

ACCJC NEWS

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

Spring 2016

MEASURES OF QUALITY: FEDERAL COLLEGE SCORECARD DATA ON GRADUATION RATE AND LOAN DEFAULT RATE

THE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMUNITY FACES A CHALLENGE. Simple metrics provided by the federal government’s College Scorecard have become an attractive means of examining or discussing institutional “quality,” and are increasingly used to develop policy arguments as well as to evaluate the performance of institutions and their accreditors. Quality is being defined by graduation “rate” in some combination with loan default or loan repayment rates. More important and complex measures of quality, and the interplay of institutional mission and type of students enrolled with those two metrics, are being lost in policy discussions that instead refer to very simple numbers as representations of quality. This has a direct impact on accreditors and the accreditation process.

The U.S. Department of Education (USDE) has increased efforts to have accreditors use federal data in their assessment of institutional quality. The federal data is collected for all institutions receiving Title IV funds. Its advantage is that it allows comparisons across institutions and institutional types. Its disadvantage is that it is not equally valid or useful for all institutional types, and provides information about only a limited aspect of an institution’s outcomes, not necessarily about quality.

It is important for institutions to understand that this enhanced federal focus on simple data elements will have a definite impact on accreditation practices going forward.

College Scorecard

In late spring 2015, the USDE posted new federal data on graduation rate, loan default rate, loan repayment rate, enrollments, annual costs and other factors for all institutions that receive Title IV funding. Called the “College Scorecard,” the data were initially intended to provide the basis for a federal college rating system, an alternative to private publication rating systems, but the idea of rating or ranking was abandoned when it became clear the data are not valid enough to be legitimately used in rankings.

Commissioners

DR. STEVEN KINSELLA, CHAIR
Administration Member

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

DR. JOSEPH BIELANSKI, JR.
Academic Member (Faculty Representative)

DR. KEVIN BONTENBAL
Academic Member (Faculty Representative)

DR. TIMOTHY BROWN
Academic Member (Faculty Representative)

DR. SONYA CHRISTIAN
Administration Member

MR. CHRIS CONSTANTIN
Public Member

DR. KAROLYN HANNA
Public Member

DR. RICHARD MAHON
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
Administration Member

DR. ELEANOR SIEBERT
Senior Colleges and Universities
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

MR. GARMAN JACK POND, 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

MS. ANN LUCKIESH, 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

Commissioner Vacancies and Request for Nominations and Applications

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) is seeking nominations and applications from individuals who wish to be considered for election as Commissioners to the ACCJC.

Commissioners are elected for a three-year term, and are eligible for re-election to a second three-year term. The composition of the Commission membership can be found in the ACCJC Bylaws, Article III, Section 1; the process for electing Commissioners can also be found in the ACCJC Bylaws, Sections 2 and 3. The ACCJC Bylaws are located on the ACCJC website at www.accjc.org. We also encourage you to review the Duties of Commissioners contained in the application on the ACCJC website.

The ACCJC is seeking nominations and applications for the following positions:

- ❖ One Commission member representing the Accrediting Commission for Schools. This position is currently vacant.
- ❖ Three Commission members representing the Public. Two incumbents of this position, Mr. Chris Constantin and Mr. Charles Meng II, are both completing their second term on the Commission and are not eligible for re-election. The third open position is currently vacant.
- ❖ One Commission member representing Academic (Faculty). The incumbent of this position, Dr. Joseph Bielanski, Jr. is completing his second term on the Commission and is not eligible for re-election.
- ❖ One Commission member representing Administration. The incumbent of this position, Dr. Steven Kinsella, is retiring and has resigned.

In addition, the ACCJC announces two other Commission positions, which have incumbents who are eligible for election to a second three-year term.

- ❖ One Commission member representing the Public. The incumbent of this position, Dr. Ian Walton, is eligible for a second three-year term.
- ❖ One Commission member representing the University of Hawai'i Community Colleges. The incumbent of this position, Dr. John Morton, is eligible for a second three-year term.

Nominations may be sent via a letter that names the nominee, his or her contact information, and the specific Commission vacancy for which the individual is being nominated and should be signed and dated by the individual making the nomination. Persons may self-nominate. Nomination letters may be sent by postal mail, email scan, or fax and must arrive at the ACCJC office by April 25, 2016.

All nominees will be contacted by the Commission, be asked to agree to be nominated, and asked to complete a Commissioner Application Background Data form.

The Nominating Committee of the ACCJC will meet in early May to nominate a slate of candidates for election to the Commission. After a slate is identified by the Nominating Committee, member college CEOs will be given the opportunity to nominate additional at-large candidates for the ballot. Ballots will be mailed to each institutional CEO in May, and the election results will be announced at the June 2016 Commission meeting.

The federal data can be found in very large excel spreadsheets at: <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/finaid/accred/accreditation.html>. Data is organized by accreditor, and the spreadsheets also provide summary data on the performance of all colleges accredited by each institutional accrediting agency.

The spreadsheets include the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data (IPEDS) graduation rate, which is defined as the percentage of first-time, full-time freshmen who graduate in 150% of the (normal, full-time) time to degree. For community colleges, that metric describes the percentage of first-time, full-time freshmen who graduate within three years of entering college. The Scorecard data also includes the loan default rate and, a more recent calculation, the loan repayment rate.

Community Colleges are particularly disadvantaged when the IPEDS graduation rate is used as a metric for college performance. The average community college IPEDs graduation rate is generally lower than the graduation rate of many institutions with entrance criteria and full-time students who are closer to the traditional age, 18 to 22. Many community college freshmen who enter as full-time students will not remain full time but will revert to part-time attendance, will transfer without achieving an associate's degree, will leave college after taking some classes that help them advance, or will need significant remediation that slows down their ability to complete a degree in the three-year period. Many students are adults with family responsibilities that require them to work and revert to part-time attendance at college even after a start as a full-time student. For many community colleges, the proportion of its entering class that is first-time, full-time freshmen represents only a small portion of the total enrollment. By the time members of this entering cohort get to 150% of the time to degree, there is attrition from the cohort due to reversion to part-time attendance, to concurrent enrollment for credits at another institution, or to transfer to another institution.

Although the College Scorecard data are not perfect or even good measures of community college performance, *they are the available data*. Members of Congress, think tanks, and news media have been using this data to examine accreditation and institutions, particularly the for-profit institutions. A November 5, 2015 letter to the higher education community entitled, *Department of Education Advances Transparency Agenda for Accreditation* stated:

“There is a broad agreement and a sense of urgency about the need for significant improvement in both the rigor and flexibility of accreditation...In his July 2015 speech on the future of higher education, Secretary Duncan emphasized the importance of outcomes and greater transparency in higher education. He noted particularly that accreditors have provided little accountability for some poor-performing institutions...”

The College Scorecard represents the USDE's efforts to be “transparent” about higher education's outcomes, and to encourage accreditors and institutions to focus on outcomes. Increasingly, “outcomes” refers to the federal metrics available on the Scorecard.

NACIQI

The National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI) is the body that recognizes accreditors as gatekeepers of Title IV federal funds. Through its recognition process, USDE is also increasing pressure for accreditors to do something more rigorous about the institutions whose performance seems low on these same federal metrics. Last June, NACIQI announced that going forward, it would ask accreditors at the time of their recognition review about how accreditors are using the posted Scorecard data on graduation rate and loan default (which it declared to be measures of quality) in their reviews of institutional quality.

At its December 2015 hearing, NACIQI members asked accreditors, including ACCJC, about the institutions that have the lowest (Scorecard) graduation rates, as well as about those that had loan default rates that were above the federal limit of 30%.

Now NACIQI appears to be formalizing its incorporation of Scorecard data into the recognition process for accreditors. In a recent Federal Register, NACIQI announced that it will ask the following questions of each accrediting commission.

- ❖ How does your accrediting agency address student achievement? Why was this strategy chosen?
- ❖ What are the student achievement challenges in the institutions accredited by your agency?
- ❖ What has changed/is likely to change in the standards about student achievement for the institutions accredited by your agency?
- ❖ In what ways have student achievement results been used for monitoring or for adverse actions (withdrawal of accreditation)? What agency activities have you undertaken to [encourage institutions to] improve student achievement?
- ❖ How does your agency define “at-risk” institutions? What tools does your agency use to evaluate at-risk institutions, to help at-risk institutions, and how have these worked?

How This Will Change Accreditation Practice?

Institutions should be aware of their own Scorecard data and be prepared to provide accreditors with additional, alternative information about the outcomes for students who enroll in their institution. Graduation rate, and loan default rate, are the key federal data elements. Outcomes can be measured in many alternative ways.

ACCJC already asks institutions to include multi-year data on student achievement in the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER). Colleges must report graduation, course completion, job placement, and transfer data, but are able to identify their own sources for such data. Evaluation teams will, as always, look at the data trends and may comment on either levels of achievement or apparent directions of change.

The federal regulations require institutions to establish “institution-set standards” for student achievement, measure the achievement levels reached, and try to improve institutional performance. ACCJC will continue to review the institution-set standards and performance against those standards.

ACCJC does not believe the Scorecard data alone can serve as a bright-line indicator of an institution’s quality, and so will consider the Scorecard data in the context of institutional mission and characteristics, and the data on student achievement the college presents, which may be other than IPEDS data. In particular, ACCJC will look closely at institutions with IPEDS graduation rates below 15%, and may ask institutions to consider what they can do to make improvements in student achievement.



Ad Hoc Committee Helps ACCJC Redesign Evaluator Training

Goals for Redesigning Evaluator Training

The ACCJC appreciates the team spirit from member institutions in helping improve our evaluator training sessions, and ultimately our teams' performance. Our goal is to have all institutions experience smoother evaluation visits and receive team reports and recommendations that are clear and helpful, thereby improving assistance to the colleges undergoing review.

Members of the Ad Hoc Committee

A group of volunteers from ACCJC member institutions is helping ACCJC Vice Presidents redesign its training for evaluators. These individuals are: Dr. Mary Kay Rudolph, Vice President Academic Affairs, Santa Rosa Junior College; Mr. Randy Beach, Faculty, Southwestern College; Dr. Ian Walton, Faculty Emeritus, Mission College; Dr. Janet Fulks, Interim Dean of Student Success, Bakersfield College; Ms. Virginia May, Faculty, Sacramento City College; Dr. Angelica Suarez, Vice President Student Affairs, Southwestern College; Dr. Lori Bennett, Executive Vice President, Moorpark College; Dr. Teresa Koroivulaono, President, College of the Marshall Islands; and Dr. Joseph Daisy, President, College of Micronesia—Federated States of Micronesia.

ACCJC Offers New Evaluator Training

New Evaluator Training Held in February

ACCJC offered its first New Evaluator Training on February 26, 2016; 62 people attended the training and have agreed to serve on one of the 26 comprehensive evaluation teams scheduled for the 2016-17 academic year. Eight experienced evaluators - Dr. Janet Fulks, Interim Dean of Student Success, Bakersfield College; Dr. Jeanie Nishime, Vice President Student and Community Advancement, El Camino College; Dr. Carol Kozeracki, Dean of Academic Affairs, East Los Angeles College; Dr. Edward Karpp, Researcher, Glendale Community College; Dr. Ann Doty, Associate Faculty, Saddleback College; Dr. Aracely Mora, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Santiago Canyon College; Dr. Francisco Arce, Vice President of Academic Affairs, El Camino College; and Dr. Vince Rodriguez, Vice President of Instruction, Coastline Community College - facilitated the interactive work with the trainees.

Training activities included: Discovering the Standards; Reviewing Case Studies (Institutional Self Evaluation Reports), Writing a Mock Team Report, and Situations Teams may Face on the Visit.

Participant response to these activities was very positive. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 equals Very Valuable, trainees rated the four activities at 4.5, 4.7, 4.5 and 4.6 respectively. Participants commented that the chance to interact with fellow new evaluators at their table, and with experienced evaluator facilitators, was a highlight of the training.

With the “newbies” now provided basic training in working with standards, self-study documents, and team reports, ACCJC will change the Team Evaluator Training to remove these basics and add opportunity for more advanced training in the work of evaluation teams.

ACCJC will repeat New Evaluator Training next year so that those in our database who were not able to attend this year can be trained, and join teams the following year.

Evolution of the Baccalaureate

The baccalaureate degree has seen increasing attention in the past few years. American Samoa Community College was the first college in the region to receive authorization to grant a baccalaureate degree using the 2014 Standards. In the past year, the California community colleges launched a pilot program for baccalaureates. To date, 14 of the California colleges have received substantive change approval to initiate the baccalaureate degree. More colleges in the region are developing baccalaureate programs.

Several years ago the ACCJC recognized the growing interest in the development of baccalaureate degrees at community colleges. At that time it requested and received authorization from the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) to change its scope to permit authorization of the first baccalaureate degree through the substantive change process.

ACCJC Responds to Interest in Baccalaureate Degrees

The 2014 Accreditation Standards were written to include a number of elements that addressed the baccalaureate degree. Some of these were specific and others had a less direct impact on the baccalaureate degree. The ACCJC has established procedures within its substantive change process to review baccalaureate applications from colleges that include considerations of appropriate standards. The ACCJC also utilized a “Protocol for the Evaluation of the Baccalaureate Degree” at its most recent review of American Samoa Community College. ACCJC will update the protocol for substantive change visits and comprehensive evaluation site visits for colleges with baccalaureate programs in the future.

ACCJC Develops Additional Policies and Procedures

In its most recent letter, USDE advised ACCJC that additional policies and procedures would be required related to the baccalaureate. The USDE noted that specific general education requirements, the level and rigor of upper division courses, and faculty qualifications for baccalaureate-level programs were clearly within the substantive change protocols of the ACCJC, but that they need to be included within the standards or policies that are applied during accreditation reviews of those programs.

In order to respond to the USDE’s concerns about the clarity of the requirements for the baccalaureate degree, the ACCJC has developed a “Policy on Accreditation of Baccalaureate Degrees.” This policy passed its first reading at the January 2016 meeting of the Commission. It is currently posted for comment from the membership and will be submitted for a second reading at the June 2016 meeting of the Commission. When adopted, this policy, along with the accreditation standards, substantive change protocols, and the *Guide to Evaluating and Improving Institutions* will become the elements the ACCJC will use in its evaluation of baccalaureate programs within the region.

Scope of Bylaws

The Bylaws specify that ACCJC extends accreditation to institutions which have, as their primary mission, the granting of associate degrees. The Bylaws also state the parameters for associate degree colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees. At present, the ACCJC’s scope permits the approval of a single baccalaureate degree at its member institutions. The ACCJC is seeking an expansion of this scope to include additional baccalaureate degrees that would fit within the definition included in the ACCJC Bylaws.

January 2016 Commission Actions on Institutions

At its January 6-8, 2016 meeting, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, took the following institutional actions:

REAFFIRMED ACCREDITATION FOR 18 MONTHS

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
Taft College

REMOVED FROM WARNING

Salvation Army College for Officer
Training at Crestmont

REMOVED SHOW CAUSE AND ISSUED WARNING

American Samoa Community College

ISSUED WARNING

Southwestern College

ELIGIBILITY DENIED

California Preparatory College

CONTINUED ACCREDITED STATUS

Antelope Valley College	Kauai Community College
Bakersfield College	Leeward Community College
Cerro Coso Community College	Los Medanos College
College of the Sequoias	Moreno Valley College
Contra Costa College	Norco College
De Anza College	Porterville College
Diablo Valley College	Rio Hondo College
El Camino College	Riverside City College
Foothill College	Santa Ana College
Hawai'i Community College	Windward Community College
Honolulu Community College	Woodland Community College
Kapi'olani Community College	Yuba College

January 2016 Commission Actions on Policies

At its January 6-8, 2016 meeting, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, took the following actions on policies:

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 www.accjc.org. All first reading policies are sent to the field for comment and can be accessed on the ACCJC website. Adopted policies can also be accessed on the ACCJC website and in the Accreditation Reference Handbook, which is updated and published annually in July.

The Commission invited comment on the first reading policy through April 26, 2016.

THE FOLLOWING POLICY WAS PRESENTED FOR SECOND READING AND ADOPTED BY THE COMMISSION:

❖ Policy on the Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions

The substantive revision clarifies when Third Party Comment must be submitted to the ACCJC so that it may be included as part of an external evaluation team's evaluation of an institution. In other cases, the regular process for addressing Third Party Comment is followed. A few additional edits were made for understandability.

THE FOLLOWING POLICIES WERE APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION FOR FIRST READING

❖ Policy on Substantive Change

During the recent ACCJC recognition review by the U.S. Department of Education and the December 2015 NACIQI meeting, the ACCJC learned that the department analysts felt certain information related to substantive change and reviews of baccalaureate degree programs should be included in Commission policy. In addition, additions and changes were made to ensure alignment of the policy and the Substantive Change Manual.

❖ **Policy on Accreditation of Baccalaureate Degrees**

This new policy sets forth the general requirements for accreditation of baccalaureate degrees, in accordance with advice from U.S. Department of Education staff as part of the recent ACCJC recognition review and December 2015 NACIQI meeting. Included are general requirements, limits on institutional baccalaureate offerings, and citations of Commission standards and special evaluation criteria related to the initial accreditation of baccalaureate degrees through substantive change approval, and the review of such degrees during the comprehensive evaluation of an institution which offers the baccalaureate degree.



Criteria Included with the Baccalaureate Policy

There are a number of criteria included with the baccalaureate policy that provide additional clarity beyond the Accreditation Standards. Some of these criteria include:

Authority

Institutions seeking approval of baccalaureate degrees must have authorization to offer a baccalaureate degree from the jurisdiction in which they operate.

Mission

Baccalaureate degrees extend the credentials, service areas, and intended student populations of colleges. Therefore, college mission statements need to reflect those differences, and the baccalaureate programs must fit within the education purposes of the mission.

Student Learning and Achievement

Student learning outcomes for baccalaureate programs must reflect the higher levels, depth, and rigor expected of upper division coursework in higher education. Student achievement standards must also separately identify and assess baccalaureate programs.

General Education

There must be nine units of upper division general education courses that reflect the higher levels of knowledge and intellectual inquiry expected at the baccalaureate level. Baccalaureate programs must include a total of 36 units of general education integrated and distributed through the degree.

Faculty

Faculty teaching in upper division courses must hold academic credentials one level higher than the baccalaureate in an appropriate discipline. There must be full-time faculty assigned to the baccalaureate.

Degree Requirements

Baccalaureate degrees have a minimum requirement of 120 semester units. At least 45 of those units must be in upper division courses that reflect the level and curriculum commonly accepted in like degrees in higher education. Student expectations, including learning outcomes, demonstrate the rigor, depth, and commonly expected norms among like degrees in higher education.

Curriculum Pathways

Course sequencing and curriculum pathways must be clearly established, communicated, and applied to students.



RECENT AMMENDMENTS TO THE ACCJC BYLAWS WERE PRESENTED FOR INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC:

❖ ACCJC Bylaws - Report on Action Taken

The ACCJC Bylaws were amended in November 2015. A new footnote was added which provided the operational definition of when an institution is determined to have as a primary mission the granting of associate degrees. Notice of this addition to the Bylaws was provided to the field at the time the change was made. Additional amendments were made to the Bylaws effective February 1, 2016, to clarify the new footnote and to align the identification of various dates across the Bylaws referring to commissioner terms.



ACCJC Educational Programming

ACCJC Spring Workshops on Assessment

This spring, ACCJC launched its new educational programming for member institutions with three workshops on assessment of learning outcomes designed to meet the needs of faculty and mid-level academic administrators. One of the topics of interest has been program-level assessment, while faculty continue to express interest in the basics of assessment.

On March 1 and again on March 3, internationally recognized author and educator Ms. Linda Suskie provided a workshop, *Taking Assessment to the Program Level*. Ms. Suskie is the author of two books, and her book, *Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide*, is one of the best-selling books on assessment in higher education. Both sessions were filled to capacity, and more than 120 people enrolled in the workshop to learn principles and effective practices for program-level assessment of learning outcomes.

On April 15, nationally recognized expert Dr. Amy Driscoll provided a workshop on *Fundamentals of Assessment*. This interactive workshop provided an introduction to the basics of assessing student learning, the terminology of assessment, the variety of authentic assessment practices and their usefulness in different circumstances, and the use of assessment data for purposes of improving educational effectiveness. The workshop was also filled to its capacity of 60 people.

The goals for the workshops were for participants to:

- ❖ Use basic assessment language.
- ❖ Identify and articulate learning outcomes for both course-level and program-level use.
- ❖ Describe both direct and indirect assessment methods.
- ❖ Make appropriate choices among potential tools and strategies to assess learning outcomes.
- ❖ Encourage colleagues to align pedagogy and curriculum with learning outcomes in courses, programs, and at the institutional level.
- ❖ Use the results of course-level assessment for determining program-level effectiveness.
- ❖ Describe the purposes for analytic and holistic rubrics and use them appropriately to support student success.
- ❖ Use assessment results to determine how to improve student learning and develop next steps.
- ❖ Describe the assessment cycle and value its impact on student learning and faculty effectiveness.

Attendees have given strong, positive ratings to these workshops, and ACCJC expects to repeat and expand on them in the next academic calendar with an additional Assessment Level II workshop offered by Dr. Driscoll. *Suggestions from member institutions are welcome.*

Educational Programming: Meetings, Trainings and Conferences



ACCJC Presentations in April

New ACCJC Accreditation Standards and Practices, a presentation to member colleges, was given on April 21, 2016 for the Pacific Postsecondary Education Commission (PPEC), in Palau.

ACCJC Listening Session: Member Comments on ACCJC Practices, was presented on April 21, 2016 for the PPEC and on April 26, 2016 for the Hawai'i Community Colleges.

Commission Meeting

The Commission Meeting will be held June 8-10th, 2016 in San Jose, California. A public session inviting comments, and adoption of policies, is scheduled for June 10, 2016 at the meeting.

Meeting Dates for Substantive Change Committee

For colleges preparing Substantive Change proposals, please consider that the final proposal, accompanied by the required fees, must now be submitted 45 days prior to the scheduled meeting date. The meeting dates for the next academic year will take place in late fall 2016, mid-winter and early spring 2017. The fee schedule can be found on the ACCJC website at www.accjc.org under the Substantive Change horizontal bar.

Upcoming Evaluation Team Chair Trainings and Team Member Trainings

There will be an upcoming Evaluation Team Chair Training in July, date TBD. Two Team Evaluation Trainings will be held in Los Angeles in August for teams conducting comprehensive visits in September and October, 2016.

ACCJC Annual Conference April 5-7, 2017

ACCJC's annual conference will be held on April 5 through April 7, 2017, at the Hotel Irvine in Irvine, California. A conference planning committee and members of the Commission are planning the contents and will be issuing a call for papers in the coming months. Pre-conference events on April 4 and the morning of April 5 will include New Evaluator Training, a workshop and training for Accreditation Liaison Officers, and a CEO meeting. The Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) is providing planning and logistics support for the conference, and a board Conference Advisory Committee is advising ACCJC on desirable content. *Watch for further announcements and the call for papers/presentations.*

Continued Changes to Accreditation Practices

Input from the Field on Accreditation

In response to the California Chancellor's Office Task Force on Accreditation Report issued last fall, the Commission held several meetings and invited member institutions to attend and provide input.

A special meeting of the Commission was held in Sacramento on October 9, 2015; about 40 persons attended.

In addition, the Commission held four "Listening Sessions" for members to give input on suggestions for change on October 30 at Bakersfield College, on November 13 at Rancho Santiago Community College District, on April 21 at Palau Community College, and on April 26 at the offices of the Hawai'i Community Colleges.

Input from the CEO Group

ACCJC is also pleased to also be working with the California Community College CEO Group, which will be providing input to improve accreditation processes and the Commission through its own work group. The CEOs expect to present suggestions to the Commission at its June 2016 meeting and thereafter work with ACCJC to implement appropriate changes to practice.

Member institutions and their constituencies are also encouraged to provide feedback to the Commission and may do so by sending general comments to the ACCJC at our Novato address or at the email address, accjc@accjc.org. The comments should be marked as "Comments for" or "Suggestions for" the Commission. In addition, public comments are welcomed at the Commission's meeting each January and June, generally at 1:00 PM on the Friday of the meeting, when the public session begins.

Planning for Change

Finally, at its workshop in March, the Commission developed a draft list of areas for change that it will discuss further at its June meeting. In response to the CEO and other constituency input, changes as appropriate will be incorporated into a strategic plan for implementation over the next few years.

Webinar Series for Accreditation Liaison Officers

A Webinar Series for Accreditation Liaison Officers (ALOs) will begin this Spring. The first topics for discussion will include "Keeping Accreditation Records" and "Communication with Constituent Groups and with the ACCJC." Details are forthcoming and will be sent to all ALOs.



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 2016, the spring of 2017, and the fall of 2017, and review by the Commission at its January 2017, June 2017, and January 2018 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 2016

(for January 2017 Commission Review)

Allan Hancock College
Antelope Valley College
Chaffey College
City College of San Francisco
Evergreen Valley College
Glendale Community College
MiraCosta College
Monterey Peninsula College
Moorpark College
Oxnard College
San Jose City College
Santa Monica College
Ventura College

SPRING 2017

(for June 2017 Commission Review)

College of Marin
Deep Springs College
El Camino College Compton Center
Irvine Valley College
Merced College
Mt. San Antonio College
Saddleback College
San Diego City College
San Diego Mesa College
San Diego Miramar College
Victor Valley College
West Hills College Coalinga
West Hills College Lemoore

FALL 2017

(for January 2018 Commission Review)

College of the Desert
College of the Redwoods
Columbia College
Cypress College
De Anza College
Foothill College
Fullerton College
Lake Tahoe Community College
Modesto Junior College
Shasta College
Solano Community 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

