

## Revised Standards and Process Workshop

### Group I-1 Mercer A - President's Morning Session

- Resource concerns
  - Possible additions to staff FTE.
  - More visitors = more costs. (A small colleges concerns, especially?)
- May fit nicely with current structures because of smaller committees etc.
- Institutions with existent planning processes, IR departments, etc. will do well but smaller ones may have big trouble ... perhaps the commission could help with consultant identification/assistance.
- Can't continue reinventing processes without some help, but same values of peer accreditation are the same : peer review, self-reflection, etc. and with plenty of help from NWCCU but still a compliance issue.
- "Gap year" idea to help with post – year seven.
- "Yellow Ribbon" issues & new requirements for new G.I. Bill.
- Use old handbook to crosswalk to new reality.
- Standard 1 terms/definitions ... to what extent will colleges adopt new terms?
- Would be very good for pilots to share their first-year report. Cohort information too.
- Holism/holograph metaphor of viewing the college.
- Versus measurable outcomes or all the variables in a complex situation.
- "Alternative" school approach. "what the hell do they know about what we do?" Lots of work to get to core themes and tie holistically into planning ... culture not fond of business models. A holistic approach addresses root causes and not just symptoms to improve overall performance.
- Question about standard 3 and where goals fit in.
- As for terms, pick them and be consistent. "They are the intermediary" to get to the detail and then back again to big picture view.
- Sustainability concerns ... pushes the institution to think about sustainability/viability every stop of the way with planning and mission as driving force ... how can this process be a strategic tool to sustain the institution?
- The measures we develop must be challenging and must help the institution sustain itself.
- Question: can themes be changed from report to report? Can we do some themes but not all?
- Semantic confusion! Sustainability not just about environmental issues.
- Strategic planning a great thing but don't ruin your college by doing it.
- Data – "turning information into insight".
- Capturing data in real time helpful for better decisions.
- Core themes are more stable than one first might think.
- More data not necessarily better "a few good indicators".
- Question: planning activities ... are they enhanced or made more worthwhile?
- Dashboard valuable.
- Strategic "positioning" rather than "planning".
- Using data to improve personnel's ability to continuously improve.
- Concerned with training of evaluators; easier to look at pieces.
- Synthesizing "silos" is a challenge for those coming from old accreditation model.
- Beauty of the model is "congruence" ... from mission to themes to goals to outcomes.
- Analysis vs. synthesis "grid" (Baker) models how the parts fit into the whole.
- Need to read about "matrix structures" ... multi-dimensional organizational understanding ...
- Continuous improvement model; inter-relatedness; systemic view.

- Addresses mission fulfillment as core feature (not necessarily in other regional accreditation), along with sustainability.
  - Not a template yet not an ambiguous/amorphous approach to cover breadth of institution types.
  - Strength – this model “permeates the organization” ... “nowhere to hide it”.
  - Criteria for standards will be approved in December 2009.
  - What work needs to be done with Board & external stakeholders in order to prepare them for & engage them in change? With staff/faculty?
-