

American Samoa Community College

Review of the Accreditation Standards Presentation to Accreditation Standard Leads and Co-Leads

Accreditation Liaison Officers
April 12, 2019



Presentation Outline:

- Provide guidance for Standard Review Processes¹
- Provide guidance for the reviewing of Accreditation Standards



4.2: Role of the Designated Organizing Committee¹

• The designated committee is responsible for organizing and coordinating the self-evaluation process to ensure that appropriate progress is made. In addition, it is an important role of the committee to ensure that evidence is shared within the institution and that relevant internal stakeholders, who have knowledge of data and who can contribute to the analysis of data and evidence, are involved in the process as appropriate.

^{1.} ACCJC Guide to Institutional Self-Evaluation, Improvement, and Peer Review (2018). Institutional Self-Evaluation Process, pp. 16-17.



Standard Review Processes



Process:

- 1. Standard Leads/Co-Leads confirm the participation of subcommittee members.
- 2. Standard Leads/Co-Leads clarify the purpose and meeting schedule(s) for the review of the Accreditation Standards¹
- 3. Standard Leads/Co-Leads ensure that appropriate resources are made available to all subcommittee members.²
- 4. Standard Leads/Co-Leads document the outcome of each review particular to Standard discussions and evidence in preparation for the compiling of the Standard draft(s).³

^{1.} ASCC Accreditation Standard Processes Presentation – 02/21; 03/21; and 03/22 (PowerPoint, slide 5)

^{2.} Standard Lead/Co-Lead USB Flashdrive – Section A: Access to Digital Information

^{3.} Standard Lead/Co-Lead USB Flashdrive – Section B: Access to Resources



Review of Accreditation Standards

Three Step Review Process:

- 1. Thoroughly read to understand each of the assigned Accreditation Standards. (*Please refer to Standard Chairpersons or ALOs for necessary clarifications*)
- 2. Determine whether the Standard is referring to a policy, procedure, or practice.
- 3. Determine the types of evidence available and if the evidence is accessible to all stakeholders.



Review of Accreditation Standards

Clarification of the 3-Step Review Process:

- Step 1: Understanding the Standard
 - a. "Understand the Standards and what they are asking, it helps to deconstruct the sentence grammatically-look for the subjects and the verbs. Each statement in the Standards delineates that the institution is supposed to do something or that someone within the institution, such as the <u>CEO</u> or the governing board, is supposed to do something.
 - b. Descriptive words and phrases in the Standards define the scope of the action that the institution or person is supposed to engage in. The descriptive phrases frequently provide parameters that limit the scope of the expected activity. If the action in the statement is followed by nouns (direct objects), those nouns can also limit the scope of persons or items upon which the action is expected to be enacted."



Review of Accreditation Standards

Clarification of the 3-Step Review Process:

- Step 2: Determining the 'who' and 'what' in the 'how' and 'why'
 - a. Determine the 'who' in each Standard. Majority of the Standards refers to the college or institution. The 'who' can be identified by actions described in the Standard, which may refer to the President, Board of Higher Education, internal constituencies¹, decision-making groups², or external stakeholders such as the Fono.
 - b. Determine the 'what' in each Standard. The 'what' refers to documented action(s), result(s), or decision(s) made, relevant to the Standard.
 - c. Review the 'how' and 'why' (process and purpose) in relationship to the 'who' and 'what', to determine if the Standard is referring to a policy, procedure, or practice.
- <u>Note</u>: Always keep in mind that all College Board policies, procedures, and practices correspond to mission effectiveness, which is bound by a <u>process</u> and linked to a <u>purpose</u>. The purpose throughout this review is focused on the <u>ASCC Mission</u>.

^{1.} ASCC Participatory Governance Structural Manual (2015). Constituent roles in governance and decision-making, pp. 13-15.

^{2.} ASCC Participatory Governance Structural Manual (2015). <u>Types of decision-making groups that provide recommendations</u>, pp. 16-19.



Review of Accreditation Standards

Clarification of the 3-Step Review Process:

- Step 3: Determining the relevancy of Evidence
 - a. Determine all possible evidence sources for each Standard.
 - b. Determine what evidence provides sufficient content in relationship to the Standard. Sorting evidence by determining the level of significance according to the Standard, may help lessen multiple referencing of evidence for each Standard.
 - c. Provide recommendations focusing on the quality of evidence or ways to improve the documentation of ASCC's processes that may include internal reports, publications, manuals, handbooks, etc.
- Note: Quality Evidence provides concrete facts on institutional processes and documentations defined to ensure quality improvements towards achieving the mission of the College or progress made to guarantee mission effectiveness/sustainability. Please do not "stray into tangential areas or evidence that are indirectly related to the Standard. Subcommittees should expect to evaluate only evidence that pertains to the Standard as the institution has applied the Standard to its own mission."



ISER Report Requirements



ISER

- I. Title Page
- II. Certification Page
- III. Table of Contents
 - A. Introduction
 - B. Presentation of Student Achievement Data and Institution-set Standards
 - C. Organization of the Self-Evaluation Process
 - D. Organizational Information



ISER

- E. Certification of Continued Institutional Compliance with Eligibility Requirements
- F. Certification of Continued Institutional Compliance with Commission Policies and Federal Regulations
- G. Structure of the Institutional Analysis of Standards
 - 1. Evidence of Meeting the Standard (for each Standard)
 - 2. Analysis and Evaluation (for each Standard)
 - 3. Conclusion (at the end of each section) and Improvement Plan(s) Arising out of the Self-Evaluation Process
 - 4. Evidence List (also at the end of each section)
- H. Quality Focus Essay (not to exceed 4,000 words)



Accreditation 2020 Timeline



2020 Timeline

- Quality Focus Improvement Plans
- Planning tasks, monitoring, and development of Quality Focus Essays.
- September 2020: Finalizing of the Accreditation Institutional Self-Evaluation Report



ISER Key Events

Key Events	Due Date
ASCC Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) - 1st Draft	November 22, 2019
Accreditation Steering Committee review of ISER - 1st Draft	December 03-07, 2019
Quality Focus Improvement Plans	May 22, 2020
Development of Quality Focused Essays	July 24, 2020
ASCC Institutional Self-Evaluation Report 2nd Draft	August 28, 2020
Accreditation Steering Committee review of ISER - 2 nd Draft	September 02-04, 2020
Culmination of Improvement Plans and Quality Focus Essays	January 29, 2021
ASCC Institutional Self-Evaluation Report 3rd - Final Draft	February 12, 2021
Accreditation Steering Committee review of ISER - Final Draft	February 17-19, 2021
Final ISER Report is submitted for the review of the President and the Board of Higher Education	March 31, 2021
Institutional Self-Evaluation Report submitted to ACCJC (at least 60 days before visit)	August 2021
External Peer Review Team Visit	October 2021
Draft Team Report sent to College CEO for correction of errors and fact	November 2021
Commission meeting and decision on accreditation	January 2022
Commission action letter received by College posted to the Website.	February 2022