

## **FOLLOW-UP VISIT PEER REVIEW TEAM REPORT**

Palo Verde College  
One College Drive  
Blythe, CA 92225

This report represents the findings of the Peer Review Team that conducted a Follow-Up Visit to Palo Verde College November 7, 2022. The Commission acted on the accredited status of the institution during its January 2023 meeting and this team report must be reviewed in conjunction with the Commission's Action letter.

Eva Bagg, Ph.D.  
Team Chair

## **Introduction:**

A peer review team visit was conducted at Palo Verde College on November 7, 2022. The purpose of the visit was to determine whether the College has addressed the requirements of the Commission as stipulated in the Commission Action Letter of January 27, 2022.

The team was comprised of the following members:

Dr. Hayley Ashby, Library Services Platform Librarian, Norco College  
Dr. Carol Kozeracki, Dean of Liberal Arts, Los Angeles City College  
Dr. Susan Murray, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, San Diego City College  
Dr. Eva Bagg, Chair, Superintendent-President, Barstow Community College

In general, the team found that the College had prepared well for the visit by arranging for meetings with the individuals and groups agreed upon earlier with the team chair. Over the course of the day, the team met with faculty and staff of the college's SLO Committee, Program Review Committee, and College Council. The team interviewed faculty who participated in program reviews for Welding, English, and Behavioral and Social Sciences where the mapping of course to program to institution-level outcomes were reported in the college's October 2022 Follow-Up report. The team also met individually with the President of the Academic Senate, the Dean of Instruction and Student Services, and the Dean of Institutional Research and Planning.

The Follow-Up Report and Visit were expected to document resolution of the following:

**Standard I.B.2. I.B.4, II.A.3 (Requirement 3):** In order to meet the Standards, the Commission requires the institution regularly assess student learning outcomes for course, program and institutional levels and use assessment data to support student learning and achievement.

**Standard I.B.3 (Requirement 4):** In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires the institution consistently use institution-set standard data to address student achievement gaps.

## **Team Analysis of College Responses to the June 29, 2020 Commission's Requirements**

### **Requirement 3**

**Standard I.B.2. I.B.4, II.A.3:** In order to meet the Standards, the Commission requires the institution regularly assess student learning outcomes for course, program and institutional levels and use assessment data to support student learning and achievement.

### **Findings and Evidence:**

The team verified from evidence provided in the 2022 Follow-Up report and from interviews with members of the SLO Committee that Palo Verde College has established six institutional learning outcomes which include communication, community and global awareness, critical and creative thinking, information competency, personal and professional development, and technological competency. The College uses eLumen to support the mapping of student learning

outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels. The team confirmed that the College measures outcomes by mapping course-level outcomes to program-level outcomes, and relevant program-level outcomes are rolled into institution-level outcomes. The College also maps service area outcomes to institution-level outcomes, and while connections between SAOs and ILOs could not be clearly made in all areas, the College did gain valuable insights from this process.

The team conducted interviews with faculty who participated in the assessment process, the SLO Committee, the Program Review Committee, College Council, and the Academic Senate President. The team noted that the College uses division representation for committees which encourages cross-disciplinary conversations and collaboration on curriculum and teaching best practices. Faculty indicated that the mapping of courses to programs to institutional learning outcomes made the connection between courses and higher-level outcomes more explicit and helped reveal gaps for the purposes of developing new courses and programs.

Interviews with faculty confirmed that outcomes from the mapping and assessment processes have resulted in improvements. For example, Counseling discovered a disconnect between the role of student services and academic affairs with respect to student advising on student education plans. As a result, the two areas have increased their level of collaboration through discussions related to guided pathways and Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs). Welding faculty evaluated the program in comparison to current industry and employment needs and discovered that equipment was outdated and courses and programs were not sufficient. The College made a substantial investment in updating the Welding equipment, and new courses and certificate pathways were created. The program is now accredited by the American Welding Society and provides an accredited test facility.

The team confirmed that the College has collected data for institution-level outcomes through the mapping process which is available in eLumen. In Fall 2022, the program review process includes an analysis of institution-level outcome data at the division level. The team confirmed that the College has a plan in place for Spring 2023, when the SLO Committee will review disaggregated assessment data from courses and programs that map to all six institutional learning outcomes. This analysis will be brought to College Council for review before moving forward to the Board of Trustees. All six institutional learning outcomes will be reviewed on a yearly basis. The College shared plans to incorporate institution set standards and institution-level outcomes into the strategic plan and integrated planning manual including when and where they will be discussed.

In sum, not only did the team confirm that the College regularly assesses student learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels, it uncovered through interviews excitement and commitment to continue using assessment data to strengthen their programs and continually improve student learning and achievement.

### **Conclusion:**

The institution has addressed the requirement, corrected the deficiencies, and now meets Standards I.B.2. I.B.4, II.A.3.

#### **Requirement 4**

**Standard I.B.3:** In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires the institution consistently use institution-set standard data to address student achievement gaps.

#### **Findings and Evidence:**

The team confirmed that the College followed a participatory process in Spring 2022 to update and expand the Institution-Set Standards and determine expectations for performance and stretch goals. Two new standards addressing employment rates and licensure pass rates were developed.

This process involved discussion in existing governance groups (Academic Standards Committee, Program Review Committee, Academic Senate, College Council) in February and March, followed by a special all-staff meeting on May 26. The results of this meeting were documented and included in the Follow-Up Report: three years of data on each Institution-Set Standard, defined levels for expected performance and aspirational goals, and discussion of strategies supporting improvement.

From interviews with members of the Program Review Committee and College Council, as well as faculty leaders including the Academic Senate President and Division Chairs, it was clear to the team that there was broad engagement in the process of updating the standards. The most current data and updated standards that appear in the Follow-Up Report have been published on the Institutional Effectiveness webpage of the college's website. The team's interviews with faculty and administration demonstrated that there is broad understanding and awareness. In particular, several individuals in different roles discussed how faculty input resulted in revisions from the initial draft of the standard on employment rates.

The College has also taken action to create and fill its first Dean of Research, Planning, and Effectiveness position. Responsibility for data updates to Institution-Set Standards and preparation of data for the ACCJC Annual Report is assigned to this role, confirmed by interviews with the Dean as well as by College Council representatives.

The College has designed an annual cycle of review of Institution-Set Standard data to align with the submission of the ACCJC annual report each spring. This process will follow the same model established with the Spring 2022 update and will flow through participatory governance committees to College Council. The College's Integrated Planning Manual, which defines cycles and deadlines for all institutional planning processes, was noted as a publication where this annual review process will be documented.

The College shared plans for the upcoming strategic planning cycle, scheduled for 2023-24, that will support alignment of the Institution-Set Standards and ILOs with institutional metrics in the plan.

The team noted that the College has a robust process for reviewing and vetting program review data in the Program Review Committee. Once approved, individual Program Reviews are then presented to College Council and the Board of Trustees each cycle (four years for academic programs, three years for service areas, and two years for career and technical programs). This practice exemplifies the College's commitment to transparency and the use of data for

improvement, which is evident in plans for consistent review of Institution-Set Standards.

**Conclusion:**

The institution has addressed the requirement, corrected the deficiencies, and now meets Standard I.B.3.