Work Group #1

Agenda

November 7, 2012
1:30-3:00 pm
MUB 39

1. Preparing Show Cause Report

2. Role of Workgroup
   a. Review, Revise, Rewrite Standard 1A1, 1A2, 1A3, 1A4

3. Tools
   a. Progress Report Template
   b. Show Cause Template

4. References –
   a. Accreditation Standards
   b. 2012 Self-Study
   c. Special Report
   d. ACCJC Evaluation Report
   e. Questions from the ACCJC Guidelines to Institutional Self-Evaluation

5. Delegate Assignments

6. Next Meetings:

Attachments:

- Progress Report Template
- Show Cause Template
- Questions from the ACCJC Guidelines to Institutional Self-Evaluation
Accreditation Response Team
Overview of Deadlines and Timeline to Show Cause Report

Deadlines:
Show Cause Report – March 15, 2013
Closure Report – March 15, 2013
College Status Report on Student Learning Outcomes – March 15, 2013
Annual Report – March 31, 2013
Annual Fiscal Report – March 31, 2013
ACCJC Evaluation Visit – Spring 2013

General Timeline:
October 16, 2012 – Steering Committee Meeting
October 25, 2012 – Board of Trustees Meeting / Accreditation Progress Report
November 6, 2012 – Steering Committee Meeting
November 9, 2012 – Workgroup Progress Report Forms Due
November 15, 2012 – Board of Trustees Meeting / Accreditation Progress Report
November 19, 2012 – Steering Committee Meeting
December 7, 2012 – Workgroup Show Cause Templates Due
December 13, 2012 – Board of Trustees Meeting / Accreditation Progress Report
December 18, 2012 – Participatory Governance Council
January 8, 2013 – Steering Committee Meeting – Review 1st DRAFT Show Cause Report
January 14, 2013 – 1st DRAFT report online for college review and feedback
January 24, 2013 – Board of Trustees Meeting / Review 1st DRAFT Show Cause Report
February 5, 2013 – Steering Committee Meeting -- Review 2nd DRAFT Show Cause Report
February 11, 2013 – 2nd DRAFT report online for college review and feedback
February 21, 2013 – Participatory Governance Council Review -- 2nd DRAFT Show Cause Report
February 28, 2013 – Board of Trustees Meeting / Last DRAFT Show Cause Report
Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

The Institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

A. Mission

The Institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student populations
2. The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.
3. Using the institution’s governance and decision making processes, the institutions reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.
4. The Institution’s mission is central to institutional planning and decision making.
Accreditation Show Cause Report PROGRESS FORM

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this form to Gohar Momjian (gmomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Friday, November 9.

Complete a separate progress form for each Standard/subsection for which you are responsible (see attached “Assignment Chart of Responsibility”).

1. Full Standard Number (e.g., II.B.3):

2. Full Standard Text:
   Please copy and paste the full text of the Standard from the September 2012 ACCJC Manual for Self Evaluation beginning on page 11, found at:

3. Based on your Workgroup’s assessment of our 2012 Self Study response to this Standard, how much work is there to do based on the findings of the ACCJC Evaluation Report and the response contained within our October 15 Special Report?
   □ No revision necessary
   □ Some revision necessary
   □ Extensive revision necessary

4. Describe your plans for addressing necessary revisions by responding to Questions 4a-4c below.

   4a. Name of individual(s) responsible for drafting a revised response that includes (1) a descriptive summary, (2) a self evaluation, and (3) actionable improvement plans (keep in mind that the revised response will be due Friday December 7).
4b. Will you need updated data?
   □ Yes
   □ No

   If yes, please specify the data you will need below:


4c. Will you need to confer with other workgroups and/or administrative units?
   □ Yes
   □ No

   If yes, please specify these workgroups and/or administrative units below:


Accreditation Show Cause Report TEMPLATE

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this template to Gohar Momjian (gmomjian@ccsf.edu) and Grace Esteban (mesteban@ccsf.edu) via email by Friday, December 7.

Complete a separate template for each Standard/subsection for which you are responsible (see attached “Assignment Chart of Responsibility”).

1. **Full Standard Number** (e.g., II.B.3):

   

2. **Full Standard Text:**
   Please copy and paste the full text of the Standard from the September 2012 ACCJC Manual for Self Evaluation beginning on page 11, found at:

   

3. **Descriptive Summary:** A primarily descriptive overview of what the institution does in relation to each of the Standards.

   

4. **Self Evaluation:** Based on the descriptive summary, the institution should analyze and systematically evaluate its performance against the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, Commission policies and its institutional mission. This analysis should result in actionable conclusions about institutional effectiveness and educational quality and decisions for improvement. The basic questions to explore are whether or not, and to what degree, institutional evidence demonstrates that the institution meets the Standards and how the institution has reached this conclusion. The Commission expects current and sustained compliance with the Standards, focusing on accomplishments and outcomes that have been achieved and not just structures or processes used.

   

5. **Actionable Improvement Plans:** Continuous quality improvement is a hallmark of institutional effectiveness. As an institution evaluates its programs and services with reference to each Standard, it identifies areas in need of change. The Commission expects the institution to identify goals related to the areas that require change and decide on the action required to meet these goals. The institution should include the required actions in improvement plans. It may not be possible for the institution to have improvement plans fully developed at the time of submission of the institutional Self Evaluation Report. The Commission expects these actionable improvement plans to be integrated into the Institution’s continuous evaluation and planning processes.

   Please provide a narrative summary of the goals and associated actions in the text box below:
Please complete the table below to summarize the goals and actions described above as concisely as possible (add rows as needed):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Associated Action(s)</th>
<th>Expected Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions to Use in Institutional Evaluation

This Guide is designed to provoke thoughtful dialogue and judgment about institutional quality by college communities engaged in self evaluation and by external evaluation teams assigned to affirm the quality of institutions. As either group seeks to evaluate an institution’s ability to meet the Accreditation Standards, inquiry — asking questions and seeking answers — is necessary before judgment is made. The following questions are designed to provoke thoughtful reflection about institutional quality and may be asked by either the institution engaged in self-reflection for self evaluation, or by the External Evaluation Team that visits the college. The Guide also provides a list of possible sources of evidence that can be used to develop answers to the questions raised through the process of inquiry.

The questions, and lists of possible evidence, are designed to inform discussions of student achievement, such as number of graduates, number of transfer students, retention rates, course completion rates, job placement rates; institutional performance such as the presence and effective use of institutional resources, structures, and policies, to achieve the institutions educational mission; and student learning outcomes such as the acquisition of knowledge, skills, abilities and attitudes that the institution intended students to learn and which are defined by the institution as the intended learning outcomes. There may be many other questions that institutions and team members can and should ask in order to assess institutional quality and effectiveness.
Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

The institution demonstrates strong commitment to a mission that emphasizes achievement of student learning and to communicating the mission internally and externally. The institution uses analyses of quantitative and qualitative data and analysis in an ongoing and systematic cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation to verify and improve the effectiveness by which the mission is accomplished.

A. Mission

The institution has a statement of mission that defines the institution's broad educational purposes, its intended student population, and its commitment to achieving student learning.

- What does the institution's mission statement say about its educational purposes? Are these purposes appropriate to an institution of higher learning?
- Who are the college's intended students? How does the institution determine its intended population? Is the identified population a reasonable match for the institution's location, resources, and role in higher education?
- What processes does the institution use to foster college-wide commitment to student learning? Does the mission statement express this commitment?

1. The institution establishes student learning programs and services aligned with its purposes, its character, and its student population.
   - Have discussions been held among key constituents regarding the relevance of the mission statement to student learning?
   - What statements about student learning are included in the mission statement? How do these statements make explicit the purposes of the institution?
   - How does the institution know that it is addressing the needs of its student population?
   - What assessments of institutional effectiveness are undertaken?

2. The mission statement is approved by the governing board and published.
   - When was the current mission statement approved by the board?

3. Using the institution's governance and decision-making processes, the institution reviews its mission statement on a regular basis and revises it as necessary.
   - How effective is the institution's process for periodic review of the mission statement? Does the process allow for incorporating the interests of the institutions' stakeholders?
   - How does the institution know that the way the mission statement is developed, approved and communicated to all stakeholders is effective? What circumstances prompt changes to the statement?
4. The institution’s mission is central to institutional planning and decision making.

- How effectively does the mission statement prompt planning and decision making? To what extent is the mission statement central to the choices the college makes?
Sources of Evidence: Examples for Standard I

Listed below are examples of potential sources of evidence for Standard I. There may be many other sources that institutions should provide and teams should consider.

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

A. Mission

☐ Evidence that analysis of how the institutional mission and goals are linked to the needs of the student population has taken place

☐ Evidence of analysis of how the mission statement is developed, approved and communicated to all stakeholders

☐ Evidence of analysis of the process used for the periodic review of the institution’s mission; evidence that the process is inclusive

☐ Evidence that the mission statement provides the preconditions for setting institutional goals

☐ Evidence of analysis of how the cycle of evaluation, integrated planning, implementation, and re-evaluation relates to the mission and is used for institutional improvement