

ACCJC NEWS

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES,
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Summer 2014

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND ACCREDITATION

THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

is due to be reauthorized this year, but it is clear final legislation will not be completed before 2015. Nevertheless, bills introduced in early summer give some indication of the ideas for change that may affect accreditation. Congress continues to be concerned with college completion and student success, improving transparency of college information that students might use in making choices, improving access and increasing affordability. As ideas on these four themes develop, accreditors could be asked to play a more prominent role in supporting college completion, student success, and increasing affordability. However, for now, “transparency” is the theme where proposed legislation most directly impacts accreditation.

Transparency

Senator Harkin, Chair of the Senate Higher Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, released a proposal that included provisions to make accreditation “more transparent” by requiring accrediting agencies to make a number of documents available to the public on the accreditor website. The proposed documents include self study reports, accreditation team reports, accreditor reports on institutional compliance with standards and institutional performance with respect to student achievement, and reports on adverse actions taken against institutions with

“supporting evidence” for such actions. The proposal would also require the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) to maintain a web page that serves as a single portal to all of these accrediting documents. A similar set of concerns was expressed in the proposed House *Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act (HR 4983)*, which would make college and university data on completion, graduation, costs of attendance and student debt available to the public through a federal website. However, in this legislation the focus is on institutional disclosure, not accreditor disclosure.

In addition, the USDE recently announced that it will expand the number of experimental demonstration sites that can offer competency based education, and allow institutions to use alternative forms of measuring learning as the criterion for financial aid eligibility. Measurements of student learning are likely to become more prominent as an indicator of student outcomes. The House has approved a bill expanding the experimental sites.

Possible Relief from Regulation

In a white paper released by Representatives Klein and Fox in late June, policy discussion included the idea that federal policy should “protect the balance of responsibilities that has always existed” among the federal government, states and accreditation

Commissioners

DR. STEVEN KINSELLA, CHAIR
Administrative Member

MS. SUSAN KAZAMA, VICE CHAIR
Academic Member (Faculty Representative)

DR. SHERRILL L. AMADOR
Public Member

DR. JOSEPH BIELANSKI
Academic Member (Faculty Representative)

DR. TIMOTHY BROWN
Academic Member (Faculty Representative)

MR. CHRIS CONSTANTIN
Public Member

DR. FRANK GORNICK
Administrative Member

DR. SHARON LOUCKS
Secondary Education Representative Member

DR. RICHARD MAHON
Academic Member (Faculty Representative)

MS. VIRGINIA MAY
Academic Member (Faculty Representative)

MR. CHARLES MENG, II
Public Member

DR. JOHN MORTON
University of Hawai'i Community Colleges
Representative Member

DR. MARY OKADA
Pacific Postsecondary Education Council
Representative Member

DR. RAÚL RODRÍGUEZ
Administrative Member

DR. GLORIA ROMERO
Public Member

DR. ELEANOR SIEBERT
Four-Year Institutions Representative Member

MR. ERIK SKINNER
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
Representative Member

DR. IAN WALTON
Public Member

MR. JOHN ZIMMERMAN
Independent Institutions Representative Member

Commission Staff

DR. BARBARA A. BENO, President

DR. SUSAN B. CLIFFORD, Vice President

DR. KRISTA JOHNS, Vice President

MR. GARMAN JACK POND, Vice President

DR. JOHN NIXON, Associate Vice President

DR. NORVAL WELLSFRY, Associate Vice President

MS. CHERI M. SIXBEY, Executive Assistant to the President and Business Officer

MS. MINDY GRAHAM, Events Coordinator and Administrative Support

MR. TOM LANE, Administrative Support

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

Publication Address:

10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949

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

(the “triad” or “three legged stool”) by reducing regulations that have been promulgated over the last few years by the USDE.

Senator Alexander has asked the American Council on Education (ACE) to form a Task Force to provide suggestions for reducing federal regulations, and a report is due to the Senator by December 2014. The regulations that ask accreditors to examine how institutions apply “credit hour” to different types of courses and learning experiences is likely to be challenged. State authorization regulations have stalled for another year, but the strong Congressional interest in consumer protection will likely enhance the role of state governments in the work of quality assurance. ♦

Commission Approves Revised Standards

At its June 2014 meeting, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) adopted revised Accreditation Standards and Eligibility Requirements, culminating a two and a half year process of intensive review by the Commission and member institutions. Initiated by the Commission at its June 2011 meeting, the review process began in November 2011, with notice to the field from Commission Chair Mike Rota.

The Commission had last reviewed the Accreditation Standards and practices during the years 2006 to 2008. The results of that review were published in *Quality Assurance: A Formative Review* (ACCJC publication, 2008). Since then, significant changes have occurred in institutional practices, in the national regulatory environment, and in public expectations regarding educational quality and transparency. While the Commission believed the 2002 Accreditation Standards still largely reflected practices indicative of educational quality, it was an appropriate time to undertake another review.

In 2011, the Commission asserted that the review would result in a revised set of Standards and accreditation practices that (1) promote institutional effectiveness with measurable outcomes; (2) define college responsibilities for supporting and demonstrating student achievement and attainment of learning outcomes and goals; (3) reflect current federal regulations and effective practices; and (4) are clear to member colleges and to the public. Based on input received over the years since adoption of the 2002 Standards, the Commission also expressed goals to improve clarity, reduce redundancy, simplify format, and reflect significant trends in effective teaching and learning in higher education.

Phase 1 of the Review of Standards concluded in October 2012, following a series of public hearings held in California and Hawai'i, workshops and meetings with ACCJC task forces, and multiple calls for written input. In the end, more than 175 suggestions from groups and individuals were received regarding accreditation practices, as well as the form, format, specific wording, and desired additions and deletions of various sections of the Standards.

Also as a part of its review, Commissioners undertook a study of higher education practices, developments in regional accreditation, and the manner in which the Accreditation Standards have supported institutional effectiveness, educational quality, and continuous quality improvement.

Based on all of the foregoing, the Standards Review Committee developed preliminary draft revisions to Standards for Commission input at the June 2013 Commission meeting. The Commission then directed staff to further solicit input on the preliminary draft revisions from subject matter experts across the region, representing member institutions and affiliated organizations.

Revised Standards, continued on page 4

The ACCJC received further input from field experts, including persons serving on the ad hoc General Education Committee, Distance Education Task Force, Student Learning Outcomes Task Force, and Financial Review Task Force. Staff also met with a number of constituency groups representing member institutions, including the Pacific Post-Secondary Education Council (PPEC), Hawai'i colleges, Accreditation Liaison Officers, California Community College Chief Executive Officers, Chief Instructional Officers, Chief Student Services Officers, Chief Human Relations Officers, Chief Business Officers, and the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges. In addition, staff received input from individuals representing member institutions.

After careful review, Commission staff made further revisions to the Standards and presented them as draft Accreditation Standards and Eligibility Requirements to the Evaluation and Planning and Standards Review Committees for their review in November 2013. Following a final review by the Standards Review Committee, the Commission approved for first reading a draft of revised Standards at its January 2014 meeting. The first reading draft Standards were posted on the ACCJC website along with a call for additional input.

While the first reading draft Standards substantially maintained the principles and substance of the 2002 Standards, a number of revisions reflected national trends on matters of academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and student learning outcomes. In response to field requests, the revisions reduced redundancy and complexity. The draft also reflected consistent input from the field that no wholesale changes to the Standards were necessary; this input supported the judgment of the Commission that the 2002 Standards were largely effective and appropriate.

Following the January 2014 Commission meeting, the Commission conducted public hearings within its region, soliciting input on the first reading draft Standards. From February through April 2014, the Commission received input from several hundred individuals and constituent organizations. Using that input, staff, working with the Standards Review Committee, revised the first reading draft Standards. They prepared a final draft for Commission second reading and adoption. Recognizing the significant work undertaken over the past two and a half years, including significant study and discussion by the Commission and input from over 500 individuals and organizations, the Commission adopted the revised Standards and Eligibility Requirements at its June 2014 meeting. The revised Standards will be the basis for comprehensive institutional evaluations for reaffirmation of accreditation beginning spring 2016. For all other purposes, the 2014 Accreditation Standards and Eligibility Requirements took effect upon their June 2014 adoption. The final Standards reflect the following significant changes:

❖ **Standard I**

Standard I is now organized into three sections: Mission, Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Institutional Integrity. The section on Mission has been expanded, reflecting the foundational role mission plays in defining a college. Academic Quality has been singled out as a subsection, and it contains expectations for defining and assessing student performance and completion outcomes. Institutional Integrity is now a separate section, containing existing standards previously in other sections, and new expectations drawn from Commission policy and field input for integrity and honesty in actions, communications, and policies.



❖ **Standard II**

Standard II has three sections: Instructional Programs, Library and Learning Resources, and Student Support. The Instructional Programs section delineates responsibilities and expectations for assuring academic quality, and it sets expectations for degree requirements, including general education. The section on Student Support defines expectations affecting co-curricular programs and athletics, and it defines expectations for academic advising and student pathways to completion. The section on Library and Learning Resources assures that aspects from the Standards in the two other sections of Standard II will also pertain to library and learning resources and services.

❖ **Standard III**

Standard III is organized into four sections as it was previously: Human Resources, Physical Resources, Technology Resources, and Financial Resources. Under the Human Resources section, expectations are defined for qualifications of all personnel who have responsibility for academic quality. The section on Financial Resources remains largely unchanged from its last revision in 2012.

❖ **Standard IV**

Standard IV now has four sections: Decision-Making Roles and Processes, Chief Executive Officer, Governing Board, and Multi-College Districts or Systems. The sections define specific expectations for delineation and distinction of roles and responsibilities in leadership and governance. The section on multi-college districts or systems defines specific expectations for the functional relationship between a district or system and a college.

With adoption of the 2014 Accreditation Standards and Eligibility Requirements, revised from the 2002 Standards, and with completion of the Review of Accreditation Standards and Practices, the Commission's attention now turns to Commission practices. The intention is to improve accreditation processes and align them with the 2014 Standards. From the beginning of the review process, the Commission has received input from the field on its practices and in response decided to make changes to practice, including a longer cycle for the reaffirmation process, revised approach to midterm reporting, initiation of an annual conference, and alignment of definitions of Commission actions with those of the other regional accreditors. Over the next six months, the Commission will report on its changes to accreditation practices in the ACCJC News and on the ACCJC website. ♦



Degree-Level SLOs the Focus of College DQP Projects

DQPP CONFERENCE:

Sixteen colleges in the WASC region came together in San Diego, California for the 2014 Degree Qualifications Profile Project Conference, held May 1-3, 2014. The conference served as the culmination of college projects related to degree-level student learning outcomes, general education outcomes, and institutional learning outcomes that were conducted in 2013 and 2014 using the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP). The conference provided an opportunity to look at ways in which the work could be shared with other colleges in the region. Projects ranged from college wide to degree-specific applications of the DQP.

All 16 colleges presented their work from the previous year, including objectives, activities, results, and future plans. A panel of independent judges evaluated the projects for their effective use of the DQP, significance and impact of the project on the college, and potential benefit of replicating the work at other interested colleges. Participating colleges also recommended projects for award consideration. Three colleges were identified for awards of excellence, and three colleges received honorable mention awards.

THE COLLEGE PROJECTS:

Berkeley City College focused on strengthening the Liberal Arts in Social and Behavioral Sciences through student learning outcomes work in the college's first-year experience cohorts. The college looked at civic learning and acknowledging diverse perspectives. The project established curriculum and student activities that would address these competencies, and had the first cohorts of students participate in the newly-developed activities in spring 2014.

Cerritos College examined how its career-technical programs and degree-transfer programs aligned with the DQP outcomes, using the Cosmetology and Political Science programs. The alignment efforts were used to identify gaps in SLOs and create course-taking pathways for students.

College of the Marshall Islands mapped its General Education courses to the DQP, and then created cross-discipline embedded assignments with campus-wide rubrics to assess the outcomes. The process also provided a means for enhancing the ethics component and for evaluating the rigor and degree-level expectations within SLOs.

Copper Mountain College used a process of "Tuning to the DQP" to look at selected degrees from a competency and learning outcomes perspective, in order to enhance student transfer. Initially focusing on communication studies and mathematics, the college is expanding into other disciplinary areas.

Gavilan College wanted to streamline the transfer process and increase transfer rates to the state university in two areas: Digital Media and Computer Programming. Using tools within the DQP, including the spider graph, the college identified ways for the programs to describe themselves to prospective students and to refine the curriculum.

***Award of Excellence recipient.**

Grossmont College used the DQP to look at course-level SLOs through the lens of its General Education and Institutional Learning Outcomes. The purpose was to identify relevant and high quality assessments across multiple courses. The college developed a unique model that describes a framework for essential learning, which supports the DQP areas of learning. Together, these hold up the college's mission.

***Honorable Mention Award recipient.**

Kapi'olani Community College wanted to ensure that its new Associate Degree in Hawaiian Studies had clearly defined outcomes and competencies, and that the course progression was clear and relevant for students. A multi-disciplinary group of faculty used the DQP to evaluate and strengthen outcomes in the major and in general education, which lead to some interesting results.

***Award of Excellence recipient.**

DQP Projects, continued on page 7

MiraCosta College faculty in the Sociology Department used the DQP to assess the learning outcomes and competencies associated with the degree. The process involved full and part time faculty, impacted courses in the degree track, and resulted in some creative ways to obtain assessment information from graduates.

Mission College worked within selected disciplines offering both AA-T and AA or AS degrees to align outcomes and competencies for the degrees using the DQP framework. The project was designed to achieve increased degree completion through greater student understanding and coherence of degree programs within the transfer path.

Pasadena City College's project looked at the use of a theme—sustainability—as a cross-cutting element in their engineering programs, and for honing degree-level outcomes using the DQP. The effort involved creation of a first-year experience, project-based learning, and deep conversations about stackable certificates marking steps along the pathway to the degree.

Riverside City College used a process of “Tuning to the DQP” to better identify the core learning and competencies that were key to particular degrees and those which were critical for RCC students earning associate degrees. The resulting Degree Specifications describe the degree programs in terms of the learning rather than the course progressions. They are being used in advising and counseling, as well as for communications with prospective students and to employers.

***Honorable Mention Award recipient.**

Sacramento City College underwent an assessment of its existing SLOs using an “outside in” (general education outcomes to programs and courses) and “inside out” process (aligning program outcomes to institutional and degree-level outcomes) with the DQP. The resulting gap analysis informed deeper discussions around teaching and learning at the college.

Saddleback College aligned its outcomes with the DQP, and then created signature assignments that would measure multiple competencies and areas of learning at or near the end of students’ programs of study. A new signature assignment in Speech (the Carl Rogers Ted Talk), and revised capstone project in Child Development (the Student Teaching Experience), resulted in excellent assessment information for program improvement.

Santa Rose Junior College's project goal was to identify General Education outcomes separate from the existing Institutional Learning Outcomes. They were motivated by an upcoming accreditation visit and a newspaper article quoting a student that “College is not worth it.” SRJC was able to place their college’s SLO work into a national context using the DQP, and to articulate for students, college constituents, and the public, the value of their degrees.

Shasta College's project was led by faculty from the communications and math departments, and the college’s director of research, with support from the academic affairs office. Project participants examined outcomes common across the University Studies degrees at the college, and the needs of both transfer students and students stepping out of higher education after completing the University Studies degree. The project resulted in strategies for faculty to articulate the purpose and value of their degrees to students and the public, and created tools to communicate the value of liberal education (general education) to all students.

***Award of Excellence recipient.**

West Hills College Coalinga wanted to ensure that its degree-level SLOs were valuable and representative of intentional learning. Using the DQP competencies, they created a coherent learning plan of courses for students pursuing career-technical degrees, piloting it for the administration of justice and the agriculture science technology degrees.

***Honorable Mention Award recipient.**

DQPP PROJECT WORK, 2013-2014:

In support of the college project activities, DQPP project staff conducted six workshops and four 90-minute webinars during the 2013-2014 year. Project leaders from participating colleges presented webinars about their work in an 8-10 minute format. The webinars are being featured on the website of the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment, where they can be accessed by any interested persons at:

<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/accjcwebinars.html> . ♦

Trends in Deficiencies Leading to Sanction

Since 2009, ACCJC has collected data regarding the deficiencies that lead to colleges being on or placed on a sanction. The deficiencies are reported every year in the Commission's summer newsletter. The information is also available on the ACCJC website: www.accjc.org on the President's Desk page.

The main deficiencies for sanction are related to Program Review, Planning, Internal Governance, Board Roles, and Financial Stability or Management. Common sanctions new to 2014 were related to Student Learning Outcomes Implementation and Employee Evaluation. Over the four years from January 2010 to January 2013, the number of colleges on sanction did not decrease significantly. In 2014, ACCJC is happy to report a significant reduction in sanctions.

Five-Year Trend - Colleges on Sanction January 2010 - January 2014 *Top Deficiencies Causing Sanctions*

Colleges on Sanction	Program Review	Planning	Internal Governance	Board Roles & Responsibilities	Financial Stability or Management	Student Learning Outcomes Implementation	Employee Evaluation
2010 Sanctions (N=19)	68% (13)	89% (17)	42% (8)	58% (11)	58% (11)		
2011 Sanctions (N=21)	19% (4)	71% (15)	24% (5)	67% (14)	62% (13)		
2012 Sanctions (N=28)	21% (6)	71% (20)	18% (5)	71% (20)	50% (14)		
2013 Sanctions (N=25)	28% (7)	64% (16)	20% (5)	68% (17)	52% (13)		
2014 Sanctions (N=16)	37.5% (6)	87.5% (14)	31% (5)	37.5% (6)	50% (8)	75% (12)	62.5% (10)

- ❖ Overall, the Commission sees improvement. There has been a significant drop in the number of institutions on sanction, from a peak of 28 institutions in 2012 to 16 institutions in 2014.
- ❖ There has been a significant drop in colleges that have difficulty with governing board roles and responsibilities that led to sanction, now down to 37.5% and 6 institutions.
- ❖ A large proportion of institutions on sanction – 87.5%, 14 of the 16 – still have not been able to demonstrate that they are integrating their institutional evaluation efforts such as program review to institutional actions such as resource allocation, planning and implementation of needed changes.
- ❖ Three quarters of those institutions on sanction have not implemented the ACCJC's standards on student learning outcomes.
- ❖ About half of the institutions on sanction have not been able to demonstrate sound fiscal management or stability – but the overall number, 8, is lower than previous years. ♦

June 2014 Commission Actions on Institutions

At its June 4-6, 2014 meeting, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, took the following institutional actions:

REAFFIRMED ACCREDITATION

Lassen College
Mendocino College
Moreno Valley College
Ohlone College
Norco College
Riverside City College
San Joaquin Delta College

CONTINUED THE ACCREDITED STATUS

Carrington College
College of the Desert
College of Micronesia-FSM
College of the Redwoods
College of the Siskiyous
Copper Mountain College
Cypress College
Deep Springs College
Fullerton College
Gavilan College
Glendale Community College
Imperial Valley College
Los Angeles County College of Nursing and Allied Health
Los Angeles Pierce College
Los Medanos College
Merced College
Santa Barbara City College
West Hills College Coalinga
West Hills College Lemoore

REMOVED FROM WARNING AND REAFFIRMED ACCREDITATION

Barstow College
Coastline College
Hawai'i Tokai International College
Los Angeles Mission College
Los Angeles Southwest College
Orange Coast College

CONTINUED ON WARNING

Golden West College
College of the Marshall Islands
Imperial Valley College
Los Angeles Valley College

ISSUED WARNING

Cerritos College
West Valley College

REMOVED FROM PROBATION AND ISSUED WARNING

Hartnell College

PLACED ON PROBATION

Evergreen Valley College
Mission College
Palo Verde College
San Jose City College
Victor Valley College

For a more detailed report please visit:

http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Commission_Actions_on_Institutions_June_4_6_2014.pdf

June 2014 Commission Actions on Policies

At its June 4-6, 2014 meeting, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, took the following actions on policies:

ADOPTED INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES:

- ❖ **Policy on Procedures for Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College Multi-Unit Districts or Systems**
- ❖ **Policy on Closing an Institution**
- ❖ **Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions**
- ❖ **Policy on Complaints Against the ACCJC**
- ❖ **Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits**

ORGANIZATIONAL POLICIES AND DOCUMENTS:

- ❖ **ACCJC Bylaws - Report on Action Taken:** The ACCJC Bylaws were amended in March 2014 and again in June 2014 in accordance with the Bylaws.

FUTURE ACTIONS:

- ❖ The Policy Committee obtained Commission endorsement of its plan to proceed with revising the definitions of accredited status in response to input from the field and in accord with actions by the Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (C-RAC).

POLICIES APPROVED FOR FIRST READING:

- ❖ **Policy on Representation of Accredited Status**
The revisions put into policy the expected online posting by institutions of accreditation information within one page (one click) of the institution's home page that took effect in Spring 2013. The revision also clarifies that both candidate (pre-accredited) and accredited institutions are required to post information concerning their accredited status.
- ❖ **Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions (Section V, Actions that Terminate Accreditation)**
The revision approved for first reading applies to new language in Section V, Actions that Terminate Accreditation. This language establishes a new post-termination status for qualified institutions entitled "Restoration Status".

FURTHER COMMISSION ACTIONS, JUNE 27, 2014:

Comment on First Reading Policies was invited through June 25, 2014. On June 27, 2014, the Commission voted by electronic ballot, in accordance with ACCJC Bylaws, to adopt revisions to the following policies approved for first reading at its June 4-6, 2014 Meeting:

- ❖ **Policy on Representation of Accredited Status**
- ❖ **Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions (Section V, Actions that Terminate Accreditation)**

The policies and more detailed explanations of the actions on policies were sent to CEOs and ALOs of member institutions for circulation to the colleges. They can also be found online at:

<http://www.accjc.org/actions-on-policy>.

ACCJC NEWS/UPDATES

SAME TIME NOTIFICATION

To join the practice of other accrediting commissions across the country, and to meet U.S. Department of Education (USDE) regulatory requirements that the USDE be notified of an accreditor's actions at the same time as the institutions are notified, ACCJC has initiated electronic communication of action letters to institutions and posting of the Commission Actions. All action letters now arrive at a campus in electronic form only, ready for printing. The action letters are emailed to arrive at campuses a few hours before the list of all actions taken is emailed to the USDE and posted on the ACCJC's web site. The change provides more transparency of Commission actions. The ACCJC welcomes feedback.

NEW ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

At its June 2014 meeting, in Public Session, the Accrediting Commission adopted revised Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards. The adoption culminated the Review of Accreditation Standards and Practices that began in November 2011, and resulted in identification of needed revisions to Standards in June 2013.

The new Standards will be the basis for comprehensive institutional evaluations for reaffirmation of accreditation beginning spring 2016. Please note, the new Standards, for all other purposes, became effective upon their June 2014 adoption, and may be used by institutions wishing to develop a baccalaureate degree. An annotated version of the Standards will be developed, to link relevant regulations and Commission policies with Standards. A glossary of terms will also be included with the annotated version. The adopted Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards are available on the ACCJC website: www.accjc.org.

ACCJC IS GOING E-FICIENT

In response to feedback and requests from the field, ACCJC is working to become more electronically efficient, or "E-fficient". This summer and fall ACCJC will be completing the yearly manual and publication updates. New high quality pdf versions of ACCJC publications including the Accreditation Eligibility Requirements, the Accreditation Standards, the Accreditation Reference Handbook, and several of the ACCJC manuals will be included in this update. Most publications will no longer be printed in hard-copy. This new practice will ensure:

- ❖ All members of the field have access to the most current versions of ACCJC publications available on the ACCJC website
- ❖ ACCJC publications are word searchable and copy and paste friendly electronic documents
- ❖ Reduced paper document production and waste



In addition to providing these improvements, the electronic publications will also ease the transition to the new Accreditation Standards that were adopted in June 2014. Those colleges going through a comprehensive institutional evaluation through fall 2015 will use the 2002 Standards in preparing their Self Evaluation Reports and will need updated current versions of manuals. The 2014 Standards will be the basis for comprehensive institutional evaluations beginning spring 2016, and new manuals are being created accordingly. Electronic versions of both sets of Standards are available on the ACCJC website, and the July 2014 Accreditation Reference Handbook will include both sets of Standards. It is the responsibility of the individual colleges to reference the appropriate version of the Standards.

Thank you for your understanding during this transition. When new publications are available, ACCJC staff will notify the field. ♦

Changes in Commissioners

COMMISSIONERS WHO COMPLETED THEIR SERVICE IN JULY

Dr. Barry Russell – Dr. Russell completed one term on the Commission as the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Representative Member. Dr. Russell served as a member of the Sub-committee on General Education, the Lumina Grant Advising Committee, and the Committee on Substantive Change. His term began in July 2011.

Dr. Patrick Tellei – Dr. Tellei completed two terms on the Commission as the Pacific Postsecondary Education Council (PPEC) Representative Member. Dr. Tellei served as a member of the ACCJC Audit Committee and the Eligibility Committee. His term began in July 2008.

Dr. Sharon Whitehurst-Payne – Dr. Whitehurst-Payne completed two terms on the Commission as a Public Member. Dr. Whitehurst-Payne served as Chair of the Evaluation and Planning Committee. Her term began in July 2008.



NEW COMMISSIONERS (TERM BEGINNING JULY 1, 2014)

Dr. Mary A.Y. Okada – Dr. Okada was elected to serve on the Commission as the Pacific Postsecondary Education Council Representative Member. She serves as chairperson of the PPEC, a council of presidents and chancellors of institutions from American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, the Marshall Islands, and the State of Hawaii that addresses regional and post-secondary education issues. Dr. Okada has been the president at Guam Community College since 2007, and has served on several ACCJC accreditation teams. She holds a BA in Business Administration and a master's degree in Public Administration from the University of Guam, and a doctorate in Educational Leadership from the University of Phoenix.



Senator Gloria Romero (Ret.) – Sen. Romero was elected to serve on the Commission as a Public Member. She is a former California State Senator, the Founder/Strategic Planner of the California Center for Parent Empowerment, and is a featured columnist with the Los Angeles/Orange County Register. During her service in the California State Senate, Sen. Romero served as the Senate Majority Leader, the first woman to ever hold that leadership position in the history of the California State Senate. She served as Chair of the Senate Education Committee, the Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee on Education, and the Chair of Public Safety, making her one of the most influential voices on education policy in California. Sen. Romero has taught at every level of higher education and remains a Full Professor at California State University, Los Angeles. She holds an AA from Barstow Community College, a BA in Psychology from California State University-Long Beach, and a master's degree and doctorate in Psychology from the University of California-Riverside.

Changes in Commissioners, continued on page 13

Mr. Erik Skinner – Mr. Skinner was elected to serve on the Commission as the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office Representative Member. Mr. Skinner serves as Deputy Chancellor in the Chancellor’s Office where he oversees the office’s divisions including: Academic Affairs; Student Services and Special Programs; Economic Development and Workforce Preparation; and College Finance and Facilities Planning. Previously, Mr. Skinner served as Assistant Secretary for Fiscal Policy in California’s Office of the Secretary of Education and as a Fiscal and Policy Analyst in California’s Legislative Analyst’s Office. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in history from Grinnell College and a Master of Public Policy degree from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.



COMMISSIONERS RE-ELECTED (TERM BEGINNING JULY 1, 2014)

Dr. Timothy Brown – Dr. Brown, Academic Member (Faculty Representative), was elected to serve a second term on the Commission.

Dr. Raúl Rodríguez – Dr. Rodríguez, Administrative Member, was elected to serve a second term on the Commission.

Dr. Eleanor Siebert – Dr. Siebert, Four-Year Institutions Representative Member, was elected to serve a second term on the Commission.

Mr. John Zimmerman – Mr. Zimmerman, Independent Institutions Representative Member, was elected to serve a second term on the Commission. ♦

Upcoming Events

REGIONAL WORKSHOPS FALL 2014

This spring, the ACCJC continued the regional workshop series on “Institutional Internal Quality Assurance and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment” with two successful workshops. The series will continue this fall with dates and locations listed below. Attendance at the workshops is by invitation. Attendees will have the opportunity to engage with ACCJC staff, Commissioners, and Dr. David W. Marshall, Associate Director of Tuning USA from the Institute for Evidence- Based Change. Dr. Marshall will share his expertise in student learning outcomes during his presentation “Elements of Design: Definitions of Learning Outcomes, Measures of Learning, Summarizing Learning Outcomes Data, and Using Assessment Data,” setting the stage for a successful day of training.

Expanding on the opening presentations, representatives from member institutions will showcase effective methods for educational quality improvement. Working together with the presenters, participants will have an opportunity to discuss their own success stories, assessment results, and challenges their colleges may face. The closing plenary session will include a strengths summary of the model practices introduced earlier in the day and conclude with small group discussions and a question and answer session with the presenters. Participants will take away practical tools for improving institutional effectiveness.

- ❖ **September 19, 2014 – Citrus College-Glendora**
Pasadena City College will present effective models of educational quality and using assessment data practiced at their institution.
- ❖ **October 3, 2014 – College of the Sequoias-Visalia**
West Hills College Coalinga will present effective models of educational quality and using assessment data practiced at their institution.
- ❖ **TBA – Pacific Post-Secondary Education Council (Hawai’i and Pacific Island Colleges)**



ACCJC TO DEBUT ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The ACCJC will initiate an annual conference on accreditation and quality practices in spring 2015 in response to interest expressed by member institutions during the Review of Accreditation Standards and Practices just completed (see article on page 3). The ACCJC is appointing an advisory committee of member institutions and Commissioners that will plan the contents for the conference. While this first year’s conference will be focused and relatively small, we hope that institutional interest will support larger conferences in future years.



Until now, the ACCJC has been providing training to specific constituencies through its regional workshops, through Accreditation Liaison Officer annual training events, and by partnering with the Community College League of California and various constituency groups such as the Pacific Postsecondary Education Council, the Chief Instructional Officers, the Chief Financial Officers, and the Academic Senate of the Community Colleges of California. The ACCJC will be reducing its involvement in these partnerships this year to develop the ACCJC annual conference.

Stay tuned for further notice about the conference theme, dates and location. ♦

Future Comprehensive External Evaluation 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 external evaluation visits in the fall of 2014, the spring of 2015, and the fall of 2015, and review by the Commission at its January 2015, June 2015, and January 2016 meetings, respectively. 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. This information is also available on the Future Comprehensive External Evaluation Visits page of ACCJC's website www.accjc.org.

FALL 2014

(for January 2015 Commission Review)

American Samoa Community College
College of the Canyons
Contra Costa College
Crafton Hills College
Cuesta College
Diablo Valley College
El Camino College
Long Beach City College
Los Medanos College
Rio Hondo College
San Bernardino Valley College
Santa Ana College
Santiago Canyon College

SPRING 2015

(for June 2015 Commission Review)

Berkeley City College
Butte College
College of Alameda
College of the Marshall Islands
Laney College
Merritt College
Palomar College
Pasadena City College
Santa Rosa Junior College
Willow International Community College Center

FALL 2015

(for January 2016 Commission Review)

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
Southwestern College
Taft College





ACCREDITING COMMISSION
for **COMMUNITY** and
JUNIOR COLLEGES

10 Commercial Blvd., Suite 204
Novato, CA 94949

NON PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT #161
SANTA ROSA, CA

