College ready for ACCJC external evaluation team visit Mon., Mar. 9 thru Thur., Mar. 12

After more than 2-1/2 years of self evaluation activities and six years of planning to prepare for BCC’s six-year external evaluation team visit by the Association for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACCJC/WASC), the college submitted its report in December 2014. ACCJC accreditation teams will visit Berkeley City College, College of Alameda, Laney College and Merritt College Mar. 9-12, 2015.

At BCC, more than 80 BCC faculty, staff members, administrators and students worked for over 1-1/2 years on the four accreditation standards which resulted in a comprehensive self evaluation. They conducted interviews and surveys, gathered data, met with students, faculty and staff, and researched and organized data to prepare for an ACCJC accreditation team visit set for Mon., Mar. 9 through Thur., Mar. 12.

Standard I: Institutional Mission and Effectiveness
Co-Chairs: Dr. May Chen and Jenny Lowood
Principal Writer: Jenny Lowood

• Standard IA: Mission
  Co-Chairs: Dr. May Chen and Gail Pendleton
  Principal Writer: Shirley Fugarino

• Standard IB: Institutional Effectiveness
  Co-Chairs: Dr. May Chen and Jenny Lowood
  Principal Writer: Jenny Lowood

Standard II: Learning Programs & Services
Instructional Programs, Student Support Services, Library & Learning Support Services
Co-Chairs: Brenda Johnson
Principal Writer: Jenny Lowood

• Standard IIA: Instructional Programs
  Co-Chairs: Dr. Dylan Eret and Jenny Lowood
  Principal Writer: Katie Koelle

• Standard IIB: Student Support Services
  Co-Chairs: Allene Hamilton-Hegler and Brenda Johnson
  Principal Writer: Hermia Yam

Standard III: Resources—Human, Physical, Technology and Financial Resources
Co-Chairs: Shirley Slaughter and Dr. Carlos Cortez
Principal Writers: Dr. Tim Rose, Laurie Brion, Gabe Winer and Adan Olmedo

• Standard IIIA: Human Resources
  Co-Chairs: Antonio Barreiro and Nancy Cayton
  Principal Writer: Laurie Brion

• Standard IIIB: Physical Resources
  Co-Chairs: Mostafa Ghous and John Pang
  Principal Writer: Dr. Tim Rose

• Standard IIIC: Technology Resources
  Co-Chairs: Dr. Fabian Banga and Lee Marrs
  Principal Writer: Gabe Winer

• Standard IIID: Financial Resources
  Co-Chairs: Shirley Slaughter and Jennifer Lenahan
  Principal Writer: Adan Olmedo
I want to thank you all for your work on Berkeley City College’s self evaluation over the past 2-1/2 years. An important component of the accreditation process is the external evaluation. On March 9-12, 2015, Berkeley City College will host an External Evaluation Team comprised of professional peers from a cross-section of community college constituencies, who volunteer their time and provide independent insights based on both the written Institutional Self Evaluation Report and their interactions and observations during the campus visit. Ms. Renee Martinez, team chair and president of Los Angeles City College, was selected based on her expertise and accreditation experience.

Additional team members were drawn from a roster of experienced educators who have exhibited leadership and balanced judgment. They include faculty members, academic and student services administrators, a chief executive officer, a trustee, a business officer, and individuals with expertise/experience in learning resources, distance education, and/or planning, research and evaluation.

During their time on campus, members of the External Evaluation Team will expect to meet with the college/district CEO, administrators, department chairs/program coordinators, members of the Governing Board, students and persons with substantial responsibility for producing the Institutional Self Evaluation Report. External evaluation team members may also decide to attend meetings of Peralta’s Board of Trustees, should one be scheduled during the time of the site visit.

Dialogue with External Evaluation Team members will include both structured conversations—such as an Open Forum, classroom visits, individual interviews, or meetings—and informal conversations with members of our campus community. Among the primary responsibilities of the External Evaluation Team will be to:

- assess the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, and clarify any questions;
- confirm that institutional practices are aligned with the Accreditation Standards;
- identify potential areas for improved compliance;
- assure the Commission that the institution continues to meet eligibility requirements; that the institution has been responsive to the recommendations of previous visiting teams; and that the institution has developed sound evaluation and planning procedures to foster improvement of student achievement and student learning outcomes;
- reinforce and extend the College’s commitment to its continuing pursuit of excellence; and
- write an evaluative report with recommendations for improvement.

Even when institutions meet all Accreditation Standards, continuous improvement remains a key goal of the accreditation process.

Remember that team members are here to:

- affirm the content of BCC’s self evaluation; and
- measure BCC in relation to the Accreditation Standards and Eligibility Requirements.

They will also:

- request documents throughout the visit;
- request to meet with individuals or committee representatives to clarify/affirm information; and
- visit BCC classes (Online and/or in person).

On the final day the team will make a general statement but will not comment on the college’s accreditation status or the team’s final recommendations. No questions will be taken. This will occur from 12:15 to 1:15 p.m. on Thur., Mar. 12, in the auditorium, during College Hour.

Thank you again to everyone in BCC’s college community for their commitment to our students and the accreditation process which affirms and ensures that we will continue to transform lives for many years to come.

Sincerely,

Dr. Deborah F. Budd, President
Berkeley City College welcomes
ACCJC/WASC External Evaluation Team

Berkeley City College welcomes the ACCJC/WASC external team members who will spend Mon., Mar. 9 through Thur., Mar. 12 evaluating the college’s Self Evaluation Report, programs and services. They will meet with faculty, staff, students and administrators, observe classes and attend college meetings. Group members represent a variety of community college roles. We welcome them and look forward to their evaluation.

Ms. Renee Martinez, Team Chair, is President of Los Angeles City College (LACC). In August of 2012, Ms. Martinez was appointed Interim President at LA City College by the Chancellor of Los Angeles Community College District. In July 2013, she became LACC’s 16th permanent president. She has worked in community college education for more than 36 years and notes that she feels a responsibility to set an example as a leader to all students attending community colleges, especially female students. She supports her staff and encourages them to be independent in their work environment, to further their education and to provide good customer service to all needing their assistance. Her responsibilities include managing all college departments, faculty, and staff as well as overseeing the college budget, student success, and student support services. Her principal responsibility is to provide the vision, leadership, and strategic direction to ensure that LACC achieves the goals set forth by Los Angeles Community College District.

Dr. Daniel Walden, Team Assistant, is Vice President of Academic Affairs at Los Angeles City College (LACC). He has many years of direct administrative experience, as a dean of academic affairs, dean of institutional effectiveness, and vice president of academic affairs. In addition, he has served as the administrator charged with facilitating campus planning (including program review), facilitating the SLO process, and overseeing the Office of Institutional Research and as an Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO). Over the past 13 years, he has worked to improve effectiveness in serving under-prepared students coming from socioeconomically depressed areas. He holds a Ph.D. in Education with a focus in Higher Education Administration from Claremont Graduate University.

ACCJC/WASC External Evaluation Team Faculty Representatives

Dr. Linda Lopez Chaparro is a Psychology instructor at Oxnard College. She teaches a wide range of courses in Psychology and developed a Certificate of Proficiency in Community Mental Health in collaboration with the Ventura County Behavioral Health Department. Dr. Chaparro is a graduate of California State University, Northridge, holds a master’s degree from UC Berkeley, and earned her Ph.D. from the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.

Dr. Howard Irvin is Dean of Student Development and Matriculation at San Diego Miramar College. Dr. Irvin’s extensive background in California’s community college system includes over 18 years’ experience in administrative and faculty positions. He has served on four visiting team site visits for ACCJC/WASC. Dr. Irvin holds a Ph.D. in Human Organizational Systems from Fielding Graduate University, and two master’s degrees, one in Counseling from San Diego State University and the other in Human Development, also from Fielding.

Dr. Pamela Kersey, Ed.D., MSN, RN is Chief Instructional Officer and Dean at Copper Mountain College in Joshua Tree, CA. Prior to her role in Joshua Tree she was a Nursing Professor and the Assistant Director of the Nursing Program at San Diego City College. She earned her Ed.D. from San Diego State University’s Community College Leadership Program and earned Master of Science and Bachelor of Science degrees in Nursing from California State University Dominguez Hills.

Professor Lisa Marchand is Professor of English as a Second Language (ESL) at Consumnes River College, Sacramento. Professor Marchand has been Academic Senate President, chaired committees, led SLO development and curriculum alignment, and edited accreditation self-studies. She has also been an adjunct ASL teacher, classified employee, and community college student. Her education includes a B.A. in Communication Studies from California State University, Sacramento; and M.A. in Linguistics from UC Davis.

(see p. 4)
Dr. Marie Mestas is Associate Professor of Library Science at San Bernardino Valley College. She joined San Bernardino Valley College as a librarian in 1991 and then served for 16 years as library dean. A 2013 reorganization eliminated the library dean’s position and Dr. Mestas rejoined the faculty. She also teaches as an adjunct in the college’s Library Technology associate’s degree and certificate program. Dr. Mestas earned an M.L.I.S. degree in Library and Information Science from UCLA’s School of Library and Information Science and a Ph.D. from Capella University.

Mr. Charles Sasaki is Dean of Arts and Sciences at Kapiolani Community College in Honolulu, HI. As Dean of Arts and Sciences at Kapiolani Community College, Mr. Sasaki collaborates with over 200 faculty who teach courses for university transfer, general education, STEM, and New Media Arts. He has served as a Chief Diversity Officer, in senior leadership roles in Student Affairs, and as an Ethnic Studies faculty member. Mr. Sasaki is a former Fulbright Scholar with a particular interest in the success of minority, first-generation, and economically disadvantaged students.

Dr. John Sciacca is Dean of the Health Sciences Division at Cypress College. Dr. Sciacca has worked in a variety of positions in higher education for over 30 years. He is an experienced evaluation team member for ACCJC as well as for numerous public health education programs. He holds a master’s degree in Health Care Administration from Central Michigan University; and Ph.D. in Health Education from Purdue University.

Dr. Daniel Wanner is a Professor of Music and Accreditation Co-Chair at Los Angeles City College (LACC), where he has taught since 2001. Dr. Wanner has taught full-time in the music department at Los Angeles City College since 2002. He served as music department chair for nine years and as the chair of department chairs for seven years. He is currently the faculty co-chair of the college’s accreditation efforts. Dr. Wanner received his M.A. degree in Music and Doctorate of Musical Arts degree in Composition from Columbia University in New York City.

Mr. Laurence Frank is President of Los Angeles Trade and Technical College. Mr. Frank has been a pastor, union, then community and political organizer, and attorney, faculty leader, deputy mayor and now president of Los Angeles Trade-Technical College. As Deputy Mayor of Los Angeles, he oversaw workforce development and external labor relations. He graduated Phi Beta Kappa and Magna Cum Laude from St. Lawrence University in Canton, New York with a bachelor’s degree in Religious Studies. In 1990, he received a J.D. degree from the UCLA School of Law.

Mr. Edralin Madruli is Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services of the West Valley-Mission Community College District in Saratoga, CA. He has served as the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services for the West Valley Mission Community College District since April 2009. Mr. Madruli responsible for the district’s finances, information systems, public safety, maintenance operations, facility renovation/construction, and general services. Previously, he served as the Assistant Superintendent/Vice President at Cuesta College and Vice President at Las Positas College. Before accepting his community college administrative posts, he served in the United States Air Force, retiring as a Lieutenant Colonel.

Dr. Kayleigh Carabajal is Vice Chancellor of Educational Planning and Services at the Yuba Community College District in Marysville, CA. Dr. Carabajal has served as chief instructional officer and institutional researcher at Lassen College in Susanville, CA. Her experience also includes service in various academic and student service positions from culinary arts instructor and academic advisor to Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Research at Central New Mexico Community College.

Ms. Myra Cruz is a Trustee for the San Jose/Evergreen Community College District in San Jose, CA. She holds a bachelor’s degree in Psychology from the University of Puerto Rico and a master’s degree in Education from San Jose State University. Ms. Cruz serves as faculty and Academic Senate President at De Anza College. She has been a Trustee for the San Jose/Evergreen Community College District since 2009 and a Board President for S.I.R.E.N., an immigrant organization.
College committed to mission, vision, values

Berkeley City College is committed to continuous improvement and outcomes which will support its mission, vision and values. College planning and processes are centered around these. BCC’s Mission is posted throughout the college: in classrooms, on bulletin boards and in its primary publications. Copies are online at: http://www.berkeleycitycollege.edu/wp/bccpub/files/2014/10/Mission_Vision_Values.pdf

Mission

Berkeley City College’s mission is to promote student success, to provide our diverse community with educational opportunities, and to transform lives.  

*Adopted by the Peralta Board of Trustees October 7, 2014*

Vision

Berkeley City College is a premier, diverse, student-centered learning community, dedicated to academic excellence, collaboration, innovation and transformation.

Values

Berkeley City College embraces values which allow all members of our college community to grow and thrive. Our values include the following:

• A Focus on Academic Excellence and Student Learning. We value our students’ varied educational and experiential backgrounds and learning styles, as well as educational objectives.

• A Commitment to Multiculturalism and Diversity. We value diversity, which fosters appreciation of others, depth of understanding, insight, empathy, innovation and creativity, characteristics our institution seeks in its students, faculty and staff.

• A Commitment to Preparing Students for Citizenship in a Diverse and Complex Changing Global Society. We value the fact that students live and work in an increasingly complex society and world.

• A Commitment to a Quality and a Collegial Workplace. We value the high quality that characterizes everything we do.

• The Importance of Innovation and Flexibility. We value innovation because it encourages our students to question the typical and expand their thinking in a flexible manner that allows them to understand life’s dynamic potential.

College ready for ACCJC External Evaluation Team
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- Standard IV: Decision Making Roles & Processes
  - Co-Chairs: Paula Coil, Ramona Butler and Cleavon Smith
  - Principal Writer: Dr. Joseph Bielanski

- Standard IV-A: Decision-Making Roles & Processes
  - Co-Chairs: Paula Coil, Ramona Butler and Cleavon Smith

- Standard IV-B: Board & Administrative Organization
  - Chair: Dr. Joseph Bielanski
  - Principal Writer: Dr. Joseph Bielanski

  “We can all be proud of this accomplishment,” said Jenny Lowood, English Department chair and principal author and editor of the report. “Many people spent many hours using and developing tools to evaluate our strengths and weaknesses; our self evaluation shows that BCC has made tremendous progress.”

View BCC’s self evaluation and related accreditation materials online at: www.berkeleycitycollege.edu/wp/accreditation

Faculty, staff, administrators and student leaders participated in BCC’s latest self evaluation.

During their Mar. 9-12 visit, the ACCJC accreditation self evaluation team will engage in activities which include classroom visits, interviews, open forums, and college and District meetings.
12 common questions and answers about accreditation

The questions and answers below provide basic information about the regional accreditation process. They will help you to understand the purpose of accreditation and how college self evaluations are implemented.

1. What is regional accreditation?

Regional accreditation is a successful and robust, time-tested model of professional peer review that supports educational excellence. Accreditation is a voluntary process of quality review that institutions agree to undergo periodically. The accrediting commissions with responsibility for accreditation in various regions are legally recognized by the federal government. The public has come to value accreditation as a mark of quality.

Accreditation is a system of self regulation developed by higher education institutions to evaluate overall institutional quality and encourage continual improvement. Colleges and universities form membership associations to set up an accrediting agency and work with that agency to establish the quality standards used to rigorously evaluate the institutions. Accreditation Standards represent the best practices in higher education and set a high expectation for quality.

There are six geographic regions under the U.S. system recognized by the federal government and one accreditor has exclusive responsibility for accreditation within each. There are other types of accreditation (national, programmatic) but regional accreditation status is regarded as the most comprehensive and rigorous for institutions to attain.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) is part of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) region. WASC operates in California, Hawaii and the Pacific Region that includes Guam, American Samoa, the Republic of Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands. Five other regional accreditors operate in and have names associated with other geographic regions of the United States.

2. What authority do regional accreditors like ACCJC have to impose Accreditation Standards on institutions?

Regional accreditors are given the authority to apply their Accreditation Standards by the member institutions that have voluntarily joined a regional association to improve educational quality. The ACCJC and other regional accrediting bodies are also authorized to operate by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) through the Higher Education Opportunity Act. The USDE evaluates accrediting bodies every five years through a process called “recognition.”

The USDE has several requirements that accrediting bodies must demonstrate they continuously meet, including integrity of the process, making the results of accreditation available to the public, and fairness in the even application of the Accreditation Standards to all institutions.

Accreditation from a U.S. Department of Education-recognized accreditor, such as the ACCJC, enables institutions to qualify for federal Title IV funds (financial aid for students) and other federal grants and contracts. The Accreditation Standards of a recognized accrediting body such as the ACCJC are developed with some input from the Department of Education and Congress, which also asks each accreditor to encourage the active participation of all member institutions in a transparent and open process that assures educational quality.

3. What is the purpose of regional accreditation?

Accreditation is a proven method for assuring that a higher education institution has the ability to offer a quality education to the men and women who will lead their communities in the future, and to improve that quality over time. By establishing high standards and then being externally evaluated against those standards, colleges and universities can provide a degree or certificate that students and the community can trust.

In achieving and maintaining its accreditation a higher education institution assures the public that the institution meets standards of quality, that the education earned there is of value to the student who earned it, and that
employers, trade or profession-related licensing agencies and other colleges and universities can accept a student’s credential as legitimate.

Just as important, the process provides a means for an institution to continuously improve educational quality and grow to meet the changing needs of students and society. Internal evaluation is a critical part of the accreditation process and through the various phases of an accreditation process colleges and universities are able to build on strengths and improve weaknesses so that they offer a better education.

4. **How is the accreditation review conducted?**

There are four phases to the accreditation process involving internal evaluation, external evaluation by professional peers, Commission evaluation, and institutional self-improvement to meet evolving regional and federal standards. Every six years ACCJC members have agreed to undergo the comprehensive process to determine whether they are meeting their established Accreditation Standards and to develop ways to improve their future ability to serve students.

Every accreditation review starts with an internal evaluation. An institution engages in comparing itself to Accreditation Standards, writes an internal (i.e., self) evaluation report, develops its own plans for improvement where needed, and submits the written analysis to its accrediting agency for review.

At the second phase, a trained team of education professional peers from member institutions conducts an external institutional evaluation. The external evaluation team, all volunteers, visits the institution, examines the institutional internal evaluation, examines institutional practices, and writes an evaluative report with recommendations for improvement.

The third phase occurs when the members of the regional accrediting commission evaluate all the information and make the decision on the accredited status of the institution. The Commission may also provide recommendations and direction for institutional improvement in areas where improvement is needed. ACCJC Commissioners review institutional cases at meetings in January and June of each year.

Whether the institution meets the current Accreditation Standards or not, the fourth phase is about self-improvement and each institution uses the recommendations of the external evaluation team and the Commission to guide changes that make their educational quality better.

The goal is always to improve institutional performance before the start of the next six-year review. The Commission may monitor and advise an institution until it improves. If an institution is out of compliance with the Accreditation Standards, the Commissioners may require a follow-up report from the institution, or another team visit, and/or may impose a sanction and deadlines for the institution to come into compliance with all Accreditation Standards. A sanction signals the institution and the public that there are institutional issues that need to be addressed if quality is to be maintained. While on sanction, institutional accreditation continues and the institution works to resolve any such issues.

An institution seeking accreditation for the first time undergoes a similar process including an internal examination using the Accreditation Standards and an external team evaluation using the Accreditation Standards. It then will spend three to five years in pre-accreditation statuses of Eligibility and Candidacy as it demonstrates that it has the capacity to continuously meet Accreditation Standards. When the institution is found to meet all Accreditation Standards and policies, it is awarded “initial accreditation”, and thereafter is subject to a comprehensive review every six years.

(see p. 8, column 1)
5. What are the Accreditation Standards?

The Accreditation Standards are the basic tool used by member institutions to gauge their success in providing high quality education and in continually improving. The Accreditation Standards focus a good deal on institutional practices that support student completion of certificates and degrees, and student learning. Accreditation helps assure that students get a sound and useful education that is of lifelong value.

Accreditation Standards are established in collaboration with an accrediting association’s member institutions and discussed in public hearings with multiple opportunities for comment by the member institutions and the concerned public before they are adopted. Standards are reviewed, and changes are considered, every six years. In addition, Accreditation Standards are statements of expected practice that are developed by the Accrediting Commission, with input from the U.S. Department of Education that reflect Congressional guidelines and expectations for institutional quality. These federal requirements are increasingly more rigorous.

The Accreditation Standards describe good practices in areas of institutional operations, including institutional mission, institutional effectiveness (i.e., achieving stated mission, providing effective educational services), instruction, support services, library and learning resources, human resources, facilities and physical resources, information technology resources, fiscal resources and fiscal management, and governance and decision making.

6. Who are the Commissioners?

The ACCJC has nineteen Commissioners who represent the interests of the general public and the regional member institutions. According to the ACCJC bylaws established by the member institutions:

- Three represent the public interest and have no affiliation with any member institution, as required by federal regulations;
- Two may be people who do not fit any of the other categories of members; and
- Three are administrators from member institutions;

Six people each representing one of the following educational entities:

1. The California Community Colleges;
2. The University of Hawai‘i Community Colleges;
3. The Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of WASC;
4. The Accrediting Commission for Schools of WASC;
5. The Pacific Colleges other than Hawai‘i accredited by the ACCJC; and
6. Private colleges accredited by the ACCJC.

7. How are the members of the Commission elected?

The Commissioner election process solicits nominations and applications for vacant Commissioner positions through a widely distributed announcement each year in February. Persons interested in becoming a Commissioner complete application materials. A Nominating Committee comprised of four sitting Commissioners and four persons from member institutions nominates a slate of candidates; chief executives of member institutions may add alternative candidates to the slate. The chief executive officers of member institutions then elect the new Commissioners. The Commissioner election process ensures that individuals with personal integrity and true commitment to higher education quality are elected to serve as Commissioners.

8. Who serves on evaluation teams?

Evaluation teams are comprised of eight to 12 volunteer education professionals from member institutions who have relevant expertise and are trained by the Commission staff to employ the ACCJC Accreditation Standards in evaluating institutional practices. They are administrators, faculty, and sometimes trustees of two-year colleges. They have experience in educational governance and administration, instruction, student services, research, facilities, learning resources, fiscal management, human resources and technology resources.

The Commission selects evaluation team members on the basis of their professional expertise and specializations (e.g., Distance Education experts are frequently needed), their experience with accreditation at their own campuses and their ability to apply the Accreditation Standards fairly and consistently. Work as a volunteer evaluator requires a substantial commitment of the evaluator’s time, and a team member participates in a four-to five-day long evaluation visit.

Evaluators must also be analytic and use evidentiary materials, have strong interpersonal skills, be able to apply Accreditation Standards to institutions objectively, be able to write well, use a computer for writing, and work well as members of the team. Evaluator training and experience help the team members enhance their skills, and so individuals willing to serve as team members for several years are desirable.

9. Are the institutions expected to meet all Accreditation Standards at all times?

Yes. Institutions that seek ACCJC accreditation agree to adhere to the Accreditation Standards established by the member institutions at all times. Since accredited status is a signal to the public that an institution satisfies all Accreditation Standards, institutions have to remain in compliance at all times. Anything short of that would diminish public confidence in accreditation as a means of assuring quality. When there is a major change in
12 questions, answers about the accreditation process
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Accreditation Standards, the Commission sets a reasonable time line for institutions to comply with them; for example, the 10-year time line for implementing student learning outcomes.

However, institutional practices may change, and institutions sometimes don’t continuously meet all Accreditation Standards. The purpose of the six-year review is to provide the impetus for re-evaluation of institutional quality. Recommendations for improvement result if the evaluation concludes there are some institutional deficiencies to address OR there are opportunities to improve and exceed the Accreditation Standards.

10. Does the Commission’s process help institutions improve, or just expose them to negative publicity when the institution is found not to meet all Accreditation Standards?

The accreditation process is very effective in helping institutions to improve their educational and institutional effectiveness. Accreditation Standards developed by the ACCJC are drawn from best practices within the member institutions as well as from best institutional practices nationally.

The accreditation processes reinforce the institutional responsibility to implement these Accreditation Standards. The institution is given a good deal of professional advice and support for improvement and opportunities to train faculty and staff on the Accreditation Standards. Professional peers who comprise the evaluation teams give good advice, tailored to the institution’s mission and other institutional characteristics. Professional peers on the Commission also provide advice and recommendations. Commission staff also gives advice, training and support to institutions that have been found out of compliance and are trying to make needed changes.

Except in the most egregious cases, the Commission gives institutions some time to implement the recommendations for improvement and to come into compliance with Accreditation Standards. Colleges report to the Commission that the accreditation findings and recommendations, and the time limit given for improvement, and even the sanctions given, help to focus institutions on what must be done to improve.

11. If found out of compliance, how long does the institution have to correct that situation? Is there a limit on the amount of time an institution will be given to improve?

Federal law requires higher education institutions that are found to be out of compliance to come into full compliance with all Accreditation Standards within two years. This is known as the “Two Year Rule.” The law requires the Commission to terminate accreditation if an institution fails to come substantially into compliance within this period unless there are some rare and extenuating circumstances.

12. How does the Commission ensure that its decisions are fair and unbiased, and that its evaluation teams are unbiased?

The Commission applies the Accreditation Standards in a consistent manner to all the institutions being accredited. The accreditation process is designed to be transparent and collaborative so that the institutions feel the accreditation process is fair and will yield accurate results. The Commission holds itself accountable for good practice by evaluating and assessing its own ability to make fair and unbiased decisions on accreditation. The evaluation encourages feedback so an institution’s views of the process or an evaluation team report can be heard by the Commission.

The Commission works to make sure the process is fair through the development of clear conflict of interest policies, effective training of evaluators, rigorous evaluation of team members by staff and member institutions, and by encouraging feedback by institutions undergoing evaluation.

The Commission’s policy on Conflict of Interest applies to Commissioners reviewing an institutional case as well as to evaluation team members and Commission staff. Commissioners with a conflict or potential conflict are not permitted to evaluate a case; team evaluators with a conflict or potential conflict are not permitted to serve on a team or are removed from an evaluation team if a conflict is identified by the individual, the institution or the Commission.

The Commission members undergo training on fairness and consistency. Commission meetings always begin with a review of the Policy on Conflict of Interest as well as a discussion of fairness and consistency in applying Accreditation Standards to all institutions. All evaluation team members are trained prior to each comprehensive evaluation assignment. All members of comprehensive evaluation teams are evaluated by the team chair, and the ACCJC keeps data on those evaluations. Team members who receive critical evaluations are individually advised to correct behaviors, or are not asked to serve on future teams.

In addition to the extensive self-evaluations of these professional peer review teams, the accreditation process encourages feedback at all levels. Colleges undergoing comprehensive evaluation are asked to evaluate the performance of the visiting evaluation team. That feedback may include general or specific statements about team members. These comments are also retained in the Commission’s database and, if negative, may result in a decision not to ask the individual to serve on future teams.

The chancellor, president, or other top official of an institution undergoing accreditation review is given opportunity to respond to draft evaluation team reports in order to correct errors of fact. A college may also exercise its right to respond to a team’s findings and recommendations in writing or by appearing before the Commission when the case is being considered.
Online & personal tutoring available for students who need writing help

Let your students know that individual tutoring in writing is available to them both in-person and online. If you have students who need help with writing, ask them to e-mail: LRC.SC@peralta.edu to reserve a spot.

Students must include the day and half-hour time slot that they prefer and specify whether they would rather work with an in-person or online tutor. Tutoring is available at BCC’s South Campus, 2070 Allston Way, Suite 201:

At BCC’s South Campus, 2070 Allston Way, Suite 201 —
1:30-5:30 p.m., Tuesdays & Thursdays
1:30-3:30 p.m. Fridays
1-3 p.m., Saturdays

At BCC’s Jerry L. Adams Learning Resources Center, 2050 Center St., 1st Floor —
6-8 p.m., Wednesdays
1-3 p.m., Saturdays

Online —
1:30-5:30 p.m., Tuesdays & Thursdays
6-8 p.m., Wednesdays
1:30-3:30 p.m. Fridays
1-3 p.m., Saturdays

PowerPoint instructions on how to log in for online tutoring sessions are available via e-mail at LRC.SC@peralta.edu.

Dr. Lipi Ghosh, visiting Fulbright Fellow, to speak at BCC on development of education in South and South East Asia, 6-8 p.m., Mon., Mar. 23

“Development of Education in South and South East Asia-Glimpses from India, Myanmar and Thailand” will be presented by Dr. Lipi Ghosh, visiting Fulbright Academic and Professional Excellence Fellow from University of Calcutta, India, 6-8 p.m., Mon., Mar. 23. It will take place at BCC, 2050 Center St., Rm. TBA, and is part of Dr. Loretta Kane’s Education 197 class.

Dr. Ghosh will introduce students to her work with minority cultures in India, Thailand and Myanmar, and the educational systems in those countries. She presently is affiliated with California State University, Sacramento.

Dr. Laura Ruberto, co-chair of BCC’s Arts and Cultural Studies Dept., who is a Fulbright alumna and represents that program at BCC, was invited to apply for a Fulbright Outreach Lecturing Funds grant to bring a scholar and lecturer to Berkeley City College for a brief visit. Her grant was funded and resulted in Dr. Ghosh’s visit to BCC.

You can find out more about this program at http://www.cies.org/program/outreach-lecturing-fund?qt-program=2.