

Summary of Accreditation Task Force Aspirational Vision for Accrediting Agencies

Characteristics of a Successful Accrediting Agency

- A. *“The accreditor emphasizes improvement rather than compliance.”*
Accreditation should ensure the integrity of the community college system, not punish or weaken institutions.
- B. *“The accreditor demonstrates collegiality and consistency in all of its actions with member institutions and constituent groups.”*
Accreditation should be equitable and avoid conflict of interest.
- C. *“Accreditation reports that indicate deficiencies include clear expectations for correction and allow reasonable opportunities for improvement.”*
The level of significance of deficiencies is identified and sanctions are never a first response.
- D. *“The accrediting process and accreditor actions and decisions are transparent.”*
The accreditor does not take actions in response to public input which appear to be retaliatory. Accreditation team members are selected in a transparent way using a process that involves system stakeholders.
- E. *“The regional accreditor demonstrates and maintains consistency with federal accreditation mandates and regional accreditor peers.”*
Best practices for accreditation used by all regional bodies are followed.
- F. *“The accreditor provides quality training to commissioners, visiting team members and member institutions that is inclusive of all groups involved in the accreditation process.”*
System constituent groups are involved in developing training. Visiting teams represent these groups equitably.
- G. *“The accreditor is responsive to and collaborates with California Community College constituent groups.”*
Trustees, faculty, staff and students should be included, along with all levels of administration.
- H. *“The accreditor respects the roles and responsibilities of college and system constituent groups.”*
This item specifically references bargaining units, along with Boards of Trustees, administration and faculty in other capacities. It captures our concerns with incursions into the scope of bargaining.
- I. *“Member institutions have a formal process for periodic evaluation of the accreditor.”*
The formal evaluation is not an internal review but asks for feedback from member institutions.