

Accreditation NOTES

Summer 2006

Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Race to Reform:

Can Regional Accreditation Change Fast Enough to Avoid Federal Intervention While Maintaining the Support of Those They Accredit?

By Brice W. Harris, Commissioner

Dating back to the origin of regional accreditation more than 100 years ago, accrediting commissions have always found themselves in a tight spot between holding institutions accountable and yet being sponsored by those very colleges and universities. Although some argue that this is a clear conflict, in reality the system of peer evaluation has served higher education, and the United States, well and has become the envy of the world. Even today, countries around the globe continue to try to emulate our system of self-evaluation underpinned by the concepts of peer review and academic freedom.

However, in the current climate of increased accountability, our regional accrediting associations find that tight spot to be more like a vice. On one side are forces at the national level ready to throw out regional accreditation in favor of a federal approach; while at the local level, they are faced with institutions resistant to rapid change and increased scrutiny. This debate resembles a race. If the regional associations can change fast enough, the current federal pressure may subside, as did the SPRE of the 90s. If not, accreditation of the future may look more like Form 1040.

What Changes are Being Demanded?

The calls for reforming regional accreditation are nowhere more clearly stated than in recent issue papers on behalf of the Secretary of Education's Commission on the Future of Higher Education (Spellings Commission). Those recommendations for change include: measuring student outcomes rather than inputs; providing more

consumer information about colleges and universities; making the process of accreditation more transparent; and demonstrating higher consistency in the actions taken by commissions from one institution to another. At the root of these demands is the belief that accreditation can command greater accountability from institutions, and that more accountable institutions will ultimately produce more successful students.

What Changes are Being Made?

Regional accrediting agencies are listening. In fact, all of the commissions have been transitioning to new standards that clearly cause colleges and universities to embrace Student Learning Outcomes at the course, program and institutional levels. This work has been going on for several years, but the task is enormous and therefore slow, too slow for some.

Additionally, a dialogue about the transparency of the accreditation process is underway. Here the challenge will be to provide more consumer information on individual institutions without jeopardizing the sensitive nature of self-evaluation and peer review. It is too early to tell what that conversation will produce, but the associations do hear the call for a more open process.

The criticism related to action consistency may be unfounded. The length to which commission members go to ensure that the action they take with one institution is consistent with actions taken at other institutions with similar situations is remarkable. The challenge will be in providing evidence of that consistency in an environment

Continued on page 2...

that requires a certain level of confidentiality in order to maintain the integrity of the process itself.

Why is Change So Slow?

Many colleges and universities are suffering from “accountability fatigue.” One large four-college system recently assembled a list of more than 550 various accountability reports required of one or more of the colleges. These reports range from traditional accreditation documents to the annual report on the content of the water in the boilers. Accrediting commissions pushing for more accountability at a faster pace are experiencing pushback from staff desperately trying to focus on teaching and learning while completing yet another in a seemingly endless stream of local, state, and federal reports. The changes that are being called for by the commissions need time to take root. Simply developing the new standards and vetting them with faculty and staff was a very long process. Although some would argue that all of this change should just move more quickly, one of the very things that has made American higher education great, a free and open exchange of ideas, is not always a speedy process by its nature.

The resistance to making the process of accreditation more open and transparent is partially rooted in a fear by the academy that making public the sensitive discussions about commission actions will make the process increasingly political. Opening closed session conversations about the accreditation status of an institution could make those discussions more like a city council meeting than a peer review process. Institutions fearing negative commission action might begin to bring increasing numbers of people to commission meetings to make a case in support of their college occasionally turning what is currently a discussion based on facts, verified by visiting teams, into a political convention.

Accreditation Notes is published by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

Publication Address:

10 Commercial Blvd, Suite 204, Novato, CA 94949
E-mail: accjc@accjc.org • Web site: www.accjc.org

What Can Be Done to Speed the Rate of Change?

Simply saying, “just give us more time” will probably not satisfy the forces for change. The regional commissions nationally will have to listen more carefully and encourage the changes already beginning to be implemented to move at a faster pace. At the same time, those calling for change, and expecting it to move at the speed of the Internet, should be cautioned not to push the greatest system of higher education in history off a cliff. Not only is forcing too much change too fast likely to be unsuccessful, it could make colleges less accountable in the long run.

The one demand of regional accreditation that probably should not be implemented is the push to alter the process to provide more consumer information. Forcing regional commissions to begin a Consumer Reports approach to rating institutions is an expansion of their mission that is in conflict with peer review for institutional improvement.

What is very clear from the current debate is the lack of understanding of the current process of accreditation. The regional commissions can and should be much more open and candid about the accreditation process. They need to help the public understand the purposes and processes of the accreditation process. They can also do a better job of communicating their actions in general without threatening individual institutions. The increasingly negative view of regional accreditation nationally is partly due to the commissions allowing their story to be told only by their critics.

The reforming of regional accreditation is a race between two groups: those who want to fix the system now or throw it out and start over, and those who are willing to make incremental change in a system they believe has served the colleges and the public well. Both factions believe they have the best interest of students in mind, and hopefully they will reach the finish line together.

June 2006
Commission Actions on Institutions

Reaffirmed Accreditation

Barstow Community College
City College of San Francisco
Defense Language Institute
Guam Community College
Heald College
Lake Tahoe Community College
Los Angeles Harbor College
Los Angeles Southwest College
West Los Angeles College

Placed on Warning

Feather River College
Hawaii Tokai International College
Lassen College

Granted Initial Accreditation

West Hills College, Lemoore

Accepted Progress Report with Visit

Brooks College
College of Micronesia-FSM
Victor Valley College

Continued on Warning

College of the Redwoods

Continued on Probation

College of the Marshall Islands

Removed from Warning

West Hills College Coalinga

Removed from Probation

Salvation Army Crestmont College for Officer Training

Accepted Progress Report

El Camino College
Los Medanos College
Merced College

Accepted Focused Midterm Report with Visit

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College

Accepted Focused Midterm Report

Chabot College
Las Positas College
Los Angeles City College

Accepted Focused Midterm Report (cont.)

College of Alameda
Merritt College
Vista Community College (renamed Berkeley City
College effective June 1, 2006)

Rejected Focused Midterm Report

Laney College

Accepted Midterm Report

American Academy of Dramatic Arts/Los Angeles
Butte College
East Los Angeles College
Palomar College
Southwestern College
Taft College

Approved as Eligible to Seek Candidacy Status

Woodland Center, Yuba College

Accepted Closure Report

Don Bosco Technical Institute

Accepted Request to Seek Joint Accreditation with ACSCU

American Samoa Community College

Accreditation Withdrawn at the Request of the Institution

Queen of the Holy Rosary College

Approved Substantive Changes

American Academy of Dramatic Arts/West: Approved name change to American Academy of Dramatic Arts/Los Angeles

Vista Community College: Approved name change to Berkeley City College

American River College: Approved new center at North Natomas Educational Center

Solano Community College: Approved on-line certificate programs – (Computer and Information Science; Business; Criminal Justice; Electronics; Fire Technology; Small Business Management)

Solano Community College: Approved on-line degree programs – (Computer and Information Science - Computer Programming; Computer and Information Science - Microcomputer Applications; Computer and Information Science - Web/Network Administration; Business; Criminal Justice – Corrections; Criminal Justice - Law Enforcement; Criminal Justice - Fire Technology; Management - Small Business Management)

South Orange County Community College District: Approved Advanced Technology Education Park (ATEP)

June 2006

Commission Actions on Policies

Approved for First Reading:

Policy on Review of Accreditation Standards. This policy revision separates the review of each edition of the Accreditation Reference Handbook from the review of the accreditation standards. The handbook is now updated annually rather than on a six-year cycle.

ACCJC Fall 2006 Workshops

Each year, ACCJC holds workshops to train evaluators and team chairs who will conduct comprehensive reviews of member institutions as well as workshops for institutions about to begin the process of self study leading to the Self Study Report and comprehensive visit.

Self Study Training Workshops will be held this fall for the following institutions preparing for self study review and comprehensive visits in two years:

September 19, 2006

Diablo Valley College, Los Medanos College, Contra Costa College

September 21, 2006

College of the Canyons, El Camino College, Long Beach City College, Rio Hondo College

September 22, 2006

San Bernardino College, Crafton Hills College

September 26, 2006

Cuesta College

TBA

American Samoa Community College, College of the Marshall Islands

Team Training Workshops are held for specific teams and require that all team evaluators and chairs attend. This process benefits team development and allows the teams to begin work on the upcoming visit well in advance. Workshops will be held at the locations indicated for the following teams:

September 7, 2006

Los Angeles – Bakersfield College, Cerro Coso College, Porterville College and College of the Sequoias

September 12, 2006

Oakland – Hawaii Community College, Honolulu Community College, Kauai Community College, Kapi'olani Community College

September 13, 2006

Oakland – Leeward Community College, Maui Community College, Windward Community College, Northern Marianas College

Team Chair Training Workshops will be held on August 14th and 16th for the chairs that will be conducting visits in the fall of 2006.

Conferences and Happenings

ACCJC Sponsored Conferences

Community College League of California Partner Conferences

Each year, the ACCJC presents an Accreditation Liaison Officer Workshop and an Accreditation and Executive Leadership Workshop at the Annual Convention of the Community College League of California (CCLC) by offering pre-convention workshops as part of the CCLC's Partner Conference series. This year's convention will be held in Costa Mesa November 16-18, 2006, at the Hilton Costa Mesa.

Registration information is mailed and posted in August to the CCLC web site at: www.ccleague.org.

Strengthening Student Success

ACCJC supports the conference "Strengthening Student Success: What Counts." This conference will be held at the Doubletree Hotel – Mission Valley in San Diego October 4-6, 2006, and is an excellent opportunity to expand college capacity to assess student learning outcomes. The conference is sponsored by the California Partnership for Achieving Student Success (Cal-PASS), the Research and Planning Group of California (RP Group), and the California Assessment Institute (CAI) in collaboration with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. Participants will leave the conference with a broad range of tested strategies and techniques to improve teaching and learning. Over 50 sessions with more than 100 presenters from 50 community colleges and other educational institutions will share their findings.

Participants will bring back strategies for their colleges' work on student learning outcomes and practical assessment techniques. The conference strands include: basic skills, student services, social science, science, English, math, Cal-PASS, and general education. In addition, there are sessions of general interest. One such session is a three-part "Developing Communities Of Inquiry: Closing The Achievement Gap In Community Colleges" that will provide a framework for discussing issues relative to examining inequities in educational outcomes for historically underserved groups. Other sessions include: assessment of difficult outcomes like critical thinking, ethics, and appreciation; choosing assessment tools; the use of technology for assessment and assessment for on-line courses; and the basics of assessment for department heads and division deans.

The Conference Keynote Speakers are:
Lee S. Shulman, President, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching will present on "Counting and Recounting – Understanding Student Learning." How do we learn about our students' learning? Counting – numbers are one form of evidence. Recounting – narratives are another story of significance. The interplay between counting and recounting moves us to deeper understanding about what counts in student success.

Kay M McClenney, Director, Community College Survey of Student Engagement Senior Associate, "Achieving the Dream: Community Colleges Count", Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin, will present on "Building a Culture of Evidence: Doing More of What Counts in Student Success." For a very long time, educational institutions (particularly community colleges) lived relatively comfortably in a culture of anecdotes. But heartwarming student success stories, however welcome, are no longer sufficient. This closing keynote address points to the growing recognition of evidence as a powerful and useful tool for prompting courageous conversations, guiding our work, and charting a course toward better outcomes for all students.

For further information, see the Research and Planning Group web site at: www.rpgroup.org/10-06-SuccessConf-Main.htm.

Related Conferences and Events

AACRAO's 16th Annual Strategic Enrollment Management Conference

The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) Conference on Strategic Enrollment Management will be held November 12-15, 2006 at the Pointe Hilton Squaw Peak Resort in Phoenix, Arizona. The Conference will focus on all aspects of SEM – from fundamental principles to cutting-edge strategies. Participants will learn the industry's best practices from proven experts in the field on topics ranging from first contact to graduation. The Conference will link SEM to overall institutional success. Topics addressed will be: recruitment and retention strategies, institutional teamwork, strategic planning, enrollment and goal setting, communication of plans, staff development, and financial aid strategies.

For further information, see the AACRAO web site at:
www.aacrao.org/sem16/

Higher Education Reauthorization Act Delayed Again

It now appears almost certain that the Higher Education Reauthorization Act (HERA) will not be adopted this summer, and there is only a slight possibility it will be adopted this calendar year. The House of Representatives passed its version of the bill, HR 609, in March. Other legislative matters in the Senate will stall consideration of this important legislation through the summer, and most likely through the November elections.

If there are significant changes in the composition of Congress as a result of the November elections, the Act may need to be redrafted by new congressional committee members and staffs. Below is a summary of the progress of the HERA over the course of the past academic year.

The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005

In December, changes to the Higher Education Act (HEA) that had funding attached were signed into law as part of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (signed by President Bush in February 2006). Those provisions significantly changed the regulatory landscape for distance education, addressed issues associated with student loans, and reduced limits on institutions that assess students' prior learning as a basis for awarding of degrees and certificates.

The regulations that pertain to distance education regulations changed to eliminate two "50% rules." One 50% rule limited institutions eligible for Title IV financial aid to offering less than half of the total courses required for a degree as e-learning courses. The effect of this rule was to limit the e-learning courses and the proliferation of e-learning programs by Title IV - eligible institutions. Effective July 1, 2006, there will no longer be any limitation on the percentage of classes toward a degree that may be offered by an institution eligible for Title IV financial aid. *It is likely that the number of institutions offering degree programs through distance education will increase significantly with this regulatory change.*

The second 50% rule related to institutions at which less than half of the programs led to an associate degree or higher degree. Those institutions had to limit their

total student enrollment in e-learning courses to less than 50%. Effective July 1, 2006, this second 50% rule is eliminated.

The second significant change included in the Deficit Reduction Act was the elimination of a long-standing regulation that prevented institutions that did not offer direct instruction from seeking Title IV eligibility. Now, eligibility will be extended to institutions and programs that offer "direct assessment of student learning" rather than offering instruction themselves. There is one caveat: such institutions must have approval by their accrediting agency as well as permission from the Secretary of Education. The Secretary's approval is likely to serve as a "brake" on new program proliferation, at least until institutions master the art of gaining that approval. This change to regulations will likely result in more institutions offering degrees based on assessment of student experience, including formal instruction or life experience. It will challenge once again the notion that clock or seat time is necessary for a higher education degree. *The ACCJC may see increased substantive change applications from its member institutions that decide to expand competency-based degree or certificate programs.*

The Deficit Reduction Act also made several changes to the student loan provisions of the HEA. Since these changes were more urgent, the inclusion of portions of the HERA in the Deficit Reduction Act effectively removed some of the pressure to pass a Higher Education Reauthorization Act this year.

HR 609

In late March 2006, the House of Representatives passed HR 609. The house debated the bill for two days and considered 22 amendments. In its final form, HR 609 contains language that, with few exceptions, is language agreed to by the Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (CRAC). In several areas of concern to CRAC, amendments proposing significant changes to accreditation requirements were NOT successful. The ACCJC's investment in the work of CRAC has been a good investment.

Continued on page 7...

HR 609 as passed by the House included the following:

- Change to current law regarding the accreditor's requirement to review institutional disclosures to students. HR 609 would require accreditors to ensure that onsite comprehensive evaluation teams evaluate the substance of the information required of institutions that participate in federal financial aid, especially that which requires institutions to disclose to prospective students a summary of student outcomes for full-time undergraduate students, including completion or graduation rates; any other student outcome data deemed by the institution to be relevant to its stated educational mission and goals; and licensing and placement rates for professional and vocational programs.
- Change to current law to require accreditors to consistently apply and enforce standards that "consider the stated mission of the institution of higher learning, including religious missions."

Senate Draft Bill Language

The Senate's bill, S 1932, has not yet been scheduled for debate. Its language contains several proposed changes (in italics) that are of concern:

- Requires accreditors to "respect the stated mission of the institution of higher education, *including religious missions.*"
- *Requires accreditors to demonstrate that standards effectively address the quality of an institution's distance education (programs and courses) but that the accreditor shall not be required to have separate standards or policies for such evaluation. Requires accreditors to assure that institutions have policies to ensure students registering for a program is the same student who participates and receives academic credit. Requires accreditors to have evaluators trained to evaluate distance education.*
- Requires accreditors to evaluate an institution's success with respect to student *academic* achievement as determined by *student retention*; *course and program completion*; *as appropriate*, state licensing and placement; and, *as appropriate*, *other student performance information selected by the institution, particularly information used by the institution to evaluate or strengthen programs or the institution.*
- Extends current law which allows institutions

to appeal a termination of accreditation action to allow institutions to *appeal placement on probation*; it also makes appeals processes subject to a conflict of interest policy (all regional accreditors also have such a policy and practice in place) and *allows institutions to be represented by counsel during all stages of an appeal.*

- Extends current law which requires accreditors to notify the Secretary and state licensing agencies within thirty days of a commission decision to award accreditation or to deny or terminate accreditation, to *include placement on probation.*
- Requires teach-out agreements among institutions to be approved *in advance when the Department removes eligibility for financial aid, the accreditor removes accreditation, or the institution announces its intention to end the program or to close the institution.*
- *Requires the accreditor to review federally required information the institution provides its current and prospective students, and the institution to have transfer of credit policies that are publicly disclosed, to not deny transfer of credit solely on the basis of the accreditation of the sending institution, and the approval or denial of transfer of credit is decided according to criteria established by the institution's admissions committee.*
- Requires the accreditor to *monitor the growth of programs at institutions that are experiencing significant enrollment growth.*

There are several items in the Senate version of the bill that CRAC hopes to help change, including extension of the due process requirements and specification of the religious mission of institutions.

A 2007 HERA

Should the HERA not pass this year, there will be opportunity for other interests to suggest amendments that CRAC has previously worked to oppose. There will also be some changes in emphasis if one house of Congress loses its majority Republican membership. The Spellings Commission (see related article) will issue its recommendations for changes to higher education in September; it is possible that some of these recommendations may find their way in to the 2007 versions of the Higher Education Reauthorization Act.

Spellings Commission Issues Draft Report

On June 14, the National Commission on the Future of Higher Education (Spellings Commission) issued a second draft of its report that will be out in final form in September. The report was significantly changed in tone and content from earlier discussion papers released by the Commission. The regional accrediting commissions, through the Council for Regional Accreditation (CRAC), have provided several responses to the Spellings Commission over the Spring, the most recent of which appears in a related article in this newsletter. (See CRAC Response to Spellings Commission)

The latest draft report from the Spellings Commission continues to describe the “shortcomings” of accreditation. Its chief concerns are that accreditors play a role in quality assurance that is largely “internal” to higher education, that their reviews are “typically” kept private, and that the reviews that are made public focus on institutional processes rather than “bottom line results for learning or costs.” The paper argues that the growing demand for accountability and transparency argues for significant changes to accreditation: a “transformation.” The report goes on to state that accreditors should make performance outcomes – completion rates and student learning – the “core” of their assessments. The paper argues for establishment of accreditation standards to allow for comparisons across institutions on learning outcomes, to support institutional innovation, and to require institutions to move toward “world class” quality and report their improvement relative to national and international peer institutions. The report can be found in its entirety at www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/reports/0714-draft.pdf, and these references can be found on page 11 and 12.

It is difficult for accreditors or institutions to consider how they might respond to such broad recommendations. Higher Education has yet to establish metrics that it feels comfortable using to compare institutions given the broad diversity of institutional missions. Open access institutions admit students with many educational goals, and simple completion or graduation rates do not adequately measure or convey institutional effectiveness. There are significant public policy issues that need to be addressed if higher education is to establish institutional peer groups (groups of institutions with similar missions and resources) for comparative purposes, including the policy issue of whether American higher education wants to so codify its institutions as well as the implications for educational and social mobility if it does so. Finally, there is not yet an operational definition of “world class” quality against which to compare institutional progress.

While the ACCJC currently requires institutions to make team reports available for the public, the level of transparency called for in the Spellings report would actually require the reports to be written in a way that is readily understood by the public. Such re-framed reports would alter the fundamental principles of accreditation – quality assurance through peer review and support for institutional improvement – and change the utility of the reports for the institutions. The ACCJC believes that higher education should find means of providing the public with more information about institutional quality. There are probably more effective means of providing consumer information than altering accreditation, which has an established track record of assuring and improving higher education quality.

Comprehensive 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 a comprehensive visit in the fall of 2006, spring of 2007, and fall of 2007 and a review by the Commission at its January 2007, June 2007, and January 2008 meetings. 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.

Fall 2006

(for Jan. 2007)

Bakersfield College
Cerro Coso Community College
College of the Sequoias
Hawai'i Community College
Honolulu Community College
Kapi'olani Community College
Kauai Community College
Leeward Community College
Maui Community College
Northern Marianas College
Porterville College
Windward Community College

Spring 2007

(for June 2007)

Coastline College
Copper Mountain College
Gavilan College
Hartnell College
Imperial Valley College
Los Angeles County College of Nursing and Allied Health
Los Angeles Mission College
Los Angeles Pierce College
Los Angeles Valley College
Orange Coast College
San Joaquin Valley College
Western Career College

Fall 2007

(for Jan. 2008)

Cabrillo College
Cañada College
College of San Mateo
Cuyamaca College
Grossmont College
Marymount College
MTI College
Riverside Community College
Moreno Valley Campus
Norco Campus
Salvation Army Crestmont College for Officer Training
Sierra College
Skyline College

Report of the Commissioner Selection Committee

Current Commission policy allows Commissioners to serve up to two three-year terms. Four Commissioners completed their first term. Three have elected to reapply for a second term; one has retired. The Commissioner Selection Committee met on June 6 and took the following actions:

Dr. James Albanese was reappointed for a second, three-year term as a Public Member of the Commission.

Mr. Floyd Takeuchi was reappointed for a second, three-year term as a Public Member of the Commission.

Ms. Tess Hansen was reappointed for a second, three-year term as a Faculty Member of the Commission.

The Committee had an insufficient pool of qualified candidates for the vacant Faculty Position, and the Commission acted to announce the vacant position in August and September and will consider applicants for this position in the fall.

COMMISSIONER VACANCY

The Commission is accepting applications to fill a Faculty position on the Commission. Application forms are available from the Commission office.

Per ACCJC Bylaws, the Commission Selection Committee consists of seven members, including at least two administrators, two faculty members, and two representatives of the public interest. Three of these members are appointed by the Commission Chair, two from the Commission, and one from the private institutions accredited by ACCJC. One member is appointed by the Pacific Postsecondary Education Council. The Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges, the California Chief Executive Officers, the California Community College Trustees, and the Hawaii Community College Academic Senate Chairs appoint whatever additional faculty, administrative, and representatives of the public are required to complete the composition of the committee. The ACCJC President serves as a nonvoting secretary to the Committee.

Commissioners are appointed for staggered three-year terms and are limited to two three-year terms unless the person is elected as an officer for a term which extends beyond a sixth year in which case, an additional three-year term may be served.

ACCJC's 2006-2007 External Review

The ACCJC is committed to continuous quality improvement of its own processes, standards, and policies. It ensures this commitment through on-going self-evaluation procedures, evaluations of team training and self study workshops, and institutional appraisal of comprehensive evaluation visits. Approximately every six years, the Commission engages in a significant evaluation process that is guided by an External Review Committee. The last six-year review was conducted in 2000-2001. At its meeting in January 2006, the Commission authorized another six-year evaluation for implementation in 2006-2007. The research design for the evaluation will include four phases: structured interviews, internal document and materials review, focus groups, and surveys.

The Commission's Evaluation and Planning Committee is overseeing the work of the External Review Committee (ERC), which began its work in April, 2006. The ERC refined the established purposes of the Commission's 2006-2007 evaluation into the research questions

to be asked and assisted with development of the research design. It will participate in portions of the research to be conducted, as well as the interpretation of findings and preparation of the final draft report. Members of the ERC include Dr. Martha G. Romero, Chair, former Commission Chair and Executive Director of CCLDI, and retired California Community College (CCC) CEO; Dr. Marchelle Fox and Dr. Leslie Purdy, retired CCC CEOs; Dr. Jerry Rudmann, faculty assessment leader and researcher; Dr. Linda Umbdenstock, lead research consultant; Ms. Julie Slark, researcher; Dr. David Drew, higher education representative; Dr. Celina Sau Lin Ing, former Commissioner and faculty member; Ms. Carol Daly, public representative; Dr. David B. Wolf, former ACCJC Executive Director and Dr. Darlene Pacheco, former ACCJC Associate Director. Dr. Sherrill Amador, Chair of the Evaluation and Planning Committee serves as an ex officio member, and Dr. Deborah G. Blue, Vice President for Policy and Research, is the staff member assisting the Committee and working with the lead research consultant.

Substantive Change Committee Meeting Schedule 2006-2007

Institutions seeking substantive change must submit complete documents one month before the Committee meeting.

Fall 2006

September 15, 2006

October 20, 2006

November 17, 2006

December 15, 2006

Spring 2007

No meeting in January because of Commission meeting

February 16, 2007

March 16, 2007

April 20, 2007

May 18, 2007

Summer as needed

(All meeting dates are subject to change depending on scheduling circumstances.)

Note to Institutions: Please contact Commission staff before submitting a substantive change proposal in order that the Committee review of the proposal can be scheduled in a timely manner. Copies of each institutional substantive change application must be mailed directly to each of the committee members. Staff will provide the mailing list after initial institutional contact.

One copy of the college catalog should accompany every application. In addition, applications must include supporting materials such as course syllabi. See the Substantive Change Manual for additional information (available on the Commission web site at: www.accjc.org). Applications must be received no later than one month BEFORE the date of the scheduled meeting.





ACCJC
10 Commercial Blvd.
Suite 204
Novato, CA 94949

COMMISSIONERS

Dr. E. Jan Kehoe, Chair

Long Beach City College

Ms. Lurelean B. Gaines, Vice Chair

East Los Angeles College

Dr. James Albanese

Public Member

Dr. Sherrill L. Amador

Public Member

Ms. Holly Beernink

Western Career College

Mr. Steven Bruckman

Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges

Ms. Christina L. Dyer

Schools Commission Member

Ms. Tess Hansen

Foothill College

Dr. Brice W. Harris

Los Rios Community College District

Dr. Louanne Kennedy

Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities

Dr. Ann Morey

Public Member

Dr. Victoria P. Morrow

Skyline College

Ms. Susan J. Moses

College of Micronesia-FSM

Mr. Joseph L. Richey

Public Member

Mr. Michael T. Rota

University of Hawaii

Mr. Floyd K. Takeuchi

Public Member

Ms. Margaret Tillery

Allan Hancock College

Dr. Norval Wellsfry

Cosumnes River College

COMMISSION STAFF

Dr. Barbara A. Beno

PRESIDENT

Dr. Deborah G. Blue

VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. Garman Jack Pond

VICE PRESIDENT

Dr. Lily Owyang

ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT

Ms. Barbara Dunham

BUSINESS OFFICER, ASST. TO PRESIDENT

Mr. Tom Lane

ITAS