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Certification of Institutional Follow-Up Report

DATE: October 2014

TO: Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

FROM: Porterville College
100 E. College Avenue
Porterville, CA 93257

This institutional Follow-Up Report is submitted to fulfill the requirement from the February 7, 2014 ACCJC letter to the College president.

We certify that there were opportunities for broad participation by the campus community in the development of this report and we believe the report accurately reflects the progress made in responding to the recommendations of the October 2012 accreditation visiting team.

Sandra Serrano, Chancellor, KCCD

John Rodgers, Board President, KCCD

Rosa Carlson, President, Porterville College

Bill Henry, Accreditation Liaison Officer

Christopher Piersol, President, Academic Senate

Tiffany Haynes, President, CSEA
Statement of Report Preparation

On February 7, 2014, the College president received a letter from Dr. Barbara Beno, President, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) indicating that at its meeting on January 8-10, 2014 the Follow-Up Report submitted by Porterville College and the report of the Evaluation Team that visited Porterville College were reviewed and considered. It further stated that the Commission took action to require Porterville College to submit a Follow-Up Report by October 15, 2014. This follow-up report provides evidence that the college has addressed College Recommendation 3 and fully resolved the deficiencies. The contents of this letter were released to the College and discussion began regarding the planning and development of our report.

Porterville College was only asked to respond to College Recommendation 3. The Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) was designated as the coordinator for the Follow-Up Report.

The original co-chairs of the Standard committees of the Self Evaluation report most closely related to Recommendation 3 assumed responsibility for developing the response. The progress in the development of the Follow-Up Report was discussed in the College Learning Council (CLC) and a preliminary draft was submitted to the CLC at its September 15, 2014 meeting, which was the first meeting of the academic year. The Follow-Up Report draft was also submitted to the College Administrative Council, Enrollment Management and Division Chairs, and Faculty Academic Senate for review. The final report was reviewed and approved at the October 6th meeting of the CLC and then submitted to the District office for Board review and approval. The Board of Trustees approved the report at its October 9, 2014 meeting. The report was then sent to the ACCJC as required.
College Recommendation

College Recommendation 3: Include and analyze disaggregated data in program review

To meet Standards and improve its planning process, the College’s program review should include disaggregated indicators of success, using indirect measures such as grades, retention, and persistence along with direct assessment of course level and program level student learning outcomes (Standards II.A.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.d, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.A.2.h, II.A.2.i, II.A.6.a, II.A.6.c).

Progress in Addressing Recommendation

The College is continually making changes to its program review processes and procedures, including the data used by programs. A number of changes had been made in order to address this recommendation prior to the fall 2013 follow-up visit and additional improvements have occurred since then.

As of the fall 2013 visit, the College had added demographic data to its program review data template and revised both the template itself and program review forms used by both instructional and non-instructional programs. Student success measures were disaggregated by course delivery method (face-to-face vs. distance education). In addition, disaggregated student success measures were available via the College’s data warehouse through a variety of reports.

The visiting team recommended that the College add disaggregated student success measures such as course retention and success rates to the data template provided by the Institutional Research Office and include these in the 2013-14 program review cycle. The additional measures are now included as part of the program review template. The Office of Institutional Research provides the specific course retention and success rates for the template.

The College conducts program review by academic division for instructional programs and data are provided for each of the seven instructional divisions annually. Program review is conducted on a three-year cycle, with annual updates. Two instructional programs were due for review during the 2013-14 academic year: Health Careers and Physical Education & Athletics.

Though the 2013-14 program review cycle had already begun when the visit occurred, the College added the disaggregated student success data as a supplement to the data that had already been provided to each of these two divisions. (CR3-1, CR3-2). Additionally, these same data were provided for each subject within the division. (CR3-3).

The disaggregated data includes course retention and success rates by demographics, including gender, ethnicity and age. Additionally, these rates are provided by delivery method as well.

Because the number of degrees and certificates in most programs is small (typically fewer than 10 per major), these are not provided in a disaggregated data as each group would be very small. But the data are available via the KCCD data warehouse.

These two programs completed their program reviews during the 2013-14 academic year and included these data in their analyses. (CR3-4, CR3-5). While these data were provided for the 2013-14 program review cycle on a supplemental basis, their inclusion is being institutionalized throughout the College’s
program review process. A revised program review template has been created for use by all three colleges within the Kern Community College District (KCCD) that includes these data and makes other adjustments requested by the colleges. This template will be used by all Porterville College programs and the data will be made available at both the division and subject level. (CR3-6, CR3-7). In addition to the demographics mentioned above, we also added disaggregation by matriculation factors including whether the student has a student education plan (SEP) and whether they are fully matriculated (meaning they have completed assessment and orientation, seen a counselor and have an ed plan). Should programs need additional data on a disaggregated basis that is not included in the standard template, much is available via the district data warehouse and via ad hoc requests of Institutional Research.

In addition to program review, the College is committed to using disaggregated student achievement and success data throughout its planning processes. In 2013, the College joined the Achieving the Dream project, a national organization focused on the improvement of community college success rates and the use of data and evidence in college decision-making. One of the tenets of the Achieving the Dream initiative is the systematic use of disaggregated student cohort data throughout the college decision-making process. Through this initiative, the College has collected and is using student success data disaggregated on a number of variables, including gender, ethnicity, age, major and educational goal, unit load, and a number of student choices and behaviors determined in the literature and in our practice to have an impact on student success. (CR3-8).

The College is also compiling a Student Equity Plan in which a series of student success measures will be tracked on several demographics such as gender, ethnicity, age, disability, and economically disadvantaged status. (CR3-9). These data are being examined and the College is determining the next steps to take to address disproportionate impacts that are found in the data.

**Conclusion:** The College, as a result of reviewing and revising the program review process including the use of disaggregated data, has addressed the deficiencies listed in College Recommendation 3. Some of these changes were taking place before the recommendation was made and are now permanently institutionalized. The additions to the program review template address the concerns of the 2013 visiting team.

**Future Plans:** These efforts are only part of the College’s ongoing efforts to address demographics differences using disaggregated data. Program review is only one part of the College’s planning process and through Achieving the Dream, the Student Equity Plan currently being drafted and other efforts, we plan to address gaps identified in disaggregated data and narrow them to the extent possible.

**List of Evidence:**

- **CR3-1:** Program review data (division Health Careers)
- **CR3-2:** Program review data (division Physical Education & Athletics)
- **CR3-3:** Program review data (subject example Psychiatric Technology)
- **CR3-4:** Program review Health Careers, 2013-14
- **CR3-5:** Program review Physical Education & Athletics, 2013-14
- **CR3-6:** Program review data for 2014-15 cycle, division Social Sciences
- **CR3-7:** Program review data for 2014-15 cycle, subject Anthropology
- **CR3-8:** Porterville College Achieving the Dream Supplementary Data
- **CR3-9:** Student Equity Plan Data
Summary

Porterville College agrees with Dr. Beno’s statement in her February 7, 2014 letter in which she states, “Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring integrity, effectiveness and quality.” The 2012 Self Evaluation process, in addition to the work recently completed on the Follow-Up Report, have been an effective and essential means to regulate ourselves to ensure that we are meeting the standards of accreditation while providing the most effective service possible for our students.

In addition to addressing the recommendations of the visiting team, the College continues to work on the Actionable Improvement Plans that were listed throughout the 2012 Institutional Self Evaluation. The College will also continue to build upon the strengths found during the self-evaluation process.