Work Group #12/13

Agenda

November 7, 2012
3:30-5:00 pm
MUB 39

1. Preparing Show Cause Report

2. Role of Workgroup
   a. Review, Revise, Rewrite Standard IVA1, IV2, IVA3, IVA5

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 IV: Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

A. Decision-Making Roles and Processes

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making process. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward the ideas from their constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

   a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

   b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution’s constituencies.

4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with accrediting Commission Standards, policies, and guidelines, and commission requirements for public disclosure, self evaluation and other reports, team visits, and prior
approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously respond to recommendations made by the commission.

5. The role of leadership and the institution’s governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.
Accreditation Show Cause Report TEMPLATE

Work Group Leaders: Please complete and submit this template to Gohar Momjian (amomjian@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>
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>
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:


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 IV: Leadership and Governance

The institution recognizes and utilizes the contributions of leadership throughout the organization for continuous improvement of the institution. Governance roles are designed to facilitate decisions that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness, while acknowledging the designated responsibilities of the governing board and the chief administrator.

A. Decision-Making Process

The institution recognizes that ethical and effective leadership throughout the organization enables the institution to identify institutional values, set and achieve goals, learn, and improve.

1. Institutional leaders create an environment for empowerment, innovation, and institutional excellence. They encourage staff, faculty, administrators, and students, no matter what their official titles, to take initiative in improving the practices, programs, and services in which they are involved. When ideas for improvement have policy or significant institution-wide implications, systematic participative processes are used to assure effective discussion, planning, and implementation.

- What do the statements about institutional mission and goals reveal about the institution's commitment to student success and educational excellence?
- Are the institution's goals and values clearly articulated and understood by all? Can college staff list what those goals and values are?
- Can staff describe their roles in assisting the institution to achieve its goals?
- What information about institutional performance is circulating and available to staff and students? How is the information kept current? Is it easily accessed, is it understandable? Is it regularly used in institutional dialogue and decision-making sessions?
- Do the institution's processes for institutional evaluation and review, and planning for improvements, provide venues where the evaluations of the institution's performance are made available to all staff?
- Do institutional planning efforts provide opportunity for appropriate staff participation?
- How do individuals bring forward ideas for institutional improvement?
- How does the institution articulate the responsibilities of individuals to develop ideas for improvements in their areas of responsibility?
- How do individuals and groups at the institution use the governance process to enhance student learning?

2. The institution establishes and implements a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes. The policy specifies the manner in which individuals bring forward ideas from their
constituencies and work together on appropriate policy, planning, and special-purpose bodies.

a. Faculty and administrators have a substantive and clearly defined role in institutional governance and exercise a substantial voice in institutional policies, planning, and budget that relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise. Students and staff also have established mechanisms or organizations for providing input into institutional decisions.

- What do institutional policies and procedures describe as the roles for each group in governance, including planning and budget development?
- What evidence demonstrates that these policies and procedures are functioning effectively?

b. The institution relies on faculty, its academic senate or other appropriate faculty structures, the curriculum committee, and academic administrators for recommendations about student learning programs and services.

- What documents describe the official responsibilities and authority of the faculty and of academic administrators in curricular and other educational matters?

3. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution. These processes facilitate discussion of ideas and effective communication among the institution's constituencies.

- Do the written policies on governance procedures specify appropriate roles for all staff and students? Do these policies specify the academic roles of faculty in areas of student educational programs and services planning?
- Are staff and students well informed of their respective roles. Do staff participate as encouraged by these policies? Do the various groups work in collaborative effort on behalf of institutional improvements? Is the result of this effort actual institutional improvement?
- Is there effective communication at the college - clear, understood, widely available, current communication?
- Do staff at the college know essential information about institutional efforts to achieve goals and improve learning?

4. The institution advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationships with external agencies. It agrees to comply with Accrediting Commission standards, policies, and guidelines, and Commission requirements for public disclosure, self-evaluation, and other reports, team visits, and prior approval of substantive changes. The institution moves expeditiously to respond to recommendations made by the Commission.

Standard IV: Leadership and Governance
5. The role of leadership and the institution's governance and decision-making structures and processes are regularly evaluated to assure their integrity and effectiveness. The institution widely communicates the results of these evaluations and uses them as the basis for improvement.

- What process does the institution use to evaluate its governance and decision-making structures? Are the results communicated within the campus community?
- How does the institution use identified weaknesses to make needed improvements?