

*CHEA TASK FORCE  
FACULTY &  
ACCREDITATION*

Presented by

Mary Ann Swain, Ph.D.

Professor and Chair, Student Affairs Administration, Binghamton  
University

And

Marilee Bresciani Ludvik, Ph.D.

Professor, Postsecondary Education Leadership, San Diego State University

# THE INTENTION FOR THE PROPOSED CHANGES

What do the federal  
authorities  
wish to create from  
these proposed changes?

- Decreased cost of higher education degrees = increase units of learning/dollar
- Improved access through innovation
- Enhanced transparency
- Strengthened quality and value of a degree
- Reformed traditional accreditation process by creating options for alternative accreditation models

# CHALLENGES POSED BY FEDERAL OVERSIGHT

What are the threats to  
innovation and creativity  
presented  
by these proposed changes?

- Delivery and evidence of knowledge acquisition is affordable, however the learning and development being requested in greater volume and at a higher level is costly to deliver and assess - by increase units of learning/dollar
- Academic Freedom/Faculty Driving Curriculum Decisions– by regulating state standards and assessments, including gainful employment

# CHALLENGES POSED BY FEDERAL OVERSIGHT, CONTINUED

What are the threats to  
innovation and creativity  
presented  
by these proposed changes?

- Peer Review/Area expertise evaluating area expertise – by removing regional accreditation process and handing it to the States
- Commitment to Differential Campus Missions - by regulating state standards and assessments, including gainful employment discussions
- Reduced Collaboration across Colleges and Universities – by proposing separate state standards for recognizing and funding financial aid for degree attainment

# NEED FOR A FACULTY VOICE

How do we address  
the intent for  
accreditation reform  
while reducing the  
risk to innovation and  
creativity?

- To advocate for quality in learning and development such as...
- Something other than job preparedness
  - Gainful employment does not equate to facilitating the kinds of learning needed to create new “jobs and careers” – other “measures” must be employed
- The standards set don’t necessarily facilitate graduates being able to continue their lifelong learning – other “measures” must be employed

# NEED FOR A FACULTY VOICE, CONTINUED

How do we address  
the intent for  
accreditation reform  
while reducing the  
risk to innovation and  
creativity?

- Innovation within higher education will not come without faculty research to inform it
- Recent neuroscience findings demonstrate that standardized tests are not the most appropriate way we can demonstrate the types of learning and development that will strengthen the quality and value of a higher education degree
- In order to increase access or continue it, we need campus/program mission-centric decision-making

# NEED FOR A FACULTY VOICE, CONTINUED

How do we address  
the intent for  
accreditation reform  
while reducing the  
risk to innovation and  
creativity?

- Learning to learn is not readily identifiable in all contexts - other “measures” must be employed
- Change the discourse from “cost” of education to “investment” in generating problem solving, innovation, and creativity
- Develop mission-centric comparative outcomes for various kinds of state/federal expenditures and performance indicators

# GROUP INPUT

- Break into sub-groups
  - number off 1-6
- Your number is associated with the numbered theme
- Choose one group member to record and one to report out

1. What are the accreditation issues important to faculty?
2. How do we increase faculty participation in accreditation?
3. How do we develop a compelling case for peer review?
4. What roles can faculty plan in influencing reauthorization legislation?
5. What are examples of current accreditation standards/federal or state legislation that limit creativity and innovation?
6. How do we provide examples of faculty innovation to legislative decision makers?



# PROCESS

- Using sticky notes, individually list items relevant from your point of view (concerns/solutions)
- Led by the group appointed recorder, develop themes by grouping similar items
- Name and briefly describe the themes that emerge – recorder transfers to butcher block paper
- Group appointed reporter, report your group results out to all

1. What are the accreditation issues important to faculty?
2. How do we increase faculty participation in accreditation?
3. How do we develop a compelling case for peer review?
4. What roles can faculty plan in influencing reauthorization legislation?
5. What are examples of current accreditation standards/federal or state legislation that limit creativity and innovation?
6. How do we provide examples of faculty innovation to legislative decision makers?

# REPORT OUT

- Discussion and Questions
- For a narrative summary of this session, please contact Marilee Bresciani Ludvik at [mbrescia@mail.sdsu.edu](mailto:mbrescia@mail.sdsu.edu)