



ASCC Accreditation Status

Presentation to the Board of Higher Education

March 15, 2016

Compiled by the
ASCC President, Vice Presidents, and Accreditation Liaison Officers



Thank you for your Support!

Outline of Presentation

- Part I:
 - Status of Accreditation
 - ASCC Required Actions
 - ASCC Focus and Action Plan
 - Sustaining Institutional Effectiveness
 - Action Timeline
- Part II:
 - Review of Board 2015 Show Cause Recommendations
 - Board Policies
 - Recommendations

Status of Accreditation: Warning

- The Warning sanction is assigned when “an institution has been determined by the Commission not to meet one or more standards, and Reaffirmation for One Year is not warranted. When the Commission finds that an institution is out of compliance with the Commission’s Standards to an extent that gives the Commission, it may issue Warning to the institution to correct its deficiencies, refrain from certain activities, or initiate certain activities, and meet the standards. The Commission may also issue Warning if the institution has acknowledged within its Institutional Self Evaluation Report or Special Report the deficiencies leading to serious noncompliance, and has demonstrated affirmative steps and plans to fully resolve the deficiencies within twelve months. The Commission will specify the time within which the institution must resolve the deficiencies and demonstrate compliance, generally twelve to eighteen months. During the Warning period, the institution will be subject to reports and visits at a frequency to be determined by the Commission. If Warning is issued as a result of the institution’s comprehensive review, reaffirmation is delayed during the period of Warning. The accredited status of the institution continues during the Warning period.”

Commission Action

Dr. Rosevonne Pato
American Samoa Community College
February 5, 2016

Additional Information:

< Under U.S. Department of Education enforcement regulations, the Commission is required to take immediate action to terminate the accreditation of an institution which is out of compliance with any standards, or, alternatively, may provide an institution with additional notice and a deadline for coming into compliance that is no later than two years from when the institution was first informed of the non-compliance. > With this letter, American Samoa Community College is being provided with notice of the Standards for which it remains out of compliance, and is being provided time to meet the Standards.

American Samoa Community College was placed on Show Cause in January 2015, following its comprehensive review in fall 2014. Following the Commission's review of the October 2015 Show Cause Report and Show Cause Evaluation Team Report, the Commission finds that the College has resolved most of the deficiencies in meeting standards and only remains out of compliance with the three Standards noted above. American Samoa Community College must resolve the remaining deficiencies and meet the three remaining Standards by **October 2016**. This deadline falls within the two-year period permitted by federal regulations.

Definitions Related to Commission Actions and Action Letters

- Enforcement Action: Federal regulations require accreditors to take adverse action (action to deny or withdraw accredited status) to enforce compliance with accreditation standards. Under U.S. Department of Education enforcement regulations, the Commission is required to take immediate action to withdraw the accreditation of an institution which is out of compliance with any standard. At the discretion of the Commission and in the alternative, the Commission may provide the institution with notice and a deadline for resolving the deficiencies and coming into compliance that must not exceed two years from when the institution was first informed for noncompliance. The two-year rule, as is commonly known, is found in federal regulations 34 C.F.R § 602.20. It should be noted that the U.S. Department of Education requirement is based solely on the passage of time following notification to the institution of any standard it does not meet. The maximum allowable period for meeting a standard is not based upon whether there is the imposition of a sanction.

ASCC Required Actions

- Follow up Report: is required when an institution must provide evidence that demonstrates it has addressed recommendations, resolved deficiencies identified in evaluation team reports, and meets Commission's Standards. ¹
- *The Report includes a narrative analysis and evidence that describes the resolution of deficiencies identified in the Commission action letter; verifies that Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies (together Commission's Standards) are met; and affirms that the institution will sustain changes/improvements.* ²

¹ ACCJC Guidelines for Preparing Institutional Reports to the Commission, p. 1 (October 2015 Revised Edition)

² ACCJC Guidelines for Preparing Institutional Reports to the Commission, p. 5 (October 2015 Revised Edition)

Report Required Format

- Cover Sheet: The Cover Sheet identifies it is a Follow-Up Report and includes the name and address of the institution and the date of submission.
- Certification Page: The Certification Page certifies there was broad participation in the preparation of the Report and the Report is an accurate reflection of the nature and substance of the institution. The college Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chair of the Governing Board, and other college personnel as appropriate, sign this certification attesting to their review of the Report.
- Table of Contents: The Table of Contents is a listing of the contents of the Report, including appendices.
- Report Preparation: This section describes the process of report preparation and identifies those who were involved in preparation.
- Response to the Commission Action Letter: Each deficiency identified by the Commission in its action letter must be resolved. The Report must provide a narrative analysis and evidence that demonstrates the institution has addressed each recommendation and resolved the associated deficiencies. It must also demonstrate that the Commission's Standards are met and affirm that the institution will sustain the changes/improvements.
- Appendices: The Follow-Up Report shall include appropriate evidence to support the information provided in the Report.

Submission of Report

- The ASCC Follow-Up Report is due to the Commission on the 15th of October, 2016.

ASCC Accreditation Focus

- **Standard I: Mission, Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and Integrity**
 - I.A Mission:
 - I.A.2: The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, and whether the mission directs institutional priorities in meeting the educational needs of students.
 - I.B Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness:
 - I.B.3- Academic Quality: The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information.
 - I.B.6- Institutional Effectiveness: The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.

I.A.2: The institution uses data to determine how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, and whether the mission directs institutional priorities in meeting the educational needs of students.

Effective Practices: A culture of evidence and inquiry is pervasive in the institution, including cohort tracking, using disaggregated data and strong support from the institutional research unit. ¹

Focus Questions: ¹

1. What data does the institution use to determine whether or not it is accomplishing its mission? What institutional processes does the institution use to evaluate the effectiveness and success of its mission? (*Federal Regulation*)
2. How does the institution meet the standard as to the baccalaureate degree, and how is this demonstrated in evidence?

Visiting Team Notes: ²

1. “The College needs time to evaluate its planning processes and to use data for more long range planning.”
2. “The College is in the beginning stages of directing institutional priorities, based on the results of assessment data.”
3. “The College does not meet the Standard.”

¹ ACCJC Guide to Evaluating & Improving Institutions, p. 13 (July 2015 Revised Edition)

² ASCC Show Cause Visiting Team Report to Commission, p. 4

ASCC Action Plan to Address I.A.2:

Improve institutional processes for Program Review, Assessment, Planning and Resources Allocation by solidifying the linkage of these processes to institutional learning outcomes and institutional-set achievement standards to determine institutional priorities and mission effectiveness.

Note: In order to achieve this substandard, substandard I.B.3 and I.B.6 must be addressed first.

Academic Quality- I.B.3: The institution establishes institution-set standards for student achievement, appropriate to its mission, assesses how well it is achieving them in pursuit of continuous improvement, and publishes this information.

Focus Questions: ¹

1. What criteria and processes does the college use to determine its priorities and set minimum expectations (institution-set standards) for student achievement, including required expectations of performance for course completion, job placement rates, and licensure examination passage rates? (*Federal Regulation*)
2. Is there broad-based understanding of the priorities and the processes to implement.
3. To what extent does the college achieve its standards? (*Federal Regulations*)
4. How does the college use accreditation annual report data to assess performance against institution-set standards?
5. If an institution does not meet its own standards, what plans are developed and implemented to enable it to reach these standards? (*Federal Regulations*)
6. How does the institution meet the standard as to the baccalaureate degree, and how is this demonstrated in evidence?

Visiting Team Notes: ²

1. “Time is needed to complete the assessment cycle to determine how well they are achieving the Standard to reach the stage of continuous improvement.”
2. “The College does not yet meet the Standard. It will complete its assessment of student achievement this fall.”

¹ ACCJC Guide to Evaluating & Improving Institutions, p. 15 (July 2015 Revised Edition)

² ASCC Show Cause Visiting Team Report to Commission, p. 7

ASCC Action Plan to Address I.B.3:

1. Complete the Student Learning Outcomes 2015-2016 academic calendar assessment cycle (Institutional Learning Outcomes, General Education Outcomes, Program Learning Outcomes, Course Learning Outcomes)
2. Institutional Data Sets (IDS) for institution-set standards and Student Learning Outcomes analysis are compiled, updated, and disseminated for program review, planning, and resources allocation.

Institutional Effectiveness- I.B.6: The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.

Effective Practices: An equity agenda is integrated with efforts to improve student learning and achievement. ¹

Focus Questions: ¹

1. Does the institution identify significant trends among subpopulations of students and interpret their meaning?
2. Has the institution set performance expectations (key performance indicators) for the subpopulations?
3. How does it judge achievement of the target outcomes?
4. Is the institution performance satisfactory?
5. What changes have been made or are planned as a result of the analysis of the data?

¹ ACCJC Guide to Evaluating & Improving Institutions, p. 16 (July 2015 Revised Edition)

Institutional Effectiveness- I.B.6: The institution disaggregates and analyzes learning outcomes and achievement for subpopulations of students. When the institution identifies performance gaps, it implements strategies, which may include allocation or reallocation of human, fiscal and other resources, to mitigate those gaps and evaluates the efficacy of those strategies.

Visiting Team Notes: ¹

1. “Although the College does disaggregate data by subpopulations for student achievement metrics, it does not disaggregate data by subpopulations with regards to learning outcomes.”
2. “It would still be beneficial to disaggregate the student learning outcomes by gender, age, or other variables.”
3. “The College does not meet the Standard.”

¹ ASCC Show Cause Visiting Team Report to Commission, pp. 8-9

ASCC Action Plan to Address I.B.6:

Review the IDS and identify other areas of student achievement data that should be disaggregated which may include:

- Achievement by age
- Achievement by gender
- Achievement by race/ethnicity
- Achievement by socio economic status
- Achievement by delivery mode
- Achievement by cohort
- Other, as relevant to the college's service area and mission

Sustaining Institutional Effectiveness

- Demonstrating sustainability and compliance:
 - Eligibility Requirements
 - Accreditation Standards
 - Commission Policies



Timeline: General Overview of Planning Tasks and Accreditation Schedule

Please refer to the handout 😊



Sustaining Board Best Practices

Presentation to the Board of Higher Education

March 15, 2016

Part II

Outline of Presentation

- Part I:
 - Status of Accreditation
 - ASCC Required Actions
 - ASCC Focus and Action Plan
 - Sustaining Institutional Effectiveness
 - Action Timeline
- Part II:
 - Review of Board 2015 Show Cause Recommendations
 - Board Policies
 - Recommendations



ACCJC Guide to Accreditation for Governing Boards



‘Accreditation Basics’ Online Course

- **Accreditation Basics:** An online workshop that offers a comprehensive overview of higher education accreditation in the United States, including regional accreditation, and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges as well as an in-depth look at the ACCJC Accreditation Standards. Participation in the workshop will be required for new team members and is recommended for all those interested in learning more about accreditation and/or for team members who are interested in an update on the principles of accreditation or learning more about the Accreditation Standards.
- The workshop will offer a flexible, self-paced learning opportunity. Participants can register and complete the workshop at any time that suits their schedule. The workshop, if taken in full, requires approximately two hours.
- Access to the ‘Accreditation Basics’ Online Course:
<http://www.accjc.org/events/accjc-accreditation-training/accreditation-basics-%E2%80%93-an-online-workshop-on-the-basic-principles-of-accreditation>

Board 2015 Show Cause Recommendation

- **ACCJC Recommendation 9**: In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College use and publish the results of Board of Higher Education self-evaluation to improve Board performance.
(Standard IV.C.10)
 - **Standard IV.C.10**: Board policies and/or bylaws clearly establish a process for board evaluation. The evaluation assesses the board's effectiveness in promoting and sustaining academic quality and institutional effectiveness. The governing board regularly evaluates its practices and performance, including full participation in board training, and makes public the results. The results are used to improve board performance, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness.

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 9

- Setting of Board Outcomes:
 - Clarification of Self Evaluation Processes:
 - Purpose of Self Evaluation
 - Self Evaluation Procedures
 - Utilization of Self Evaluation Findings to set Board Annual Goals
 - Cycle of Self Evaluation Implementation and Review of Self Evaluation Categories
 - Dissemination of Board Self Evaluation Findings and Annual Goals

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 9

- Reviewed Policies on Self Evaluation:
 - What policies do we have on Self Evaluation?
 - There is a policy that mentions self-evaluation however, there are limitations with the process.
 - Board Policy Statement was drafted “Policy 2007” to include processes for Self Evaluation.”

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 9

- Reviewed Board 2014 Self Evaluation:
 - What have we learned?
 - Reemphasizing the purpose of self-evaluation.
 - Facts:
 - Limitation of years served.
 - Familiarity with Board Bylaws and Policies.
 - 2013: Majority of the Board were new members.
 - 2014: The new Self Evaluation was taken.
 - The Board conduct regular self evaluation regarding policies to determine the achievement of the college's mission.
 - Board Policy revisits policy on the terms of the Trustees to ensure the carry over of tasks for continuity.

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 9

- Review of Board Self Evaluation Criterion:
 - I. Mission & Planning
 - II. Policy Role
 - III. Board-ASCC President Relations
 - IV. Community Relations and Advocacy
 - V. Educational Programs and Quality
 - VI. Fiduciary Role
 - VII. HR and Staff Relations
 - VIII. Board Leadership
 - IX. Board Meetings
 - X. Board Education

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 9

- Established the process for Self Evaluation:
 - Set the Responsibilities for each Trustee
 - Mandatory for all Board Trustees
 - Taken during Annual Retreat (Proposal: Week after the ASCC Graduation)
 - Identified the division that compiles the results
 - Institutional Effectiveness
 - Setting of Annual Goals
 - Cycle: During the Annual Retreat
 - Self Evaluation is Taken
 - IE compiles and presents results to the Board (Average & Percentages)
 - Board Sets its Annual Goals
 - Goals/policies are made available to the community

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 9

- Established the process for Self Evaluation:
 - Monitoring Annual Goals
 - Mechanism/Cycle:
 - Calendar of Board Activities
 - » Board members are assigned to monitor particular goals
 - Goals are reviewed quarterly (Policy)
 - Goals/policies are made available to the community
 - Indirect Assessment of Internal Stakeholders: (Board Initiative Fall 2015)
 - » Staff
 - » Students
 - » Community
 - Direct Assessments through Fact Sheets/Reports (Status of Student Achievement Percentages)

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 9

- Established the process for Self Evaluation:
 - Publicizing Board Rulings/Actions Taken
(Considerations to Board Policy)
 - **ASCC Website**
 - **Student 411 Newsletter**
 - **Community Press Release**
 - **Connections/Staff Newsletter**
 - **College Corner on Samoa News**
 - **Facebook**

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 9

- The Board completed its Self Evaluation in August 2015 and used their evaluation to base the setting of annual goals and objectives.



Board actions taken to address Recommendations 9

- Board 2015 Set Goals:
 - Board-ASCC President Relation (Category III)
 - **Goal 1**: The Board will develop better working relationships with the President:
 - Objective 1: To review the effectiveness of institutional decision making through the implementation of ASCC policies.
 - » Referencing Governance Policy Manual: 3002, 3002.1, 3002.2, 3003, 3004, 3005,
 - Objective 2: To enhance teamwork, collaboration, transparency and accountability.
 - » Referencing Governance Policy Manual: 2013, 3010

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 9

- Set Goals:
 - Board Education (Category X)
 - **Goal 2**: The Board will receive training in areas required for trusteeship.
 - Objective 1: To require all new Board Trustee(s) to attend orientation on:
 - Board Roles and Responsibilities
 - Accreditation Basics “Online Course”
 - History, Culture and Values of the Institution
 - Mission and Vision Effectiveness
 - » Referencing Governance Policy Manual: 2010, 2010.1
 - Objective 2: To ensure ongoing training is provided for Board Trustees.
 - Attend ongoing training/workshops concerning governance, institutional leadership and accreditation.
 - » Referencing Governance Policy Manual: 2010

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 9

- Set Goals:
 - Board Meetings (Category IX)
 - **Goal 3**: The Board will follow parliamentary procedures.
 - Objective 1: To set agenda by the Chair and the Board in consultation with the President.
 - » Referencing Governance Policy Manual:, 2001, 2007, 2008, 2009
 - » Referencing Board Policy Manual -I.F
 - Objective 2: To assure Board meetings are open to the public.
 - » Referencing Governance Policy Manual: 2008.2, 2009.4, 2009.5
 - **Goal 4**: The Board will review and monitor Institutional Strategic Plan implementation annually.
 - Objective 1: To invite committees to provide updates on Strategic Planning implementation.
 - » Referencing Governance Policy Manual: 2009.3, proposed policies

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 9

- Set Goals:
 - Community Relations and Advocacy (Category IV)
 - **Goal 5**: The Board will seek community input to determine its needs.
 - Objective 1: To survey the community through an annual college and community educational summit.
 - » Referencing Governance Policy Manual: 2009.4, 2009.5, 2009.6, 8200
 - **Goal 6**: The Board will work with ASG to ensure PL 22-30 is fully enforced.
 - Objective 1: To acquire through a petition the subsidy as determined through the head count.
 - » Referencing Public Law 22-30
 - Objective 2: To develop academic programs through partnerships with private sectors.
 - » Referencing Governance Policy Manual: 8000, 8100, 8200

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 9

- Sustaining Best Practices:
 - Clarified the Board’s policy on Self Evaluation?
 - Introducing of New Policy on Board Self Evaluation:
 - Policy # 2007.1 Board of Higher Education Self Evaluation (Adopted)

Recommendations 9: (Show Cause Report Narrative)

- The Board of Higher Education took action to clarify the roles and practices it has in place for self-evaluation and publication of roles and actions. The Board took action to ensure that it meets this Standard by revising Policy 2005: Board of Higher Education Establishment of Board and College Policies, adopting new Policy 2007.1: Board of Higher Education Self Evaluation, A revision to the Self Evaluation Instrument was made in order to better evaluate the Board's performance in meeting their annual goals. The Board assures transparency and accountability for their performance by publishing on the College website the Self Evaluation results, the 2015-2016 Annual Goals, and Board meeting minutes. ¹

¹ ASCC 2015 Show Cause Report, Responses to the Commission's identified Deficiencies, p. 13

Recommendations 9: (Show Cause Report Evidence)

- Publishing of Board Rulings for institutional Access:¹
 - New Policy 2007.1: Board of Higher Education Self Evaluation (*Adopted*)
 - Revision of Policy 2005: Board of Higher Education Establishment of Board and College Policies
 - Board 2015-2016 Annual Goals (*Approved*)
 - Board Self Evaluation Instrument (*Approved*)
 - Board Self Evaluation Results (*Approved*)
 - Board approval of Policies (*Adopted*)
 - Board Meeting Minutes

¹ ASCC 2015 Show Cause Report, Responses to the Commission's identified Deficiencies, p. 13

Board 2015 Show Cause Recommendation

- **ACCJC Recommendations 10:** In order to meet the Standard, the team recommends that the College establish and implement a Board Code of Ethics and conflict of interest policy that clearly defines conflict of interest and the process for dealing with behavior that violates its code. (Standard IV.C.11; ER 7)
 - **ER 7: Governing Board:** The institution has a functioning governing board responsible for the academic quality, institutional integrity, and financial stability of the institution and for ensuring that the institution's mission is achieved. This board is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are used to provide a sound educational program. Its membership is sufficient in size and composition to fulfill all board responsibilities. The governing board is an independent policy-making body capable of reflecting constituent and public interest in board activities and decisions. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. The board adheres to a conflict of interest policy that assures that those interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution. (Standards IV.C.1, IV.C.4, IV.C.11)
 - **Standard IV.C.1:** The institution has a governing board that has authority over and responsibility for policies to assure the academic quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution.
 - **Standard IV.C.4:** The governing board is an independent, policy-making body that reflects the public interest in the institution's educational quality. It advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or political pressure.
 - **Standard IV.C.11:** The governing board upholds a code of ethics and conflict of interest policy, and individual board members adhere to the code. The board has a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code and implements it when necessary. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. Board member interests are disclosed and do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution.

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 10

- Board Actions:
 - Board meeting with the Governor of American Samoa
 - Actions have been taken. A Trustee recused himself as a member of the ASCC Board of Higher Education.
 - Board accepted the resignation of a Trustee and a letter was submitted to the Governor informing of the resignation.
- Enforced and Strengthened the Board Code of Ethics policies on Conflict of Interest:
 - Policies have been revised:
 - BP 2001 Board of Higher Education Code of Ethics (2 pages)
 - Notes: Bullet #4 (*Recognize that the primary duty of the Board is to represent “the entire College” while maintaining independence from special interests or other politically-active, narrowly focused groups*)
 - Bullet #7: *Remember that as an individual, a trustee has no legal authority outside the meetings of the Board. (Clarified)*
 - **Bullet #10:** *Encourage the active involvement, within the shared governance process, of students, employees and citizens of the “College” with respect to their recommendations on policy development and regulations and consider other’s perspectives as issues are discussed. (COLLEGE Community in place of citizens)*
 - *Policy 2001 has been approved August 25, 2015 by the Board with noted revisions above.*

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 10

- Board Revised Policies:
 - BP 2002 Board of Higher Education Code of Conduct
 - Notes: Bullet 2: Remove CEO and replace with “ASCC” President
 - Review of Board Policy Manual (1998- Policy I.G) and Governance Manual (2008- Policy 2002) on conflict pertaining to the Board of Higher Education Code of Conduct.
 - The Board approved to integrate/incorporate the Board of Higher Education Policy Manual with the Governance Manual and for it to become one document.
 - Board Policy Manual I.G Notes:
 - » Notes:
 - To remove item (8) and place in another policy. *“The College shall indemnify and protect Board members, against death, bodily injury, property damage, and contractual claims suits including defense thereof, when damages are sought for alleged negligent or wrongful acts while such Board member, is acting under the direction of the Board” as written in the Governance Manual, policy 2002.3.*
 - Board Policy I.G from the Board Policy Manual (items 4 – 7) will now be inserted in Governance Policy 2002- Board of Higher Education Code of Conduct.

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 10

- Board Revised Policies:
 - BP 2002.1 Board Violation of the Law, Codes of Ethics and Conduct
 - Notes: New policy to address violation of the Board's Codes of Conduct and Ethics. 2002.1 to be included in the Governance Manual and reformat/renumber policy 2002.1 to 2002.3.
 - Approved by the Board

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 10

- Board Revised Policies:
 - BP 2002.2 Board of Higher Education Conflict of Interest
 - Notes: Items (1-3) were taken from the Board Policy Manual- Policy I.G.
 - Approved by Board

Board actions taken to address Recommendations 10

- Board Revised Policies:
 - BP 2005 Establishment of Board and College Policies
 - Notes: Section C: Official Policy Manual (*The official copy shall be kept in the President's office and the President or designee shall be responsible for its accuracy and currency as approved by the Board.*)
 - Approved by the Board 😊

Recommendations 10: (Show Cause Report Narrative)

- The College took action by the establishment of Board Policies that clearly defined the conflict of interest and process for dealing with behavior that violates this code. The policies that were revised include Policy 2001: Board of Higher Education Code of Ethics and Policy 2002: Board of Higher Education Code of Conduct. New policies were adopted to clearly identify the actions of the Board for violation of its code of conduct which include Policy 2002.1: Board of Higher Education Violation of the Law, Code of Ethics and Conduct and Policy 2002.2: Board of Higher Education Conflict of Interest. The Board Trustee with a conflict of interest resigned in August of 2015, resolving the conflict of issue code. ¹

¹ ASCC 2015 Show Cause Report, Responses to the Commission's identified Deficiencies, pp. 13-14

Recommendations 10: (Show Cause Report Evidence)

- Cited Evidence: ¹
 - Board Meeting Minutes on resignation of Board member.
 - Revised Policy 2001: Board of Higher Education Code of Ethics.
 - Revised Policy 2002: Board of Higher Education Code of Conduct.
 - Policy 2002.1: Board of Higher Education Violation of the Law, Code of Ethics, and Conduct.
 - Policy 2002.2: Board of Higher Education Conflict of Interest.

¹ ASCC 2015 Show Cause Report, Responses to the Commission's identified Deficiencies, p. 14



Awesome Job!

Status Review of Board 2015 Goals

- **Goal 1:** The Board will develop better working relationships with the President.
 - Objective 1: To review the effectiveness of institutional decision making through the implementation of ASCC policies.
 - Objective 2: To enhance teamwork, collaboration, transparency and accountability.
- **Goal 2:** The Board will receive training in areas required for trusteeship.
 - Objective 1: To require all new Board Trustee(s) to attend orientation on:
 - Board Roles and Responsibilities
 - Accreditation Basics “Online Course”
 - History, Culture and Values of the Institution
 - Mission and Vision Effectiveness
 - Objective 2: To ensure ongoing training is provided for Board Trustees
 - Attend ongoing training/workshops concerning governance, institutional leadership and accreditation.
- **Goal 3:** The Board will follow parliamentary procedures.
 - Objective 1: To set agenda by the Chair and the Board in consultation with the President.
 - Referencing Governance Policy Manual:, 2001, 2007, 2008, 2009
 - Referencing Board Policy Manual -I.F
 - Objective 2: To assure Board meetings are open to the public.
 - Referencing Governance Policy Manual: 2008.2, 2009.4, 2009.5

Status Review of Board 2015 Goals

- **Goal 4**: The Board will review and monitor Institutional Strategic Plan implementation annually.
 - Objective 1: To invite committees to provide updates on Strategic Planning implementation.
- **Goal 5**: The Board will seek community input to determine its needs.
 - Objective 1: To survey the community through an annual college and community educational summit.
- **Goal 6**: The Board will work with ASG to ensure PL 22-30 is fully enforced.
 - Objective 1: To acquire through a petition the subsidy as determined through the head count.
 - Objective 2: To develop academic programs through partnerships with private sectors.

Status Review of Board 2015 Goals

- What data do we have?
- Where do we want to go?
- How do we get there?



Status Review of Board 2015 Goals

- Notes: