



# ASCC Accreditation Status

## Presentation to Internal Stakeholders

March 17, 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

# 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. <sup>1</sup>
- *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.* <sup>2</sup>

---

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

<sup>2</sup> 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 15<sup>th</sup> 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. <sup>1</sup>

### Focus Questions: <sup>1</sup>

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: <sup>2</sup>

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.”

---

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

<sup>2</sup> 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: <sup>1</sup>

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: <sup>2</sup>

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.”

---

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

<sup>2</sup> ASCC Show Cause Visiting Team Report to Commission, p. 7

# ASCC Action Plan to Address I.B.3:

1. Complete the SLO 2015-2016 academic calendar assessment cycle (ILOs, GEOs, PLOs, CLOs)
2. Institutional Data Sets (IDS) for institution-set standards and SLO 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. <sup>1</sup>

Focus Questions: <sup>1</sup>

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?

---

<sup>1</sup> 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: <sup>1</sup>

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.”

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 😊



# ‘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>