## Accreditation Committee Agenda

## 8:00am-9:00am  Nov 18, 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, Judy Fallert, Kendra Haney, Sherie Burgess, Vern Butler, Melissa Long, Miranda Warren, Rachel Surprenant.

1. **Zoom vs F2F meetings for spring?**
2. **Writer / editor**
3. **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**
				1. “While the College has made some important and significant steps with the use of data, there is still work to be done. One area of possible improvement includes the level of follow-up on Data Team recommendations. Some recommendations may not be appropriate or may be determined to not be actionable at a certain moment in time, but the team and the Success and Equity Committee to which it reports have not always had reliable feedback on what action(s) have been taken. Therefore, during the 2018-19 academic year, the Data Team will work with the Success and Equity Committee, and other groups as appropriate, to develop a tracking system to ensure we close the loop on all Data Team recommendations.” (ISER, Pg 65)

**Evidence one**

**Evidence two**

* + - * 1. “The College has been thorough in terms of gathering data. However, the College continues to aspire to do a better job in employing this information in order to…” (ISER, pg 73)

**Evidence one**

**Evidence two**

* + - * 1. “While the College has made significant efforts to improve learning outcomes assessment, there is still more work to be done….” (ISER, pg 93)

**Evidence one**

**Evidence two**

* + - * 1. “The goal is to have a staff development plan by the end of the Fall 2018. This plan will encompass…” (ISER, pg 105)

**Evidence one**

**Evidence two**

* + - * 1. “It should be noted, however, there are some challenges related to research..” (ISER, pg 127)

**Evidence one**

**Evidence two**

* + - * 1. ”While Porterville College has made tremendous strides to articulate the various degrees and certificate program options, there is still work to be done in this area…” (ISER, pg 135)

**Evidence one**

**Evidence two**

* + - 1. **Who else provides data?**
		1. 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, Rachel**
			2. **Evidence – Referred to the letter on Accreditation website**
				1. **Distance Learning Committee Minutes**

**POKER Assessment Process**

* + - * 1. **Peer Review for Online Courses**

**Continuous Interaction in Online Course**

**OEI Reviewers**

**Stipends available for faculty**

* + - * 1. **Canvas Training**
				2. **Quick Tip Training for Online Teaching**
			1. **Who else provides data?**
				1. **Prima will contact Sarah Phinney and Karen Bishop for more information – Distance Learning Committee**
		1. 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: • Further with SAOs
* GELOs really well in Curriculum
* ILOs really well in CC
* Outcomes discussed in committee meetings regularly
* Feedback and homework
* Implementation plans
	+ - * 1. What are the strengths of the process that help the college to improve teaching and learning? •

Collaborative with multiple interest parties involved

Outcomes are assessed by group capable of changing them

Simplified

Tutorials/videos

Canvas page

* + - * 1. What growth opportunities in the assessment process has the college identified to further refine its authentic culture of assessment? •

PLOs need to be on forefront

Delays due to Covid and before

Confusion on PLOs

Adjunct-only discipline

Weakness/difficulty in division chair assessing outside expertise

Faculty spread thin

Professional development opportunities offered regularly

* + - * 1. Provide examples where course, program, or service improvements have occurred based on outcomes assessment data. •

Writing Center

Voter awareness expanded

Evening hours for Student Services (from assessment findings)

Timely Care

Accreditation findings

* + - * 1. In those areas where assessment may be falling behind, what is the college doing to complete the assessments per the college’s schedule?

Reminders

Researching new avenues for solutions

Collaborating to find what’s working

SLO Listserv

* + - * 1. Evidence: Provide evidence to support the information and narrative described above.

Accreditation findings

Internal discussions minutes

Canvas page

* + - 1. **Committee members**
				1. **Melissa, Osvaldo, Dustin, Bob**
			2. **Evidence**
			3. **Who else provides data?**
		1. 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, Kendra**
			3. **Evidence**
				1. New process for this developed in fall 2020, describe in narrative.
				2. Probably have not fallen below floor standards. Aspirational goals recently set.
				3. How much to include on initiatives undertaking to improve? We do a lot, but this should be succinct, right?
				4. Inform constituents: College Council, post on web (need to do this—planning docs page or accreditation page?)
				5. Provide most recent annual report—due in spring. We can draft this in fall, but may need to update the narrative a bit in early spring.
			4. **Who else provides data?**
		2. 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, Vern**
			2. **Evidence**
				1. **QFE Outcomes**

**AB705 assessment**

**Minutes from College Council and Curriculum committees regarding GELO/ILO assessment**

**Outcomes Committee minutes**

**“Internal database for outcomes” ?**

**Program reviews w/ SAO assessment**

**How are we distributing assessment results across the college?**

From the ISER (pg 80): There are some limitations to this approach however. The Outcomes Committee is creating a handbook to formalize the process and address persisting questions about best practices in assessment. In addition, we noted during this review that the Outcomes Committee is not among those currently reporting its activities to College Council at each meeting, a practice that we can easily address. Additionally, the College plans to formalize the dissemination of assessment results further by placing summaries of program-level assessment results on the college web site where programs are listed. During the 2018-19 academic year, the Outcomes Committee will be added to the list of committees and other groups that provides a report at each meeting of College Council. During the 2018-19 academic year, the Outcomes Committee will discuss ways to more broadly communicate assessment results, including placing results on the college web site where programs are listed.

* + - * 1. **QFE Programs Maps**

**Guided Pathways workgroup**

* + - * 1. **QFE Professional Development**

**Limited results – not systematic & not comprehensive across all groups**

**Classified staff are experiencing limited participation**

**Outside goal tracking in evaluations, limited for classified – lacking direction and specifics**

**President communication**

* + - 1. **Who else provides data?**
				1. **Melissa Long**
				2. **Michael Carley**
	1. 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?**
	2. **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**
	3. **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)
	4. **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)