**AIQ Report, October 7, 2015**

**Committee activities focus on:**

1. Developing Strategic Directions Initiatives reports process
2. Developing surveys on perception of effectiveness of college services and district services to the colleges.
3. Examining documents arguing whether CCC’s should retain or remove the ACCJC (Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges) as our regional accrediting commission.

**The summary is in response to #3:**

Only 37 of the California Community Colleges have not received a sanction[[1]](#footnote-1) in the last ten years. BC is one of them. Some schools have had difficulty getting off sanction and had divisive experiences dealing with the process. Others have viewed sanctions as a way to finally get administration or the college on the right path.

The City College of San Francisco (Show Cause status in 2012) situation has been particularly difficult and divisive. CCSF has experienced a dramatic decline in number of students attending. Fewer students🡺fewer sections**🡪**fewer faculty. It was revealed at the CCSF trial that the visiting team had not made a recommendation of Show Cause, but the Commission did. This situation is not the only time the Commission’s position has been different, usually stronger, than the visiting team’s. The Commission’s position is that they see all the reports on all the colleges and apply sanctions consistently. So if College X received a sanction for program review and College Y is showing the same problem, then Y will receive a sanction, too. The visiting team does not have that context and larger view.

Over the years various groups have expressed concern, written reports, and developed resolutions about the ACCJC and the accreditation process. Some feel the Commission has been unresponsive; some feel the Commission has not been responsive enough. Others continue to embed the goals of accreditation—to have an effective institution with quality programs serving students and their communities—in their work.

The June 2014 report by the California State Auditor, *California Community College Accreditation*: *Colleges Are Treated Inconsistently and Opportunities Exist for Improvement in the Accreditation Process*, noted that “88 percent of the college executives responding felt that the commission’s recommendations were reasonable, meaning that the commission appropriately identified issues and concerns and that the commission’s recommendations related to the issues identified” (4).

The most recent report commissioned by the State Chancellor’s Office, the *2015 Task Force on Accreditation*, states that

* The structure of accreditation in this region no longer meets the current and anticipated needs of the California Community Colleges.
* The ACCJC has consistently failed to meet the expectations outlined in section three of this report.
* On several occasions the ACCJC has promised changes and has offered reports detailing their efforts to address concerns, but these promises and reports have led to few significant improvements.
* The California Community College system and its member institutions have lost confidence in the ACCJC. (8)

At its September 21st meeting, the Board of Governors directed the Chancellor to send the Task Force Report to the Department of Education. The Chancellor’s Office declined to meet with ACCJC, which has set an open meeting for Friday, October 9. Sonya and I will be attending. I also read the 57-page report from the BOG meeting (in closed caption form).

Some colleges have developed resolutions or written letters to the DOE in support of ACCJC (Victor Valley, West Hills, Rancho Santiago, Gavilan); the state Academic Senate has resolutions up for voting at the Fall Plenary, November 2015. One is a resolution to endorse the report from the Chancellor’s Office.

AIQ has been reading and discussing the documents as they appear. We now have ACCJC’s written response and its letter to the Department of Education. Relevant documents are posted and continue to be posted at the AIQ page: <https://committees.kccd.edu/bc/committee/accreditation>

I hope that AIQ will develop a position and make a recommendation for voting at the Senate Plenary.

1. Categories:

   a.**Reaffirm Accreditation (**No noncompliance issues)

   b. **Reaffirm Accreditation for** \_\_\_\_ (Specify period up to 18 months) **with a FollowUp Report3** Note: If an evaluation team visit is recommended in addition to the institution’s Follow-Up Report, the reasons should be provided in the team chair’s confidential letter to the Commission.

   c. **Warning with a Follow-Up Report** and evaluation team visit in 18 months

   d. **Probation with a Follow-Up Report** and evaluation team visit in 18 months

   e. **Show Cause** with a Show Cause Report and evaluation team visit in 6 months

   3 If the recommendation is for any action other than “Reaffirmation of Accreditation,” the Team Chair is asked to write a confidential letter to the Commission summarizing reasons for the team recommendation, drawing from the External Evaluation Report. The team chair’s letter will also include explanation if the team wants to recommend a time frame different from what is generally associated with the action. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)