines.

 APR FORM: Keep SW (Strengths and Weaknesses) dump OT (Opportunities and Threats). Measure goals and assessments for Fall 2013.