

Revised Standards and Process Workshop

Group II-4 San Juan

- What constitutes an adequate rationale?
 - You know it when you see it.
 - Do we really want more specificity?
 - How can we ensure the rationale we present reflects the entire institution?
 - Process allows for revision of information along the way.
 - Important to know what to assess and monitor.
 - Important to choose meaningful assessments.
 - Identification of data should focus on information that drives improvement.
 - Will there be possibilities for revision to the standards after the pilot process?
 - Other than timelines, is this process fundamentally different than the previous process?
 - Emphasis on analysis/synthesis rather than description.
 - Under old process, evaluators are doing the synthesis. New process forces institutions to do their own synthesis.
 - New model forces integrated cross-talk.
 - Old process might have provoked “defensive” writing.
 - There are few people on most campuses who have the necessary broad view to lead the process.
 - Identification of teams, subcommittees works well if they are responding to the needs of the process.
 - Steering committee/core team committee liaisons.
 - While those involved in the accreditation/assessment process understand the change, carrying this message to our campuses can be a challenge.
 - New process promotes dialogue between the institution and evaluators.
 - Evaluators roles are particularly those of peer “consultants”.
 - Process allows for suggestion at key moments rather than strictly judgment.
 - Struggling with identifying the difference between core themes & values.
 - Core themes are demonstrable.
 - Underlying values are the things we “believe” or that we say we “are”.
-