

# ACCJC Annual Report Targets

Presentation to the Hartnell College Council

Dr. Gayle Pitman & Dr. Layheng Ting

*Office of Institutional Equity, Effectiveness, and Success*

December 12, 2025



- Course Completion Rates
- Number of Certificates
- Number of Degrees (including ADT Degrees)
- Transfers (Total)
- Licensure passage rates (applicable programs only)
- Job Placement Rates (for CTE Programs)

Link:

<https://hartnellcommunitycollege.box.com/s/zlnjms8yqnpjqjfxtv6zzzlgr8nczxai>



- Baseline established using mean of the most recent 3 years of data
- Number of Certificates, Number of Degrees, and Transfer: AT (Attainable Goal) is set at **20% growth by 2029-30**.
- Course completion, licensure, job placement rates):  
AT =  $1.03 \times$  recent mean (**3% increase annually**).
- ME (Minimum Expectation):  $0.9 \times$  AT (**10% tolerance below AT**).
- AS (Aspirational Goal):  $1.1 \times$  AT (**10% stretch above**



- Set ONE Target
  - Number of Certificates, Number of Degrees, and Transfers:  
AT (Attainable Target) =  $1.04 \times$  recent mean  
*(4% increase from the baseline mean)*
  - Course Completion, Licensure, and Job Placement Rates:  
AT =  $1.03 \times$  recent mean  
*(3% increase from the baseline mean)*
  - ME (Minimum Expectation):  $0.9 \times$  AT (**10% tolerance below AT**).
  - AS (Aspirational Goal):  $1.1 \times$  AT (**10% stretch above AT**).
- Targets are reviewed annually and adjusted based on real performance and context (dynamic model)
- If we meet the target: the target is reset higher for the next year.
- If we do not meet the target: we continue working toward the same target the following year.



- Same as Method 1
  - Baseline established using mean of the most recent 3 years of data
  - Number of Certificates, Number of Degrees, and Transfer: AT (Attainable Goal) is set at **20% growth by 2029–30**.
  - Course completion, licensure, job placement rates):  
 $AT = 1.03 \times \text{recent mean}$  (**3% increase annually**).
  - ME (Minimum Expectation):  $0.9 \times AT$  (**10% tolerance below AT**).
  - AS (Aspirational Goal):  $1.1 \times AT$  (**10% stretch above AT**).
- Targets are reviewed annually and adjusted based on real performance and context (dynamic).

# Pros and Cons of Each Method

Method 1	Method 2	Method 3
<b>Pros</b>	<b>Pros</b>	<b>Pros</b>
Institution can evaluate progress each year against clearly tiered expectations.	Simple and easy to understand: Dynamic approach—continuously adjusts targets based on real-time performance trends and external environmental changes.	Dynamic approach—continuously adjusts targets based on real-time performance trends and external environmental changes.
Encourages institution to work toward higher performance each year.		Encourages institution to work toward higher performance each year.
<b>Cons</b>	<b>Cons</b>	<b>Cons</b>
Static approach—assumes a stable environment and does not adjust for shifts in external factors.	Can encourage short-term thinking: Institution may focus on hitting <i>this</i> year's number instead of building sustainable, long-term improvements.	Can create target inflation — targets may become increasingly difficult to meet over time.
Can create target inflation — targets may become increasingly difficult to meet over time.		