

**Bakersfield College**

**BC Accreditation Evaluation Survey Respondents**

Survey Administered in Fall 2013 to evaluate both the Accreditation Self-Evaluation process and the Follow-up Report process.

<b>Accreditation Self-Evaluation Respondents by Role</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Question: Went well?</b>	<b>Question: Didn't go well?</b>	<b>Question: Change?</b>
Co-Chair (Self Evaluation committee or standard subcommittee)	13	10.6%	10	9	10
Committee or Subcommittee Member	9	7.3%	7	4	5
Researcher/Writer/Editor	4	3.3%	3	3	2
Reviewer	1	0.8%	1	1	1
Logistics/Support	1	0.8%	0	0	0
Interviewed by Visiting Team	4	3.3%	2	1	1
I did not have an active role in the Self Evaluation process or ACCJC Accreditation site visit but felt informed about the process.	40	32.5%	12	9	9
I did not have a role in the Self Evaluation process or ACCJC Accreditation site visit.	49	39.8%	3	3	3
Other (please specify)	2	1.6%	1	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>123</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>31</b>

<b>Accreditation Follow-up Respondents by Role</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Question: Went well?</b>	<b>Question: Didn't go well?</b>	<b>Question: Change?</b>
Project Manager or Committee Co-Chair	6	8.8%	2	1	1
Committee Member	5	7.4%	0	0	0
Researcher/Writer/Editor	3	4.4%	1	1	1
Reviewer	1	1.5%	0	0	0
Logistics/Support	0	0.0%	-	-	-
Interviewed by Visiting Team	4	5.9%	0	0	0
I did not have an active role in the Self Evaluation process or ACCJC Accreditation site visit but felt informed about the process.	21	30.9%	7	4	4
I did not have a role in the preparation of the Follow-up report or the ACCJC Follow-up site visit.	28	41.2%	6	4	5
Other (please specify)	0	0.0%	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>68</b>		<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>

**What are one, two, three things that went well?**

Co-Chair (Self Evaluation committee or standard subcommittee):

1. We were very prepared, although we had no idea what to expect. We had good representation during the meeting, so all questions were able to be answered thoroughly. The visiting team members were friendly and easy to talk with.
2. Rapport with administrative co-chair was good. The faculty and classified staff who participated in writing the self-evaluation and the follow-up were productive and helpful.
3. The prep work and meetings before the team visit were beneficial.
4. I had about 3-4 key team members on my standard that were wonderful in taking on work to get our standard researched and written. I appreciated the support of ASC during the self-evaluation process.
5. The actual meetings with the accrediting team
6. Overall process.
7. training sessions timeline
8. The report was completed on time.
9. Materials provided were helpful in preparing the report.
10. The follow up was well organized; Early start was very nice

Committee or Subcommittee Member:

1. It was a very reflective process. The timeline worked well.
2. Preparation. Training. Using SharePoint to document everything.
3. Wow, I really don't remember! We ended up with a completed report for our section, and there were times I wasn't so sure.
4. Planning for the self-evaluation and associated accreditation processes began well in advance of the 2012 visit, so it didn't feel rushed. Having the steering committee in place made for much better management of the entire process, in comparison to past years.
5. The teams worked well together in respect to gathering evidence and meeting.
6. The sub-committee that I was on was very efficient. In fact the committee leaders did almost all of the writing; the rest of the committee just gave verbal input.
7. There was a good dialogue about specific problems. These problems were clearly identified and articulated.

Researcher/Writer/Editor:

1. My committee worked well together dividing up the job.
2. A lot of people were involved in the document so we received input from many different perspectives, which is always good.
3. The co-chairs of my standard and I met, regularly, and discussed the process.

Reviewer:

1. regular meetings of team members, regular consultation with Accreditation Steering Committee; plenty of time available for reviewers to review and check evidence.

Logistics/Support:

No comments

Interviewed by Visiting Team:

1. The visitors were friendly, objective, clearly wanted to understand what we were conveying
2. Space in Levinson adequate for the number of different groups meeting.

Did not an active role but felt informed about the process:

1. Bakersfield college was well prepared for the visit due to good planning.
2. The BC faculty, staff and admin actually pulled it off, coming from a position of overwhelming disorganization.
3. We had a very dedicated team at BC for the self-evaluation. Mooney did a great job as well as others to make things go relatively smoothly.
4. forum bluffs notes
5. Glad it's over for now and very happy about our status, and the positive feedback from the committee
6. Smooth sight visit. Well prepared document.
7. Information was gathered and presented to everyone. We received feedback as the process moved along.
8. I was off campus the day of the evaluation.
9. Bluff Notes were very informative for the Visit in October 2013
10. We were accredited! We also started the process early enough to get all the work done.
11. Communication about the process and updates from the committee

12. Apparently some areas were given an opportunity to shine. Concerns about district were heard and resulted in some better understanding about needs. A good job with all the interims.

I did not have a role:

1. Our assets were clear to the team
2. na
3. ?

Other:

accumulated reports/data for department for Administrator  
-No Comment  
Committee member for original accreditation only  
-Both documents were well written, cohesive, and well edited.

### **What are one, two or three things that didn't go well?**

Co-Chair (Self Evaluation committee or standard subcommittee):

1. Despite the fact that the visiting team members were friendly, they didn't really have a grasp of what we did as a committee. Therefore, their line of questioning was way off topic and not at all what we expected to be discussing. We all left the meeting with our heads spinning.
2. Need for wider participation among faculty and classified staff to share the load.
3. I had about 3-4 team member on my standard that did absolutely nothing. Maybe a message next time that if you don't plan to participate, don't sign up to help on a standard.
4. Having the District change the report we had written
5. Campus preparation for initial visit. Better prepared as a whole for follow-up.
6. people would commit to work on the project and then drop the ball surprise requirements/requests from the district office the district office personnel ignoring deadlines
7. 1. The committee spent too much time defining the role of the committee and the charge. 2. I felt as if I was on a scavenger hunt. I was on the hunt for documents. This seemed to be something that could have been done on a clerical level. 3. Low participation, and the employment termination of the co-chair.
8. Classified employees in the committee did not understand the purpose or their role. Also there is no accountability if a committee member does not attend meetings or participate in the process.
9. Oh that there was one thing that went wrong or well. I had an overburdened adm co-chair was left floundering without direction. The committee members were ordered to be there and didn't do much (most never showed up to meetings). If I never hear the word accreditation again, it will be too soon.

Committee or Subcommittee Member:

1. The little booklet about the standards was not widely available. The role of the district in making changes to a college document needs to be carefully scrutinized. That entire process was unclear. District expectation and process were unclear. Controlled access to district during process hindered work.
2. Something was up with leadership, I'm not sure where. I group didn't meet much until the final countdown was on, and some of the people who came to meetings didn't do much.
3. Difficulty in recruiting staff and faculty to participate in the self-evaluation. And once recruited, many participated in name only leaving the work to just a few to complete. Timelines were often adjusted unilaterally by the district -- this is out of BC's hands, but did cause a few problems.
4. I think things went well for my little part, but I can't speak for those that did much more work than I.

Researcher/Writer/Editor:

1. I think the committee chair got stuck putting all of our individual work together.
2. I think the process to get the document together was a little chaotic - some people (myself included) were unclear as to their role or what we were supposed to be doing in our subcommittees. The different perspectives led to different writing styles - I think in the future only a few people should be in charge of the actual writing the document to make it more cohesive. Lastly, there was no real process to edit the document before it went to the editor. I found a few mistakes, alerted the appropriate persons, but they were still in the final version of the document.
3. Feedback from the reviewers

Reviewer:

1. a) communication from district office changed over time, so more work had to be done in the summer on the Self Evaluation document that was originally expected b) some standards had to be rewritten by reconstituted teams

Logistics/Support:

No comments

Interviewed by Visiting Team:

1. We weren't able to answer some of the questions--what happened with assessment of SLOs and Program SLOs. It revealed gaps in our own processes (uncomfortable situation for us, to hem and haw with questions we didn't have answers for).

Did not an active role but felt informed about the process:

1. Surviving accreditation pulls too many resources from the direct face-to-face or online aspects of teaching
2. Too many surveys--I felt surveyed to death.
3. Seems like the same people are doing all the work.
4. Actually reading and comprehending the self-evaluation. Keeping the self-evaluation on the radar screen.
5. I have no suggestions
6. I was off campus the day of the evaluation.
7. I'm not sure that this went poorly, but we need to keep looking for things to fix at the campus and district, even when we are not under accreditation pressure (HR processes, etc).
8. Nothing that I can think of at this time
9. This visit got us recommendations on things we were already doing well but not documenting or integrating well. Sometimes I am amazed that people comment about things that they know nothing about. There were people talking tot he team that were not institutionally informed and we got recommendations on things we were already doing. None-the-less the ASC used that for positive forward motion

I did not have a role:

1. I think some wrong information was shared
2. na
3. ?

Other:

accumulated reports/data for department for Administrator  
 -No Comment  
 Committee member for original accreditation only  
 -No Comment

**What suggestions for change would you make for next time?**

Co-Chair (Self Evaluation committee or standard subcommittee):

1. My suggestion would be to have the committee communicate with previous committee members to discuss their experiences. It might make it easier for those who have never been through the process.
2. Release time or stipend for faculty co-chairs of self-evaluation standards, especially the huge one on curriculum/instructional programs (standard IIA).
3. I appreciate the constant feedback and updates on accreditation.
4. I like the preparation we did reviewing the speaking points for the follow-up visit. That would be a good model to follow for our next accreditation visit.
5. That when the college sets a timeline, it is followed by all including the District and BOT
6. Next time, overall awareness should be higher if the college continues to make accreditation a process and not event.
7. more deadlines for progress checks perhaps dividing each standard into "equal" parts and putting deadlines for completion on those
8. 1. Attract more active participants. 2. Recruit co-chairs who understand the charge of the committee and can communicate it.
9. Trainging in advance for specific employee groups so they understand their role and expectations.
10. Don't make people participate who don't want to.

Committee or Subcommittee Member:

1. Make the visit schedule public. Clarify, in writing, the district's role. Developing the document is the college's responsibility.
2. I'm not sure . . . I hope with it being embedded it won't be such a last-minute panic like it felt like this time.
3. Ensure broader campus participation on sub-committees and commit those participating to actually participate in the gathering of evidence and writing.
4. Would there be any use in developing a campus-wide survey that asks the key questions that would pertain to all departments from the accreditation self-evaluation?
5. Draft members from each area of campus. A small number of academic departments filled most of the roles in the process.

Researcher/Writer/Editor:

1. Besides what I suggested in Q3... I would have a slightly smaller group next time and add some PR so that those on the campus know the process and what's going on.
2. Streamlined process

Reviewer:

1. a) better coordination with district office so timelines are accurate the first time and adhered to. b) be clear with co-chairs about the work commitment needed so teams can get it right the first time.

Logistics/Support:

No comments

Interviewed by Visiting Team:

1. No changes--the experience was good and our campus is functioning better than ever and we are on a routine that ensures we'll continue to do so.

Did not an active role but felt informed about the process:

1. Stay on top of things and keep the organization that has been developed.
2. Try to make fewer surveys for staff and students. I would recommend that some careful thought go in to the surveys so there can be fewer of them, but they will still be thorough.
3. continue to work on increasing faculty understanding and involvement video the session in which feedback was given by the committee. I wasn't able to attend the meeting due to scheduling problems.
4. Continue to involve many people in the process--good job!
5. I think everything continues to improve for the better. I have no specific suggestions other than to
6. continue to hone what we are doing.
7. This process seemed to work well, though rather labor intensive, let's do it again--in other words, let's not forget what we did right and start all over with a brand new process.
8. Keep the momentum and information current so that it is not such a BIG job next time
9. Keep everyone - particularly administrators in all areas, better informed.

I did not have a role:

1. Clarify who is the main source on certain things.
2. na
3. ?

Other:

accumulated reports/data for department for Administrator

-No Comment

Committee member for original accreditation only

-No Comment

**What are one, two, three things that went well?**

Project Manager or Committee Co-Chair:

1. Everything went well. The Bluff's Notes were a great idea and were very helpful in bringing us all to the same speaking points.
2. I liked the final meeting with the team and all interested parties

Committee:

No Comments

Researcher/Writer/Editor:

1. Nothing that I could see (but I had a very limited view of the process)

Reviewer:

No Comment

Logistics/Support:

No respondents

Interviewed by Visiting Team:

No Comment

Did not an active role but felt informed about the process:

1. Constant Feedback
2. Good broad representation
3. Good communication with committee members, everyone pulled their weight.
4. forum bluffs notes
5. Smooth site visit. Well-prepared report.
6. The Open Forum with lots of good feedback was wonderful!
7. The schedule of the visiting team was publicized. The co-chairs/leads met with the president to review the entire report just prior to the visit. The college president had a wrap-up meeting at the end of the day of the visit to summarize the day, the efforts, and the results.
8. I was off campus the day of the evaluation.

I did not have a role:

1. Admin co-chair was very helpful in bringing things together.
2. Heard that overall BC was one of the few colleges that received praise
3. It all went very well
4. It seemed relatively painless.
5. No opinion.
6. n/a

Other:

No respondents

No Role Indicated on 2<sup>nd</sup> set of questions

(From 2012 roll "Reviewer")

1. The Bluff notes and the communications about the visit were great. The interview groups were large and representative.

(From 2012 roll "Interviewed by Visiting Team")

1. Open forum to discuss the process and hear from the evaluators. In hearing updates I heard words like "It feels good to be a Renegade"

(From 2012 roll "I did not have a role but felt involved")

1. Site visit was well-planned. Bluff notes were a great help (though may want to change the title in the future...). Follow-up report seemed to come together well and without great difficulty.
2. teams were constituted based on who did work for Self Evaluation, so everyone was familiar with the original document and issues
3. i was not involved . I can say what went well.
4. Bluff Notes; Exit Meeting Chaired by the President. I can't remember this happening in the past and thought it was a great way to end the Follow Up Visit this month.
5. The bluff notes were fabulous. The president prep meetings.
6. The follow-up group was focused and prepared.
7. Strong committee members, good dialog with visitors.
8. The open forum was well attended and very positive.
9. ?

(From 2012 roll "I did not have a role")

1. Seems like everything went well! I was certainly very informed about the process.

(From 2012 roll "Other")

1. Support from our President on a job well done The Bluff's Notes was a good idea

**What are one, two or three things that didn't go well?**

Project Manager or Committee Co-Chair:

1. Can't think of anything specifically.

Committee:

No Comments

Researcher/Writer/Editor:

1. I think there was one big mistake... we misinterpreted what was needed for the follow-up report. When the committee recommends that we evaluate something, I doubt they expect the results in a few months. Rather, they would like to see that we used those months to form a proper program evaluation plan. This misinterpretation resulted in knee-jerk reactions that aren't sustainable for the future evaluation.

Reviewer:

No Comment

Logistics/Support:

No respondents

Interviewed by Visiting Team:

No Comment

Did not have an active role but felt informed about the process:

1. Some people are negative no matter what
2. Keeping everyone in the loop and actually reading and discussing the follow-up report.
3. I am unaware of any part that went poorly.
4. Bluffs Notes was "cute" but stolen and had negative connotations. The second printing should have had a date on it to distinguish it from the first printing. The district never discussed its responses to its 4 recommendations with the team working on the Follow-Up Report. It also didn't present any information at College Council. The role of the district in responding to and making changes to a college document is still unclear.

I did not have a role:

1. Meetings were not at a convenient time.
2. Too many resources removed from actual job of teaching
3. n/a
4. No opinion.

Other:

No respondents

No Role Indicated on 2<sup>nd</sup> set of questions

(From 2012 roll "Reviewer")

1. These visits continue to reveal the need for systemic changes in our institution. We have bottlenecks that prevent good things from happening. We need to integrate the communication between student affairs and instruction and CTE.

(From 2012 roll "Interviewed by Visiting Team")

1. No comment, other than I was very disappointed.
2. nothing that I can think of at this time

(From 2012 roll "I did not have a role but felt involved")

1. a) Accreditation Steering Committee was told that they would be able to review the document in mid-July, but no e-mail was sent to the committee alerting them to the fact that the draft was ready for their review at Sharepoint. b) "Bluffs notes" was unfortunate name for the summary information provided to community; the reference to the Panorama Bluffs was not obvious
2. i was not involved . I can say what went well.
3. Everything went well.
4. We realized our shortcomings at the meeting.
5. ?

(From 2012 roll "I did not have a role")

1. I wasn't involved enough to say.

(From 2012 roll "Other")

1. Feedback slow in returning to those who wrote the document...

**What suggestions for change would you make for next time?**

Project Manager or Committee Co-Chair:

1. None, everything went well.

Committee:

No Comments

Researcher/Writer/Editor:

1. Take a little more time to plan.

Reviewer:

No Comment

Logistics/Support:

No comments

Interviewed by Visiting Team:

No comments

Did not an active role but felt informed about the process:

1. Perhaps meet in groups to discuss the actual status and history
2. Continue to get many people involved in the process. Good job!
3. No suggestions
4. Clarify that this is a COLLEGE process and document.

I did not have a role:

1. How about special reserved parking slots for faculty co-chairs of accreditation standards during the time leading up to the self-evaluation report?
2. video the feedback so it can be viewed at another time.
3. Keep on top of things as we currently are
4. n/a
5. No opinion.

Other:

No respondents

No Role Indicated on 2<sup>nd</sup> set of questions

(From 2012 roll "Reviewer")

1. Same good communication and cliff notes. Make it fun for people to review and contribute to the report.

(From 2012 roll "Interviewed by Visiting Team")

1. Be honest. If something hasn't been done, say so, and why.
2. Keep up the committee that did such a great job, and encourage their continued role in it

(From 2012 roll "I did not have a role but felt involved")

1. None, really. The follow-up process was well planned and smooth.
2. even in the summer, send out a notice to "bc\_all" when a follow-up report draft is ready for review. Put a clear deadline on when feedback can be received. That way anyone who is available in the summer can do a review, and the opportunity will be provided for all, just as with the Self Evaluation document.
3. i was not involved . I can say what went well.
4. I would hope that the next accreditation goes as smoothly as this time. They did a wonderful job.
5. Try to anticipate what will be asked in advance, and make changes before the visit.
6. ?

(From 2012 roll "I did not have a role")

1. Seemed great to me!

(From 2012 roll "Other")

1. Don't just let the co-chairs attend the sessions with the visiting team



## **BC Accreditation Process Evaluation**

Please help the Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) evaluate the accreditation process. ASC began meeting in Fall 2010, and the Self Evaluation Committee (SEC) began its work in Spring 2011. The report was completed in 2012, and the ACCJC team visited the college in October 2012. At its January 2013 meeting, ACCJC affirmed our accreditation status and requested a Follow-up report to be completed prior to the follow-up visit in October 2013.

The major activities in this process included:

- The preparation of the Self Evaluation document,
- The BC site visit with the ACCJC visiting team,
- The preparation of the follow-up report, and
- The BC follow-up visit with the ACCJC visiting team.

First, we'd like feedback about the preparation of the Self Evaluation document which culminated in the ACCJC Accreditation site visit in October 2012. Please answer the following four questions in regard to the Self Evaluation process and site visit (2011 and 2012):

### **\*1. What was your primary role in the preparation of the Self Evaluation document and/or the ACCJC Accreditation site visit in October 2012?**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Co-Chair (Self Evaluation committee or standard subcommittee) | <input type="radio"/> Logistics/Support   |
| <input type="radio"/> Committee or Subcommittee Member                              | <input type="radio"/> Interviewed by Visiting Team  |
| <input type="radio"/> Researcher/Writer/Editor                                      | <input type="radio"/> I did not have an active role in the Self Evaluation process or ACCJC Accreditation site visit but felt informed about the process. |
| <input type="radio"/> Reviewer  | <input type="radio"/> I did not have a role in the Self Evaluation process or ACCJC Accreditation site visit.   |
| <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify)  |   |

**Self-Evaluation and Site Visit 2011 and 2012**

**2. What are one, two or three things that went well?**

**3. What are one, two or three things that didn't go well?**

**4. What suggestions for change would you make for next time?**

Next, we'd like feedback about the preparation of the Follow-up report in Spring 2013 which culminated in the Follow-up ACCJC site visit in October 2013. Please answer the following four questions in regard to the Follow-up process and the Follow-up ACCJC site visit (2013):

**\*5. What was your primary role in the preparation of the Follow-up report and/or the ACCJC Follow-up visit in October 2013?**

- Project Manager or Committee Co-Chair
- Committee Member
- Researcher/Writer/Editor
- Reviewer
- Logistics/Support
- Interviewed by the Follow-up Visiting Team
- I did not have an active role in the preparation of the Follow-up report or ACCJC Follow-up site visit but felt informed about the process.
- I did not have a role in the preparation of the Follow-up report or the ACCJC Follow-up site visit.

Other (please specify)

**Follow-up Report and Site Visit 2013**

**6. What are one, two or three things that went well?**

**7. What are one, two or three things that didn't go well?**

**8. What suggestions for change would you make for next time?**

The Accreditation Steering Committee thanks you for your feedback!