## Accreditation Committee Agenda

## 8:00am-9:00am  October 14th, 2021  Zoom

**Our Mission**

*With students as our focus, Porterville College provides our local and diverse communities quality education that promotes intellectual curiosity, personal growth, and lifelong learning, while preparing students for career and academic success*.

**Members**: Thad Russell, Primavera Arvizu, Arlitha Williams-Harmon, Osvaldo De Valle, Michelle Miller-Galaz, John Word, Mike Carley, Kim Behrens, Erin Wingfield, Dustin Acres, Jay Navarrette, Robert Simpkins, Patty Serrato, Elizabeth Buchanan, Karen Bishop, Sarah Phinney, Vickie Dugan, Judy Fallert, Kendra Haney, Sherie Burgess, Vern Butler, Melissa Long, Miranda Warren, Students Services.

1. **Mid-term report**
	1. **Timeline (updated)**
		1. **Final report due to ACCCJC Oct 17, 2022**
		2. **Board approval (2nd Read) - September 2022**
		3. **Board 1st Read – August 2022**
		4. **Board subcommittee review – July 2022**
		5. **Near final draft for college review - June 2022**
		6. **Pre-final version – April 2022**
		7. **Early draft for college review - Feb 2022**
		8. **First draft due & editor identified – Dec 2, 2021**
	2. **What do you need?**
	3. **Breakouts to work on data/evidence.**
	4. **Components**
		1. 5. Plans Arising from the Self-Evaluation Process: This section provides an update (sic) the self-identified plans to strengthen alignment with Standards outlined by the college in its most recent Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER). Colleges should describe their progress on these plans and resulting outcomes. A chart format can be used for this section of the report if appropriate. Any plans that have not yet been fully implemented should be clearly identified, and an update of the specific timelines and responsible parties in place to support completion should be provided.
			1. **Committee members**
				1. **Mike, Elizabeth, Thad**
			2. **Evidence**
			3. **Who else provides data?**
		2. 6.A. Response to Recommendations for Improvement: This section of the report addresses any recommendations for improvement to increase institutional effectiveness noted in the Commission Action Letter following the most recent comprehensive review. (If no improvement recommendations were noted in the Action Letter, this section is not required.) The college should refer to the Peer Review Team Report for further information and context for each improvement recommendation. The narrative for this section should explain the manner in which each recommendation to improve was considered, and what, if anything, the college did as a result. The narrative should also note any outcomes or increases in effectiveness resulting from these improvements.
			1. **Committee members**
				1. **Primavera, Patty, Vern**
			2. **Evidence**
			3. **Who else provides data?**
		3. 6.B. Reflection on Improving Institutional Performance: Student Learning Outcomes and Institution Set Standards: This section of the report provides an institutional reflection on institutional performance in two areas: 1) student learning outcomes, and 2) institution-set standards. Colleges should respond to the specific prompts listed below and provide evidence to support the information and narrative.
			1. 1. Student Learning Outcomes (Standard I.B.2) ACCJC Standard I.B.2 states: “The institution defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student and learning support services.” Reflect on assessment processes since the last comprehensive review: •
				1. What are the strengths of the process that help the college to improve teaching and learning? •
				2. What growth opportunities in the assessment process has the college identified to further refine its authentic culture of assessment? •
				3. Provide examples where course, program, or service improvements have occurred based on outcomes assessment data. •
				4. In those areas where assessment may be falling behind, what is the college doing to complete the assessments per the college’s schedule?
				5. Evidence: Provide evidence to support the information and narrative described above.
			2. **Committee members**
				1. **Melissa, Osvaldo, Dustin**
			3. **Evidence**
			4. **Who else provides data?**
		4. 6.B. Reflection on Improving Institutional Performance: Student Learning Outcomes and Institution Set Standards: This section of the report provides an institutional reflection on institutional performance in two areas: 1) student learning outcomes, and 2) institution-set standards. Colleges should respond to the specific prompts listed below and provide evidence to support the information and narrative.
			1. 2. Institution Set Standards (Standard I.B.3) ACCJC Standard I.B.3 states: “The institution establishes institution set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information.” Using the most recent Annual Report, reflect on trends in data for institution-set standards on course completion, certificate completion, degrees awarded, transfer, licensure examination pass rates, and employment rates for career and technical education (CTE) students: •
				1. Has the college met its floor standards? •
				2. Has the college achieved its stretch (aspirational) goals? •
				3. What initiative(s) is the college undertaking to improve its outcomes? •
				4. How does the college inform its constituents of this information?
				5. Evidence: Provide the most recent Annual Report used for this reflection.
			2. **Committee members**
				1. **Mike, Melissa, Bob**
			3. **Evidence**
			4. **Who else provides data?**
		5. 6.C. Report on the outcomes of the Quality Focus Projects: The Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) includes a Quality Focus Essay in which colleges identify two to three quality focus projects they will implement to improve student learning and achievement. This section of the Midterm Report provides a progress update on the goals, outcomes, and data identified for each quality focus project and details any changes in student learning and student achievement that resulted from the projects. If appropriate, the narrative should also comment on any next steps, such as further expansion or replication of projects. In the event that a project did not achieve the desired results, the college should provide information about factors that contributed to that outcome and reflect on what was learned during the process.
			1. **Committee members**
				1. **Primavera, Thad, Dustin**
			2. **Evidence**
			3. **Who else provides data?**
	5. 6.D. Fiscal Reporting: This section of the Midterm Report provides an update on fiscal conditions at the college. Colleges must provide a copy of their most recent ACCJC Annual Fiscal Report (AFR) as evidence. In addition, colleges must provide narrative responses in response to the following conditions: •
		1. If any of the areas of the most recent Annual Fiscal Report indicate that the college is not meeting its goals (e.g., high loan default rates, unmet liabilities, and/or projected deficits), please describe any plans for improvement. •
		2. If the institution is on enhanced fiscal monitoring, please provide narrative describing progress on the institution’s improvement plans.
		3. If the conditions above do not apply, a narrative response is not required to supplement the copy of the Annual Fiscal Report.
		4. **Committee members**
			1. **Arlitha, Thad**
		5. **Who else provides data?**
	6. **Evidence considerations**
		1. **Ensure the included evidence actually supports the narrative, and**
		2. **Actually answers the question or directive**
		3. **Just because it’s something we’re doing wonderfully well doesn’t mean it is evidence**
	7. **PC Accreditation**
		1. **ISER**
			1. [**https://do-prod-webteam-drupalfiles.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/pcedu/s3fs-public/page/PC%202018%20Institutional%20Self%20Evaluation%20Report%20-%20Accrediation%20-%20FINAL%20072618.pdf**](https://do-prod-webteam-drupalfiles.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/pcedu/s3fs-public/page/PC%202018%20Institutional%20Self%20Evaluation%20Report%20-%20Accrediation%20-%20FINAL%20072618.pdf)
		2. **External Evaluation Report**
			1. [**https://do-prod-webteam-drupalfiles.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/pcedu/s3fs-public/page/Porterville\_EER\_2018.pdf**](https://do-prod-webteam-drupalfiles.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/pcedu/s3fs-public/page/Porterville_EER_2018.pdf)
	8. **ACCJC guidelines (pgs 4-7)**
		1. [**https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Guidelines-for-Preparing-Institutional-Reports-to-the-Commission.pdf**](https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Guidelines-for-Preparing-Institutional-Reports-to-the-Commission.pdf)