**Summary of Accreditation Task Force**

**Aspirational Vision for Accrediting Agencies**

*Characteristics of a Successful Accrediting Agency*

1. *“The accreditor emphasizes improvement rather than compliance.”*

Accreditation should ensure the integrity of the community college system, not punish or weaken institutions.

1. *“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.

1. *“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.

1. *“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 proves which involves system stakeholders.

1. *“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.

1. *“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.

1. *“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.

1. *“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.

1. *“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.