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Purpose for Discussion of Working Draft of Revisions

• To examine the proposed revisions to Standards coming out of input and suggestions from across the field.

• To continue sharing the preliminary results of the input compilation with members of the field.

• For discussants to offer input and suggestions as to the compiled draft revisions to Accreditation Standards.
CONTEXT AND CONTENT FOR PROPOSED REVISIONS

- Literature review and presentations by higher education experts
- Input from more than 250 members of the field, including individuals, public hearing participants (March, June, and September 2012), Accreditation Liaison Officers Training, Student Success Conference, and Task Forces: Distance Education, Student Learning Outcomes, Financial Review.

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR STANDARDS REVIEW

1. How can the revised Standards move colleges toward increased emphasis on student outcomes?
2. How can the review and revision improve clarity in the structure of standards and eliminate unnecessary repetition?
3. To what extent and how should the Standards represent the best and current knowledge of effective practices in teaching and learning?
**GUIDING QUESTIONS CONTINUED**

4. To what extent and how should the Standards emphasize institutional transparency in data driven decision-making?

5. Should the Standards require colleges to define performance measures/benchmarks, against which they would assess progress toward student achievement and attainment of successful student outcomes?

6. To what extent and how should the Standards promote institutional integrity?

7. How can the Standards require colleges to pursue equity in learning and achievement among diverse student groups?

8. To what extent and how should the Standards reflect a commitment to the value of core learning/general education within degrees and certificates?

9. How should the Standards reflect compliance with current federal regulations and policy directions?
RECURRING INPUT AND SUGGESTIONS RELATED TO STANDARDS

• The outline format contributes to complexity and redundancy.

• Standards should eliminate narrative for the Sub-Sections, listing only standards statements.

• Standards document should possibly reference Federal law, regulations and policies.

• Standards should be more explicit or directive about expectations for roles, responsibilities, and decision-making of colleges and district/system offices in multi-college districts.

• Standards should emphasize outcomes, resulting in less emphasis on process and more emphasis on accountability.
• Institutional self-evaluation should include student equity, vis-à-vis disaggregation of data.

• Institutional effectiveness should include baseline data, both quantitative and qualitative; there should be comparability across colleges.

• Increase emphasis and scope of general education requirements.

• Ensure expectations and requirements attendant to distance education, use of third party providers, and other educational elements at member institutions are clear; ask how the institution assures the quality of teaching and learning.

• Specify how SLO work should be incorporated into employee evaluations, and list affected constituencies specifically.
• Clarify language to specifically define expectations for a “policy” board, as opposed to a board engaged in operations.

• Improve clarity and add specificity for financial management Standards; increase specificity of expectations for systematic, ongoing assessment of fiscal capacity and processes to meet college mission and goals.

DISCUSSION:
PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE STANDARDS

[PRESS REFER TO THE DRAFT DOCUMENT, WITH HIGHLIGHTED SECTIONS]
Organizational Changes in Standard I

- The Standard now features 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 and new expectations for integrity and honesty in actions, communications, and policies.

Organizational Changes in Standard II

- Standard II has two major sections: Instructional Programs, and Student Support and Library and Learning Resources.
- 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 and Library and Learning Resources defines expectations affecting co-curricular programs and athletics, and it defines expectations for academic advising and student pathways to completion.
Organizational Notes for Standard III


- 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.

Organizational Changes in Standard IV

- The Standard 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 governance.

- The section on Multi-College Districts or Systems defines specific expectations for the functional relationship between a district or system and a college.
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