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Welcome and Introductions

• Facilitators
  • Commissioners/Experienced Peer Reviewers
  • ACCJC Staff
• Who is in the room?
• Table introductions
Training Outcomes

Upon completion of this workshop, participants will be able to:

• Understand the dual purpose of the peer review model: compliance and improvement.

• Understand the expectations of being a peer reviewer.

• Understand the importance of reviewing an institution according to standards, within the context of the institution’s mission.
Let’s Play a Game!!!!
Let’s Play a Game!!!!

Step 1: Open a browser on your cell phone

Step 2: Navigate to kahoot.it on your phone

Step 3: Type the game pin in the “Game PIN” field

Step 4: Add a nickname then click “OK, go!”

Step 5: Follow the prompts on your phone!

Let’s Play!
Speed Dating

• Arrange your chairs to face your speed dating partner

• When the clock starts, tell your partner all the things you think will happen when you serve on a team before, during and after the team has completed its work.

• Your partner will jot down your responses (bullet point it) on the scorecard

• Tally up your scores

What are your expectations for serving on a team?
ACCJC 101

• What is the ACCJC?
  • Regional Accréditor (1 of 7)
  • 1 Region, 2 Agencies

• Why do we exist?
  • Gatekeepers to Federal Financial Aid
  • Quality Assurance Based on Peer Review
    • Dual Purpose: Compliance and Improvement
Regional Accreditors
Pacific Island Colleges

plot points.csv

- American Samoa Community College
- College of Micronesia-FSM
- College of the Marshall Islands
- Guam Community College
- Palau Community College

Made with Google My Maps
Purpose of Peer Review

• The most appropriate and desirable approach to evaluate the complex environment of higher education
  • Process that uses academic inquiry to inform practices for quality improvement, based on evidence
  • Results are used to allow for the evolution of policies and practices
• Frequently at odds with governmentally directed evaluation, which often relies on standardization of expectations (CHEA, 2016)
• Dual purpose: compliance vs. improvement
ACCJC Philosophy on Peer Review

• Approaching the review with the right frame of mind
  • Celebrate the college, help the college, support the college

• Mission-centered
  • Culture and environment

• ACCJC staff role in the review

"I cannot teach anybody anything, I can only make them think."
~Socrates
Approach to Peer Review

• The Right Frame of Mind
  • College aligns to the standard vs. looking for the deficiencies
  • How do we review the college with this approach? How do we make this shift?

• The mission-centered review
  • Don’t all two-year colleges have the same mission?
ACCJC’s Expectations of Peer Reviewers

• Have a working knowledge of ACCJC Eligibility Requirements, policies, and Standards, and relevant federal regulations

• Review the college in the context of its mission
  • Remain objective, flexible, and refrain from imposing personal opinions and beliefs

• Represent the Commission and the peer review process
  • Relationships with college personnel – take the fear out of the process

• Communicate clearly and concisely, orally and in writing

• Work as part of a team
Policy on Conflict of Interest for Commissioners, Evaluation Team Members, Consultants, Administrative Staff, and Other Commission Representatives

• Current or prior employment at the institution/district/system being evaluated;
  • Includes candidacy for employment
• Current or prior service as a paid consultant or other business relationship with the institution/district/system being evaluated;
• Written agreement with an institution/district/system that may create a conflict or the appearance of a conflict of interest;
• Personal or financial interest in the ownership or operation of the institution/district/system;
Conflict of Interest Policy, Continued

• Close personal or familial relationships with a member of the institution/district/system;
• Other personal or professional connections that would create either a conflict or the appearance of a conflict of interest; or
• Receipt of any remuneration, honoraria, honorary degrees, honors or other awards from the institution/district/system

❖ If a conflict of interest has arisen that affects your ability to serve on this team, please let your ACCJC vice president know immediately.
Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission Policies – Oh, My!

• ERs
• Standards
  • I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity
  • II: Student Learning and Support Services
  • III: Resources
  • IV: Leadership and Governance
• Policies Cover Federal Regulations
• Resources
• ACCJC Website
Unpacking the Standards - Exercise

• II.A.1 - All instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, including distance education and correspondence education, are offered in fields of study consistent with the institution’s mission, are appropriate to higher education, and culminate in student attainment of identified student learning outcomes, and achievement of degrees, certificates, employment, or transfer to other higher education programs. (ER 9 and ER 11)
Starting the Review – Focusing on the Mission

• Objectives
  • Gain facility and familiarity with reviewing a college in the context of its mission
    • Different types of colleges with the ACCJC membership
    • Not comparing to your institution
    • Not using CA legislation/frameworks/initiatives as the benchmark
Focusing on the Mission for the Review - Steps

1. Individually
   ✓ Read the college’s mission statement.
   ✓ Make notes about the college in relation to its mission

2. As a group briefly discuss the benefits of your college’s mission statement
   ✓ Describe how this mission allows the college to serve its student populations
   ✓ Indicate the strengths of the mission to leverage student learning and achievement
   ✓ Discuss how the college uses the mission to serve students
Standard 1.A.1. Mission

The mission describes the institution’s broad educational purposes, its intended student population, the types of degrees and other credentials it offers, and its commitment to student learning and student achievement.
Mission Integration

- Look at the integration of the mission with other areas of the report/standards
  - The mission provides the framework for all institutional goals/activities
    - Standard 1: A.1-4, B.3,5,7,9 and C.1,5
    - Standard 2: A.1,10 and C.1,4
    - Standard 3: B.2, C.2, and D.2, 16
    - Standard 4: B.3-5, C.5,7.13 and D.2
To Meet or Not to Meet, That is the Question

• Standard II.A.2

• Exceeds the standard
• Meets the standard
• Does not meet the standard
• Somewhat meets the standard????

• Evidence
Exercise on Assignments I and II

• Assignment I: Read the entire ISER...
  • Has the college fully addressed each Standard (I.A, I.B, etc)?
  • List notable and positive aspects of the college efforts to meet each standard.
  • List any substantive concerns you see regarding the college’s efforts to meet each standard.
  • What is your initial impression of the emphasis of the college’s QFE as it relates to the improvement of student learning and student achievement?

• Assignment II: Reread the standard(s) to which you have been assigned...
  • General Observations
  • Findings and Evidence
  • Conclusions—Does the college meet the standard? – Are recommendations or commendations warranted?
  • List those you wish to interview
  • List questions you will need addressed
  • Additional evidence needed
ISER Case Study Exercise

• Read one of the excerpts provided...at your tables:

• With your table mates, discuss your impressions of the excerpt by responding to these Exercise I prompts:
  • Has the college fully addressed each Standard (I.A, I.B, etc.)?
  • List notable and positive aspects of the college efforts to meet each standard.
  • List any substantive concerns you see regarding the college’s efforts to meet each standard.

• Select someone from your table to report the table responses.
ISER Case Study Exercise

• Re-read the excerpt...at your tables:
• With your table mates, discuss your impressions of the excerpt by responding to these Exercise II prompts:
   • General Observations
   • Findings and Evidence
   • Conclusions—Does the college meet the standard? – Are recommendations or commendations warranted?
   • List those you wish to interview
   • List questions you will need addressed
   • Additional evidence needed
• Select someone from your table to report the table responses.
Interviewing Techniques

• Questioning
  • Open-ended, verify, reflect
  • What information do you need?

• Listening

• Responding
  • Body language
  • Ask for examples
  • Seek clarification
Writing Effective Recommendations and Commendations

• Have a clear idea for what issue is
• Which standard(s) is this issue aligned with
  • Use language from the relevant standard(s)
• Don’t develop solutions (in the language of the recommendation or the report narrative)
• Don’t cite California regulations (title 5)
• Must be worded in a way that will help the college align to the standard(s) (or improve) and will also help the Commission with taking action
Other Issues to Consider

• We got this recommendation, so we will give them one too
  • Evolution of peer review
• Commitment of being on a team
• Reality of team staffing
• What have we missed?
ISER Case Study

• With your table mates discuss whether a recommendation or commendation is warranted. If you decide that one is warranted, write it out and share.

NOW...let’s see what the actual visiting team did, and Commission action...
Back to our Training Outcomes

• Upon completion of this workshop, participants will be able to—
• Understand the dual purpose of the peer review model: compliance and improvement.
• Understand the expectations of being a peer reviewer.
• Understand the importance of reviewing an institution according to standards, within the context of the institution’s mission.