

ACCJC NEWS

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES, Western Association of Schools and Colleges Spring/Summer 2015

ACCREDITATION: NEW STANDARDS, NEW PRACTICES

IN NOVEMBER 2011, THE ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR COMMUNITY and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) began a formal process for evaluating its Accreditation Standards and practices, and sought input from colleges, constituency groups and the public. Hundreds of individuals contributed their thoughts to the changes they wanted to see in Standards and practices in writing, online, and at several public hearings and constituency group meetings that ACCJC held.

The input asked for the following changes:

- ❖ Eliminate redundancies in the Standards and simplify them where possible
- ❖ Provide a longer accreditation cycle
- ❖ Better balance between the examination of compliance with Standards and support for institutional quality and improvement
- ❖ Give institutions more time to make needed changes after a finding of noncompliance
- ❖ Provide more training on accreditation practices and requirements, and more sharing of good practices in the region

Colleges asked the Commission to *reduce redundancies in and to simplify the Standards where possible.*

In June 2014, the Commission adopted revised Accreditation Standards and Eligibility Requirements that simplified and clarified the Standards, and reduced redundancies between Standards where possible. There are now 30% fewer Standards. The ACCJC also linked Eligibility Requirements to specific standards so that a self evaluation report submitted for reaffirmation of accreditation will be shorter and simpler.

Since then, ACCJC has adopted additional new practices and policies that will complete its response to the input received.

New Practices

Colleges requested a *longer accreditation cycle.* The Commission responded. When colleges are reviewed under the 2014 Accreditation Standards, their comprehensive evaluation cycle will be moved from six to seven years. Colleges will be asked to submit the Midterm Report at the middle of the cycle, in year four.

Colleges have asked ACCJC to *better balance the examination of compliance with standards with greater support for institutional quality and improvement.* ACCJC will be doing this in a number of ways.

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. 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

MS. ALEXANDRA SPRING, Project Manager

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 Institutional Self Evaluation Report prepared at the time of a comprehensive review will change to include a Quality Focus Essay that stems from issues identified in the institutional self evaluation. The Essay will be a description of two or three projects that an institution wishes to work on over a few years and that are designed to improve student outcomes and success. The external evaluation team and the Commission will provide feedback on the proposed projects. Intended to be a “space” for experimentation and innovation, the projects should help the institution move its self-identified agenda for improvement forward. Colleges will be asked to report on their progress or outcomes at the time of their Midterm Report, and this will comprise a significant part of the Report. The Commission will also share, or ask institutions to share, project successes through the ACCJC NEWS and at the new ACCJC annual conference (more on that below).

The Midterm Report will change significantly to focus on institutional quality and improvement, and to provide a data foundation for the next comprehensive evaluation visit. In addition to a report on the projects the institution identified in its Quality Focus Essay, ACCJC will ask institutions to report longitudinal data on students and student outcomes for the four years prior to the Midterm Report (this data is the same asked for in ACCJC annual reports). Colleges will be asked to write about their analysis and interpretation of those data trends, and their implications for college practice. These same data, analyzed for seven years, will form the foundation for data presentations in the next comprehensive Institutional Self Evaluation Report. Commission feedback on the Midterm Report will be designed to support institutional inquiry and self-improvement. ACCJC will provide templates and instructions for this annual report data, and institutions will be encouraged to add data elements that support their work on the quality improvement projects as well.

Colleges asked ACCJC to *provide more time for institutions to work to correct deficiencies before the next evaluation visit.*

Continuing a change made in 2014, ACCJC evaluation team reports and action letters will separate team recommendations to meet the Standards from those to help the institution improve. Team evaluation reports will state more simply whether Standards are met or not. Institutions will be required to come into compliance with all Standards before the Midterm Report in year four, and may continue working on recommendations to improve throughout the seven-year cycle.

In June 2014, the Commission adopted new language for its “Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions”, which now uses definitions of the meaning of sanctions – Warning, Probation, Show Cause, and Withdrawal of Accreditation – common to all regional accrediting commissions. In that same policy, the Commission also added a new action, “reaffirmation for one year”, which gives the Commission the option of awarding a limited term for accreditation, in lieu of issuing a Sanction, while an institution corrects deficiencies.

Colleges asked ACCJC to *provide more training for colleges on the requirements of accreditation, and the process of preparing for accreditation visits.* ACCJC has made several changes to respond to this request:

- ♦ ACCJC held a region-wide Symposium on the new Standards and practices in April 2015. The Symposium was sold out. Given the strong interest, ACCJC will hold additional, smaller trainings in the 2015-16 academic year at some of the other professional conferences being held in the region.
- ♦ ACCJC held its first CEO Forum providing for CEO dialog with the Commission’s leadership and among CEOs about ideas and concerns about accreditation. The Forum will become an annual event.
- ♦ ACCJC established the CEOForum@accjc.org email address through which the ACCJC and CEOs can readily correspond about accreditation issues.
- ♦ ACCJC has committed to holding an annual conference giving member institutions opportunity to exchange information about good practices and to support a broader opportunity for college members and all of their constituencies to learn about accreditation.

The first annual conference is planned for October 2016, and an Advisory Task Force is already providing guidance on content. Planned sessions include:

- ❖ “Developing an Effective Self Evaluation Report” for institutions one year out from a comprehensive evaluation visit.
- ❖ “What Happens After the Evaluation Visit” session for institutions to share strategies they have used to move institutions forward.
- ❖ “Introduction to Team Training” workshop that will be available to prospective team members *and open to all others wishing to learn about how teams operate.*
- ❖ Plenary speakers on higher education quality.
- ❖ Discussion panels and presentations sharing institutional practices that lead to quality and student success.
- ❖ Sessions and conference tracks for constituency groups and groups such as trustees, persons new to accreditation practices, and institutions seeking assistance after an evaluation visit.

The ACCJC practices its philosophy of continuous quality improvement. It continues to welcome the suggestions of member institutions and constituency groups for improvements to accreditation practice. Quality assurance is the shared responsibility of institutions and the accreditor. ACCJC hopes through its own practices to support improved higher education practice in the Western Region, and is committed to working with member institutions in their ongoing work to improve student success. ♦



The ACCJC would like to thank the following individuals who are serving on the ACCJC *ad hoc* Annual Conference Advisory Committee:

Mr. John Zimmerman, President, MTI College, Committee Chair & ACCJC Commissioner
Ms. Susan Kazama, Faculty, Kapiolani Community College, & ACCJC Commission Vice Chair

Dr. Eva Bagg, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, Long Beach City College

Dr. Helen Benjamin, Chancellor, Contra Costa CCD

Mrs. Sally Biggin, Trustee, Redwoods CCD

Mr. Stephen P. Blum, Esq., Trustee, Ventura County CCD

Dr. Danika Bowen, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, Carrington College

Dr. Kathleen Burke, President, Los Angeles Pierce College

Dr. Joe Daisy, President, College of Micronesia FSM

Dr. Brian King, Chancellor, Los Rios CCD

Dr. Cindy Miles, Chancellor, Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD

Dr. David Morse, Faculty, Academic Senate (Long Beach City College)

Dr. Bill Scroggins, Superintendent/President, Mt. San Antonio CCD

Dr. Ray Somera, Vice President of Instruction, Guam Community College

Dr. Arvid Spor, Vice President of Student Services, Citrus College

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 that were 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 was happy to report a significant reduction to 16 colleges on sanction. As of June 2015, only 12 colleges remain on sanction!

Five-Year Trend - Colleges on Sanction January 2011 - June 2015 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
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)
2015 Sanctions (N=12)	58.3% (7)	75% (9)	41.7% (5)	75% * (9)	50% * (6)	83.33% (10)	66.66% (8)

** 1 district with difficulties has affected the status of 4 colleges*

- ❖ 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 12 institutions in 2015.
- ❖ There has been a significant drop in districts that have difficulty with governing board roles and responsibilities that led to sanction, now down to 6 districts/colleges.
- ❖ For the 12 colleges on sanction, it remains a challenge to regularly perform data driven program review, and a challenge to use data on educational quality to drive planning and improvement.
- ❖ A large percentage of the institutions on sanction have not implemented the ACCJC's Standards on student learning outcomes.
- ❖ The number of institutions with difficulties in fiscal management is down to 6 (3 districts). ♦

January 2015 Commission Actions on Institutions

At its January 7-9, 2015 meeting, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, took the following institutional actions:

CONTINUED THE ACCREDITED STATUS

Antelope Valley College
Cañada College
Cerro Coso Community College
College of San Mateo
College of the Redwoods
Columbia College
Cuyamaca College
DeAnza College
Defense Language Institute
Foothill College
Fresno City College
Grossmont College
Hawai'i Community College
Honolulu Community College
Kapi'olani Community College
Kauai Community College
Lake Tahoe Community College
Leeward Community College
Modesto Junior College
Mt. San Jacinto College
MTI College
Porterville Community College
Reedley College
Shasta College
Skyline Community College
Solano Community College
Windward Community College

REAFFIRMED ACCREDITATION

College of the Canyons
Cuesta College
Contra Costa College
Diablo Valley College
El Camino College
Long Beach City College
Los Medanos College
Rio Hondo College
Santa Ana College
Santiago Canyon College

REMOVED FROM WARNING AND REAFFIRMED ACCREDITATION

College of the Sequoias
Sierra College
Woodland Community College
Yuba College

PLACED ON RESTORATION STATUS

City College of San Francisco

ISSUED WARNING

Crafton Hills College
Salvation Army College for Officer
Training at Crestmont
San Bernardino Valley College

ORDERED SHOW CAUSE

American Samoa Community College

For a more detailed report please visit:

http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Commission_Actions_on_Institutions_January_7_9_2015.pdf

June 2015 Commission Actions on Institutions

At its June 3-5, 2015 meeting, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, took the following institutional actions:

REAFFIRMED ACCREDITATION

Butte College
Palomar College
Santa Rosa Junior College

GRANTED INITIAL ACCREDITATION

Clovis Community College Center

CONTINUED THE ACCREDITED STATUS

Barstow College
Coastline Community College
College of the Siskiyous
Defense Language Institute
Feather River College
Gavilan College
Guam Community College
Hawai'i Tokai International College
Lassen Community College
Los Angeles Harbor College
Los Angeles Mission College
Los Angeles Southwest College
Mendocino College
Ohlone College
Orange Coast College
San Joaquin Delta College
West Los Angeles College

REMOVED FROM WARNING AND REAFFIRMED ACCREDITATION

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

REMOVED FROM PROBATION

Evergreen Valley College
San Jose City College
Victor Valley College

REMOVED FROM PROBATION AND ISSUED WARNING

Mission College
Palo Verde College

ISSUED WARNING

Berkeley City College
Laney College

IMPOSED PROBATION

College of Alameda
Merritt College
Pasadena City College

For a more detailed report please visit:

http://www.accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Commission_Actions_on_Institutions_June_3_5_2015.pdf

2015 Commission Actions on Policies

At its January 7-9 and June 3-5, 2015 meetings, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, took the following actions on policies:

ADOPTED ORGANIZATIONAL POLICIES AND DOCUMENTS:

- ❖ Policy on Access to Commission Meetings (January 2015)
- ❖ ACCJC Bylaws - Report on Action Taken (January and June 2015)

ADOPTED INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES:

The following policies were approved for first reading in at the January 7-9, 2015 Commission meeting. These policies were then sent to the field and made public on the ACCJC website for opportunity for input. At its June 3-5, 2015 meeting, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, took action to adopt these policies:

- ❖ Policy on Eligibility to Apply for Accredited Status
- ❖ Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions
- ❖ Policy on Commission Good Practice in Relations with Member Institutions
- ❖ Policy on Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems
- ❖ Policy on Closing an Institution
- ❖ Policy on Substantive Change

POLICY APPROVED FOR FIRST READING:

Additionally, at its June 3-5, 2015 meeting, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, approved the following policy for first reading:

- ❖ **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.

Please note: The Commission invites comment on the first reading policy through August 31, 2015, 5:00 p.m. Pacific Time.

There is no special form for comments on policy. Comments may be made in written form and mailed, FAXed, or emailed to one of the following addresses:

- ❖ Email: kjohns@accjc.org
- ❖ FAX: 415-506-0238
- ❖ Mail: ACCJC, ATTN: Krista Johns, 10 Commercial Blvd. Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949

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. ♦

Spring 2015 Eligibility Applications Approved

At its March 18, 2015 meeting, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, approved the following Eligibility Application:

GRANTED ELIGIBILITY

El Camino College Compton Community Education Center



“Why Become Involved in Evaluation Team Work?”

External evaluation by professional peers is an essential component of the regional accreditation process. The external evaluation team, comprised of volunteers, visits the institution, examines the institutional self evaluation, examines institutional practices, and writes an evaluative report with recommendations both for meeting standards and for improving institutional practices. Quality institutional review could not be done without the thoughtful participation of the volunteer evaluators.

Evaluation teams are comprised of eight to 12 volunteer education professionals from member institutions who are trained by the Commission staff to employ the Accreditation Standards of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) in evaluating institutional practices. They are administrators, faculty, and other experts, sometimes including trustees of two-year colleges. The Commission selects evaluation team members on the basis of their professional expertise and specializations, their experience with accreditation at their own campuses, and their ability to apply the Accreditation Standards fairly and consistently.

Team service begins with all first-time evaluators completing the Accreditation Basics Course online. In this course, team members learn about the uniqueness of the peer-based review process in the United States and the organization, function, and use of peer-based evaluation based on the Standards set forth by the ACCJC.

About one month before the visit, teams gather to participate in the required Team Training Workshop where they meet other members of their evaluation team. The workshop provides the team with a deeper understanding of the accreditation process and the roles of the team evaluators and the team chair. Following the visit, team members are asked to review the External Evaluation Team Report and return it to the team chair with suggested revisions in a matter of a few days. The visit may only last 3 ½ days, but it is intense, with examination of additional evidence, interviews with college staff and students, team meetings to triangulate team discoveries and judgments, and the preparation of sections of the written report.

Why Become an Evaluator, continued on page 10

Although serving as an evaluation team member involves committing to a great deal of work, before, during, and after the visit itself, there are many benefits to serving as an evaluator. Participants at a recent Team Training Workshop provided some interesting answers to the question “Why did you become involved in the peer evaluation process?” **Here are some of their responses:**

“I became involved so that I could learn best practices in the region in order to make my own college serve students better.”

“It’s a lot of work, but it’s rewarding. I always come back walking a bit taller and very proud to be part of this organization.”

“I became involved because I believe in the value of the peer-review process and wanted to lend my experience and knowledge to the process.”

“Serving as an evaluator will introduce me to new colleges and will expose me to the good work being done throughout the region. I hope that the experience will benefit me and my own institution.”

“It’s a wonderful experience. Peer evaluation binds us all together, helps us all improve, and underscores our collective mission.”

“I became involved to develop, as a trustee, a deeper understanding of academic quality. I hope to bring information back to my fellow trustees that will strengthen our roles and focus on our responsibility to ensure we are operating with integrity and delivering high quality academic programs.”

“I started working on accreditation at my own campus and found the chance to step out of my everyday work to get a big picture view of what we are doing very rewarding. I eventually became the Accreditation Liaison Officer.”

“The most important thing I have gained from this experience (team service) is perspective. Perspective as it relates to what other schools are doing well, where they are falling short and struggling with issues similar to those at my own institution, and the Commission’s expectations of member institutions. I learn a tremendous amount from each visit, and each visit restores my faith in the system.”

“As a young educator in our system, serving on an accreditation team was pivotal. It crafted my understanding of the larger issues our colleges face, especially the interconnectedness of all our local processes and committees.”

“I am a new ALO, and serving on an evaluation team will be valuable in helping me understand the process. I recognize and value the importance of accreditation in assuring quality in education.”

“I have had the opportunity to serve on a team to a proprietary college and found it to be an eye-opening experience. The work that college did on placement testing was real and deep.”

“Service on an external evaluation team represents an important service I, as a professional in higher education, should be providing. It also provides me with the opportunity to see how other colleges operate and helps me to contribute more to my own institution’s accreditation process.” ♦



Accreditation Asks for a Focus beyond Compliance to Quality Improvement

One of the purposes of accreditation, in addition to quality assurance to the public, has always been encouraging institutional improvement. This can be seen throughout Eligibility Requirements and Accreditation Standards. For example, Standard I.B.3 and Eligibility Requirement 11 require institutions to establish institution-set standards for student achievement and assess how well they are achieving them “in pursuit of continuous improvement...” Standard I.B.6 requires institutions to disaggregate and analyze learning outcomes and achievement data for subpopulations of students, and when they identify performance gaps, “implement strategies...to mitigate those gaps and evaluate the efficacy of those strategies.” Standard I.B.9 and Eligibility Requirement 19 expect institutions to create “a comprehensive process that leads to accomplishment of the mission and improvement of institutional effectiveness and academic quality. [The Accreditation Standards adopted in June 2014 are available on the ACCJC website.]

Improvements Coming out of the Self Evaluation Process

When an institution undertakes self-evaluation for accreditation, it may identify policies, procedures, or practices in need of change or student outcomes it wishes to improve. An institution may make some changes or improvements immediately, before an evaluation team arrives. Other changes and strategies for improving outcomes will require a longer time to accomplish. These changes and strategies should be identified as the institution’s plans for improvement (action plans), and should be integrated into the ongoing planning and decision-making processes at the college, with timelines for completion. In addition, the immediate improvements undertaken can be included in the Self Evaluation Report as examples of improvements arising out of the self-evaluation process. The additional changes/improvements that are planned should be included in the Report as “Actionable Improvement Plans.” Finally, at the time of the institution’s next comprehensive self-evaluation (in 6 or 7 years), the identified changes/-improvements that were integrated into the college planning processes should be included in the Self Evaluation Report as examples of improvement coming from self-evaluation.

Institution-Identified Projects to Improve Student Learning and Student Achievement

Using the format of a Quality Focus Essay (QFE), an institution will identify two or three “action projects” for further study and action that have good potential for improving student outcomes. The projects should be related to Accreditation Standards, emerge from the institution’s examination of its own effectiveness in accomplishing its mission in the context of student learning and student achievement, be based on the institution’s analysis of data collected, and identify areas of needed change, development, and improvement. The QFE, with a 5,000 word limit, describes the projects in detail to include the following components:



Identification of the Projects: The projects should be vital to the long-term improvement of student learning and achievement over a multi-year period;

Desired Goals/Outcomes: The QFE should describe specific, well-defined goals expected to lead to observable results;

Actions/Steps to be Implemented: The QFE (or an Appendix to the QFE) should provide the steps to be implemented for each project;

Timeline: The QFE (or Appendix) should include a calendar of all steps to be implemented;

Accreditation Asks for a Focus beyond Compliance, continued on page 12

Responsible Parties: The QFE should provide clear lines of responsibility for implementation and sustainability;

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;

Assessment: The QFE should include the institution's plan for evaluating the outcomes and effectiveness of the projects.

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 Mid-term, the institution will provide a progress report or, if the projects are completed, a final report on the outcomes of the projects.

Trend Analysis of Student Learning and Student Achievement Data

In addition to the report on the QFE, there will be a second component to the Midterm Reports, due in the fourth year following the comprehensive review. An institution will be asked to complete a trend analysis of data it has submitted annually to ACCJC in Annual Reports related to student learning and student achievement. ACCJC will provide templates for this data, but an institution will be encouraged to also include in its analyses other data that are of interest to the institution for purposes of examining achievement of its mission. The institution will also provide information about how the data analyses inform efforts to improve institutional effectiveness and student outcomes. ♦



Test Your Knowledge About the Two-Year Rule

True/False

1. The Two-Year Rule comes from the Higher Education Act and from federal regulations.
2. The Two-Year Rule is about the timeline for accreditors to enforce compliance with accreditation standards, by withdrawing (terminating) the accreditation of a college that is out of compliance with any standard.
3. The Two-Year Rule governs timelines in all cases involving involuntary withdrawal (termination) of a college's accreditation.
4. The Two-Year Rule ensures that a college is provided two years to achieve compliance with standards once it is placed on Show Cause.
5. In a Two-Year Rule situation, if a college can show the need, or demonstrate sufficient reasons, then it qualifies for an additional two years to achieve compliance with standards through a Good Cause Extension.

Turn upside down for answers below.

Answers

1. True. The Two-Year Rule comes from federal regulation 34 C.F.R. § 602.20 which is authorized in 20 U.S.C. § 1099(o).
2. True. The regulation applies any time the accreditor's review of an institution under any standard indicates that the institution is not in compliance with that standard.
3. False. The regulation applies to the enforcement of accreditation standards. Withdrawals of accreditation for nonpayment of dues or other administrative actions do not fall within this regulation.
4. False. The regulation requires that an accreditor initiate immediate action to withdraw the accreditation of an institution found out of compliance with any standard. However, the regulation does allow an accreditor to provide a period of time not to exceed two years to come into compliance with the accreditation standards.
5. False. If the institution does not bring itself into compliance within the specified time, then the accreditor must take immediate action to withdraw the college's accreditation, unless an extension is granted by the accreditor for good cause. Institutions do not have the right to a good cause extension; it is a discretionary option of the accreditor, granted only in limited situations. An extension is considered when: the college demonstrates it has accomplished all it could accomplish since first notification of the noncompliance but that specific intervening circumstances have prevented achieving full compliance; there are no remaining deficiencies which have a substantial negative impact on educational quality or institutional integrity; and the remaining deficiencies can be fully resolved within a specified period of time of no longer than two years.

ACCJC NEWS/UPDATES

ACCREDITATION STANDARDS SYMPOSIUM



We were pleased to have 260 participants at the sold-out ACCJC Accreditation Standards Symposium in San Diego, California, April 23-24, 2015. The Symposium featured a CEO Forum and ALO Workshop on Thursday afternoon, and an introduction to the new 2014 Accreditation Standards on Friday. Thank you to all who attended and for your great questions and discussion. Presentation slides and other materials from the Symposium are posted on the ACCJC website under Other Resources. Questions from the audience are being answered in writing. As Q&A segments are completed, they will go online as well.



TIMELINE FOR THE 2014 ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

The revised 2014 Accreditation Standards and Eligibility Requirements (ERs) will be the basis for comprehensive institutional evaluations for reaffirmation of accreditation beginning spring 2016. For all other purposes, the 2014 Accreditation Standards and ERs took effect upon their 2014 adoption. For example, colleges submitting Substantive Change Proposals for baccalaureate degrees will write to the new Standards as they address that level of degree.



SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE REVIEW SUBMISSION AND FEES

For colleges preparing Substantive Change Proposals, please remember that the final proposal, accompanied by the required fees, must be submitted 30 days prior to the scheduled meeting date. The dates for the next academic year are November 4, 2015, February 29 and May 3, 2016. The Fee Schedule can be found on the ACCJC website at www.accjc.org under the Substantive Change horizontal bar.

FROM THE FIELD

Every year, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) honors institutions that demonstrate outstanding institutional practice. The 2015 Effective Institutional Practice in Student Learning Outcomes: CHEA Award recipients are Boston Architectural College and James Madison University. Information about the award and its past and present recipients is available at http://www.chea.org/chea%20award/CHEA_Awards_All.html. ACCJC invites you to read about these institutions as a source of inspiration and best practice. ♦



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 2015, the spring of 2016, and the fall of 2016, and review by the Commission at its January 2016, June 2016, and January 2017 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 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

* Piloting the 2014 Standards

SPRING 2016 *

(for June 2016 Commission Review)

College of Micronesia-FSM
College of the Siskiyous
East Los Angeles College
Los Angeles City College
Los Angeles Harbor College
Los Angeles Mission College
Los Angeles Pierce College
Los Angeles Southwest College
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
Los Angeles Valley College
Palau Community College
West Los Angeles College

* Using the 2014 Standards

FALL 2016 *

(for January 2017 Commission Review)

Allan Hancock College
Antelope Valley College
Chaffey College
Evergreen Valley College
Glendale Community College
Mira Costa College
Monterey Peninsula College
Moorpark College
Oxnard College
San Jose City College
Santa Monica College
Ventura College

* Using the 2014 Standards





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

