Conference Attendance Report Form

CONFERENCE: ASCCC Accreditation Institute

DATE OF CONFERENCE: February 17 & 18, 2017   SPONSOR OF CONFERENCE: Academic

Senate for CA Community Colleges

ATTENDEE: Eric Kaljumagi   ATTENDEE POSITION: Member, CCA Board

All CCA Board members or representatives whose conference attendance is being paid by CCA must submit a completed report form to the Treasurer in order to be reimbursed. A copy must also be attached to your board report at the next CCA Board meeting; representatives will email this form to their District Director for inclusion in that board report.

Reports are for the purpose of informing the Board and Council delegates of important information gleaned from the conference workshops, ideas for future CCA conference workshops, networking connections made that should be followed up on, and any other information that can help CCA better represent its members.

ACTION ITEMS (Motions for Board approval):
- None

REFERRALS (include to whom):
- None

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS (Include brief summary of sessions attended):
- See below

ADDENDUMS (any relevant notes or other items; list here):
- None

Summary of Sessions:

Friday, 9:30 AM
Scanning the Horizon: New Requirements for Disaggregating Achievement and Outcomes Data
Randy Beach (ASCCC) and Craig Hayward (RP Group)

Although colleges have disaggregated data by subpopulations for many years, the addition of standard I.B.6. has caused a lot of confusion and anxiety. We are encouraged to be "purposeful" in conducting data disaggregation. We are supposed to have an idea of what we want to do with the data rather than work from a compliance perspective.

I.B.6. "The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies."

"Outcomes assessment is faculty research" that is intended to improve teaching and curriculum. We should begin with a research question and devise data collection methods based on what we want to know. The focus should be the creation of locally meaningful data instead of an attempt to comply with ACCJC directives.

Possible things to disaggregate are online vs. traditional vs. hybrid, declared major vs. non-declared, working vs. non-working, and dual enrollment vs. non-dual enrollment. The ethnicity and gender analyses are important, but it is possible that we have a temporarily larger interest in things like veteran status or age.

IEPI is working to survey the field to identify and promote promising practices. These are available at https://prolearningnetwork.cccco.edu . Current "solution kits" include integrated planning and enrollment management. Each of the tools have a write-up to introduce the process and provide a case study.

At CCSF, each instructor collects SLO data on at least one SLO for every student in every section. Section level data was also mentioned as a way we could get some level of disaggregation. For example, one could look at an SLO for a traditional group of students as compared to an accelerated group of students. The use of results given as examples were for a department to offer basic skills workshops and for a department to create common texts and common assignments. Data can be presented within the self-study in Standards I.B.5., I.C.3., II.A.3., II.A.14., II.B.3., and II.C.2.

We are at an early stage of determining what expectations exist with regard to I.B.6. At the moment, most colleges are responding to I.B.6. by discussing their student equity activities. Only recently have researchers begun to collect data on the effectiveness of disaggregating SLO data to make program improvements! Colleges may define their own subpopulations in order to ensure that locally useful data is generated. However, one should be cautious about local decision making. Some colleges are using institutional priorities to inform SLOs instead of using SLO data to inform institutional level priorities.

We are encouraged to focus disaggregation efforts where there are many sections. There will be less value in studying single section courses, and at a minimum data would have to be collected over several years. This will also help the SLO data from becoming faculty assessment data. The presenter recommends that our contracts explicitly prohibit the use of SLO data in faculty evaluations.

Friday, 11:15 AM
SLOs: Everything You Always Wanted to Know But Were Afraid to Ask
Randy Beach & Lisa Marchand (ASCCC Accreditation Committee)

SLO's first appeared in the 2002 ACCJC standards. They were noted as an "emphasis" and "required SLOs in decision making." In 2007, a rubric appeared where colleges were categorized into "awareness," "development," "proficiency," and "continuous quality improvement." We were required to be at "proficiency" by 2012. Beginning in 2012, we had to demonstrate "compliance." In 2014, we have "integrated, holistic evaluation of institutional effectiveness and academic quality in all regards."

The newest guide (2017) states that "assessment data [from SLOs] are used to organize institutional processes, analyze student learning gaps and implement strategies, allocate resources, and continuously evaluate the efficacy of the institution's efforts to support and improve student learning." They have added "SLO results are used by students as they progress through their programs of study."

They used an analogy of measurable objectives being the ingredients and procedures to make a cake and the SLOs the analysis of the quality of the finished cake. This sets up a considerable difference between what is an objective and what is an outcome.

A six column report was provided that included columns for SLO, Data, Action, Resources, Implement, and Access. For example, the SLO might be "Identify and correct writing errors," the Data could be "65% of students were assessed as non-proficient," the Action was "Increase proficiency by 10% by implementing a Power Study tutoring program," the Resources was "$20,000 for 20 tutors," the

Implement was "Hire and assign the tutors," and Assess was "Measure the SLO every semester for the next two years."

SLOs now need to be on syllabi and in the Course Outline of Record. This requires a very different definition for SLO than what we have been using at Mt. SAC. Now "Students will be able to ..." needs to be understood by the student.
The presenters argued that if we evaluate on outcomes, students will understand what they have to do.

The presenters suggest that we place SLOs on assignments, so students understand the purpose of the work. If we assign grades on the basis of what a student <u>can do</u> rather than homework or participation, we will be closer to declaring success or non-success based on SLOs.

Program level outcomes should be in the descriptions of the program. Student level outcomes should be a portion of the description of each course and should be described in detail in the syllabus. The tone of the presentation seemed to be that SLOs should be broad in definition, but assessed with very specific assignments.

Friday, 1:15 PM
Imagining the Future
Dolores Davison (ASCCC Secretary), Lisa Marchand (ASCCC Accreditation Committee), & Catherine Webb (Monterey Peninsula College)

Marchand noted that her dream would be to eliminate departments and switch to teams of faculty, classified, and management that worked to provide a cluster of related majors. Each team would offer a comprehensive range of courses that would met transfer and graduation requirements. Accelerated basic skills would be embedded into the required courses so that students would not have to travel to dedicated centers. This structure is utilized right now at small liberal arts colleges that focus on a handful of majors.

Webb noted that her college is now on probation. She mentioned that engagement is higher when tasks are meaningful for the individual, beneficial for the group, and supportive rather than punitive. This engagement is affected by one's confidence in their ability to carry out the task. This could be affected by professional development / training, or the ease of the interface required to complete the task.

Further reading on moving SLOs from compliance to improvement is at https://goo.gl/6uhuYo .
Monterey Peninsula's assessment toolkit is at https://goo.gl/PQMXo8 .

Friday, 2:30 PM
Distance Education and Accreditation -- Going Beyond Describing Regular and Substantive Contact
Dolores Davison (ASCCC Secretary), Conan McKay (ASCCC Exec.), and Fabiola Torres (ASCCC Accreditation Committee)

Faculty can modify their syllabus, the visible application of regular and effective contact policies in weekly design, accessibility, and student services so as to ensure alignment to locally decided DE policies. The regular and effective contact policies are locally developed. Canned courses are not generally sufficient to show compliance with locally generated policies.

Some colleges require that student contact outside of the LMS system be documented. In that way, we can prove regular and effective contact. Other colleges require use of the LMS.

When designing the DE syllabus, several methods of contact along with the instructor's estimate of response time is expected. Instructors must use campus email. The instructor should explain his role in the course and how he will provide regular and effective contract. (Ex.: I will post announcements, join

you in weekly class discussions, facilitate the discussion forums, and provide detailed feedback on major assignments.) One must also define online attendance in terms of academic engagement rather on just logging in.

We should have a local definition of "regular and effective contact" and an Academic Senate policy to support same. Acceptable methods of contact may include instructor-student (ex.: interaction in discussion boards, archivable chat, and ADA compliant synchronous sessions), student-student (ex.: CMS messaging, discussion boards, chat, group document editing, group communications, and collaborative projects), or student-content (ex.: modules within the CMS, closed captioned podcasts or videoconferencing).

All distance education materials must be accessible. This includes text alternatives for non-text content, captions, and sufficient contrast. This includes the perception of items, the operation of items, and understandability. Make sure that videos are closed captioned and that images have "alt" text tags. Place the link to the DSPS handbook in the syllabus and on the first block of the course shell. It is also a good practice to link to academic honesty pages, the DE student page, the Student Services page, your welcome letter, and your syllabus.

In hybrid courses, the online components must all still exist! It is recommended that weekly work is visible for the present and next week. Third party applications must be available for visitors to access. All items must been seen in the CMS. For example, if you email out an announcement, also provide the announcements via the CMS in the corresponding week.

Friday, 4 PM
New Challenges with Student Learning Outcomes
Ginni May (ASCCC Exec.) and Craig Rutan (ASCCC Accreditation Chair)

Colleges are not doing well with I.B.6. and II.A.9. The first is disaggregation of data; the second is that course credit is given based on the completion of SLOs.

May sat on the ACCJC commission back when I.B.6 was written. According to her, the intent was for the college to use data in a way that is meaningful to the college. She recommends that we not base our decisions on whether or not another college found favor with the ACCJC for a similar practice. However, disaggregated data should be used in program review, and thus in the resource allocation process.

It is not necessary to maintain the same disaggregation over time. Further, colleges do not have to do the same thing to meet the same standard. We do not have to disaggregate all SLO assessment data for all subpopulations. We do not need to disaggregate for the same subpopulations for SLO assessment data and student achievement data either. Therefore, section level tracking is fine -- not every disaggregation needs to be student level!

Local senates should be involved in determining what subpopulations are used and how the SLO processes work at each campus.

Much of this workshop was general anxiety and the asking of specific questions that were not directly answered. However, the point was made that mastery of a topic need not be the point of an SLO. It could be that a general understanding or introductory knowledge is what we need at that point in the student's education.

Saturday, 8:30 AM
The Changing Federal Landscape of Accreditation

Julie Bruno, Cindy Miles (Chancellor, Grossmont), Craig Rutan (ASCCC Accreditation Chair), and Richard Winn (Interim President ACCJC)

There are multiple pressures on accreditation at a national level. These are largely linked to the privatization of higher ed (both private colleges and the increased student share of costs). New metrics at use are student default rates, repayment rates, and gainful employment. High student debt, low graduation rates, student complaints, and the failure of private colleges have been taken as evidence of waste.

As a result, an increasing number of US senators have expressed a lack of faith in the accreditation process. Washington is said to have "palpable angst," and the idea of improving quality and the idea of using proxy data like completion and employer satisfaction surveys to estimate quality is taking hold.

Countering this is a general Republican ideology of reducing government regulation. A speech by Virginia Foxx (R-NC) three weeks ago mentioned the need to empower student decisions (perhaps by using the Federal College Scorecard), to simplify the student aid process, to repeal unnecessary regulations, and to keep the current accreditation system. Foxx also noted that "under Trump, and with DeVos at the helm, we will be in good hands."

The USDE now has consolidated authority over accreditation and is focused on public accountability. Their IPEDS database includes student demographics, unduplicated headcount, retention rates, degree and certificate programs, and graduation rates. However, it only counts first-time, full-time students, and graduation must occur within 1.5 times of base. This is available at http://collegescorecard.ed.gov . Our CA Student Success Scorecard counts more students and allows for graduation within 3 times of base.

The Council of Regional Accreditation Commissions (C-RAC) is looking at colleges with low graduation rates (<25% for four year and <15% for two year). In addition, there was a bill proposed in 2016 that would hold accreditors accountable by making twenty changes to accreditation. These changes would have included uniform standards for student achievement and expanded powers of the USDE. This bill will return this year, but perhaps not with expanded powers to the USDE. Many others have proposed reforms as well.

Other national trends are a blurring of the lines between private and public, an increasing acceptance of non-institutional educational providers, and the outsourcing of college functions such as curriculum review. For example, Straighterline has a relationship with 107 accredited colleges and universities. Their courses are approved for transfer by ACE CREDIT.

Saturday, 10 AM

Future of Accreditation in the California Community Colleges
Craig Rutan (ASCCC Accreditation Chair), Helen Benjamin (Retired Chancellor), Cindy Miles (Chancellor, Grossmont), Richard Winn (Interim President, ACCJC)

Ed Code requires the BoG to define minimum conditions that include accreditation status. Title 5 thus requires each college to be accredited. ACCJC was explicitly removed from the Title 5 regulations in January 2015.

The CCCCO had four task forces on accreditation in 2009, 2013, 2015, and 2016. This resulted in a resolution from the BoG to have the chancellor speak about change to the USDE. Then, college CEOs began to shift the conversation to having the colleges take responsibility for our accreditor so that we would respect our culture of collegial consultation, innovation, and respect. The goal was to drive change through collaboration. The CEO Symposium in March 2016 had about 90 CEOs take place. Nearly 100 CEOs responded to a survey on accreditation and 89% opted for change.

Using this data, the BoG approved a plan that would form two workgroups. The first would recommend immediate changes to improve existing processes and the second would pursue a model for regional accreditation to align all segments of higher education in the western region. Workgroup I began to meet in April 2016, and Workgroup II began to meet the next month.

Workgroup I had twelve CEOs, and two each of ALOs, ACCJC commissioners, and the ASCCC leadership. Their timeline was from April to early June 2016. They worked on team training and selection, communication tone and quality, the evaluation process, structure of the visit, and commission operations. Roughly 100 recommendations were sent, and ACCJC responded with a 22 page document in August 2016. The workgroup continues to meet to monitor progress and a working relationship with ASCCC has now been formed.

Winn spoke favorably of the workgroup. He mentioned that he had twelve years of experience at WASC and "retired" to ACCJC. He was recently the ACCJC vice-president and has now spent about six weeks as the interim president. Much change is happening at ACCJC. By next fall, 100% of senior staff will have changed. An executive search is underway with a goal of August placement.

Near-term, there is a commission development workshop coming up in March that is informed by the work of Workgroup I. They are looking for ways to are the review process more effective, less burdensome, and more safe. They claim to be establishing "a spirit of openness to new directions and diverse opinions." Several improvements were mentioned. For example, ACCJC has cut the required annual report in half. They are working to improve their training events and they are attempting to give colleges and visiting teams the same instructions, possibly in the same document.

Washington has a trend towards federalization could undercut the peer review process. It is not clear that they understand the role of public two-year colleges.

Workgroup II had fifteen CEOs (thirteen were CCC), and other accreditation representatives including the WASC Senior President and the ACCJC Interim President. One of the CEOs was from Maui CC, which was previously accredited by ACCJC but is now accredited by WASC. This group is tasked to provide updates to the region and did so in September 2016. They have met in person four times, most recently in January 2017.

Miles noted that ACCJC only dates from 1962 and came from the California Master Plan. Now with the blurring of lines between the segments of education and increasing demands on accreditors from the USDE, Workgroup II wants to unify higher education accreditation.

The key elements they identified are to have a collegial learning community that considers the accrediting commission as a partner, transparency, a well developed infrastructure, peer evaluation, clearly defined measures of student learning, opportunities for pathways, and a willingness and ability to respond to changing needs. From this, the workgroup created a roadmap that would provide for any of four options: a stronger relationship with WASC, letting colleges choose between ACCJC or WASC, a single accreditor (WASC) or another accreditor for two-year colleges. After debate, the unanimous decision was that a single accreditor would be best.

It is assumed that this will take at least a decade to complete. We will need a western region community college consensus, followed by a request to WASC. Then, WASC will have to make a request to the USDE for a change of scope, and upon approval, this will be followed by a transition sequence. The workgroup is currently creating a white paper and will next present at the joint CEO Symposium in late February.