



## Proposal Regarding Standard III.A.6

*The evaluation of faculty, academic administrators, and other personnel directly responsible for student learning includes, as a component of that evaluation, consideration of how these employees use the results of the assessment of learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning. – ACCJC Standard III.A.6*

PART 1: In light of the following concerns, the ACCJC Commission proposes the removal the Standard III.A.6 and an expanded focus of Standard II.A.2, based on the following considerations:

PART 2: An important goal of these proposed revisions is to refocus the evaluative spotlight from the individual toward a shared practice. Teams should not be expected to make judgments about if, or how well, individual faculty members are performing their work. If individuals are not appropriately engaged in the use of student data, that should be a departmental concern. Since the improvement of program-level student learning outcomes is largely a collective activity among groups of faculty, evaluation teams can focus on the institution's collaborative conversations in which appropriate faculty groups review assessment results and make shared decisions about improving the curriculum or pedagogy. These are common and standard practices in higher education. Peer evaluators can inquire as to whether program review practices include the relevant stakeholders rather than checking the files of individual faculty, counselors, or librarians. Note that Standards I.B.1 to I.B.6 place the responsibility for assessment and use of learning outcomes at the institutional and collective levels rather than at the individual level.

The Commission's desire to see assessment outcomes employed to improve learning could be addressed by more precisely emphasizing group expectations with this proposed expansion of Standard II.A.2:

Redline Version:

| Standard II.A.2. Faculty, including full time, part time, and adjunct faculty, regularly engage in ensur