

ACCJC NEWS

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Spring 2010

The National Agenda for Higher Education

By 2020, the Obama administration wants to ensure that community colleges graduate an additional five million students, that 60% of American adults have at least one year of college education, and that America has the most educated workforce in the world. Some recent calculations by national policy makers suggest that meeting this goal will require the following:

- A 37% annual increase in productivity (production of graduates) of higher education
- A dramatic increase in the participation and success of new majority populations
 - 27% of today's undergraduates are "traditional" students
 - 73% are "new majority" undergraduates, but success rates for some of these new majority groups are significantly lower than for traditional students

It is by focusing on student learning, the impediments and supports for learning, that greater effectiveness will be achieved. The accreditation system of continuous quality assurance and the focus on student learning assessment are critical to the success of the nation's higher education system in addressing these national goals.

Undersecretary of Education, Martha Kanter, has recently stated that accreditors must consider whether their processes are really helping institutions improve or whether they are focusing too much on "inputs" rather than on what students have learned. (January 26, 2010, Council for Higher Education Accreditation Annual Meeting). The ACCJC has, with its current Standards, focused on what students have learned, and by giving its member institutions years to implement new strategies, is helping institutions to focus on improving student learning and increasing institutional effectiveness.

"The accreditation system of continuous quality assurance and the focus on student learning assessment are critical to the success of the nation's higher education system..."

LEGITIMACY OF SELF REGULATION

The legitimacy of accreditation is based in the professional values and behaviors of the professorate and of academic institutions.¹ The work of accreditation is based in the broad participation of academics in peer review. Standards of accreditation are autonomously developed by academic institutions acting through their voluntarily established accrediting commissions, but standards are linked to national policies or priorities. The very large amount of money that governments provide to higher education institutions has increased governmental concerns that the funds be used wisely and effectively. Accreditation has been accepted by governments because it is viewed as a rigorous process that has integrity, and which honestly assesses institutional quality and helps institutions to improve effectiveness.

The legitimacy of accreditation demands that the accreditation decisions be independent from governments, higher education institutions, and other political pressures. The legitimacy of accreditation is also based in public confidence that accreditation has high standards that work to the benefit of students and of society.

THE IMPORTANCE OF DOING ACCREDITATION WELL

Accreditation is increasingly important for institutions. Institutions use the advice and recommendations of an accreditation team to guide institutional changes and improvements, and sometimes to set institutional short-term priorities. Students, the public, and the federal government use the outcomes of an accreditation decision on an institution to make decisions and choices. The importance of accreditation to all these groups indicates the significance of doing accreditation well. ♦

¹ See AAUP Statement on Academic Freedom

Commissioners

MS. LURELEAN B. GAINES, CHAIR
East Los Angeles College

DR. SHERRILL L. AMADOR
Public Member

MS. HOLLY BEERNINK
Western Career College

MR. STEVEN BRUCKMAN
Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges

MS. CHRISTINA L. DYER
Schools Commission Member

DR. FRANK GORNICK
West Hills Community College District

DR. LOUANNE KENNEDY
Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities Member

DR. STEVEN KINSELLA
Gavilan College

MS. VIRGINIA MAY
Sacramento City College

DR. JOHN NIXON
Mt. San Antonio College

MR. MICHAEL T. ROTA
University of Hawai'i

DR. MARIE SMITH
Public Member

MS. EILEENE TEJADA
Napa Valley College

DR. PATRICK TELLEI
Palau Community College

MS. MARGARET TILLERY
Allan Hancock College

DR. NORVAL WELLSFRY
Cosumnes River College

DR. SHARON D. WHITEHURST-PAYNE
Public Member

Commission Staff

Dr. Barbara A. Beno, President
Dr. Susan B. Clifford, Vice President
Dr. Steve Maradian, Vice President
Mr. Garman Jack Pond, Vice President
Dr. Lily Owyang, Associate Vice President
Ms. Barbara Dunham, Assistant to the President, Business Officer
Ms. Whitney Sparks, Administrative Assistant
Mr. Tom Lane, Information Technology & Administrative Support

ACCJC NEWS is published by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC),
Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

Publication Address:
10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949

Phone: 415-506-0234
E-Mail: accjc@accjc.org ♦ Website: www.accjc.org

World Wide Changes in Higher Education

GLOBAL INFLUENCES ON ACCREDITATION IN THE U.S.

Across the world, quality assurance of higher education is increasingly important. The demand for higher education exceeds the supply available from state-sponsored (public) institutions, and there is a proliferation of private higher education. Much of that private higher education is legitimate. After all, U.S. higher education was predominantly private until the 20th century, largely when expansion of public higher education occurred following WWII and passage of the G.I. Bill. Harvard, Yale, and the faith-based institutions like Loyola, Marquette, Notre Dame, Boston College, Princeton and Georgetown University, are all examples of private higher education that preceded the expansion of state universities and community colleges.

Across the world however, the newer private higher education institutions are increasingly for-profit organizations. Governments and legitimate higher education providers are relying on accreditation and peer review as a means of assuring quality and controlling the spread of poor quality higher education and illegitimate or fraudulent institutions.

In Europe, as well as in other regions of the world, governments are asking quality assurance agencies to also help promote some common elements of higher education - common core competencies for certain disciplinary degrees that are the basis for professional practice (medicine has had this for years, engineering has more recently developed common core competencies as have some other disciplines in the U.S., such as psychology). Now, governments are urging quality assurance agencies to develop common core competencies for all degree levels that reflect national and employer needs for a trained workforce and good citizenry.

In Europe, Qualifications Frameworks (Frameworks) are being developed to align degrees/disciplines across more than forty nations. The Frameworks will specify the competencies and knowledge that are expected to be common to disciplinary degrees. Once the Framework is developed, institutions will be asked to “tune” their own degree programs to the Qualification Frameworks.

Will this result in a loss of academic freedom and of diversity of academic institutions, missions, and knowledge? Maybe, or maybe not. In the U.S., the acceptability of transfer of credits, or of lower level degrees for entrance into programs providing higher level degrees, has always been based on a shared understanding of the disciplinary “canon” and the degree to which institutions judged other institutions as successful in providing the essential education.

Beyond Europe, other regions of the world are working together on common core competencies for higher education. Central America is doing such work; Australia and Southeast Asia are working together on the same issue. This international trend is driven by the rapidly changing world, by technology, by globalization, by advances in understanding of cognitive sciences, and many other factors. The trend is irreversible. Institutional isolation is no longer viable, and students will not be well served by institutions that fail to address student needs for the competencies that will enable them to participate in a changed and changing world. ♦

New Stimuli for National Discussions of Institutional Quality and Accreditation

Think tanks, foundation-funded research and conferences, and partnerships or alliances among higher education actors or between them and private parties interested in higher education are a growing influence on national discussions of higher education quality and accreditation. These entities provide pressures for higher education change (read: reform) as well as opportunities to explore new practices that might lead to better student outcomes. Increasingly, business and industry appear to recognize the important role that higher education needs to play in the economy; political leaders recognize the role that higher education needs to play in social and economic mobility of population subgroups. Quality is becoming synonymous with student outcomes (not endowment, library holdings, or edifices) in these discussions. Expectations for student outcomes are rising at the same time that state funding for public higher education is declining.

In this period of very limited public and private funds (national recession), many advocate for a reorganization of institutional and accreditation priorities in order to achieve greater student learning outcomes without more resources for institutions.

New Stimuli, continued on page 4

New Stimuli, *continued from page 3*

THE AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE

On November 17, 2009, the American Enterprise Institute held a conference about increasing accountability in higher education. Mr. Kevin Carey wrote a paper entitled "Accreditation" for this meeting. In reading it, one notes that the criticisms of accreditation as too lenient, promoted years ago by the Spellings Commission, resurface. In an unfortunate institutional case study, Mr. Carey details the actions of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education toward an institution that was retained on sanction over a long period of time.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT (NILOA)

Peter Ewell of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems has written an interesting article for NILOA entitled "Assessment, Accountability, and Improvement: Revisiting the Tension." The paper discusses the tension between accountability-focused models of institutional review, and improvement-focused models. Accreditation, as you know, tries to do both.

NEW LEADERSHIP ALLIANCE FOR STUDENT LEARNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Funded by the Carnegie and Teagle Foundations, the New Leadership Alliance for Student Learning and Accountability (The Alliance) was established to improve student learning at the undergraduate level and to find educationally valid ways of demonstrating that such improvement is taking place. The Alliance hopes to improve student learning through voluntary and cooperative professional efforts. Recently, regional accreditors were invited to meet with The Alliance's Board of Directors, and Sylvia Manning, President of the Higher Learning Commission, has joined the board. The regional commissions have been asked to endorse appropriate elements of the Alliance's goals; the Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (CRAC) will be considering such an endorsement. More about The Alliance can be found at its website at: www.NewLeadershipalliance.org. ♦

Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions Discuss Challenges

Three commissions and the executive of each of the seven regional accreditation commissions gathered in February to discuss the key challenges that regional accreditation and American higher education are facing. The discussions resulted in adoption of priorities and an action plan for CRAC.

One clear challenge is the growing expectation that accreditation meet the expectations of the public for institutional accountability. While there are many institutional accountability vehicles in place or in development (e.g., the Voluntary Framework for Accountability being developed by the American Association for Community Colleges), policy makers and others want some standardized accountability measures, and look to accreditation as a possible source. (Federal reporting requirements, state higher education reporting, and voluntary institutional reporting would be alternative sources of such information.)

Closely related to this is the issue of transparency of accreditation decisions - providing more information that is easily understood by the public about institutional quality. The possibilities include a standardized matrix of institutional ratings, an "accreditation report card" on each institution, or other simplified reports. Accreditors are concerned that any public reporting formats not distract from the detailed and academic analysis, and report that accreditation teams provide institutions in order to encourage improvement.

A third challenge is the need to consider what will be "next" in student learning assessment. Many national actors, including policy makers and foundations, are pushing for agreed upon definitions of student learning outcomes at some level - at the general education level, at the degree level, etc. (See related article on International Higher Education). Accreditors have asked institutions to develop their own approaches to defining learning outcomes and assessment. The accreditors will be working to publicize what they have done to promote institutional assessment, but institutions will ultimately need to answer the public's call for some consistency or common definitions of learning outcomes.

A fourth challenge is the criticisms of regional accreditation, and the pressure to explain how regional accreditation serves the public and institutions better than national accreditation might. Policy makers and some parts of the public do not understand that regional commissions represent voluntary associations of institutions; CRAC will be doing more work to publicize and explain the regional organization of accreditation in the United States.

The group also discussed regional accreditors' need to be responsive and supportive to institutional innovations in light of increasing and restrictive federal regulation of accreditation. Lastly, the group discussed the financial challenges facing institutions in the current economy, and the need to maintain quality standards during this period. ♦

Distance Education

Distance education is becoming more and more common as a delivery mode for instruction among institutions within our region. Sixty percent of the substantive change reviews for the ACCJC this past year were for colleges offering more than 50% of a program, degree, or certificate through a mode of distance or electronic delivery.

The 2009 Higher Education Opportunities Act (HEOA) recently separated distance education from correspondence education by defining each:

DEFINITION OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

“Distance education is defined, for the purpose of accreditation review as a formal interaction which uses one or more technologies to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and which supports regular and substantive interaction between the students and instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. Distance education often incorporates technologies such as the internet; one-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices; audio conferencing; or video cassettes, DVDs, and CD-ROMs, in conjunction with any of the other technologies.

DEFINITION OF CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION

Correspondence Education means:

- (1) Education provided through one or more courses by an institution under which the institution provides instructional materials, by mail or electronic transmission, including examinations on the materials, to students who are separated from the instructor;
- (2) Interaction between the instructor and the student is limited, is not regular and substantive, and is primarily initiated by the student;
- (3) That are typically self-paced; and,
- (4) Correspondence education is not distance education.

A Correspondence Course is:

- (1) A course provided by an institution under which the institution provides instructional materials, by mail or electronic transmission, including examinations on the materials, to students who are separated from the instructor. Interaction between the instructor and student is limited, is not regular and substantive, and is primarily initiated by the student. Correspondence courses are typically self-paced;
- (2) A course which is part correspondence and part residential training, the Secretary considers the course to be a correspondence course; and,
- (3) Not distance education.”¹

This language is also contained in the Distance Education and Correspondence Education Manual on the ACCJC website at: www.accjc.org.

Additional requirements for accreditors to monitor include whether or not institutions have a process for verifying that the student who enrolls in a distance education course is the same student participating in the course and receiving credit for the course, as well as the growth of distance education and correspondence education courses/programs.

While the Commission recognizes and embraces distance education as a convenient, flexible, and effective means of providing education, it also has the responsibility to assure institutional quality to the public and to promote continuous institutional improvement of distance education and correspondence education courses and programs.

Member institutions will benefit from preparing a campus-wide inventory of course/program offerings via distance or correspondence education and assessing student attainment of the intended learning outcomes, student achievement data, and the quality of student support services to be sure they are comparable to the courses/programs offered through face-to-face instructional delivery methods. ♦

¹ Language taken from the Federal Register 8/6/2009

Upcoming Conferences and Workshops

❖ ANNUAL ACCREDITATION CONFERENCE ❖

ACADEMIC RESOURCE CONFERENCE April 21-23, 2010 - Long Beach Westin Hotel, California

This year's Academic Resource Conference (ARC), co-sponsored by the ACCJC and the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities (ACSCU) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), will be held in Long Beach, California April 21-23 at the Westin Hotel. The theme of this year's ARC is "Sustainability: A Vision For Higher Education." The plenary speakers will be **Martha Kanter**, President Obama's Undersecretary of Education; **Jerome Ringo**, President of Apollo Alliance, a coalition of major national environmental organizations; and **Graham Leicester**, Director of the International Futures Forum. Current economic, environmental, and social challenges put U.S. higher education at risk. At such a time, it is critical to focus on questions of **sustainability, stewardship** and **educational quality**. Several ACCJC member colleges will be making presentations on what has worked well for their campus. The 2010 ARC is dedicated to supporting institutions of higher education as they define their challenges, develop solutions, and demonstrate results. ACCJC will have a strand of informative workshops as part of the conference including a workshop for new college presidents on April 21 from 2:00 until 5:00 p.m.

ACCJC WILL PRESENT THREE WORKSHOPS ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 2010

- *Effective Program Review for Integrated Planning (9:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon)*
- *Accreditation Liaison Officers Workshop (2:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.)*
- *Accreditation Essentials for New ACCJC/WASC Presidents (2:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.)*

More information about the Academic Resource Conference can be found on the ACCJC website at: http://www.accjc.org/workshops_meeting.htm and the ACSCU/WASC website at: www.wascarc.org.

NEW CEO WORKSHOP April 21, 2010 - Long Beach Westin Hotel, California

The ACCJC is holding its second annual session, Accreditation Essentials for New ACCJC/WASC Presidents, on Wednesday, April 21, at the WASC Academic Resource Conference. The session provides an overview of ACCJC Standards and reporting requirements and shares information about key topics, including basic accreditation review, annual reporting requirements, substantive change with respect to new programs, new sites and distance education, the CEOs role in leading institutional quality, the CEOs role in preparing the self study report, choosing the Accreditation Liaison Officer and assigning institutional responsibilities to him/her, and other information critical to CEO success. The workshop will provide opportunity for questions and answers about any and all accreditation matters. Participants will receive a copy of all recent communications to the field about expectations. New leaders will receive an invitational letter from the ACCJC or may call the Commission office to enroll. ♦

STRENGTHENING STUDENT SUCCESS CONFERENCE October 6-8, 2010 - Hilton Orange County/Costa Mesa

The very popular Strengthening Student Success Conference series continues this fall in Southern California. Co-sponsored by ACCJC and the Research and Planning Group, the conference provides a unique opportunity for a wide cross-section of people (faculty, deans, program directors, student services staff, professional development leadership, researchers, and planners) to engage each other about strategies for building institutional effectiveness and improving student learning. The 2010 conference will explore translating information into action, as well as the integration of instruction, basic skills, student services, career and technical education, and college effectiveness structures.

More information about the Strengthening Student Success Conference can be found on the RP Group website at: www.rpgroup.org/events/SSS10.html. ♦

Assessment Retreats

The ACCJC offers workshops on topics designed to assist member institutions to meet Standards at all times. WASC (ACCJC and ACSCU) have been co-sponsoring Retreats on Student Learning and Assessment for faculty and academic leaders for a number of years. Many community colleges have found the workshops worthwhile in establishing a culture of assessment and improving student learning.

Two assessment retreats were recently offered earlier this spring. Sixty-five individuals from 12 member institutions attended the Level II Retreat in Hawai'i, and 47 individuals from 16 member institutions attended the Level I Retreat in Emeryville, California in February. Participants from outside the WASC region attended both retreats. The workshops were a blend of presentations from institutions and interactive exercises for the institutional teams that attended.

A common question emerging from each assessment retreat concerns the frequency of course-level assessment in response to the requirements of Standard II.A.1.c; II.A.2.b; II.A.2.e; and II.A.2.f, as well as statements in the Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness-Part III: Student Learning Outcomes. Institutions are encouraged to develop an on-going and systematic assessment strategy which serves its institutional needs, to begin with the results of program review, and which focuses upon the improvement of student learning. As examples, one institution has developed a prioritized schedule of on-going assessment for those courses which serve the greatest number of students and utilizes assessment data for improvement. Another college uses its scheduled on-going program review results to identify student achievement data (course completion, retention from term to term, and progression to the next course/level). These data are then matched against assessment of student learning outcomes within these courses to adjust instruction and thereby increase student learning and achievement.

Assessment Level I - Level I retreats provide participants with presentations made by institutions that have begun assessment on their campuses.

Topics include:

- ◆ assessing general education
- ◆ assessing the discipline major
- ◆ assessing the co-curriculum
- ◆ analyzing student learning
- ◆ improving curriculum and pedagogy, and
- ◆ developing and applying rubrics

At the conclusion of the program, teams return home with campus implementation plans.

Assessment Level II - Level II retreats provide participants with presentations from institutions with broad assessment systems in place that have successfully closed the loop based on assessment findings. Each participating team will share two promising practices from its own campus experience. Topics include:

- ◆ adapting the campus infrastructure to support the culture of evidence
- ◆ successful strategies for engaging faculty and other campus professionals in assessment
- ◆ a specific assessment study, including description of data collection, data analysis, and the impact of the study
- ◆ incorporating student learning outcomes into program reviews, and
- ◆ assuring the quality of campus assessment

❖ RETREATS FOR STUDENT LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT WILL CONTINUE IN FALL 2010 ❖

WASC (ACSCU and ACCJC) plans to continue this successful series by offering two retreats this spring. Watch the ACCJC website (www.accjc.org) for announcements about these events and registration information.

January 2010 Commission Actions on Institutions

Institutional Accreditation and Reports

At its meeting, January 6-8, 2010, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, took the following actions on institutional accreditation:

REAFFIRMED ACCREDITATION

American River College
Chabot College
Citrus College
Cosumnes River College
Folsom Lake College
Las Positas College
Napa Valley College
Sacramento City College
Santa Barbara City College

GRANTED INITIAL ACCREDITATION

Moreno Valley Campus
Norco Campus

GRANTED ELIGIBILITY

Willow International Community College Center,
Reedley College

PLACED ON WARNING

Taft College
Riverside City College

PLACED ON PROBATION

Southwestern College
Cuesta College
Diablo Valley College

CONTINUED ON WARNING

East Los Angeles College
Feather River College
Imperial Valley College

CONTINUED ON PROBATION

Crafton Hills College
Solano Community College

REMOVED FROM WARNING AND REAFFIRMED ACCREDITATION

El Camino College
Lassen Community College
Long Beach City College
Palo Verde College
Rio Hondo College
Santa Ana College
Santiago Canyon College
Sierra College

REMOVED FROM WARNING

College of the Redwoods

REMOVED FROM SHOW CAUSE AND PLACED ON PROBATION

Diablo Valley College

ACCREDITATION WITHDRAWN AT THE REQUEST OF THE INSTITUTION

Maui Community College (Accreditation transferred to ACSCU/WASC)

The Commission also took action to accept or reject the following institutional reports:

ACCEPTED FOLLOW-UP REPORT

Cañada College
College of San Mateo
Contra Costa College
Cuyamaca College
DeAnza College
Foothill College
Grossmont College
Los Medanos College
Mt. San Jacinto College
Skyline College
Salvation Army College for Officer Training at Crestmont
Yuba College

ACCEPTED MIDTERM AND SPECIAL REPORTS

Bakersfield College
Cerro Coso College

ACCEPTED MIDTERM REPORT

College of the Sequoias
Hawai'i Community College
Kapi'olani Community College
Leeward Community College
Northern Marianas College
Porterville College
University of Hawai'i Community College System
Windward Community College

ACCEPTED FOCUSED MIDTERM REPORT

Honolulu Community College
Kauai Community College

ACCEPTED CLOSURE REPORT

Brooks College

All of the Actions on Institutions are posted on the ACCJC website, including actions on substantive changes.

January 2010 Commission Actions on Policies

The following policy revisions were approved by the Commission at its January 2010 meeting. These will be posted on the ACCJC website and have been mailed to Chief Executive Officers and Accreditation Liaison Officers. The revisions are summarized below:

POLICY ON COMMISSION ACTIONS ON INSTITUTIONS

The revision added language to describe procedural actions on institutions that have submitted a “Follow-Up Report” under Part III. There is additional language under Order Show Cause to clarify institutional responsibilities with respect to the Show Cause Report.

POLICY ON DISTANCE EDUCATION AND ON CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION

The revisions are required to comply with the 2009 Higher Education Opportunities Act as amended. The current definitions are now included, and the policy name has been changed to reflect the new definitions. Requirements are included for institutional processes to be in place to assure that students who register for distance education or correspondence programs/courses are in fact the individuals doing the work and receiving the credit.

POLICY ON PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

The revisions consist of edits to the current policy. The Commission no longer maintains a “directory,” and the remaining edits primarily reflect current practice and improved grammar.

POLICY ON THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACCJC AND MEMBER INSTITUTIONS IN THE ACCREDITING PROCESS

The revisions are required to comply with the 2009 Higher Education Opportunities Act as amended. The changes provide clarity for both the Commission and member colleges regarding protocols, visits and reviews.

POLICY ON TRANSFER OF CREDIT

The revisions are required to comply with the 2009 Higher Education Opportunities Act as amended. Changes clarify the transfer-of-credit policies that institutions are required to have in order to enhance educational opportunities for students by facilitating student mobility and assuring that transfer-of-credit practices are consistent with Accreditation Standards and policies.

JOINT ACCREDITATION PROCESS BETWEEN THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES AND THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR SCHOOLS

The Commission adopted a procedure for joint accreditation between the ACCJC and the Accrediting Commission for Schools for two-year colleges seeking to offer a high school program and/or a high school diploma.

STANDARD II. A. 6

The Commission approved an edit to Standard II.A.6 changing the word objectives to **outcomes**. This makes the language consistent throughout the Standards ♦

Future Comprehensive Visits

Under current U.S. Department of Education regulations, ACCJC must provide opportunity for third-party comment regarding the institutional qualifications for accreditation. The institutions noted below are scheduled to undergo comprehensive visits in the spring of 2010, the fall of 2010 and the spring of 2011 and review by the Commission at its June 2010, January 2011, and June 2011 meetings. Third-party comment on these institutions should be made to the ACCJC President, Dr. Barbara A. Beno, at 10 Commercial Blvd. Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949. For consideration, such comment must be made in writing, signed, accompanied by return address and telephone number, and received no later than five weeks before the scheduled Commission meeting.

SPRING 2010

(for June 2010 Commission Review)

Allan Hancock College
Chaffey College
College of Micronesia - FSM
College of the Siskiyous
Glendale Community College
Mira Costa College
Monterey Peninsula College
National Polytechnic College of Science
Palau Community College
Santa Monica College

FALL 2010

(for January 2011 Commission Review)

Antelope Valley College
College of Marin
Evergreen Valley College
Irvine Valley College
Moorpark College
Mt. San Antonio College
Oxnard College
Saddleback College
San Diego City College
San Diego Mesa College
San Diego Miramar College
San Jose City College
Ventura College

SPRING 2011

(for June 2011 Commission Review)

College of the Desert
Cypress College
Deep Springs College
Fashion Institute of Design & Merchandising
Fullerton College
Merced College
Victor Valley College
West Hills College Coalinga
West Hills College Lemoore

Success After Sanction

In fall 2009, 24 member institutions were on various levels of sanction resulting from deficiencies in meeting Commission Standards. The most common reasons for the sanctions were: (1) lack of planning linked to resource allocation; (2) failure to complete a full cycle of program review, planning, and improvement; (3) fiscal management and stability issues; and (4) governance. Institutions responded to the action letters and implemented activities and strategies to correct deficiencies to meet the Standards: most colleges are removed from sanction within 12 months.

At the January 2010 meeting, Commissioners reviewed 59 institutional reports including Midterm Reports, and Follow-Up Reports. Nine institutions were removed from Warning while only two were issued Warning; three institutions were continued on Warning. Probation was imposed on two colleges and continued on two others. One college was removed from Show Cause and placed on Probation. One institution resolved deficiencies in six months, one institution required 24 months to successfully address deficiencies.

As a consequence of the colleges' work and Commission actions, six fewer institutions are on sanction; 18 institutions are on sanction currently. This reflects actions at the January 2010 meeting as well as actions from previous Commission meetings.

The Commission staff continues to work with member institutions to ensure compliance with Commission Standards within the two-year period, as required by the U.S. Department of Education. ♦

Substantive Change: Spring 2010

With new federally funded initiatives on the horizon there will be opportunities for member institutions to develop new programs, new partnerships with business and industry, new locations or expansion of distance learning and courses/ programs. These may require **Substantive Change** proposals to the Commission for quality assurance and to maintain Title IV financial aid funds for students of the institution.

DATES OF SCHEDULED MEETINGS FOR THE ACCJC COMMITTEE ON SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE FOR SPRING 2010 YEAR ARE:

- *Friday, March 12*
- *Friday, April 16*
- *Friday, May 7*
- *Friday, May 21*

Commission resources which may be useful in the development of a substantive change proposal include:

- Substantive Change Policy
- Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education
- Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations
- Policy on Institutions with Related Entities
- Interregional Policies on the Accreditation of Institutions Operating Across Regions
- Substantive Change Manual
- Distance Education and Correspondence Education Manual

The **ACCJC Substantive Change Manual** is designed to assist institutions as they consider substantive changes and to guide institutions in developing proposals demonstrating evidence that the institution will continue to meet Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards. The **ACCJC Distance Education and Correspondence Education Manual** provides additional assistance with substantive changes related to distance education and correspondence education courses/programs. ACCJC staff assigned to facilitate and assist with the substantive change process is Dr. Susan B. Clifford, sclifford@accjc.org. For a complete list of substantive change actions ratified at the January 2010 Commission meeting, please visit our website at: www.accjc.org. ♦

Commissioners to be Selected

The Commission is accepting applications to fill vacant positions on the Commission. Per ACCJC Bylaws, Commissioners are appointed for staggered three-year terms and are normally limited to two, three-year terms.

A SELECTION COMMITTEE WILL MEET THIS SPRING TO FILL THE FOLLOWING VACANCIES:

- **First Term Expiration: One public member (eligible for reappointment)**
- **Second Term Expirations: Two faculty members**
- **Vacant Positions: Two public members**
- **Vacant Position: One administrative member (completed unexpired term and is eligible for appointment for initial three-year term)**
- **ACS Nomination: Accrediting Commission for Schools representative**

Application forms are available from the Commission Office. ♦



**ACCREDITING COMMISSION
FOR COMMUNITY AND
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204
Novato, CA 94949

NON PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT #166
PETALUMA, CA

