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Lead-off Batter: Applying New ACCJC Standards

The new ACCJC accreditation standards will roll out in spring 2016. These standards direct colleges to construct a substantive plan that focuses on three to five big picture issues of academic quality and will guide action for the next three to four years. The RP Group has initiated a number of resources for community college professionals to get direct answers to their accreditation questions, including creating a new listserv and accreditation wiki page.

What’s been missing is a sit down, face-to-face discussion with the colleges that are the lead-off batters for the 2016 standards: the nine institutions of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD). At this session, LACCD leaders will share what has worked and what has not in this new process. In addition, we will engage the participants in designing ways to innovate at their own institutions based on what we learn from our LA colleagues.
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First of Many

WEBINARS, TIGERS AND BEARS

Napa → LACCD → San Jose And Evergree → Merced and Others

Fall 2015 → Spring 2016 → Fall 2016 → Spring 2015

http://listserv.cccnext.net/scripts/wa.exe?A0=ACCREDITATION
The New Model and Structure of the Self Evaluation

1. Evidence of Meeting the Standard
2. Analysis and Evaluation
   a. Progress Monitor
   b. Changes Made During and in the Future Based on the Evaluation
   c. Point to the QFE
      - Needed Change
      - Development
      - Expansion
      - Institutionalisation
Sources of Information

Eligibility Requirements

Accjc Materials

Checklist

Policies

Standards
Source of Information on the QFE
Connecting the Dots

Task One:

Take a look at the four primary sources of information on the topic of institutional set standards. Compare and contrast the expectations for each and brainstorm ways to be able to connect the information for completeness and to make the job of the site teams easier.
QFE Not Really New
The concept of quality enhancement is at the heart of the Commission's philosophy of accreditation. Each institution seeking reaffirmation of Accreditation is required to develop a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). Engaging the wider academic community and addressing one or more issues that contribute to institutional improvement, the plan should be focused, succinct, and limited in length. The QEP describes a carefully designed and focused course of action that addresses a well-defined topic or issue(s) related to enhancing student learning.

At the culmination of the QEP, the Commission on Colleges sends an on-site committee of professional peers to the campus to assess the educational strengths and weaknesses of the institution. The written report of the committee helps the institution improve its programs, refine its QEP, and also provides the basis on which the Commission decides to grant, continue, reaffirm, or withdraw accreditation.
The concept of quality enhancement is at the heart of the Commission's philosophy of accreditation. Each institution seeking reaffirmation of Accreditation is required to develop a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). Engaging the wider academic community and addressing one or more issues that contribute to institutional improvement, the plan should be focused, succinct, and limited in length. The QEP describes a carefully designed and focused course of action that addresses a well-defined topic or issue(s) related to enhancing student learning.

At the culmination of the QEP, the Commission on Colleges sends an on-site committee of professional peers to the campus to assess the educational strengths and weaknesses of the institution. The written report of the committee helps the institution improve its programs, refine its QEP, and also provides the basis on which the Commission decides to grant, continue, reaffirm, or withdraw accreditation.

The AQIP Pathway

The Academic Quality Improvement program (AQIP) is one of several pathways leading to reaffirmation of accreditation with the Higher Learning Commission. Others include the Open and Standard Pathways. AQIP differs from the other pathways in that it is premised on principles of continuous quality improvement, and its various processes and requirements are designed to assist institutions in achieving quality improvement, along with reaffirming the institution's accredited status with the Commission once every AQIP cycle. Many institutions have reported transforming their quality cultures since embarking on the AQIP Pathway.

Updates to the AQIP Pathway

The Board of Trustees adopted policy changes related to the AQIP Pathway at its meeting on June 12-13, 2014.

View the new Eight-Year Cycle for the AQIP Pathway.

New: Systems Portfolio Structure and AQIP Categories - This document identifies the revised AQIP Categories (now six in number) and the accompanying revised Systems Portfolio structure. The document includes all action plans and institutional success indicators. The new approach to AQIP is streamlined and engaging.
Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for SMU

Engaged Learning Beyond the Classroom
Executive Summary

Southern Methodist University
Quality Enhancement Plan
February 22, 2011

The focus of the SMU Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is on Engaged Learning experiences beyond or outside of the classroom, locally and globally. All SMU undergraduate students will be encouraged to participate in at least one extensive experiential learning activity prior to graduation.
QFE Tip
Source of Information on the QFE
Understanding the Contents

Compare the language in the Guidebook expectations for the QFE with the language in the Manual itself. Where are the similarities? Where does the language appear to vary? Where would you map words from the Manual language to the expectations from the Guide?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guide Contents</th>
<th>Manual Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the Projects: The projects should be vital to the long-term improvement of student learning and achievement over a multi-year period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired Goals/Outcomes: The QFE should describe specific, well-defined goals expected to lead to observable results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions/Steps to be Implemented: The QFE (or an Appendix to the QFE) should provide the steps to be implemented for each project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline: The QFE (or Appendix) should include a calendaring of all steps to be implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Parties: The QFE should provide clear lines of responsibility for implementation and sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources: The QFE should include a realistic plan for the resources (human, physical, technology, or financial resources) the institution will need in order to implement and sustain the projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment: The QFE should include the institution’s plan for evaluating the outcomes and effectiveness of the projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The New Model and Structure of the Self Evaluation

1. Evidence of Meeting the Standard
2. Analysis and Evaluation
   a. Progress Monitor
   b. Changes Made During and in the Future Based on the Evaluation
   c. Point to the QFE
      - Needed Change
      - Development
      - Expansion
      - Institutionalization
Changes and Plans Arising out of the Self Evaluation Process
During the process of self evaluation, institutions commonly find areas where institutional effectiveness can be improved or changes are needed in order to meet the Commission’s Standards. Both the changes made during the self evaluation process and plans for future action should be included in the institution’s Self Evaluation Report. The plans should also be integrated into the institution’s ongoing evaluation and planning processes for implementation and follow up. The institution should include changes it has made in response to its self evaluation, and of future actions planned. These changes and planned changes demonstrate the necessary linkages between the self evaluation process and institutional planning, decision making, resource allocation, and continuous improvement. The changes made and plans for future action should be placed in the Self Evaluation Report following the relevant grouping of standards (for example, I.A, I.B, I.C, II.A, etc.). The discussion should include any timelines for implementation and expected outcomes. It is suggested that the institution develop a chart summarizing changes made in response to its self evaluation process and future actions planned for ease of institutional tracking and monitoring.
Review of the Essay

From the Guide...

The comprehensive evaluation team and the Commission will review and provide constructive feedback on the QFE, with the goal of supporting institutional efforts to enhance student learning and achievement. At the Midterm, the institution will provide a progress report or, if the projects are completed, a final report on the outcomes of the projects.

From the Manual...

excellence. The areas identified in the Essay will become critical focal points for the institution’s Midterm Report. Evaluation teams and the Commission will comment on the institution’s QFE and may offer constructive advice or assistance.
IB1. The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

- Dialogue about *learning outcomes* (institutional, program and course) takes place at all college levels through regularly scheduled college committees, college-wide gatherings, and leadership and department/program meetings. Curricular maps and assessment plans are completed every three years. The previous curricular map cycle was from Fall 2011 to Spring 2013, and the current cycle is from Fall 2013 to Spring 2016 (IB1-1: Baking Curricular map). Through the curricular map process, every three years all faculty within programs dialogue about whether or not their established learning outcomes (program and course) are reasonable and appropriate and make plans for corrections as needed (IB1-2: Curricular map Program dialogue, FD). An example of the results from this dialogue from the Fashion Design program - the faculty all agreed that changes in instructional methods and scheduling were needed. Throughout the assessment cycle not only program faculty involve in dialogue, but also disciplines/departments meet and dialogue about assessment results, identify gaps/areas for improvement, provide recommendations for changes and identify resources needed to implement these changes (IB1-4: Discipline Dialogue-FD).

- Furthermore, dialogue about student outcome data is an important component of the program review and prioritization processes. During program review, programs are required to dialogue about program outcome data, determine its implications, and make plans for program improvements as needed. During the prioritization process, scores in the demonstrated need section are based on the quality of program responses as they relate to outcome data and analysis (IB1-5 PR1415-PRI1314 rubrics).

- Dialogue about *student equity* matters and plans starts at the student success committee meetings (IB1-6- StudSucComte-050114-Minutes). Feedback about closing achievement gaps among disaggregated groups and strategies on how the college can help to improve success rates is received from the different governance structures (IB-Committee structures), task forces, and/or during campus wide gatherings (IB1-7-DoD evidence 091814). This work can be exemplified by the number of meetings and participants in the development of the Student Equity Plan. Beginning in Spring of 2014 the Office of Institutional Effectiveness prepared campus research equity report and presented it at several Student Success and other committee meetings with the intent of brainstorming, sharing ideas and gathering feedback from different groups pertaining to: how to better read and understand equity gap data, further disaggregation needs and requirements, and to collect feedback on how to present data in a clear way. Data was also presented and feedback was received at other different types of college wide gatherings, such as Convocations (Staff and Faculty). Throughout the fall semester, Student Success Workgroup sessions were scheduled every Wednesday to dig deeper into the individual indicators. The expected outcome from the meetings was to help draft goals and action plans to address the equity gaps as well as to ensure alignment with the strategic priorities of the College. These sessions were widely attended by students, faculty and staff and feedback was incorporated into the final draft of the plan (IB1-8 Student success).
IB1. The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.
IB1. Dialogue About

Student Outcomes
Discuss: Learning and Achievement
Show: Sustained, Substantive and Collegial

Student Equity
Discuss: Learning and Achievement
Show: Sustained, Substantive and Collegial

Academic Quality
Discuss: Learning and Achievement
Show: Sustained, Substantive and Collegial

Institutional Effectiveness
Discuss: Learning and Achievement
Show: Sustained, Substantive and Collegial
IBI. The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement in student learning and achievement.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard

Learning Outcomes

- Dialogue about learning outcomes (institutional, program and course) takes place at all college levels through regularly scheduled college committee, college-wide gatherings, and leadership and department/program meetings. Curricular maps and assessment plans are completed every three years. The previous curricular map cycle was from Fall 2011 to Spring 2013, and the current cycle is from Fall 2015 to Spring 2018 (IBI-1-Drawing Curricular map).

- Through the curricular map process, every three years all faculty within programs dialogue about whether or not the established learning outcomes (program and course) are measurable and appropriate and make plans for corrections as needed (IBI-1-Curricular map Program dialogue FD). An example of the results from this dialogue is the Future Design program - the faculty all agreed that changes in instructional methods and scheduling were needed. Throughout the assessment cycle not only programs faculty involve in dialogue, but also discipline departments meet and dialogue about assessment results, identify gaps areas for improvement, provide recommendations for changes and identify resources needed to implement these changes (IBI-4-Discipline Dialogue FD).

- Furthermore, dialogue about student outcomes data is an important component of the program review and prioritization processes. During program reviews, programs are required to dialogue about program outcomes data, determine its implications, and make plans for program improvements as needed. During the prioritization process, scores at the demonstrated need section are based on the quality of program responses as they relate to outcomes data and analysis (IBI-3 PR1415-PR1514 outcomes).

Student Equity

- Dialogue about student equity matters and plans start at the student success committee meetings (IBI-6: StudentCom mtg-0514-14-Maine). Feedback about closing achievement gaps among disadvantaged groups and strategies on how the college can help to improve success rates is received from the different governance structures (IBI-Committee structures), task forces, and during campus-wide gatherings (IBI-1-Div) evidence 061414. This work can be exemplified by the number of meetings and participants in the development of the Student Equity Plan. Beginning in Spring of 2014 the Office of Institutional Effectiveness prepared campus research equity report and presented it at several Student Success and other committee meetings with the intent of brainstorming, sharing ideas and gathering feedback from different groups pertaining to: how to better read and understand equity gap data, further disaggregation needs and requirements, and to collect feedback on how to present data in a clear way. Data was also presented and feedback was received at other different types of college-wide gatherings, such as Conferences (Staff and Faculty). Throughout the Fall semester, Student Success Workgroup sessions were scheduled every Wednesday to dig deeper into the individual indicators. The expected outcome from the meetings was to help draft goals and action plans to address the equity gaps as well as to assure alignment with the strategic priorities of the College. These sessions were widely attended by students, faculty, and staff and feedback was incorporated into the final draft of the plan (IBI-1-student success website).

- One of the 2014-15 Student success committee goals is to Complete and monitor progress of SSSP and Student Equity Plans (IBI-4-StaffCom Minutes 07/10/15).
data in a clear way. Data was also presented and feedback was received at other different types of college-wide gatherings, such as Conversations (Staff and Faculty). Throughout the Fall semester, Student Success Workgroup sessions were scheduled every Wednesday to dig deeper into the individual indicators. The expected outcome from the meetings was to help draft goals and action plans to address the equity gaps as well as to ensure alignment with the strategic priorities of the College. These sessions were widely attended by students, faculty and staff and feedback was incorporated into the final draft of the plan (B1-10 Student Success website). One of the 2014-15 Student success committee goals is to Complete and monitor progress of SSSP and Student Equity Plans (B1-9 StudentCom-Minnesota-030715).

Academic Quality

- Dialogue about the overall level of academic quality takes place in the context of how well the college meets its mission and is measured through accomplishment of the Institution standards and approved through the shared governance process. Discussion and approval of the Institution's standards was comprised by the following actions: Accreditation Steering Committee (B1-2 ASC-3-11-13 Minutes), Academic Senate (B1-3 Academic Senate 3-13-2013), B1-4 AS-Minutes-040015, B1-5 AS-Minutes-051414, B1-6 AS-Minutes-022014, Academic Council (B1-7 Acad-Council-3-14-13-Minutes), College Council (B1-8 College-Council-Minutes-011113), B1-9 College Council, 011513, Educational Policies Committee (B1-10 Ed-Policies-Minutes-3-19-13), B1-11 Ed-Policies-Minutes-041613), Student Success Committee (B1-12 Student Success Minutes 022115), Academic quality and institutional effectiveness matters are also discussed throughout the various shared governance meetings, college-wide gatherings (B1-10 - DoD Newsletter 11/2014) and Districtwide College presentations (B1-11 - Bart Effectiveness Report).

Academic Quality for Online Education has been a major topic of discussion at the Ed Policies committee that has been having rich conversations about comparisons between student success rates of regular vs online courses - major dialogue has taken place to develop standards threshold in identifying courses with low success rates and percentages on how to deal with the low success rates (B1-17 Ed Policies minutes 052014, 091614, 102114, 111114). This committee has also put forth Syllabus enhancements and PD activities around the syllabus (B1-18 ED Policies minutes 271113). To improve Academic quality, the student success committee has also discussed about strategies to help improve math and English student progressions (B1-12 Student success agenda 061015, 090115).

Institutional Effectiveness

- Conspicuous of the need for increased dialogue to improve institutional effectiveness - since 2011 the college institutionalized the third Thursday of the month to hold "Days of Dialogue (DoD)" as needed. As part of that process, from September of 2012 to May of 2014, the college engaged in a pilot to identify and dwell down on cultural issues. Participants identified seven main issues: Communication, undefined roles processes, lack of collaboration, participation, the inclusion as key decisions, lack of respect/fair, lack of resources to accomplish goals. Several DoD sessions were set aside to dialogue about these issues and identify strategies to address them. After the seven issues were completely discussed, a post survey conducted in May 2014 revealed that this approach helped to improve as six of them. From the inception of DoD in 2013 until today, a total of 20 days of dialogue have taken place covering various topics including, but not limited to: Accreditation, Student Success, Institution-set standards, Budget and Facilities Master planning and cultural issues to name a few. A total of 1850 students, faculty and staff have participated in all the sessions. Either President Frank and/or the Vice President and attend and lead all of them (B1-33 DoD accompany). Days of dialogue were proposed in the summer of 2013, when the College launched an Accreditation Summer Campaign where
IBI. The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.

LATTC engages in ongoing and self-reflective dialogue to explore complex issues about learning and achievement to build collective understanding, strengthen teams and stimulate innovation to foster positive change.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Dialogue about student learning occurs in instruction at the course, program and institutional levels as well as in student services programs and services, and in the administrative service units.

Learning Outcomes

- Dialogue about learning outcomes (institutional, program and course) takes place at all college levels through regularly scheduled college committees, college-wide gatherings, and leadership and department/program meetings. Curricular maps and assessment plans are completed every three years. The previous curricular map cycle was from Fall 2011 to Spring 2013, and the current cycle is from Fall 2013 to Spring 2016 (IBI-1-Building Curricular map). Through the curricular map process, every three years all faculty within programs dialogue about whether or not their established learning outcomes (program and course) are reasonable and appropriate and make plans for corrections as needed (IBI-2-Curricular map Program dialogue-FD). An example of the results from this dialogue from the Fashion Design program - the faculty all agreed that changes in instructional methods and scheduling were needed. Throughout the assessment cycle not only program faculty involve in dialogue but also discipline/divisions meet and dialogue about assessment results, identify gaps/areas for improvement, provide recommendations for changes and identify resources needed to implement these changes (IBI-4-Discipline Dialogue-FD).

- Furthermore, dialogue about student outcome data is an important component of the program review and prioritization processes. During program review, programs are required to dialogue about program outcome data, determine its implications, and make plans for program improvements as needed. During the prioritization process, scores in the demonstrated need section are based on the quality of program responses as they relate to outcome data and analysis (IBI-5 PR1415-PR1514 rubrics).

Student Equity

Dialogue about ensuring equitable outcomes in student success and learning for all students, including historically underrepresented groups is a core activity of LATTC to meet its institutional mission.

- Dialogue about student equity matters and plans start at the student success committee meetings (IBI-6-StdSuccComte-50114-Minutes). Feedback about closing achievement gaps among disaggregated groups and strategies on how the college can help to improve success rates is received from the different governance structures (IB-Committee structures).
IB1. The institution demonstrates a sustained, substantive and collegial dialogue about student outcomes, student equity, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, and continuous improvement of student learning and achievement.

LATTC engages in ongoing and self-reflective dialogue to explore complex issues about learning and achievement to build collective understanding, strengthen teams and stimulate innovation to foster positive change.

Evidence of Meeting the Standard:

Dialogue about student learning occurs in instruction at the course, program and institutional levels as well as in student services programs and services, and in the administrative service units.

Learning Outcomes

- Dialogue about learning outcomes (institutional, program and course) takes place at all college levels through regularly scheduled college committees, college wide gatherings, and leadership and department program meetings. Curricular maps and assessment plans are completed every three years. (IB1-1-Baking Curricular map)

- Through the curricular map process, every three years all faculty within programs dialogue about whether or not their established learning outcomes (program and course) are reasonable and appropriate and make plans for corrections as needed (IB1-2-Curricular map/Program dialogue_ED).

- Throughout the assessment cycle not only program faculty involve in dialogue, but also disciplines departments meet and dialogue about assessment results, identify gaps/areas for improvement, provide recommendations for changes and identify resources needed to implement these changes (IB1-4-Discipline Dialogue_ED).

- Furthermore, dialogue about student outcome data is an important component of the program review and prioritization processes. During program review, programs are required to dialogue about program outcome data, determine its implications, and make plans for program improvements as needed. During the prioritization process, scores in the demonstrated need section are based on the quality of program outcomes as they relate to outcome data and analysis (IB1-5_PR1415-PR1314 rubrics).

Student Equity

Dialogue about ensuring equitable outcomes in student success and learning for all students, including historically underrepresented groups, is a core activity of LATTC to meet its