

# Revised Standards and Process Workshop

## Group 1-11 Elliott A

### Introductions

- CBC, CC, UPS, Truckee, Vancouver BC, Walla Walla CC, Linfield, Tillamook CC, Utah State University, Gonzaga, Grays Harbor College, N. Idaho, Warren Pac., Centralia, Idaho State U.

### Themes

- Logical for institution?
  - Mission statement rewritten?
    - No – career model at CBC; CC – extrapolate key elements (self-ident) from mission and strategic plan
  - Challenges on agreement?
    - No – correlated with strategic plan/ conversation about whether stewardship a theme or core value (CC).
  - Anticipate difficulty with identifying themes?
    - Faculty buy-in an issue; get everyone in conversation.
    - No-but difficult to get own themes (allowed a lot of freedom to define themes).
    - Operationalize “sub-themes” along organizational lines?
      - CC: not much in current organization
        - Theme: what you are doing
        - Value: now you are doing it
    - Some themes are broad, i.e. undergraded.
    - Some themes “meatier” than others.
      - But all are crucial parts of mission.
      - Ways in which themes intersect.
    - St.4 - “measurement” – how do you assess more abstract themes? What are indicators?
      - Could be geared toward opportunities provided, participation in events, classes over time.
    - Formal learning objectives?
      - Wonder how learning outcomes assessment feed into reports.
      - Institutional goals – may not sort neatly into themes; CC articulating relationships of mission, goals – articulate connections in report.
      - “critical thinking”, for example, may not tie directly into a theme.
      - Program-level assessment.
    - Identifying themes seems amorphous.
      - Re-examine and change as we progress.
      - Articulate connections.
        - E.g., services learning courses may show up in academic program with Catholic identity.
    - Developing narrative (report) after identifying themes? Timeline?
      - Drafts based on themes, written by committee with steering committee overview (CBC).
      - Subcommittee of steering committee writing by theme (CC).
        - Goals, outcomes, indicators.
        - Conversation in community – draft.
        - Campus-wide meeting.
          - Overall process.

- Feedback on draft.
  - Feedback from commission after OH1/report 1 provides occasion for discussion prior to visit in “year 3”. [concern of institution starting with “7<sup>th</sup> year” – lack of feedback]. Wherever in process, will have to work more quickly.
- Leadership of process? Financial aspect?
  - CC: co-chairs (course release for faculty), administration, institution effectiveness (3 person steering committee leaders).
    - Replicated in subcommittee (but no release).
    - Suspects need an ongoing group (rather than reconstitute for every report).
    - Institution may need to decide how/who involved.
- Next section/report (resources)
  - Anticipate use previous reports as guide but guidelines not yet determined.
  - Encourage NWCCU – page limits for report 2/resources
- How will “year 7 first” proceed?
  - Committee/sub-committees approach.
  - Evaluator training concerns.
    - “language issues” (if determined by institution)
    - Consistency across visits.
    - Concern about one evaluator reviewing academic program ...
      - Cornish College of Arts – actually, she’s looking for it – has a strategic plan - a lot of congruency, though not everyone sees it. Her worry is how long those steps will take – collapses the process – doesn’t want to short circuit the more meaningful process.
      - We should tell Ron – well you can’t be perfect – just write down process. It’s our passions that are our core themes.
      - Assuming data collecting and assessment practices. How much do you need before .
        - Pac. U – he’s been up to we’re reinventing form of data collection. He’s happier with new form but not yet completely clarified.
        - U of Portland 2011 – may not have everything lined up – doesn’t make sense. He can show you how to do it though.
        - Pilot – you need to be thinking ahead better to start manageable – think about core themes – you already have a lot of

data – IR started categorizing what they have.

- Do you see dropping off some day?
- OSU 2<sup>nd</sup> 5 years of 10 year plan – shifting some, tossing others – but still in their own language for their purposes. Forget done things that aren't meaningful to them.
- Question to Pilot – curious about 2 year, then expanding to 7 year. Then will you staff that? Have you figured out how to staff?
- A-ACSB changed to model like this a few years ago. 5 year process, faulty, centered. Report annually, visit 5 years in past – time off for faulty. Now expected and ongoing.
- Were – part of way we do business. Problem: we don't like to change; administrators giving over turf, power – seeing it as “we”, we've got to think as institution, not our little turf.
- Lack of communication.
- Go back to assessment in departments – we're working on in-class assessment – but how do we make that in a form that's useable for larger one?
- U of – she comes up with groups for everything she does. She does nothing without a discussion.
- Do you go through program reviews? Yes, at departmental level. Just moving (new provost) toward everything from department up. New way of thinking.
- Long standing academic teacher. She's VP Student Affairs – made transition to parallel set of ? clear educational goals, but departments not teaching, we're struggling.
- Taking same review process and using it in other departments.
- Involve whatever groups responsible for strategic planning – move them into other things. Keep them together.
- Forget lofty plans that aren't tied to anything.
- Questions for Pilots – Are you sure you have right core themes? Answer – yes, assessing annually before Board of Directors – confirmed. It's part of the process.

- OSU – you choose your themes because those spoke to you, seemed to represent your ideas. If not, as time goes by, shift them.
- Question: danger of auditors saying – you have ever shifting themes. Answer: well, you would notice it, too. You need a program with some stability so you don't have a shifting target.
- Reason he asked about “correct” core themes. Difference between core values and core themes. Wants to know difference because everything they do flows from values, but he doesn't understand well enough.
- He's been under three NWCCU – standard #1 always remains. Everything flows from that. Accrediting agency's understand that.
- Values not measureable, themes are.
- Well – what are your core values? Spiritual/organization, core values, etc. They have outcomes that flow.
- Pacific - We ask the question: what is it we do? What are we about? One way – that's the way.
- What you do? Values are why you don't.
- Pilots: Took core standards – we need a process of determining themes and revisiting periodical. But: is student services a theme or a value? Well, you're supposed to tie resources to ?
- Treasure Valley CC – what will auditing teams look at? What is the method they will use to determine if we're working at it?
- Worry: team sends out “critical thinking guru” that may impose his own view of it.
- One critical part of evaluator training – you state themes, what you're doing then – this is how we're measuring it ourselves. When someone on team has said – but – they're not doing it right, usually leader reminds of true job.
- Yes, you pick the indicators. So they can't dismiss them.
- But that worry could hold true with current system.

- The more sensible you connect this measurement with theme, goal becomes a hard theme for a wanton evaluator.
- This new set seems like the value the evaluator would be looking at is alignment, not arbitrary standards.
- Seems less of an issue with new format. Less of opportunity for someone to impose their own ideas.
- NW Indiana College – they are fairly unique. New process seems an opportunity to be different. He likes the change – at least it lets us share uniqueness.
- In general – are we receiving this well? Is it a positive direction? Yes – the alignment and continuous process seems great. On other hand, it's still like nailing jelly to a tree! But a lot of fun !
- Pilots: Are you getting direction from commission? Pilot – her school is interested in order to have more interaction. It might be good to have further dialogue with commission for everyone.
- Pilot groups are all talking to each other despite ambiguity. Sister colleges are good idea.
- Is Ron the primary architect or committee? He's fronting it – main representative, but various committees.
- Impression is that NWCCU is developing a template – it's our role to justify how we've answered question. They can't say "that's a bad core theme" as long as you line up everything. We're not "meeting" standards - rather living standards.
- Other associations – it would be curious to find out.
- SACS has been longest – they started process that Neon is using. They are coming out of report – come up with theme of something you haven't spent a lot of time on and need to work on. That's a 3-5 year process in addition to every year projects. Maybe we're pioneers.
- Structural question: all these one year reports looked at by experts? How is this going to work? Interrater reliability?

We've all had experiences – luck of draw who evaluated is.

- Are they going to give us guidance so that we take a wrong path and get clobbered later?
  - He did say panel of 5 – multiple panels – no. There may be smaller groups in 2011. He didn't say. After the bubble maybe more manageable.
  - In past – evaluators are from peer institutions. That won't probably change.
  - What effect on annual reports for OSD. of E. They fill it out but seems meaningless – no obvious rationale for questions.
- 
- Relationship of elements (St2) and the themes?
    - “Old” format distilled? Or should there be some way of incorporating into themes? No conclusion yet.
    - St3 and St4 seem more place to manifest incorporation.
  - All Standards addressed in first report then go back to St1 in next year's report.
  - Benefit of this process: ongoing, especially in terms of reports – structure will be in place, then able to modify.
- All 7 in 2011.
    - Similar to old system (but new system being defined during process).
    - Submit CH1 before 2011 for feedback.
    - Communication among institutions at this stage.
    - Invite Rob Baker (frequently).
    - Journals from pilot institutions.
    - Suspend 5 year interims due in 2010 so commission can review 2011 CH1's.
  - Indicators.
    - Most were comfortable with idea of indicators.
    - Likelihood of approval?
      - Commission committed to change?
      - General support from those in attendance at 2/5 meeting.
        - Like that process is “real time” and evolving; fits well into strategic planning processes.
  - How were Pilot schools chosen?
    - CBC: administration working on a process – they are in process of accrediting under “old” model.
    - Some colleges invited but declined.
  - Suggestions for Commission:
    - Finalize and distribute handbook ASAP.
    - Supporting documentation needs to be identified (ASAP\*)
    - Models provided for other standards (via pilot institutions?)

- What does a team really need, in terms of supporting documentation?  
Let institution decide.
    - However, will begin to define themselves based on evaluator experience.
    - Some guidelines will be helpful.
-