

## Revised Standards and Process Workshop

### Group II-6 Orcas B

- Buy-in from campus regarding process.
- Sense of integrative process – not another layer of accountability.
- Will there be political backlash from “inconsistent” approaches?
- Implementation schedule pressure.
- Looking forward to feedback on our progress in significant recommendations/goals.
- Role of the institutional researcher?
- Institutional effectiveness does not equate to IR
- Conflict with management model and accreditation, holistic model = flatter model of leadership, i.e. CEO training.
- Is this model no university left behind?
- Can't be personality driven model of leadership. It's long term institutional change.
- We can't afford to let this process fail.
- Desire for efficient process and resources to do this work.
- Centralized office or diffused model?
- Connections between management processes and accreditation processes – how easily can institutions do this?
- Some feeling that a person or a position to lead this for continuity a concern with decreasing resources.
- Synthesis required buy-in – not centralized. Process designer, cheerleader to engage others.
- How does this process involve (or not) faculty and staff? Integral part of process is that faculty part of strategic process and should be part of new process.
- Faculty contract issues to participate/understand accreditation role in their lives. Education of both sides. i.e. co-chairs of committees.
- Suggestion: NWCCU make clear the faculty's role.
- How do you get a culture of involvement on your campus?
- Concerns about expense to involve faculty, staff in addition to their other duties.
- Most difficult aspect?
  - Rationale for indicators not clear.
  - Is this on historical snapshot?
  - What is acceptable methodology for indicators?
  - Desire for support/feedback from commission.
- Reporting to legislature vs. NWCCU – may not be the same indicators.
- Will we be evaluated on our choice of indicators? i.e. “balanced budget” not a good measure.
- Evaluators – will everything be tossed out? Any continuity with old process?
- Potential confusion on terminology. How to achieve consistency? Or do we?
- Evaluators will seek clarity/understanding on use of terms.
- Can year of evaluation reject indicators introduced in year 1?
- Can each evaluation team change your direction?
- What is meant by “non-compliance” with standards? i.e. claim SCO measurement, but not doing it.
- Is standard 2 just the old report?
  - No. more macro analysis.
- What mistakes have we made?
- 2011 deadline – can they submit year 1-3-5 reports earlier and get feedback? Scheduling concerns for 2013 as well.

- Pilots appreciate the new structure timeline.
  - “Vote” in 2009 – what does this mean? What happens if it fails? Is there a “disaster plan” in place?
  - Core themes vs. values. How has Carral handles this distinction? Should values be measured?  
Access – value or theme?
    - If theme, must have a management methodology. Will this be a discussion with evaluators?
    - “Sustainability” – value now, may develop into a theme.
  - Sub-themes mentioned.
    - What are they?
    - Individual prof/technical programs.
    - Perception that sub-themes lead back to old paradigm. We should avoid “stovepipes”.  
Keep narrow focus.
  - Regional meetings – purpose?
-