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SUMMARY OF EVALUATION REPORT

INSTITUTION: Porterville College

DATES OF VISIT: October 22 – 25, 2012

TEAM CHAIR: Michael Claire

An eleven-member accreditation team visited Porterville College from October 22 to October 25, 2012 for the purpose of evaluating how well the institution is achieving its stated purposes, analyzing how well the College is meeting the Commission standards, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the status of the College.

In preparation for the visit, team members attended an all-day training session on September 14 2012, conducted by ACCJC staff and studied Commission materials prepared for visiting teams. Team members read carefully the College's 2006 Self Study report, including the recommendations from the October 2006 visiting team, and assessed the evidence provided by the College.

Prior to the visit team members completed written evaluations of the Self-Evaluation Report and began identifying areas for further investigation. On the day before the formal beginning of the visit, the team members spent the afternoon discussing their views of the written materials provided by the College, reviewing evidence provided by the College and other materials submitted to the Commission since its last comprehensive visit. The team also visited Porterville College to meet key members in the preparation of the Self Evaluation Report and to tour the campus.

During the visit, the team met with over 40 faculty, staff, administrators, members of the Board of Trustees, and students. The team chair met with members of the Board of Trustees, the president of the College and various College and Kern Community College District administrators. The team attended two open meetings to allow for comment from members of the campus and local community.

The team felt that the Self Evaluation Report was well organized, was written in a clear concise manner, and was an accurate reflection of the College. However, the team also felt that certain portions of the Self Evaluation Report were not up-to-date. After conducting several interviews, the team found that the College had made further progress in meeting certain Standards than what was documented in the Self Evaluation Report. The team was appreciative that evidence was provided in an electronic format. For future reports, however, the team recommends that the College point to specific documents or specific pages within documents as much as possible so that team members can quickly
locate the relevant evidence. Team members found members of the Porterville College very helpful and available for interviews and follow-up conversations.
Major Findings and Recommendations of the October 22-25, 2012 Visiting Team

Recommendations

**College Recommendation 1: Expand use of data and formalize data analysis**
In order to improve its planning process the team recommends that the College expand the use of its available qualitative and quantitative data and formalize the data analysis process at both the program and institutional level. While the team found evidence that the College is using the results of data analysis in its program level and institutional planning processes, the link between data analysis and planning should be made more explicit (Standards I.B, I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.3, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2).

**College Recommendation 2: Make integration among plans more explicit**
In order to improve its planning process, the team recommends that the integration among plans at the program level, institutional level, and district level be made more explicit. Although the team found evidence suggesting that the various plans are related and that resource allocation are tied to the planning process, the link among various plans and their hierarchy should be more clearly documented (Standards I.B.3 III.A.6, IIIIB.2.b).

**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).

**College Recommendation 4: Meet with advisory boards on a regular basis**
To improve, the College should meet with its advisory boards and Career and Technical Education partners on a regular basis and systematically identify competency levels and to develop measurable student learning outcomes (Standards II.A.2.b, II.A.5).

**College Recommendation 5: Conduct research to assure quality in the distance education program**
In order to assure the quality of its distance education program and to meet Standards, the team recommends that the College conduct research and analysis to ensure that courses offered in a distance education mode and related student and learning support services are of comparable quality (Standards II.A.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.2, II.A.2.d, II.A.6, II.B.1, II.C.1).
College Recommendation 6: Identify a suitable math assessment instrument
In order to improve, the team recommends the College move expeditiously to find a suitable math assessment instrument that accurately measures student preparation and aligns with the mathematics curriculum (II.B.3.e).

College Recommendation 7: Fully integrate human resources planning into the planning process.
In order meet Standards related to planning for human resources, the team recommends that the College assess its future human resource needs and fully integrate the results of the assessment into its institutional planning process. Furthermore, the team recommends that the College determine its professional development needs and assess the efficacy of its professional development efforts on a regular basis (III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b, III.A.6).
District Recommendations

District Recommendation 1: Review and Update Board Policies on a Periodic Basis
In order to comply with the Standards, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees establish a process to ensure that the Board’s policies and procedures are evaluated on a regular basis and revised as appropriate (IV.B.1.e).

District Recommendation 2: Board Member Development Program
In order to comply with the Standards the team recommends that the Board of Trustees in consultation with the Chancellor develop and implement a development program that meets the needs of the newer board members as well as board members who have a considerable amount of experience as a governing board member (IV.B.1.f).

District Recommendation 3: Evaluate the Board of Trustees Self Evaluation Process
In order to comply with the Standards, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees review the elements of its Self Evaluation Process and ensure that the Standards' minimum requirements for a Self Evaluation Process which are: 1) have clearly defined processes in place, 2) have processes implemented and 3) have processes published in the Board's policy manual are included in the Self Evaluation Process. The Board's policy 2E2 prescribes additional requirements when conducting the Boards Self Evaluation (IV.B.1.g).

District Recommendation 4: Evaluation of Role Delineation and Decision Making Processes for Effectiveness
In order to comply with the Standards, the team recommends the District conduct an evaluation of the new decision-making processes and evaluate how effective the new processes are in making decisions and in communicating the decisions to affected users (IV.B.3.g).
Commendation 1: Positive work environment
The team commends Porterville College for its positive work environment. The College has maintained a high level of collegiality and mutual respect among the faculty, classified staff, and administration despite the general uncertainty due to the budget climate.

Commendation 2: Proactive response to current economic climate
The team commends the College for its proactive response to the current economic climate. In particular, the team was impressed with the College’s “Core of the Core” planning effort, which is in its initial stages. The team believes that this planning process will serve the College well as it determines its priorities over the next several years.

Commendation 3: Student Services shift in focus from “helping” to teaching students
The team commends the Student Services Division for shifting their focus from “helping” to “teaching” students by revising their orientation and counseling approaches and integrating a wide array of online tools to the website in order to provide students the resources necessary to determine their own career and educational paths.

Commendation 4: Inclusive and caring environment
The team commends the College for creating an inclusive and caring environment for all students. In particular, the team was impressed with the College’s efforts to support and enhance student understanding and appreciation of diversity through its Cultural and Historical Awareness Program (CHAP) and multicultural studies graduation requirement.

Commendation 5: Well-maintained physical learning environment
The team commends the College for providing a well-maintained physical learning environment for students.
Porterville College was established in 1927 as a part of the Porterville Unified School and College District. Porterville College joined the Kern Community College District (KCCD) in 1967. Porterville College is one of three Colleges in the district. KCCD serves all or parts of five large rural counties and also includes the Colleges of Bakersfield College and Cerro Coso Community College.

Porterville College is one of two community Colleges serving Tulare County. College of Sequoias, located thirty-five miles to the northwest, also serves Tulare County. Tulare County is an economically depressed area with a high unemployment rate. Porterville College’s service area is expected to be 179,000 residents by 2015. Per capita income for the service area of the College has been very modest and is expected to reach $16,040 by 2015.

Approximately sixty-six percent of the residents in Porterville College’s service area are of Hispanic descent. The remainder of the residents in the College’s service area is primarily of Caucasian descent. The city of Porterville has a population of approximately 54,000 residents. The majority of Porterville College students live in a portion of Tulare County or northern Kern County within a forty-minute drive time to the campus. Distance education comprises approximately nine percent of the College’s student enrollment.

Porterville moved to its current 70 acre location in 1955. Porterville has refurbished most of its facilities thanks to a general obligation bond passed in 2002. Since the last accreditation visit, the College has completed construction of a new library, a complete renovation of the Learning Resource Center, and a new Fitness Center.

Porterville’s non-duplicated headcount has declined approximately seven percent from fall 2008 through fall 2011. This decline is consistent with the overall enrollment decline of California Community Colleges as result of significant cuts in state funding. Approximately sixty-three percent of Porterville College’s students are younger than twenty-five. This age demographic has grown in relative terms by ten percent over the last four years. Females comprise sixty-three percent of students. Approximately eighteen percent of Porterville’s students are non-native speakers; forty-two percent of students take twelve or more units per semester and approximately forty-six percent of students have identified transfer as their educational goal. College programs include general education courses, basic skills courses, and career and technical courses (CTE) leading to associate degrees or certificates.
Evaluation of Institutional Responses to 2006 Recommendations

College Recommendations

**College Recommendation 1: Institutional Commitments**
The College must reframe its mission to include the educational goals that may be fulfilled at the College and describe the primary student population for which the College is designing programs. The revised mission statement must then be used as the driving document for institutional planning (Standard IA).

Porterville College revised its mission statement in 2007. The process of revision involved discussion at shared governance committees, and the representatives were responsible for contacting their constituencies for feedback. Evidence suggests that the dialogue leading up to revision of the mission was widespread and pervasive on campus. The mission is well articulated and used in several documents as well as in the webpage. The strategic plan goals for 2012-15 are directly related to the mission. The use of the mission in program review for both instructional and non-instructional areas ensures that the mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making.

This recommendation has been met.

**College Recommendation 2: Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement**
As required in the comprehensive accreditation visit six years ago, the College must shift to the use of data as the basis for making decisions by developing and implementing College-wide planning that:

- Integrates all aspects of planning, evaluation, and resource allocation (Standards IB.3, IB.4, IB.5, IIA.1, IIA.2, IIB.4, IIC.2, IIIA.6, IIIB.2b, IIIC.2, IIID.1a, IIID.1c, IIID.2g, IIID.3, IVA.5, IV.2b, Eligibility Requirement 19),

- Is based on an analysis of community workforce needs and uses that research to plan and evaluate educational programs (Standard IIA.1a),

- Incorporates research and data in a strategic plan which is the foundation for assessing action plans with measurable objectives (Standards IB.3, IIA.2f, IIC.2),

- Includes a resource plan that compares current College staffing and resource allocation to the College’s strategic plan, and then assigns (or reassigns) resources as needed to ensure that financial, human, and physical resources are driven by an integrated College plan (Standards IIC, IIIA.6, IIIB.2, IIID.3),

- Includes a technology plan that evaluates, supports, and plans for the future of instructional, student services, and administrative functions at the College and is integrated with a current district technology plan (Standards IIIC.1c, IIIC.2),
• Relies on involvement of faculty, staff, students, and administrators (Standards IB.4, IVA.1, IVA.2, IVA.3),

• Uses data for decision-making both as an indicator of issues and needs as well as an indicator of accomplishments and effectiveness (Standard IB),

• Results in specific action plans with assignment of responsibility, timelines, and status reports, such that College plans provide focus on important strategic issues and improvement of College effectiveness (Standards IB.4, IB.4), and

• Includes a periodic review of the planning process (Standards IB.6, IB.7).

The College has been engaged in robust dialogue regarding institutional effectiveness focusing on the mission, integrated planning and budgeting systems, governance structures and systems to support student learning outcome and assessment cycles. College dialog regarding institutional effectiveness and planning have led to the development and evolution of new planning and governance models as well as a program review and budgeting model that uses ties to the mission or institutional goals as the driver for further plans and resource allocation requests.

These new systemic planning processes and procedures are inclusive of appropriate constituent groups and provide ample opportunity for participation. Challenges remain regarding the type and quality of the data that is used in program review. The team also had difficulty in identifying formal, documented processes regarding the use of institution-level data as an indicator of issues and needs and as a measurement of accomplishments and effectiveness.

Furthermore, while it is clear that the College is evaluating their planning systems, the team had difficulty identifying a consistent formal mechanism of evaluation of the planning system.

The team feels that the College has made a sincere effort and has partially addressed this recommendation. At the same time, the College must formalize and make explicit its processes for the analysis of data for both planning purposes, as well as the evaluation of planning systems and processes. Most of what the team learned about the use of data came as result of interviews and College personnel. See 2012 Recommendations 1 and 2.
College Recommendation 3: Student Learning Outcomes
As also required in the comprehensive visit six years ago, the College must develop and implement student learning outcome processes that

- Focus on students - what they learn in instructional programs and how they are supported in that learning (Standards IIA.1, IIA.2),

- Include dialogue as a way to develop, document, implement, and evaluate assessment plans of student learning outcomes in both instruction and student services (Standards IB.1, IB.5, IIAS.1c, IIB.4, IIC.2),

- Assess instructional programs at course, program, degree and certificate levels (Standards IIA.2a, IIA.2e, IIA.2f, IIA.2, Eligibility Requirements 10, 11),

- Use these assessments to improve courses, programs, and services (Standards IIA.1c, IIA.2e, IIA.2f, Eligibility Requirement 19),

- Link student learning outcomes, planning, and resource allocation (Standard IB), and

- Create a cycle of continuous assess of the effectiveness of College programs and services on student learning (Standard IB.7).

Student learning outcomes (SLO) are defined for all programs at Porterville College and are published currently in the online supplement to the 2011-12 Catalog. The assessment of program SLOs is designed to ensure that students completing the College’s courses and programs (academic degrees and certificates) are achieving these expected outcomes. The SLOs Committee and the Curriculum Committee, both sub-committees of the Academic Senate, ensure that course outlines of record have clearly stated measurable outcomes and are reviewed on a regular basis.

The College has put the appropriate structures in place so that the College can satisfy the current Commission expectations regarding student learning outcomes and assessment. At the same time, expectations have increased since the original recommendation was written. While the majority of the College meets the current expectations of the Commission, there are segments of the College that have not fully met current Commission expectations.

This recommendation has been fully met with respect to Commission expectations at the time the recommendation was written.
College Recommendation 4: Institutional Integrity
The College must standardize student services across the College to ensure that students taking courses through distance education, during the summer, or evening have the same access to consistent and reliable information as on-campus day students (Students IIB.1, III.3a)

The team found ample evidence that the Office of Student Services has standardized its programs and increased the availability of its services to summer, evening, and distance education students. In fact, in a time of resource constraints the College has done a very good job in examining services critically and delivering those services in an intelligent manner.

This recommendation has been met.

College Recommendation 5: Organization
To meet the standards related to ethical, effective, and empowered leadership, the College must identify the roles, scope of authority, and responsibility of faculty, staff, students, administrators, and committees in the decision-making processes. The College/district is encouraged to review and evaluate if the number of administrators is commensurate with the size of the institution (Standards IVA, IVA.1, IVA.2, IVA.3, Eligibility Requirement 5).

Upon review of the management structures of other Colleges in the system, the Administrative Council recommended that the College should begin to build back its administrative staff in an effort to better serve the campus and provide effective leadership. A new administrative structure was developed and presented to the College Leadership Council (CLC) for review and discussion. The current team has concluded that the College has a sufficient number of administrators and other personnel for a College of its size.

The College has been engaged in robust dialogue regarding governance structures and systems to support student learning outcome and assessment cycles. Under the leadership of the College president, the College has had a very good dialog regarding the participatory governance model and the appropriate roles of administrators, faculty, classified staff, and administrators.

This recommendation has been met.
District Recommendations

District Recommendation 1
The team recommends that the colleges, working with appropriate District leaders and with the consideration of the unique conditions of each of the four sites in the District, complete the development, implementation, and assessment of the budget allocation model.

The College, in collaboration with the District leadership and other colleges developed and implemented a Budget Allocation Model (BAM) that is based on SB-361. Funding is allocated to each of the three colleges and the District operations based on BAM that was developed through the shared governance participation and is frequently reviewed and amended as required. As the result of BAM, the colleges maintain ending balances that may be applied to projects.

This recommendation has been met.

District Recommendation 2
The team recommends that the colleges, in conjunction with District leaders, complete an organizational map that clearly delineates the roles and responsibilities between entities and identifies an evaluation process that will provide for ongoing improvement (Standard IVB.3; Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems).

In 2011, the KCCD developed the KCCD decision making document, The Elements of Decision Making, which delineates the role, responsibilities and decision making processes of Kern Community College District. This document is based in part, on an earlier document developed in 2006. The document details the process of decision making at the KCCD level and provides a functional mapping for the Decision Making Chart. The KCCD services are evaluated annually or biannually via the Standing Committees in the areas of Information Technology, Human Services and Business Services, as well as, the evaluation embedded in the Decision Making document. The Porterville College President serves as a member of the Chancellor’s Cabinet, which is the “clearing house for the consideration of all proposals for creation of or amendments to Board Policies and Procedures as well as considering other issues that may require decisions” (IV.B.2, IV.B.43, IV.B.45).

The KCCD conducted a confidential Climate Survey in 2011-2012. The Bakersfield College visiting team stated that the results of the report identified one significant area of concern relating to communication between Bakersfield College and the KCCD. The survey results revealed that approximately 50 percent of all employee groups disagree that a timely exchange of information between the KCCD and College exists. The report indicates that the new district document, The Elements of Decision Making addresses the concerns revealed by the survey, it is unclear if the document is put into practice. Additionally, it is unclear if there have been improvements in the flow of communication.
throughout the KCCD as a result of *The Elements of Decision Making* document. This evidence was not included for Porterville College.

Based upon the conclusions of the Bakersfield College visiting team, this recommendation has been fully addressed.

**District Recommendation 3**

The team recommends that the board adopt and implement the self-evaluation process being developed and routinely administer the process. In addition, the current ethics policy should be revised to include a procedure for dealing with violations of the policy.

The Board of Trustees completed a self-evaluation process in time to be noted in the 2009 Midterm report. After approval of the self-evaluation instrument by the Board in 2007, in section 2E of the Board Policy Manual, the evaluation instrument was administered in October 2007 by each board member. Beginning in 2007, the self-evaluation instrument is administered in October of every odd-numbered year (IV.B.17.a).

Additionally, the Board was requested to revise the ethics policy to include a procedure for dealing with violations of the policy. In October 2007, the Statement of Ethics in the Board Policy Manual, Section 2G2, was also revised. The Statement of Ethics included a five-part process for violations of ethical standards. As it stands, a complete process for dealing with ethics violations has now been developed and implemented. There is a button on the Kern Community College District website to report ethics violations anonymously helping to make the reporting of ethics violations simple and safe (IV.B.18).

The recommendation has been met.

**District Recommendation 4**

The team recommends that to ensure a coordinated and integrated approach to achieving the goals and priorities adopted by the governing board, a District Strategic Plan be used to direct the colleges’ strategic focuses and Educational Master Plan (Standard II.A, II.B and II.C).

The College’s strategic planning process is evidenced in several documents. In the development of the current Strategic Plan, links are made between college initiatives and various aspects of the KCCD and state plans. The linkage provides direction to the campus in the effort to integrate the services, goals, and objectives with the district and the state.

This recommendation has been met.
**District Recommendation 5**
The team recommends that the colleges follow the Kern Community College District Policy 7D by evaluating adjunct faculty in a consistent, timely manner with procedures that assess current performance and promote improvement (Standard IIIA.1b).

The KCCD and the Community College Association mutually agreed to follow current Board Policy 7D as negotiations on a successor agreement took place. The District initiated efforts to improve the tracking of evaluations in order to ensure consistent and timely assessment of adjunct faculty performance. New adjunct faculty are evaluated in their first semester of employment, as well as every six semesters thereafter. Finally, the college using District Policy 7D, completing 87 adjunct evaluations, a process that includes peer observation, materials review, student surveys, and an administrative review.

This recommendation has been met.

**District Recommendation 6**
The team recommends that the colleges, with appropriate District-wide input, develop a written code of ethics for all employees (Standard IIIA.1d).

The colleges, with appropriate district wide input and the leadership of a faculty member from Cerro Coso Community College, developed an employee code of ethics.

This recommendation has been met.
Eligibility Requirements

The evaluation team found Porterville College to be in compliance with the 21 Eligibility Requirements established by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

1. Authority
Porterville College is authorized to operate as an educational institution and award degrees by the State of California, the Department of Education, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, and the Kern Community College District.

2. Mission
Porterville College has a mission statement that defines its purpose and the population it intends to serve. The mission statement is consistent with its legal authorization and is appropriate to a degree-granting institution of higher education. The College reviews its mission statement on an annual basis. The Kern Community College District Board of Trustees adopted the mission statement in June 2007. The mission statement is communicated to the public both in print and online.

3. Governing Board
The Kern Community College District Board of Trustees is a seven-member body elected by registered voters within various districts. An eighth member is a student trustee who is elected by the students within the district and serves in an advisory capacity. The board is empowered to formulate policy, maintain integrity and financial stability, and ensure the College mission is being carried out. Board members are precluded by public law from participating in any action involving a possible conflict of interest or from realizing a financial gain from their position as a board member.

4. Chief Executive Officer
The Porterville College President has served as CEO since January 2006. The district chancellor delegates authority to the College CEO to administer board policies, manages resources, ensures compliance with all statutes and regulations, and maintain ongoing long range planning for the College. The Chancellor of the Kern Community College district has served as District CEO since July 2004.
5. Administrative Capacity
Current administrators possess the skills and abilities to perform their duties at a high level. The senior level administrators consist of the president, vice president of academic affairs, and the vice president of student services. There are two deans who report to the vice president of academic affairs. The College uses a division chair structure whereby faculty perform in a quasi-administrative capacity and report to the two deans of academic affairs. The College also has an associate dean of health careers as well as various directors who report either to the appropriate vice president or to the College president.

6. Operational Status
Porterville College served 4,100 students as of fall 2011. The College offers a variety of educational programs and services including a range of transfer, career technical education, basic skills, and lifelong learning curricula. Students actively pursue degrees and certificates.

7. Degrees
A majority of the educational offerings of Porterville lead to associate degrees, certificates of achievement, and certificates of proficiency. The courses offered by the College are designed to satisfy degree requirements, general education, and transfer.

8. Educational Programs
Porterville College offers 19 associate degrees and 15 certificates. These various degrees and certificates are consistent with the College mission. Programs are based on recognized fields of study in higher education, are of sufficient content and length, present sufficient variety within disciplines and are conducted and maintained at the appropriate levels of quality and rigor. The minimum requirement for an associates degree is sixty units, which equates to two academic years of full-time study.

9. Academic Credit
Academic credit is awarded pursuant to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, section 55002.5. Unit values for each course are reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee, the Academic Senate, and the Board of Trustees.

10. Student Learning and Achievement
Student learning outcomes (SLO) are defined for all programs at Porterville College and are published currently in the online supplement to the 2011-12 Catalog. The assessment of program SLOs is designed to ensure that students completing the College’s courses and programs (academic degrees and certificates) are achieving these expected outcomes. The SLOs Committee and the Curriculum Committee, both sub-committees of the Academic Senate, ensure that course outlines of record have clearly stated measurable outcomes and are reviewed on a regular basis.
11. General Education
The College’s general education requirements meet the requirements of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, section 55806. The quality and rigor of the College’s general education is consistent with the academic standards appropriate to higher education, providing breadth of knowledge, demanding critical thinking within the disciplines, and promoting intellectual inquiry.

General Education courses are listed in the College catalog as well as course descriptions. The College has recently developed student learning outcomes for students completing general education requirements.

12. Academic Freedom
The College’s Academic Freedom Policy for faculty and students is set forth in the College catalog. The College’s policy defines academic freedom in a clear manner and recognizes that faculty and students are free to examine and test ideas. The institution maintains an environment that supports academic freedom.

13. Faculty
Porterville College has a substantial core of full-time faculty responsible to the institution. All faculty are qualified to conduct the institution’s programs and they are responsible for the development and review of curriculum as well as the assessment of student learning. Faculty meet minimum qualifications, in accordance with the California Community College Chancellor’s Office requirements.

14. Student Services
Porterville College provides a range of student services consistent with its student population, supporting student learning and development within the context of the College’s mission statement.

15. Admissions
Porterville College maintains an open admission policy and process consistent with the College mission and in compliance with California Education Code, Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, and district policy.

16. Information and Learning Resources
Porterville College provides its students sufficient information and learning resources and services in support of its mission and its educational programs. Students may access the services and resources of both the Learning Resource Center and the Library where individualized programs, computers, and print media are available. The library’s fourteen electronic databases provide online access to thousands of periodical articles and more than twenty-two thousand textbooks in NetLibrary.

17. Financial Resources
Porterville College develops an operating budget on an annual basis that adequately funds learning programs and services. The Board of Trustees approves the College’s budget that is included the District’s overall annual budget. The District has planned for and has
been using its reserves to continue providing a stable level of service to communities served by the District.

Porterville College is audited, through the Kern Community College District’s annual financial audit process, by an external, independent auditor. Audit reports are posted on the District website for public review.

19. Institutional Planning
Porterville College has developed an integrated planning and budgeting model that links the program review process to budget allocations. This work has led to completion of comprehensive program reviews, annual updates, budget requests and the development of all course level outcomes and assessments. The planning system includes a Strategic Plan, which translates the educational priorities into strategic objectives, action steps, and measurable outcomes, and its Educational Master Plan, which sets forth broad educational priorities which are then developed in documents such as the Enrollment Management Plan, and the Technology Plan.

The data derived from the planning documents drives resource allocation decision-making. Specifically, the College uses a resource allocation model that integrates planning and assessment to drive resource allocations.

20. Integrity in Communication with the Public
The Porterville College catalog is published annually and includes the College’s official name and address, the mission statement; requirements for admission and student fees, degrees, certificates, and transfer; major policies affecting students; listings of all courses and services; The catalog is also published on the College’s website.

21. Relations with the Accrediting Commission
The College’s Self-Evaluation assures that the College adheres to the Accrediting Commission’s eligibility requirements, standards, and policies. Since the last accreditation, the College has complied with all requests of the Commission and has filed substantive change requests in a timely manner.
STANDARD I
Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

IA. Mission

General Observations:
Porterville College revised its mission statement in 2007. The process of revision involved discussion at shared governance committees, and the representatives were responsible for contacting their constituencies for feedback. Evidence suggests that the dialogue leading up to revision of the mission was widespread and pervasive on campus. The mission is well-articulated and used in several documents as well as in the webpage. The strategic plan goals for 2012-15 are directly related to the mission. The use of the mission in program review for both instructional and non-instructional areas ensures that the mission is central to institutional planning and decision-making (I.A).

Findings and Evidence:
The College’s mission statement reflects the institution’s broad educational purposes, and its intended student population and commitment to student learning. The College charged the Budget, Enrollment Management, and Planning Committee (BEMAP), a sub-committee of the College Learning Council (CLC), with the development of the mission statement. Minutes of BEMAP meetings reveal that the committee discussed and revised the College mission in 2006-2007. The discussions were driven by the recommendations of the previous accreditation team’s recommendation. The newly developed mission statement was deliberated extensively by the Porterville College Academic Senate. The membership of BEMAP committee included representation from administration, faculty and classified staff. The mission statement was discussed among different constituencies on campus. However, the team was not able to determine if students were involved in development of the mission (I.A.1).

Although the members of BEMAP and CLC confirmed data was used to align the College programs and services with the needs of the community, the team had difficulty in finding evidence of what data analysis was used to inform the process. The minutes of BEMAP meetings confirm the mission was approved; however, the specific analysis or research findings used to drive the discussions are not mentioned (I.A.1).

The Kern Community College District Board of Trustees adopted the mission statement at its June 2007 Board of Trustees meeting. The mission statement is widely publicized in the College website as well as in Educational Master Plan, Strategic Plan, Program Review templates (I.A.2).

The College has established a process for reviewing the mission statement annually. Since 2009, the CLC has reviewed the College mission and has not found any need to change it (I.A.3).
Program review forms the core of the campus planning process. Each instructional and non-instructional area is required to prepare its program review. The College’s mission and its resource allocation methodology is well-integrated with the program review process. Program review requires that all goals be tied to one or more of the six areas of the College mission. The resource allocation process is connected to the planning process via the program review and budget allocation form. The request for resources identified in the program review process (and connected to mission) is aligned with the strategic plan via the budget allocation form. The College went through several iterations of its planning processes in order to perfect the process (I.A.4).

Conclusions:
The College meets Standard IA. The College has engaged in a process of refining its mission pursuant to the recommendation of the previous team. Although much work has taken place, evidence suggests that the discussion was driven by the recommendation of the previous accreditation team rather than on data analysis. The College reviews its mission annually; however, there is no defined process for collecting and analyzing data to review the mission. The College has developed a comprehensive process that puts mission at the center of its planning. College planning process starts with departmental program review. All goals in program review are tied to the mission. When budget requests are made for resources identified in the program review, connection is made with the strategic directions. The budget review committee prepares a one-page comprehensive document that ties program review, mission, strategic direction, and resource allocation.
IB. Improving Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:
The College has been engaged in robust dialogue regarding institutional effectiveness focusing on the mission, integrated planning and budgeting systems, governance structures and systems to support student learning outcome and assessment cycles. College dialog regarding institutional effectiveness and planning have led to the development and evolution of new planning and governance models as well as a program review and budgeting model that uses ties to the mission or institutional goals as the driver for further plans and resource allocation requests. These new systemic planning processes and procedures are inclusive of appropriate constituent groups and provide ample opportunity for participation. Challenges remain regarding the type and quality of the data that is used in program review—in some areas it is extensive, and in some areas it is less extensive. The College is aware of these challenges and has recently begun the work to address these concerns, demonstrating commitment to continuous improvement (IB).

Findings and Evidence:
The team was able to find evidence that points to a comprehensive College-wide effort to develop an integrated planning and budgeting model that links the program review process to budget allocations. This work has led to completion of comprehensive program reviews, annual updates, budget requests and the development of all course level outcomes and assessments. The College has also identified outcomes for all programs, associate degrees and certificates. The team also found evidence that some College programs had completed assessment cycles. However, there is an uneven response among the campus departments regarding the full completion of assessment (I.B.1, I.B.2).

Each department completes a comprehensive program review every three years. All departments complete an annual update. Program reviews for an entire division is completed every four years. The instructional program review process incorporates overarching student achievement data to guide reflection and to support planning. Course-level data and analysis about student achievement, disaggregated by demographics and other measures are not included in program review.

Each division prepares instructional program reviews and their planning goals are linked to the College mission, and via the annual program review updates and budget requests, also linked to the College Strategic Plan and the KCCD Strategic Plan. Non-instructional program plans are prepared and the goals in those areas are also tied to the College mission, and via the Budget Forms to other plans. Prior to being submitted to the College Learning Committee (CLC), each program review is now evaluated against a standard rubric by the Strategic Planning Committee and that same committee provides structured feedback if the Program Review documents are found lacking.
The team found evidence that the program reviews were in fact used to allocate funds to meet the technology needs of the College, and the budget committee is continuing that work in other arenas. The College notes that their own forms have not allowed for sufficient documentation of progress on past goals from year to year, prior to the development of new goals. The College has shown the ability to change the data being asked for on its forms, as needed, to increase their usefulness and the identified many iterations of each that demonstrate continual improvement. The College is aware of the importance and value of the program reviews and constituents report deep involvement and investment in the process (I.B.2, I.B.3, I.B.4).

The College has completed a ten-year 2002 - 2012 Educational Master Plan that was revised in 2008. The College has completed a new Educational Master Plan, which was adopted at the time of team’s visit. The College’s first Strategic Plan was approved in 2007 and is now completed. The District approved its new Strategic Plan in the 2011-12 academic year and the College’s new Strategic Plan was approved in 2012.

The 2012 Porterville College Strategic Plan establishes short and long-term initiatives that are further broken into smaller goals. The team found that the goals are written in clear, measurable language with responsibilities assigned to individuals and groups.

The Strategic Planning Committee will develop specific action plans to accomplish the goals documented in the 2012 Porterville Strategic Plan. These College initiatives are linked to the KCCD Strategic Plan. The Strategic Planning Committee also developed a new iteration of the Strategic Plan Progress Report to track progress towards each goal. The initiatives and goals contained in the new planning document are based on the findings of three major research projects at the College in the previous several years as well as the need for the College to meet the demands of the Student Success Task Force (I.B.2, I.B.4).

The College has continuously evaluated and has refined its planning process over the last six years. Integrated Planning, Assessment and Action, developed in Spring 2012 and formerly adopted in the Fall of 2012, describes the College’s planning processes. All constituent groups are afforded the opportunity to participate in the planning process via their appointments on the CLC and the CLC planning subcommittees, as evidenced by meeting minutes. Interviews of campus constituent group leaders and feedback from open accreditation forums demonstrate that there is wide understanding of and support for the planning, assessment and action model (I.B.4).

Data appears to be infused throughout much, but not all, of the planning and evaluation cycles. The new Strategic Plan Initiatives and Goals were established using quantitative and qualitative data from the ARCC-SPAR study, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and the KCCD Climate Survey.

The team found evidence that budget decisions are made based on planning processes and that those processes are then evaluated and processes refined. Finally, the College has convened a task force known as Core of the Core, to undertake the task of
reimagining the College should the current economic conditions continue to deteriorate. The team found evidence that, in this process, comprehensive qualitative and quantitative data is being used to make evidence-based difficult decisions in a participatory governance environment (I.B.3).

The primary method of communicating results of assessment is through committee meetings and by email and on a limited basis, through the College website. The Strategic Planning Committee documents progress towards achieving the goals of the current plan. All planning documents including Program Reviews are housed on the Institutional Research website and reviewed, with a rubric, by the Strategic Planning Committee and then by the CLC. The number of completed SLOs and PLOs are reported on the Program Review document, the College has recently converted to Curricunet©. However, the data is not easily accessible. The team did find evidence that SLO assessment discussions were held and can be evidenced in division meeting minutes or, in some cases, via online discussion boards shared with the team. The College’s new Curricunet© adoption should make documentation of important dialogue more visible. (I.B.5)

The team found evidence by reviewing source documents such as meeting minutes, survey results, and narratives. Based upon a review of the evidence it is clear that the College has engaged in a continually iterative process of discussion, development, implementation, assessment and reimplementation/reassessment of processes and procedures relating to planning and budgeting, which has led to improvements in the planning process.

The College has shown an adaptable and nimble response based on assessments of those processes, which include: adding in a one-year update for Program Review, changing the program review documents to include past goal assessment as well as current goal assessment, developing a rubric to evaluate program reviews, and changing the planning process in relation to the survey results from Fall 2009.

In addition, the College has changed its own strategic planning goals in relation to findings from the ARCC-SPAR study and the CCSSE. The College plans to assess its goals using similar metrics. The College reports that its most recent Strategic Planning survey will be conducted during the current academic year. Finally, in relation to student success, the College participated in two significant research projects 1) the Bridging Research Information and Cultures (BRIC) to improved SLOAC efforts and to examine basic skills practices and learning communities as well as another project with the RP group which, they hope, will lead to determine best practices in reducing the achievement gap.

Although the planning and resource allocation cycle is well defined within the College, the relationship between district planning process and campus planning process is not well understood by different constituencies on campus. District Consultative Council is one of the two entities charged with bringing synergy between campus planning and district planning. However, conversations with different constituent groups indicate the effectiveness of this body is questionable (I.B.6, I.B.7).
Conclusions:
The College meets Standard IB. The College has worked hard at redesigning its planning systems to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness. The redesign of the College’s planning and budgeting processes, as well as shared governance systems, has required significant effort on the part of the entire College. The re-visioning of the CLC with its three major subcommittees of Enrollment Management, Budget and Strategic Planning (with the Student Learning Outcomes committee reporting to the Academic Senate) has led to great improvements in institutional planning.

However, these processes are relatively new and the team had some difficulty in assessing the whether the processes are fully implemented or are implemented on a consistent basis across the institution. The team believes that the College is using quantitative and qualitative data for both institutional and program level planning. However, the links between data analysis and planning need to be made more explicit. Furthermore, the team had difficulty determining the extent to which College plans and/or district plans are integrated. The College provided a document that shows the links among the plans. However, there was a lack of any narrative that fully describes the integration of the planning process. In many cases, the team was required to rely on interviews with personnel to make a determination as to the adequacy of the College’s planning processes. The team did find evidence that resource allocation decisions are based upon planning.

Finally, the addition of the annual program review is a key element in the new integrated planning processes, but the lack of quantitative data provided the instructional programs limits the ability of the program review to promote positive change, particularly at the course level.

College Recommendation 1
In order to strengthen its planning process the team recommends that the College expand the use of its available qualitative and quantitative data and formalize the data analysis process at both the program and institutional level. While the team found evidence that the College is using the results of data analysis in its program level and institutional planning processes, the link between data analysis and planning should be made more explicit (Standards I.B, I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.3, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f, II.B.3, III.A.6, III.B.2.b, III.C.2).

College Recommendation 2
In order to improve its planning process, the team recommends that the integration among plans at the program level, institutional level, and district level be made more explicit. Although the team found evidence suggesting that the various plans are related and that resource allocation are tied to the planning process, the link among various plans and their hierarchy should be more clearly documented (Standards I.B.3 III.A.6, III.B.2.b).
IIA. Instructional Programs

General Observations:
The College is committed to offering high quality educational programs that meet the needs of a diverse community. Students are proud of their College and value the educational experiences and services they receive.

The College offers transfer, career and technical education, basic skills, and community education courses with strong support services and an environment that promotes learning. There is a strong commitment on the part of the College to meet the needs of a diverse community.

Over the last several years the College has worked hard to meet the expectations of the Commission regarding student learning outcomes and assessment, as well as institutional planning and program review. As a result, the College has made numerous changes to its systems and processes. However, some of the most recent changes had not been fully implemented at the time of the team’s visit.

The College should be commended for its Cultural and Historical Awareness Program (CHAP). CHAP is a long-standing cross-campus program that promotes an appreciation for the cultural and historical heritage of the region. In addition a partnership with the City of Porterville in its Fire Academy and Administration of Justice show that the College is actively seeking partnerships to serve its students in their intellectual and academic development toward lifelong learning and satisfying careers (IA).

Findings and Evidence:
The College prominently displays its Mission Statement, Values, and Philosophy on the homepage website and on many committee agendas and documents. The College offers programs that are congruent with its mission. The College continually reviews programs relying on retention and success rates and the achievement of measurable Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). All course outlines, inventoried on Curricunet, include SLO’s that have been developed through dialog with faculty and evaluated by the Curriculum Committee.

A standing SLO Sub-Committee reports directly to the Academic Senate and is chaired by a faculty coordinator. The SLO process is also supported by a part-time classified employee. The team feels that the College has successfully created productive momentum to institutionalize the SLO assessment cycle through Flex Day trainings, Friday drop-in events, and guided discussion within division meetings as evidenced
through the Institutional Research website, agendas, flyers, and minutes (II.A.1, II.A.2.a, II.A.6).

The College identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through a very robust data gathering and sharing system. The College collects and analyses community data through Economic Modeling Specialist, Inc. (EMSI), Accuplacer testing, a Student Satisfaction Survey, and CCSSE data. Interviews with staff confirmed that the College math faculty (through data analysis and Program Review) are not satisfied with the current self-placement procedure for Math classes The faculty are working to replace the current math placement methodology with a state-normed test. An actionable improvement plan is in place for reform in the English department (II.A.1.a).

All 363 courses listed in the College’s current catalog have Student Learning Outcomes (76.31% of courses with ongoing assessment) and all 45 programs have documented Program Learning Outcomes (58% with on-going assessment). However, only the Division of Science and Math has completed one entire cycle of assessment of its Program Learning Outcomes. Presently, the highest priority of the SLO Committee is to assess the recently approved Institutional Student Learning Outcomes. Division and department minutes, agendas, and training sessions clearly indicate that the College has generated sufficient momentum to complete the assessment of PLO’s on schedule (II.A.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.c, II.A.6, II.A.6.a).

The newly-approved Enrollment Management Plan, Integrated Planning, Assessment and Action Plan (IPAA), Strategic Plan, and Educational Master Plan articulate goals, objectives, mapping, and processes that enable the College to analyze data from within and throughout the College community to evaluate the quality and improvement of all instructional courses. Each course undergoes a four year periodic review to include student success and to update Student Learning Outcomes. The Curriculum Committee uses a documented process (CurricUNET) to include faculty and administration in directed dialog to review, evaluate, and submit continuing and new College courses and programs.

Recently, the College has improved the effectiveness of advisory committees by partnering with faculty in the Porterville High School’s pathways programs. In this way, advisory committees are shared. However, minutes do not indicate that advisory committees integrate Student Learning Outcomes into the discussions. The Porterville College Fire Academy is a model program in partnership with the City of Porterville with much assistance from the California Department of Forestry and Fire (II.A.2, II.A.2.a, II.A.2.b, II.A.5).

High quality instruction is enhanced via a thorough systematic three-year faculty evaluation process. Samplings of completed evaluation forms, both full-time and adjunct (with names redacted), indicate that the College is following Kern Community College District Community College Association (CCA) contract provisions. Faculty present a portfolio (a self-assessment) to indicate their campus involvement and goals for improvement. Evaluators also analyze student evaluations in aggregated scores and
individual student comments. The faculty evaluation process is confirmed by the evaluation committee members, both faculty and area administrator, and is signed-off by the College President or designee. The faculty evaluation process allows for both a full and abbreviated review processes during alternate review cycles. A separate faculty evaluation form is used for online evaluations; however, the formalized agreement of that process is still under review by the College and the CCA bargaining unit (II.A.2.c, II.A.2.d).

The College offers traditional face-to-face, hybrid, and online classes, and has experimented with Learning Communities. The College offers 77 online and mixed mode sections out of 363 sections for Fall 2012, or 21% of total course offerings. The College uses Moodle as its platform. On July 11, 2011, the Commission approved the College’s substantive change proposal for Distance Education. Course outlines of record and syllabi indicate that faculty throughout the College use a variety of delivery modes and teaching methodologies to meet the diverse needs and learning styles of their students. The newer classrooms have smart technology, and Vocational Technical Education Act (VTEA) funds have been used to acquire a number of Smart Boards to enhance instruction for CTE and other courses.

The Institutional Researcher shared data and analysis that confirms nationwide trends of lower retention rates and lower success rates for online classes. Data and data analysis is available on the College Institutional Research’s website and is provided to Deans, Department Chairs and selected committees as a resource use Program Review and Student Learning Outcomes; however, a review of the Program Review documents suggest that the Math and Science Division is the first and only division to have completed the Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLO) cycle. Both their Program Review and PSLO’s have included a data analysis in the review, and are now developing strategies to address both the declining success rates for online instruction and Basic Skills Math (II.A.2.d, II.A.6.a).

The institution evaluates all courses and programs through a systematic three-year program review. The program review form includes data about student retention and success rates across a program or sometimes across the division, but no other disaggregated data. No data is given for individual classes. Program Learning Outcomes are listed, but except in the case of Science and Math, not assessed (II.A.2.e).

The College has made great strides in developing a planning process that integrates the measurement of SLO’s into the planning process. However, given the recent changes to its planning system, the College has not had the opportunity to fully implement the process. The team found that while assessment information is reviewed within divisions, it is not yet integrated actively into institutional planning. In short, the College has not yet had the opportunity to complete a full planning cycle, which integrates SLO assessment into the institutional planning process (II.A.2.e, II.A.2.f).

The College has not cited any departmental and/or program examinations. (II.A.2.g)
Insofar as SLO’s and PLO’s are assessed and courses are adjusted based on the results, the College awards credits based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes (II.A.2.h, II.A.2i).

The College has developed and promulgated a well-defined philosophy of education and promotes all the major areas of knowledge. Life-long learning is a major goal within the College’s planning. Computer literacy and information competency have become part of the campus culture, as the application process, general catalog, and class schedules are all accessed online. The Cultural and Historical Awareness Program (CHAP) is an exemplary program that promotes historical and aesthetic sensitivity (II.A.3, II.A.3.a, II.A.3.b, II.A.3.c, II.A.6).

The College has a very robust General Education requirement that includes 39 units of interdisciplinary core. Other disciplines include 18 units of one area of inquiry. (II.A.4) Through interviews, the evaluation team discovered that the current VP of Academic Affairs has a long history in CTE through a prior career in law enforcement, experience as a part-time faculty, full-time faculty and several years in the Dean position. The CTE Program Manager is a new administrative position developed to address student success and completion rates. The CTE Program Manager resigned her administrative secretary position to focus on this new position linking high school pathways, college programs, and improving student success and completion rates.

Through her out-reach efforts; the College has documented increases in student completion of certificates. The self-evaluation reports pass rates for licensure exams. The health majors were expanded to include the RN degree several years ago, and the College has just completed its second cycle. A tour of the Fire Academy revealed a well-managed, state-of-the-art training facility. The College has very effectively partnered with the City of Porterville to build two smart classrooms, a three story mock building, rooftop mockups, and numerous props to practice extrication methods. An informal relationship with the City and with Cal Fire has provided Porterville College students with an excellent training opportunity (II.A.5).

The informal nature of the CTE relationships with the College’s partners has also resulted in a lack of documented discussions within advisory boards about the Student Learning Outcomes, and there is little documentation of regular advisory board meetings or the discussion taking place at those meetings. The College’s Actionable Improvement Plan recognizes that advisory board meetings need to occur more regularly (II.A.5).

Through its General Catalog, the College makes available to its students clearly stated information about educational policies and transfer-of-credit policies. A Catalog Supplement was also presented to indicate the recent addition of Program-level Student Learning Outcomes and other revisions. The College website lists numerous articulation agreements with its local feeder schools and universities. Course syllabi are provided for each class with stated student learning outcomes. The faculty evaluation process includes a review of each syllabus, including online classes. The College has a program discontinuance policy in place that makes appropriate arrangements so that students may
complete their education in a timely manner with a minimum of disruption (II.A.6, II.A.6.a, II.A.6.b, II.A.6.c).

Regarding academic integrity, the College uses and publicizes its policies supporting academic freedom and honesty through the Porterville College Catalog. Board Policy makes clear that the College welcomes discussions of controversial issues. Codes of conduct for students are also articulated in the Porterville College Catalog (II.A.7, II.A.7.a, II.A.7.b, II.A.7.c).

The College does not offer curricula in foreign locations (II.A.8).

Conclusions:
The College meets most of the elements of Standard IIA. While the team feels that the College is on track to fully meet the standard, there remain some shortfalls.

Program review does not indicate a detailed, disaggregated analysis and evaluation of student achievement at the course or program level. In addition, great strides have been made in writing and assessing of SLO’s. However, comprehensive assessment reports are not available. As a result, the team had difficulty identifying how assessment results are used at the institutional planning level. Finally, course-level SLOs are aligned with degree student learning outcomes, but in a draft form.

The Distance Education program is lightly treated in the Self-Evaluation, but an investigation of the distance education platform revealed a robust program that has grown as a result of individual instructor efforts. Though individual classes are occasionally evaluated as part of faculty evaluations, there is no evidence that the distance education program has been guided by planning. The team did not find evidence that there is a regular assessment with respect to the quality of the distance education program.

With respect to Career and Technical Education, advisory boards meet infrequently; there is no evidence that the College is the party that manages these boards or that Student Learning Outcomes are discussed and evaluated.

It is clear that the College is aware of these shortcomings and the College shows a willingness to improve on them. As a result the team feels that the College is on track to fully meet the standard, particularly if they act upon the accreditation team recommendations expeditiously.

Recommendations:

See College Recommendation 1.

See College Recommendation 2.
**College Recommendation 3**
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).

**College Recommendation 4**
To improve, the College should meet with its advisory boards and Career and Technical Education partners on a regular basis and systematically identify competency levels and to develop measurable student learning outcomes (Standards IIA.2.b, II.A.5).

**College Recommendation 5**
In order to assure the quality of its distance education program and meet Standards, the team recommends that the College conduct research and analysis to ensure that courses offered in a distance education mode and related student and learning support services are of comparable quality (Standards IIA.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.2, II.A.2.d, II.A.6, II.B.1, II.C.1).
IIB. Student Support Services

General Observations:
The College has made a concerted effort to respond to recommendations from the last accreditation visit to “develop, document, implement, and evaluate assessment plans of student learning outcomes” and to “assess student services throughout the students’ matriculation at the College.” All student services programs have developed Service Area Outcomes (SAO), completed assessments and used the results to improve services to students.

The College has also implemented changes in order to respond to the recommendation to “standardize student services across the College to ensure that students taking courses through distance education, during the summer, or evening hours have the same access to consistent and reliable information as on-campus day students”. Although budget cuts have curtailed the offering of services every evening, an analysis of when most students take evening courses resulted in keeping all student services offices open until 6:30pm on Tuesday and Wednesday evenings. An adjunct counselor was also hired to provide services during the summer. In addition, the website for student services was redesigned so that it is easy to follow and consistently lists program services, staff, and hours of operation. The addition of links to all forms that students may need, and a net price calculator to help students calculate the financial aid for which they may be eligible, make the website a valuable self-help tool.

The majority of counselors and many of the support staff are bilingual, Spanish speakers, thus addressing the need of the sixty-four percent and growing Hispanic population within the service area. Because of the size of the College, counselors must take on many roles. One generalist counselor is assigned fifty percent in the fall and forty percent in the spring to transfer center coordination. Another counselor is assigned as articulation officer, athletic counselor, and Division Chair of Student Services. The third counselor serves as the matriculation coordinator and counselor.

Within the categorical programs, budget reductions have forced a reduction in the number of students served in the EOPS/CARE programs. In EOPS, approximately 460 students are served compared to the nearly 800 served prior to the State budget cuts to categorical programs. In a community where sixty five percent of students receive financial aid of some kind, prioritizing who can receive EOPS/CARE services needed careful consideration. Priority is given to veterans, foster care youth, and CARE eligible students followed by those who have completed their financial aid packaging. Over 800 students currently remain on the waiting list for services.

The disabled student population has continued to increase over the last three years in every disability category. In order to accommodate the needs of disabled students, the DSPS Coordinator has brought in outside expertise to assure that the high technology center meets the minimum requirements to provide appropriate support for students with
disabilities. The office set-up has also been rearranged to better meet the needs of students.

Because of diminishing budgets and staffing, the Student Services Division has addressed the support and learning needs of its students by developing online tools to make access to information easier. Additionally, several self-help tools such as “Frequently Asked Questions” (FAQs), Do It Yourself Advising (DIY), and email advising are available to enable students to seek out information for themselves. Another tool to assist students with their educational planning is DegreeWorks which will be implemented early next year. Students and staff will have the capability to perform degree audits and “What If” scenarios to determine what courses are needed to complete the student’s academic program. These tools address the needs of online students as well as those who are not able see a counselor in person.

Student involvement in governance committees has improved but continues to be a challenge. Four years ago, a Director of Student Programs and Athletics was hired to provide leadership for the student development program. A full schedule of student activities is offered every semester, approximately fifteen clubs are active each semester and regular meetings are held with the Associated Students of Porterville College and Interclub Council. Student representation is solicited for all governance committees on campus (II.B).

Findings and Evidence:
The three-year Strategic Plan for Student Services outlines the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) for each department and various strategies and objectives were developed to address issues raised in the SWOT analysis. One of the goals in the Student Services Strategic Plan 2011-2014 states, “Shifting our focus in Student Services from ‘helping’ students to ‘teaching’ them.” The College webpage clearly demonstrates a focus on teaching students to do for themselves. Important dates affecting students and a listing of Transfer Center Events are front and center on the page. In addition, links to career information through a Career Coach link, transfer information through ASSIST, and a link for sample educational plans, provide students valuable tools to begin their educational planning.

The development of a “Student Services for Online Students” link on the website including 600 FAQs, and access to counselor by email is indicative of the movement towards “teaching” and not just “helping” students. A Graduation Checklist for each year since 2000 is available from the Counseling webpage to assist students evaluate their own progress. The installation of DegreeWorks will also give students an opportunity to perform a degree audit to determine their progress towards graduation. The online Catalogue is easy to navigate and contains information on courses, services, and major policies affecting students. The College has a growing distance education program. The team could not find evidence that the College had assessed the effectiveness of its student support services for distance education students (II.B.1, II.B.2, IIB3.a, II.B.3.c).
Although many online tools are available to students, the assessment and orientation processes continue to be administered in person. The Accuplacer, Companion, for reading and writing placement was validated in 2008. Mathematics placement is an informed self-placement process which, by all accounts, is not an effective process. In addition, the self-placement process does not clear students for registration into a math class with prerequisites. Students are still required to provide high school transcripts to be cleared to register for any math class beyond basic math. Although the College would prefer to use an online assessment for placement into reading, writing, and mathematics, it is waiting for the proposed statewide test to be implemented. Plans to develop a YouTube orientation have been tabled because of the loss of a key staff person who was in charge of its development (II.B.3.e).

The College assures the security of its student records by assigning login access to the Banner system based upon the employee’s job function. No student workers are given access to the student record system. The District office provides data back-up for the Banner system. Student records prior to 1998 are kept in hard copy in an area that is locked and secure. The Director of Admissions & Records provided FERPA training last fall as a FLEX workshop and provides training for new faculty and staff as needed. In addition, FERPA guidelines are available to faculty on the Inside PC portal (II.B.3.f).

Although student satisfaction surveys have been conducted for several years, and student achievement data is available on the research website, widespread discussion and use of the data is not evident. Instead, the student services division has focused on program specific data collected through their Service Area Outcomes (SAO) assessment. Student services SAO assessments and program reviews are agendized at monthly Student Services staff meetings. A report on the results of the SAO assessments (pre-2011) and the resulting changes to programs and/or procedures was summarized by the Vice President of Student Services and shared with all staff at a semester meeting held by the Vice President (II.B.4).

Programs, such as EOPS, have used their SAO assessments to streamline orientation material and to develop counseling checklists so that every student receives the same information. One of the changes implemented through this process was an emphasis on applying for scholarships. As a result, fifty percent of the scholarships given out last year were to EOPS students. Transfer guide sheets given to students during workshops and counseling appointments were also revised based upon SAO assessments that indicated that students were not understanding key transfer-related issues. The Disability Resource Center reconfigured the layout of the high tech center computers to the lobby area when survey data showed that students were dissatisfied with the previous location. Another assessment will be completed to determine whether the new configuration is satisfactory (II.B.3, II.B.4).

The College provides an environment that encourages intellectual, aesthetic, and personal development and an appreciation for diversity. Approximately fifteen clubs exist on campus as well as an associated student organization that is represented by traditional and non-traditional students. In addition, a Cultural and Historical Awareness Program
(CHAP) enhances “students’ awareness of certain important aspects of our society to which they may previously have had little or no exposure.” Having the entire College rally around a theme and having faculty incorporate it into their coursework is a significant commitment to enhancing student understanding and appreciation for history and diversity. A Multicultural Studies general education requirement for graduation further solidifies the College’s commitment to enhancing student understanding and appreciation of diversity. The 2009 Student Satisfaction Survey rated helping students develop a respect for diversity a 4.10 out of a possible 5 (II.B.3.b, II.B.3.d)

Conclusions:
The College meets most of the elements of Standard IIB. The College has appropriate student support services that are designed to meet student needs. All student services programs have developed Service Area Outcomes (SAO), completed assessments and have used the results to improve services to students. As the College has grown its distance education program, it is important for College to assess the adequacy of student support services for distance education students. The team is also concerned about the math placement process. The current method of self-placement needs to be assessed and a determination made regarding a suitable math placement instrument.

Recommendations:

College Recommendation 5
In order to assure the quality of its distance education program and to meet Standards, the team recommends that the College conduct research and analysis to ensure that courses offered in a distance education mode and related student and learning support services are of comparable quality (Standards II.A.1, II.A.1.a, II.A.1.b, II.A.2, II.A.2.d, II.A.6, II.B.1, II.C.1).

College Recommendation 6
In order to improve, the team recommends the College move expeditiously to find a suitable math assessment instrument that accurately measures student preparation and aligns with the mathematics curriculum (II.B3.e).
II.C. Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations:
The College supports student learning by providing a Library and a Learning Resource Center (LRC). The Library and the LRC are co-located in a central part of the campus and are housed in one of the College’s newer buildings. The team was able to confirm that the Library and the LRC provide the following services: collections, research assistance, including the use of technology, tutoring, and computer resources.

The Library supports student learning with information in many formats of depth, variety, currency, and quantity. It offers 25 databases subscriptions, an online catalog of over 35,000 books and 1,500 media titles. The Library also serves as a community resource by maintaining the Valley Writers Collection, which consists of over 500 titles written by authors who have lived and/or worked in California’s Great Central Valley. The Library also maintains a reserve collection of books and media titles that are specifically related to College instructional activities. As result, the reserve collection is one of the Library’s most heavily used resources.

The LRC serves many Porterville College students on a daily basis and is highly rated by students in recent student satisfaction surveys. The LRC provides tutoring services and exam proctoring services. Like many other areas of the College, the LRC has had to reduce its services in the last few years as a result of budget reductions.

Findings and Evidence:
Porterville College is able to provide its students and faculty with a comprehensive collection that is sufficient in quantity, quality, depth, variety, and currency. The Library has used a variety of survey instruments to assess the quantity and quality of its various collections. The lead librarian is responsible for collection development. The librarian has relied extensively on student survey data to guide decisions regarding online library resources. In addition, the lead Librarian uses a variety of informal mechanisms, including querying faculty, to develop the collection. Finally, LRC staff work very closely with faculty to determine LRC support equipment and materials (III.C, III.C.1, III.C.1.a).

The Library offers formal classroom instruction as well as individual reference assistance so that students are able to develop skills in information competency. Librarians will also provide customized instruction at the request of faculty. The Library has also created Service Area Outcomes (SAOs), rubrics, and additional survey tools as a means to develop measurable outcomes with respect to information competency (III.C.1.b, III.C.2).

The Library is open sixty hours per week and the LRC is open fifty-two hours per week during the fall and spring semesters. These hours accommodate day and evening students, as well as distance learning students. A full complement of services, including reference desk help, is available during most of the operating hours. The Library and LRC are also open during the summer session at a reduced amount of hours. The Library has developed a robust collection of resources that can be accessed in an online format by
any Porterville College student (III.C.1.c).

The team found the Library and the LRC to be clean, well-organized, and well-maintained. 
In addition, two normal access controls, motion detector sensors, were installed in the Library in 2011. Security for the Library and LRC is adequate (III.C.1.d).

The KCCD has a contract with the SIRSI/DYNIX Corporation for its HORIZON automation/catalog system. In addition, most of the Library’s twenty-four databases and two online book collections are vetted and purchased through the Community College League of California’s (CCLC) Library Consortium. KCCD policies and procedures regarding external contracts ensure performance standards are established and that contracts are reviewed on a periodic basis (III.C.1.e).

As noted above, the Library has issued a number of student satisfaction surveys and has also developed Service Area Outcomes as a means of evaluating Library services. The team was not able to find evidence of a formal process to garner feedback from the faculty, however. The LRC has also implemented student satisfaction surveys and has conducted focus group sessions. While the LRC provides baseline data such as student usage, it is not clear if there has been any effort to tie LRC activities to other institutional measureable indicators such as student success and achievement. As part of their plan for improvement, the LRC should strongly consider an attempt to more directly link LRC support efforts to measurable learning outcomes at an institutional level and/or learning outcomes for specific programs.

**Conclusions:**

The College meets Standard IIIC. Library and learning resources are sufficient to support the College’s instructional programs and student learning. The College maintains an adequate and varied collection of resources and makes those resources available in formats that are readily accessible to students. The Library provides adequate services including instruction, training, and reference services. In addition, the LRC provides sufficient services to support student learning. Both the Library and the LRC are at the beginning stages of improving their assessment of services. Although not a formal recommendation, the team strongly encourages the Library to broaden their formal feedback instruments to include faculty. In addition, the team encourages the LRC to examine the impact of LRC services on student learning and achievement at and institutional level.

**Recommendations**

None.
III. Human Resources

General Observations:
The Kern Community College District (KCCD) performs the human resources function for Porterville College. A review of Porterville College and district documents, and interviews with campus and district staff indicate that KCCD and Porterville College have in place policies, procedures, and demonstrated practices to ensure that the campus employs personnel who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to support the campus programs and services. Porterville College has on-site Human Resources management support from the District Office which reviews, develops, and implements personnel policy and procedures through a consultation process.

Findings and Evidence:
A review of the evidence demonstrates that Porterville College employs qualified personnel that support and improve the effectiveness of the instructional, services, and operational programs following KCCD hiring procedures for faculty, classified staff, and confidential and management positions.

Porterville College uses appropriate criteria and procedures for developing and advertising descriptions, and selecting and hiring faculty, management, and classified staff. Positions are advertised internally and to the public on the College and District websites, in local and professional publications, and targeted advertising websites. The district has established criteria, qualifications, and procedures for selection of personnel (stated in KCCD Board Policy Manual and HR Operation Guidelines and posted on the College website). The College Human Resources Office works in collaboration with administration, the division chairs, faculty members, and supervisors to ensure hiring is consistent in all phases of the employment process. The District is currently drafting a comprehensive Human Resources procedural manual that will be processed through consultative process in the fall of 2012 (III.A, III.A.1, III.A.1.a).

Candidates are screened through application documents, previous work experience, certificates, degrees, panel interviews, skills testing, and reference checks to verify minimum qualifications before being selected for an oral interview. KCCD Board Policy and union contracts are used to ensure that positions in the District are uniform. Faculty candidates must meet minimum qualifications published by the California Community College Chancellor’s Office and provide transcripts, a statement of teaching philosophy as well as a teaching demonstration. Applicants with foreign degrees must provide foreign transcript equivalency from recognized foreign transcript evaluation services (III.A.1, III.A.1.a).

Porterville College employees are evaluated on a regular basis by evaluation policies set forth in the KCCD Board Policy Manual. Classified evaluations are completed per a
written agreement between KCCD and the California School Employees Association (CSEA), based on job-related criteria. All tenured and non-tenured faculty members receive uniform and consistent evaluations. Processes are defined in the KCCD Board Policy Manual and, for faculty, in accordance with procedures outlined in an agreement between KCCD and the Community College Association. The Self-Evaluation Report noted that new evaluation instruments will be established and executed to ensure standards are measured accurately (III.A.1.b).

Faculty evaluations include classroom observation by administration and colleagues, student evaluations, instructional materials review, and professional responsibilities review. The evaluation of professional responsibilities includes faculty participation in developing and assessing student learning outcomes. The Self-Evaluation Report states that KCCD and Porterville College continue to develop and improve new methods in determining effectiveness of SLOs (III.A.1.c).

The District has a commitment to high professional ethics standards and has a section written in the KCCD Board Policy Manual that addresses ethical issues and also includes a nepotism policy. The Self-Evaluation Report noted that new evaluation instruments will be established and executed to ensure standards are measured accurately (III.A.1.d).

Staffing needs at the College are initially identified through individual program reviews and reviewed as part of the participatory governance process. Faculty positions are prioritized by the Academic Senate and submitted to the College Learning Council. The College President makes the final decision regarding staffing. A steady reduction in funding in the last several years has led to all a reduction in the workforce and employee classifications to assume extra work. The KCCD Human Resources department is currently conducting a reclassification study to address all classified staffing needs district-wide to address this issue (III.A.2).

The College provides access to personnel policies as stated in the KCCD Board Policy Manual, the HR Operational Guidelines, and the faculty and classified agreements on its website or by providing links on the College website. Porterville College through the District policies, procedures, contract provisions, and departmental duties and responsibilities provides for fairness in all employment procedures. The District maintains official personnel files for each employee at KCCD’s HR office and limits access to provide sufficient security and confidentiality of the content (III.A.3).

The College exhibits a strong commitment to equity and diversity through a variety of planned social activities that promote diversity and nondiscriminatory behaviors throughout the year. A 2011 KCCD Climate Survey Report showed 87-90% of Porterville College employees feel the general climate of the campus supports diverse groups of race, ethnicity, gender, and disabilities. Board policies, employee contracts, handbooks, guidebooks, brochures, catalogs, and communication via email and the web, and bulletin boards all provide support and commitment to integrity in the treatment of students, management, faculty, and staff (III.A.4, III.A.4.a, III.A.4.c).
The College provides staff professional development through Flex days offered in the fall and spring, coordinated by the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate President. A survey tool has not been used to evaluate the flex day workshops since 2007. Classified staff have the opportunity to enroll in a professional development program that offers compensation for each 15 units completed (as specified in the CSEA contract). Additionally, the College offers a variety of technology training events instructed by College or District personnel. The College continues to consider cost effective ways to bring additional professional development programs to the campus with limited funding (III.A.5).

The College uses the Educational Master Plan, the program review process, and participatory governance (College Learning Council) to identify, assess and prioritize human resource needs for faculty and staff. However, the team had difficulty determining the extent to which human resource planning is integrated with other institutional planning efforts (III.A.6).

Conclusions:
The College mostly meets Standard IIIA. Porterville College employs sufficient qualified personnel to support student learning programs. The KCCD has appropriate policies, which are applied on a consistent basis to ensure that qualified personnel are employed and regularly evaluated in an equitable manner. Human Resources is a district-wide function administered from the KCCD. Having on-site human resource management support strengthens the liaison between the District office and the College administration, faculty, and staff regarding the human resource management issues.

The team had difficulty determining the extent to which College plans and/or district plans are integrated. The College provided a document that shows the links among the plans, including its human resource planning. However, there was a lack of any narrative that fully describes the integration of the planning process. In many cases, the team was required to rely on interviews with personnel to make a determination as to the adequacy of the College’s planning processes.

Finally, the team could not find evidence that the College is assessing the effectiveness of its professional development program on a regular basis.

Recommendations:

See College Recommendation 2.

College Recommendation 7
In order meet Standards related to planning for human resources, the team recommends that the College assess its future human resource needs and fully integrate the results of the assessment into its institutional planning process. Furthermore, the team recommends that the College determine its professional development needs and assess the efficacy of its professional development efforts on a regular basis (III.A.5, III.A.5.a, III.A.5.b, III.A.6).
IIIB. Physical Resources

General Observations:
Porterville College provides sufficient physical resources to support campus programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. The College is finalizing a five-year Facilities Master Plan to be completed Fall 2012 that is integrated with the newly updated Educational Master Plan to provide for College Facilities Planning needs, with a priority of student success. The College maintenance and operations manager meets weekly with the District’s facilities project manager to review new and current projects.

Findings and Evidence:
The facilities provide safe and sufficient resources to provide for the educational programs at the College. The campus covers approximately 70 acres and buildings include a library, learning resource center, theater, media center, trade and industry building, career development, child development center, health careers, nursing skills lab, fine arts, science-math, and a greenhouse area. Additional athletic facilities include a gymnasium, fitness center, weight room, tennis courts, baseball and softball fields, and a stadium and track that is not currently being used by a program. Ample parking is located close to all campus facilities. Porterville College provides a small portion of their public safety training at an off-site location. All other instruction is provided on the College campus (III.B, III.B.1.b).

Facilities are inspected for cleanliness, health, and safety compliance on a continual basis. A Safety and Security Team made up of Faculty, staff, and students meet at least once a semester to provide input for the development and maintenance of facilities. The Maintenance and Operations (M & O) department has adjusted work shifts to be able to provide twenty-four hour coverage to clean and maintain the campus facilities. Two employees are assigned per shift and area to provide redundancy in case of an employee being out.

Custodial work-loads are continually evaluated to ensure sufficient coverage. The M & O department has just upgraded the work order system so that maintenance orders requested by campus faculty and staff can be described, prioritized, and tracked. In addition, a Facilities Planning Advisory Sub-Committee of the College Learning Council meets at least once a semester to provide oversight into the facilities planning process. Finally, the District Facilities Project Manager meets with the College Maintenance and Operations managers weekly. The College M &O manager meets regularly with College administration and the College president to review and advise on short and long-term facilities planning (III.B.1, III.B.1.b, III.B.2).

The Porterville College Maintenance and Operations department uses a program review for non-instructional programs planning process to identify normal, recurring physical resource needs. Porterville College relies on its Educational Master Plan coupled with its a Facilities Master Plan to identify long-term physical resources needs including total.
cost of ownership. A Facilities Planning Status tracking list outlines long-range planning items with budget forecasts and is continually updated and prioritized (III.B.1.a, III.B.2.a, III.B.2.b).

Conclusions:
The College meets this standard. The College has facilities that meet its student learning needs. The College has well-developed plans to improve existing facilities and provide growth for the future. As part of a data-driven integrated planning process, the team encourages the College to more formally integrate facilities planning with other college-wide planning activities. The College should be commended for its ability to maintain the campus in a period of diminishing resources.

Recommendations:
See College Recommendation 1

See College Recommendation 2
IIIC. Technology Resources

General Observations:
The College has made significant progress on integrated planning since the last accreditation visit and is in the process of revising its Technology Plan. Due to a recent reorganization, strong collaboration is taking place between the College and District Technology Departments. The College provides excellent training and support for technology to both employees and students. Initial work has occurred on program review and on strengthening the connection between planning and resource allocation. The College has begun using outcomes assessment to improve services and to meet student learning needs.

One of the findings based on the comprehensive visits in 2000 and 2006 required the College to shift to the use of data as the basis for making decisions, integrating planning, evaluation, and resource allocation, and developing and implementing a technology plan. The specific recommendation for technology stated: Includes a technology plan that evaluates, supports, and plans for the future of instructional, student services, and administrative functions at the College and is integrated with a current District technology plan (Standards IIIC.1.c, IIIC.2).

The 2009 Midterm Report and the 2012 Self-Evaluation Report describe the progress made on all aspects of integrated planning including the use of data for decision making. In relation to technology, the College has addressed the finding by developing and implementing the 2009 Technology Plan with a 2012 Technology Plan under development, completing program reviews for distance education and information technology, and allocating technology resources based on program reviews and annual plans from across the campus.

Based on information gleaned during the campus visit, the District has chosen to adopt the College technology plans as their guiding documents. The District Information Technology staff views their role as one of support to the campuses and has determined that a District Plan would be contradictory to this role. A review of the 2011/12 – 2014/15 KCCD Strategic Plan revealed no specific goals or objectives related to technology.

Findings and Evidence:
The College has a variety of labs and computer classrooms that are well-designed and maintained. The College has expanded the number of computer resources available to students. The College provides support to students and faculty through staff assigned to the labs.

All instructional software programs are installed on the computers in the Learning Resource Center and the Library. Wireless access is now available in all buildings with additional capacity being added as needed. Eventually, wireless access will be available in all outdoor locations as well (III.C, III.C.1, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d).
Enterprise-level systems such as staff and student email, databases for research, and operational systems such as accounting, human resource management, and facilities management are centralized and provided by the Kern Community College District (KCCD). The College’s information technology (IT) infrastructure has been upgraded over the past few years and includes redundancy to provide consistent and reliable service. Backups are stored in multiple locations to prevent loss of data, and a wireless backup controller is in the early implementation stages (III.C.1, III.C.1.a).

The 2009 Technology Plan was developed to address accreditation requirements but also provided an opportunity to consolidate plans and policies related to technology. The campus reported that the plan has been useful and improvements are underway in the 2012 version. While the 2009 version of the Technology Plan was focused on operational matters, the 2012 version will include a vision, an analysis of technology trends, strategic goals, service area outcomes, and specific mention of, and alignment to other campus plans. The Information Technology (IT) Committee has primary responsibility for creating the plan, with the Director of IT serving as the main author with Committee members providing input and feedback.

The evolution of integrated planning at the College is also demonstrated by reference to technology planning in major campus plans. Goal 1 of 2007 Strategic Plan is to Expand technologies for Students, Faculty, and Staff with the related objectives of:
- The Technology Plan will include immediate and future plans for software and hardware
- Expand training for employees and students
- Link technology planning to College and District plans
- Incorporate technology planning into the budget process

The Educational Master Plan dated 2002-2012 has no references to technology other than distance education; however, the draft of the 2012-2015 Educational Master Plan specifically references the Technology Plan. The 2011/12 – 2014/15 KCCD Strategic Plan does not include any goals related specifically to technology, and there is no District Technology Plan by choice.

The College identifies technology needs through two pathways. As described in the report and confirmed through interviews, one pathway allows ideas from anyone on campus to be brought forward to the IT Committee for discussion and consideration. Recommendations are then forwarded to the College Learning Council for further consideration and finally forwarded on to the President. This pathway was described as a more informal route for the adoption of innovative technology. The purchase and implementation of smart boards on campus is an example an idea moving from conception to execution (III.C.2).

The more formal and systematic process uses program reviews and was observed during the campus visit. In Spring and Fall 2012, all technology requests from program reviews were consolidated and reviewed by the Director of IT and the Director of Finance and Administrative Services. The list was then forwarded to the IT and Budget Committees.
for further discussion and analysis. Due to some savings in other areas and existing replacement plans, all technology requests from the program reviews were able to be funded. The review of all program review requests was reported to provide a global view of the technological directions desired by members of the campus community.

The Technology Plan, the inventory list of equipment, and program review documents show evidence of regular and systematic replacements and upgrades. The campus reported that even if further budget cuts are needed, the cycle can be continued, but the timeline will be lengthened to accommodate budget reductions. The IT Committee has shown commitment to keeping classrooms and labs technologically current (III.C.2).

Evaluation of effectiveness is done through Program Review which was described as useful for identifying what is going well and what needs improvement. While no analysis of SLO and assessment data was included in the document, data and reports were provided during the visit upon request, and it was apparent that they are used to assess progress and to inform decision making. The Strategic Planning Survey results from 2009 were provided as evidence in the Self Evaluation to show evaluation of effectiveness but no analysis is shown in any committee minutes and the Director of IT did not recall using them (III.C.2).

Campus-level technology planning and management is the responsibility of the College. The District’s role is to ensure that there is some consistency in common platforms among the Colleges in the District. The previous organizational structure resulted in silos among the IT staff at the Colleges and district and duplication of services. Since the reorganization, improved communication and collaboration has resulted in a district-wide project list, implementation of a common course management system (Moodle), and cost savings on purchases and licensing agreements. The campus reported that the College has an equitable and valued voice in decision-making on technology issues at the District level (III.C.1, III.C.1.a, III.C.1.c, III.C.1.d).

Decisions regarding technology are made in IT Committee, the Budget Committee, and the College Learning Council. The Information Technology Committee was reported to have become a much more meaningful and effective body in the past two years. The evidence provided shows broad representation of constituencies, including a student member, and it was reported that the communication and decision making have greatly improved. A review of the minutes shows that a variety of issues are discussed and addressed in the Committee (III.C.1.a, III.C.1.d).

The College is doing an excellent job of providing quality training in the effective application of technology based on a review of the evidence and confirmed through interviews. An Educational Media Design Specialist (EMDS) supports professional development activities. Over 27 workshops on a variety of topics and during various times have been offered since January 2006 with 14 scheduled for Fall 2012. A new training option is the “Lunchtime Tech Bites” which are half hour sessions held at noontime.
The need for adjunct training has been addressed by offering late afternoon and evening sessions. The EMDS identified training priorities and time preferences through a survey of full and part-time faculty and received 20 responses. Training for students began in 2011 with eleven workshops focused on Office Suite products offered over the two-year period. Attendance for workshops was reported to range between two and five participants for faculty and three to eight for students. Sessions are currently evaluated through participant evaluations at end of each session, and these are used to improve future offerings. However, no overall summary is prepared to help make decisions about global improvements or trends (III.C.1.b)

The EMDS also provides training one-on-one on software and hardware. The Technology Learning Center is located directly beside the EMDS office and offers software and hardware to support face-to-face and online courses. For the past few years, a Technology Camp for faculty has been provided in partnership with Bakersfield College. The camp takes place immediately following the Spring semester and faculty work on a specific projects that are shared at the end of the session. The camp provides an opportunity for collaborative learning among the participants.

With the EMDS becoming part of the IT structure, training will be further enhanced by even more proactive planning of needed sessions as new hardware and software are purchased. For example, the EMDS has provided training on the smart boards now being installed in classrooms across campus (III.C.1.b).

**Conclusions:**
The College meets Standard III.C. The College effectively plans and implements technology resources to support student learning. Technology planning and resource allocation is tied to program review and institutional planning. Technology training is available to students and College personnel and is assessed on a regular basis.

**Recommendations:**
See College Recommendation 1
Standard IID: Financial Resources

General Observations:
The Kern Community College District (KCCD) distributes money to the three colleges based upon an internally developed allocation model that mirrors the model used by the State Chancellor’s Office. The financial resources of Porterville College are sufficient to support learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. The financial planning process on campus addresses both short-term and long-term needs of the campus. The process is integrated into the campus and District’s institutional planning process (III.D).

Findings and Evidence:
Porterville College has been able to provide program offerings that maximize the allowable funded FTES allocated to the College. The College relies upon its mission and goals as the foundation for financial planning. The College integrates its financial planning with its institutional planning through a collegial budget planning process utilizing the Educational Master Plan, annual program reviews, review of course sections, census enrollment, FTES, FTES/FTEF, retention, success, and posted completers to analyze programs to help determine how limited resources should be allocated. The Director of Finance and Administrative Services works closely with the Budget Committee, a sub-committee of the College and Learning Council (CLC) to develop the annual budget (III.D.1, III.D.1.a).

The budget process is linked to the College Mission, Strategic Plan, and program review. Annual budget requests based on program reviews, annual program review updates, and a budget worksheet are reviewed by the Budget Committee. Recommendations are made to the College Learning Council (CLC), which is comprised of all employee groups and students. The CLC coordinates and reviews all long-term and short-term institutional planning and recommends the budget to the President. The recommendation is ultimately forwarded to the District Consultation Council (III.D.1.d, III.D.4).

Financial planning follows the campus mission by responding to the educational needs of the region and by offering programs that support transfer degrees, certificates, and basic skills to all students who are capable of benefiting from community college instruction. Comprehensive support services are an important element of the financial plan to help students achieve their personal, vocational, and academic potential. All state, District, and Administrative decisions that impact current and future college budgets are communicated to the Budget Committee in a timely manner to inform their recommendations to the CLC.

Over the last several months with the status of state funding in question, the campus has organized a task force comprised of all on-campus shareholders to focus on enrollment
data, the college five-year course history, awards by academic year, campus-wide support services, and other pertinent data as part of its financial planning.

The College is fiscally conservative and has done a good job of managing its financial resources and expenditures while considering sustainability of programs and not using one time monies to meet long-term obligations. Porterville College uses a realistic assessment of financial resources and expenditures when developing financial projections based on allocation of resources from KCCD (III.D.1.b).

The College budget projects short-term financial resources based on enrollment, including health benefits, insurance costs, maintenance costs, and other costs. This information is shared with the Budget committee, a sub-committee of CLC (III.D.1.c).

KCCD has clearly defined its guidelines for budget development at the District level. The college has defined guidelines for budget development at the college level, including detailed financial planning documents (Strategic Plan, Enrollment Management Plan, Technology Plan, and Program Reviews). The College’s budget development process is outlined in the Budget Development Calendar and Program Review Updates and Budget Worksheets from each budget unit are integrated into the final budget. All documents are available to all. The process begins in October, and data begins to be gathered in preparation for the next year’s budget (III.D.2.c).

Porterville College is not audited independently from the District. The KCCD is audited on an annual basis by an independent auditor. The independent audit is an effective mechanism to provide assurance regarding the adequacy of internal controls, the assessment of the effectiveness of internal controls, and the creditability of budget and financial information from all sources. The independent audit also assures the evaluation of fiscal management practices, which include the assessment and planning for long-term liabilities including bond obligations and other post-employment benefits, and an independent assessment as to whether the organization presents a “going concern” risk based upon projected cash flows. Audit reports are prepared on a timely basis (III.D.2.a, III.D.2.d, III.D.2.e, III.D.3, III.D.3.a, III.D.3.b, III.D.3.c, III.D.3.d, III.D.3.f, III.D.3.h).

KCCD must address several long-term obligations when conducting financial planning. The District has set aside approximately $90 million for outstanding certificates of participation payment that are due in the future. In addition, it has fully funded its Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) fund and has established a leave liability fund to cover these costs as employees leave the District (III.D.1.d, III.D.1.c, III.D.1.d, III.D.1.e).

The KCCD Accounting Office periodically performs internal audits on general and categorical funds. This process helps to assure adherence to District policies and procedures, compliance with applicable federal and state regulations, and compliance with the use of restricted funds (III.D.3.b, III.D.3.h).

The results of the independent audit, including any audit findings and recommendations, are reported to the Board of Trustees on an annual basis. Audit findings and
recommendations related to the campus are used to make improvements and changes to its financial management processes as needed.

The assessment of the campus effective use of financial resources occurs on a regular basis. Both the College and the District actively monitor and assess their financial management systems. The annual audit provides an audit of the outcomes which is used to review and analyze its financial management system for any improvement (III.D.2.b).

The College works with the District to make any necessary corrections and/or implementations in a timely fashion to the extent that audit recommendations strengthen internal controls and/or improve financial procedures (III.D.2.c).

Both the College and the District maintain healthy reserves and ending balances. Preservation of a healthy level of reserves is part of the resource allocation model to provide resources for cash flow management, unfunded liabilities, risk mitigation, significant emergencies, and a buffer against future budget reductions.

Historically KCCD and Porterville College has taken a conservative approach to implementing worst-case scenarios in state funding projections. Porterville has built a 19% reserve of its 2011-12 general unrestricted budget. This is to ensure funds are available to meet operation needs and provide needed programs and services to students (III.D.3, III.D.3.a).

The Director of Finance and Administrative Services provides general guidance of financial activities. The college’s business service office works in coordination with the District Accounting Office to assure adherence to the California Community Colleges Accounting and Budget Manual, the California Education Code, Chancellor’s Office guidelines, Board Polices and related procedures, and generally accepted accounting practices (III.D.3.b, III.D.3.g).

**Conclusions:**
The college meets Standard III.D. The college and the KCCD have carefully managed their financial resources to ensure that resources are sufficient to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. Resource allocation is tied to the College mission and is integrated with the College’s planning processes. There are sufficient controls in the financial management and budgeting system at both the College and the District to assure fiscal integrity and stability. Both and the College and the District have sufficient reserves and an action plan to assure short-term and long-term fiscal solvency.

**Recommendations:**
None
Standard IV
Leadership and Governance

IVA. Decision-Making Process

General Observations:
The College has created a close-knit community, which functions well without rigid organizational structures. This organization is successful because of the size of the College community and the personalities of its leadership. The relationships among the constituencies and the unique culture of the College are a real strength.

The team felt that College engages in widespread dialog and that the roles of the constituencies are clearly defined. In fact, the College has responded well to recommendation 5 of the previous visiting team regarding the roles of the constituencies. The College, however, has not provided adequate documentation in the Self-Evaluation Report for the team to draw any evidence-based conclusions on the standard. The evidence to support their claims in regards to Standard IV were found by attending meetings and through personal interviews with campus personnel (IV.A).

Findings and Evidence:
Upon observing the institutional leaders and talking with faculty and staff at Porterville College, it is clear that there exists an environment that encourages institutional involvement and assures effective discussion, planning, and implementation (IV.A.1).

The College Learning Council is the primary means by which faculty, staff, administrators, and students participate in the decision-making process because it is here that ideas are explored, proposals are made, and issues are brought in a forum that represents all constituent parts. However, because of the College’s attempt to maintain flexibility, the structure and function of this Council is in flux. According to the Self-Evaluation Report, the Council was at one time a decision-making organization. The role of the College Learning Council has changed and it now makes recommendations to the President.

In reviewing the evidence and conducting interviews, the team found that there is a discrepancy in what is documented regarding College decision-making and what is practiced. While it appears that the College community is satisfied with the current practices regarding participatory governance, the document Participatory Governance at Porterville does not reflect current practices (IV.A.2).

Because the College strives for a sense of teamwork as a close-knit community, the “clearly defined role” between faculty and administrators is not emphasized. All constituent members of the College community have opportunity to provide input into institutional decisions. The Academic Senate is active and a major contributor to decisions made on campus (IV.A.2.a, IV.A.2.b).
After observing a meeting of the College Learning Council and conducting interviews with various constituency leaders, the team feels that the College has a strong active vehicle for the facilitation of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies. In addition, the team concluded that there are processes in place for the College to communicate concerns to the District regarding policies originating at the District level. The governance structure promotes a positive attitude, which translates into helping students. While discussing changes made by the District office that impact the College, one campus employee said, “We are going to make this work even if the structure is different.” The current governance structure promotes this type of successful thinking (IV.A.3).

The College claims that they move expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission as evidenced by being taken off warning by the Commission during the last accreditation cycle. The College has filed all subsequent reports required by the Commission. The team found that the College was well-prepared for the accreditation visit and that the College community has demonstrated honesty and integrity throughout the visit (IV.A.4).

The team had difficulty in finding evidence that would support the assertion that the College regularly evaluates the efficacy of its decision-making structures and processes. As a result of the last accreditation visit, the College changed the function of the College Learning Council, as cited above. As part of the College’s response to that visit, they presented a diagram that shows the various entities that report to the CLC and the subcommittees of that Council.

Recently, a new decision-making flow chart was designed – again in relation to the CLC; however, this is a different chart. One must assume the change was called for because of the College evaluating a given procedure by reviewing data and determining that change was needed. However the College did not supply the data and evaluation of the data nor document the rationale for the change. The College lists an Actionable Improvement Plan: “The CLC will develop and implement a committee evaluation form that will be completed by each committee chair and presented to the CLC at its last meeting each May. This form will be developed during the 2012-13 academic year and implemented in spring 2013.” While this form addresses a process for collecting data, the Actionable Improvement Plan should include how the data will be used to improve their integrity and effectiveness (IV.A.5).

**Conclusions:**
The College meets Standard IVA. Much of the success of the College’s decision-making process is linked to the current president, who is trusted by the different constituent elements of the College.

The College is to be commended for its effort toward transparency and its effort to include as many of the College community, i.e., administrators, faculty, staff, and students in the decision-making process.
Recommendations:
None

IV.B  Board and Administrative Organization

General Observations:
Standard IV.B focuses on the KCCD Board of Trustees and the relationships between the Board and the District’s three colleges, with the chancellor as the point of connection. The role of the KCCD Board of Trustees is to provide financial direction and oversight to develop and implement policies that support a platform of excellent educational opportunity for all the students of the District.

The Board Policy Manual clearly states the roles and responsibilities of the KCCD Board and the chancellor and the direct relationship to the organization of each of the three Colleges in the District, Bakersfield College, Cerro Cosso College, and Porterville College. Each College has a president responsible for administering District Board Policies (IV.B).

The Board of Trustees of the KCCD responded to the District recommendations made by the 2006 visiting accreditation team in a timely manner by directing the Chancellor of the District to develop and implement policies that met required Standards.

Findings and Evidence:
Upon examining Board policies, conversations with the College president and a KCCD Board of Trustee member, the institutions recognize the designated responsibilities that promote effective operation of the various Colleges. The policies created by the Board reflect the transparency and involvement they are encouraging of all employees within the District to promote quality education of the students.

It is clear that the Board of Trustees employs the chancellor, who in turn employs the various college presidents. The Board members are elected individuals representing their local constituents (IV.B, IV.B.1.a).

The agenda for all Board of Trustees meetings includes the mission statement for the District to ensure that its decisions address the quality, integrity and improvement of student learning programs and services, as well as the necessary resources (IV.B.1.b).

The Board Policy Manual section 2A1 and 10A5A3 validates that the Board is ultimately responsible for educational quality, legal matters and financial integrity. The KCCD District Goals further support that the Boards role to provide educational quality (IVB.1.c).
KCCD District Board Policy Manual section 2B and 2C outline the composition, responsibilities, structure and operating procedure of the Board. This Manual is published and made available to the community (IV.B.1.d).

The Chancellor’s Cabinet reviews Board policies to ensure that the Board is acting in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The schedule and procedure for reviewing policy are listed in the Board Policy Manual. The Board Policy Manual section 1C2 addresses how the Board amends its own policies. This process begins with the District Consultation Council, but the discussion to begin the process can begin at any level or constituent members of the District (IV.B.1.e).

The terms for Board members are staggered four-year terms. The identification of terms and expiration dates are listed in the Board Policy Manual in section 2B1b. The Community College League of California (CCLC) provides training for new trustees, and the Board has regular sessions (Study Sessions) to keep trustees current on various educational issues.

Accreditation Standards requires that governing boards have a program for board development and new member orientation. A written development plan for increasing the knowledge of Board Members of Kern Community College District could not be located while the team was on site. Accordingly, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees develop a comprehensive professional program to provide Board Members with additional opportunities to acquire additional and new training that will help them fulfill the significant and important obligations as a governing board member (IV.B.1.f).

The team was able to confirm that the Board of Trustees has a process for assessing the Board’s performance. As documented in the Board Policy Manual section 2e, the Board then uses the results of the evaluation to further develop the Board goals. The results of this evaluation are made public. The Board has completed the self-evaluation in 2007, 2009, and 2011.

The District has a structured Board Self Evaluation process that appears to be operating in accordance with the Board's Policy. The Board's Self Evaluation policy requires the Board evaluate the process every five years. The Board has not conducted a review of its process as required by Board Policy 2E2. The team could not find any written reports that would reveal the Board's views about goal accomplishment, how well the Board felt it was doing to act with a single voice once decisions have been made and what evidence it reviewed to assess how well the Board made progress on accomplishing the stated goals for any given year. Without more descriptive reporting of the Board's self-evaluation activities, the team could not verify the Board's compliance with Accreditation Standards regarding self-evaluation. The team conclusion is that there is insufficient evidence to verify compliance with the Standards and therefore concludes that Standard IV.B.1.g is partially met (IV.B.1.g).
Included in the Board Policy Manual the statement of ethics and a five-part process for violations of ethical statements are outlined. In addition the KCCD website provides a link by which individuals can anonymously report potential violations (IV.B.1.h).

Board members were available to members of the visitation team, and they illustrated knowledge of and willingness to be involved in the accreditation process (IV.B.1.i).

The Board has a written policy that outlines the procedure for hiring and evaluating the Chancellor (section 10), their sole employee. The team was able to confirm that the Board is conducting regular evaluations of the chancellor. The Board policy indicates that it is the Chancellor’s responsibility to hire College Presidents (IV.B.1.j).

The College president has primary responsibility for the quality of education at the College. In response to the previous visitation’s recommendations (District Recommendation 2 and College Recommendation 5), both the District and College have implemented procedures that clearly delineate the president’s role to provide effective leadership (IV.B.2).

In consultation with the Administrative Council, the College Learning Council, and the Academic Senate, the President provides the administrative leadership and structure required for the College, and is responsible for the College. (IV.B.2.a)

After observing interaction between the College president and faculty/staff and interviewing several faculty as well as staff members, it is clear that the president promotes an environment that improves teaching and learning. The process guided by the president is collegial, and is epitomized by the development of the College’s “Core of Core,” an attempt to prepare for the worst-case scenario regarding the state budget. While the research and analysis used for evaluation and planning was not immediately clear, upon examination, it is evident that both are present, and the team encourages the College to continue to improve their integration with resource planning and distribution. Procedures for evaluation of institutional planning are in place (IV.B.2.b.1-4).

The president, as the chief administrator of the College, assures the implementation of statutes, regulation, and governing board policies and assures that the practices are consistent with the College’s mission statement as well as policies. This includes effectively controlling budget and expenditures (IV.B.2.c, IV.B.2.d).

When addressing the communities served by the institution, the most obvious is the community of Porterville and its surrounding area. The Self Evaluation Report indicates a number of organizations that the President works with: “She is a member of the Rotary Club, City of Porterville Chamber Board of Directors, Tulare County Economic Development board, Central Valley Higher Education Consortium (CVHEC) board, Porterville Unified School District (PUSD) Academy Advisory Board, and serves on the state Commission on Athletics (COA) Board.” (p. 227) However, the President also works and communicates effectively with the College community as also illustrated in the Self Evaluation Report (p. 227) The President’s commitment to transparency and
integrity is exemplified by the “Open Forums” in which staff, as well as students, can bring up any concerns or issues to be discussed. (IV.B.2.e)

The District Board of Trustees has provided the primary leadership in Board policies that delineate roles of authority between the Board and the individual Colleges. The Trustee that represents the Porterville College service area indicated that he would never come to the College campus without prior notification to the President, nor would he ever directly try to influence the President. In fact he indicated that if he were to talk with an individual employee on campus, he would not do so without the College President being present. This procedure is outlined in the KCCD “Elements of Decision Making.” (IV.B.3.a)

Recently, the District moved the College’s institutional research person to the District office. As the individual pointed out at a College Learning Council, the move actually will improve the effective service to the College in this area because it will make available other researchers who have expertise in areas that the individual in question does not possess. As a result, the District is providing effective services that support the College’s mission and function. (IV.B.3.b)

Based on conversation with the College President, the District budget distribution model is based on FTES, which provides fair distribution of resources to the College. This budget allocation model is under constant review and the consultation process, which includes Chancellor’s Cabinet and the Administrative Council, provides the recommendation to the Board as part of the fair distribution process. (IV.B.3.c)

The Self Evaluation Report states, “Section 3A of the Board Policy Manual details District fiscal policies, including budget, budget income and expenditures, and budget control.” (p. 230) The Board policy also indicates the minimum District-wide reserves. In 2009, the Board affirmed its goal to improve the fiscal stability of the District to increase the minimum reserves to 10 percent. (IV.B.3.d)

The Board Policy Manual (sections 10A5A1 and 10A5B1) clearly sets forth the roles and duties of the chancellor and the College president. The College president is given full authority and responsibility for the operation of the College. Section 10E of the Board Policy Manual spells out the policy and procedure for evaluating the College President. (IV.B.3.e)

Based on data and on-site interviews, while there is some apprehension at the College level regarding the intentions of the District, it is clear that a system is in place that provides effective communication, dealing with issues of concern, and exchange of information in a timely fashion. The District Consultation Council provides the means of district employees connect with the governing District. The Self Evaluation Report also points to the District “The Elements of Decision Making” as a means to alleviate some of the concerns at the College level. (IV.B.3.f)
According to the Self Evaluation Report, “during the District’s review and discussions regarding its processes for District decision-making and the delineation of responsibilities the ‘Elements of Decision Making’ document was updated in fall 2011. This document contains a functional map and details District decision-making processes and outlines the responsibilities of the District Office and its various programs and operations. The development of this document included feedback that was obtained during discussions with the Consultation Council.” (p. 232). This was validated through interviews with both a Trustee and the College President. It was also validated during the College Learning Council as they were discussing a pertinent issue, and during a meeting of the Administrative Council. The team is not able to draw a conclusion on the effectiveness of this new process and recommends that the District evaluate the process now that it has been implemented (IV.B.3.g).

Conclusions:
The College partially meets Standard IV.B. The roles of the Board, the chancellor, and the College president are clearly defined. The College president has primary responsibility for leadership of the College, and there are operational roles and functions between the district and the College are documented and observed in practice. However, there are some areas in the Standard are not fully met.

The team noted that the Board of Trustees does not have a formal Board development program. In addition, the team could not find evidence that the Board of Trustees self-evaluation process had been reviewed on a consistent basis. Finally, the team could not find evidence that the District has evaluated the new processes outlined in the Elements of Decision Making document.

Recommendations:

District Recommendation 1 Review and Update Board Policies on a Periodic Basis
In order to comply with the Standards, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees establish a process to ensure that the Board’s policies and procedures are evaluated on a regular basis and revised as appropriate (IV.B.1.e).

District Recommendation 2: Board Member Development Program
In order to comply with the Standards the team recommends that the Board of Trustees in consultation with the Chancellor develop and implement a development program that meets the needs of the newer board members as well as board members who have a considerable amount of experience as a governing board member (IV.B.1.f).
**District Recommendation 3: Evaluate the Board of Trustees Self Evaluation Process**

In order to comply with the Standards, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees review the elements of its Self-Evaluation Process and ensure that the Standards' minimum requirements for a Self-Evaluation Process which are: 1) have clearly defined processes in place, 2) have processes implemented and 3) have processes published in the Board's policy manual are included in the Self Evaluation Process. The Board's policy 2E2 prescribes additional requirements when conducting the Boards Self Evaluation (IV.B.1.g).

**District Recommendation 4: Evaluation of Role Delineation and Decision Making Processes for Effectiveness**

In order to comply with the Standards, the team recommends the District conduct an evaluation of the new decision-making processes and evaluate how effective the new processes are in making decisions and in communicating the decisions to affected users (IV.B.3.g).