A Leadership Development Plan for Improving the Accreditation Process at Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Dr. Doris Spooner Hall, Ph.D./DMA/Ed.D.

Alabama A&M University
Normal, Alabama

A Leadership Development Plan for Improving the Accreditation Process at Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Abstract

The purpose of this paper was to develop a leadership development plan to improve the accreditation process at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Accreditation is recognized by the United States Department of Education as the body for colleges and universities that prepare teachers and other professional personnel for work in the education profession. Through this process, accreditation provides assurance to the public that the graduates of accredited institutions have acquired the knowledge, skills, and disposition necessary to help educational learning succeed for all students. A leadership plan was expected to enhance continued success, build unity, continuity, and cohesiveness among faculty and staff for the goal of the accreditation process for reaffirmation. Historically African American colleges operate for the emergence of excellence in education, the education of students, the search for new knowledge, the provision of a comprehensive outreach program, and programs necessary to adequately address the major needs or problems of capable students who have experienced differences to education. The accreditation process would satisfy appropriate collegiate education, address all components of the institution's purpose, represent the official practice of the institutions, and demonstrate planning for the evaluation process.

The establishment of a development plan was very important because of the profound effect accreditation would have on the status of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities, the students and their future employment, faculty, staff, researchers, and federal subsidizing. Through the development of a leadership plan, the level of institutional quality and performance could be elevated. A systematic planning process was also expected to enable Historically Black Colleges and Universities to deal with change. Moreover, administrators needed to be able to examine and refine the conceptual framework relative to change and effectively assist the entire human capital of the universities to understand and work cooperatively as one unified team. In addition, the administrators could consistently evaluate the existing organizational procedures, and develop a leadership plan for the accreditation process to address immediate problems. Historically Black Colleges and Universities would have a leadership development and implementation plan in place for the accreditation process.

Faculty and staff surveys were administered to obtain feedback about certain aspects of the universities and were used for review and validation of faculty and staff experiences. Faculty evaluation forms and staff performance evaluation forms were utilizing in determining performances to help guide the accreditation process for success. To improve communication and participation, various meetings were held to motivate the morale of faculty and staff for stimulation purposes, and the Vice President of Academic Affairs held meetings to promote teamwork and teambuilding.

The writer produced a leadership development plan for improving the accreditation process at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. The review of literature helped to determine that higher education is solving a plethora of problems through accreditation procedures, and similar universities have been preparing for the change to involve more

preparation of activities as well as for the accreditation process. Leadership development plans for improving the accreditation process have resulted in cost savings, time, energy, efficiency of learning, and have proven to be beneficial and successful.

Further research is needed for assessment and accountability, and also to allow leaders to be ready for the impact of accreditation in higher education through developmental planning and to address processes for the changing society and innovation for the 21st century.

Introduction

Colleges and universities are adopting an imaginative and creative approach to prepare for change that attunes them to the realities of their environment. They are applying strategic leadership development planning to discover the special niche that helps them compete more efficiently and effectively in the higher education marketplace. Through strategic planning, higher education institutions are solving a plethora of problems. These problems deal with distinctiveness, flexibility, economic forces requiring new programs, new fields of study, the task of accreditation, and new technology. Most important of all, through this process, institutions are achieving greater financial strength while their leaders are acquiring the ability and confidence to improve strategic leadership development planning for better decision making in the future, which will improve the process of accreditation (Thompson & Strickland, 2003).

The task of accreditation is related to the traditional public philosophy of the United States – that a free people can and ought to govern themselves and that they best do so through a representative, flexible and responsive system. Accordingly, the purpose of accreditation can best be accomplished through a voluntary association of educational institutions (Criteria for Accreditation, 1989-1990). The Commission on Colleges holds to the principle that regional accrediting should not be identified with either a state or a national framework. Moreover, there

are many issues to be shared at the regional level that might not be handled as effectively in a state or national association. This does not limit cooperation and exchange of ideas with other regional and professional accrediting associations that are largely parallel in aims and functions (Criteria for Accreditation, 1989-1990).

The Commission on Colleges supports the right of an institution to pursue its established educational purpose, the right of faculty members to teach, investigate and publish freely, and the right of students to have opportunities for learning. However, the exercise of these rights must not interfere with the overriding obligation of the institution to offer its students a sound education leading to a recognized certificate or degree (Criteria for Accreditation, 1989-1990). In addition, the School of Education will be the example for building a developmental plan for improving the accreditation process.

History of Higher Education and Accreditation

According to Arthur Cohen (1998), "reading history" is essential for those who would understand any strategic leadership planning or development in any process of higher education. From the earliest American colleges, debates have ranged over familiar issues in higher education: curriculum changes, faculty selection and review, student admission, accreditation processes, and institutional funding. Yesterday's practices underlie today's problems even as the system continues evolving (Cohen, 1998). How has this evolution taken place? To what degree have things changed or remained the same, even with accreditation processes? To appreciate the present and even consider the future, we must understand some significance concerning the historical aspects of education, because mass decision-making and changes with accreditation processes have all made an impact toward the future, as well as the present, of education. Georges Santayana, a philosopher is famous for the statement, "Those who cannot remember the

past are condemned to repeat it" (Bryant & Varcoe, 2002). In other words, the best way to understand the present and future is to understand the past. Education must be understood historically before accreditation processes can exist to be executed well.

The nature of education in the United States changed considerably since the middle of the 20th century. Enrollments, finances, institutions, and all aspects of the system expanded. The trends in all areas accelerated. The earlier eras had set the stage for this growth; now it happened as new campuses were opened, new types of students began attending, and new curricula were introduced (Cohen, 1998).

The higher education enterprise within the United States has long been a symbol of intellectual and academic freedom. American higher education has been characterized by high levels of autonomy that have come as a result of relatively high levels of confidence in the governance of trustees, presidents, and faculty senates. However, there exists a growing sense of concern that respect is eroding due to many factors including the cost of education and rising doubts concerning the integrity of conduct on the part of institutions and faculties (Kerr, 1994). Concerning the rising costs of higher education, Seymour (1993) states that: "higher education institutions risk becoming the 'hospitals of the 1990s' with regard to cost containment."

Following World War II, institutions of higher education in America experienced rapid growth and enjoyed a time of plentiful resources. With a rapidly expanding economy and the GI Bill creating an almost entirely new student base, institutions were in the enviable position of having the plan for the best use of a bounty of resources (Thomas, 1997).

The period of the mid 1970s has been marked by a continuation of several trends in American society and some events that could be considered turning points. The trends have included an aging population, increased participation in education at all levels, a high ratio of

women in the workplace, and more children being reared in single-parent homes. Through these various changes, management processes and systems had to exhibit mass turnarounds.

The 1980s marked a shift in America's relations with the rest of the world. The United States population was 262,755,000 in the 1980s as compared to 215,465,000 in the 1970s. Student enrollment in universities, faculty, institutions, earned degrees, and current revenue escalated tremendously high. In addition, the trends and emphasis on equal opportunity, affirmative action, private institutions, liberal arts colleges, graduate and professional education, community colleges, and other institutions escalated as well (Cohen, 1998). Moreover, Quehl, Bergquist, and Subbiondo (1999) refer to this period by saying "The Age of Accountability for higher education had arrived." Ewell (1999) referred to the reform movement of the 1980s as the "rediscovery of undergraduate education." The 1980s movement was also characterized as being the most significant innovation in post secondary education.

In the 1990s, leading and managing systems in universities demanded great leadership because of trends and change. This change in the configuration of the workplace led to an increased disparity between the incomes of the wealthy and the poor, which had a tremendous impact on education totally and specifically higher education.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the nation reached consensus that American education must be transformed to meet the needs of an emerging information society. Attaining this goal required teachers to meet professional standards (Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education, 2002)

By the end of the 20th century, the higher education system had been more of a social system. The rules of conduct, sets of shared beliefs, and expectations on the part of students, staff members, and the public has changed in leading and managing systems (Cohen, 1998). Leading

organizations in higher education has changed. During the last three decades of the 20th century, higher education has been faced with increasing pressures for accountability (Yukl, 2002).

From the trends of change in previous years, the 20th century was the establishment of strategic planning processes, conceptual framework focus, and accreditation standards by the United States Department of Education. Moreover the United States Department of Education demands that accrediting bodies for education establish a vision of education for the 21st century that believes caring, competent, and qualified teachers should teach every student (Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education, 2002).

The United States economy has fluctuated greatly in the past 20 years (Thompson & Strickland, 2003). First, there has been a decrease in public funding for higher education. Second, political in nature, there has been an endless array of new government initiatives aimed at linking allocation of governmental resources and institutional accountability (Ewell, 1994). The demands for accountability have forced an outcomes based agenda on higher education, and colleges and universities must respond (Duderstadt, 2000).

Accreditation

The accreditation system is a voluntary peer review process that involves a comprehensive evaluation of the professional education unit (the school, college, department, or other administrative body within the institution that is primarily responsible for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel). The review is based on a set of research standards developed by all sectors of the teaching profession. Accreditation requires an on-site review of the unit and a review of the individual programs within the units to enhance a more effective evaluation, and develop a plan to improve the accreditation process (Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education, 2002). The

effectiveness of self-regulatory accreditation depends upon an institution's acceptance of certain specific responsibilities, including institutional involvement in and commitment to the accreditation process (Criteria of Accreditation, 1989-1990).

An institution of higher education is committed to the search for truth and its dissemination. Integrity in the pursuit of truth is expected to govern the total environment of an institution. Each member institution is responsible for insuring integrity in all of its operations in dealing with all of its constituencies, in its relations with other member institutions, and in its accreditation activities with the Commission of Colleges. Each institution seeking any recognized status with the Commission on Colleges must document its compliance with the Conditions of Eligibility (Criteria for Accreditation, 1989-1990). Accreditation is a voluntary process that monitors and sanctions institutional quality. For over a century the United States has relied on a voluntary accreditation process as a form of quality assurance for higher education (Sheahan, 1997).

Building A Developmental Plan

This research is to prepare a leadership development plan that will improve the accreditation process at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). There are nine questions to address procedures.

Research Question 1

In developing a leadership development plan to improve the accreditation process at HBCUs, do the academic administrators understand what scope and content is involved in such a plan?

To guide the answering of this question, countless months, weeks, and hours of collaboration should occur among administrators, faculty, and staff then the administrative

leadership in the School of Education must reorganize and expand to assure administrative oversight of all programs, policies, procedures, and personnel. The Dean, Director of Field Experiences, and NCATE director should establish ongoing relationships with other administrators locally, chairpersons, co-chairpersons, program coordinators, and other leaders at the HBCUs in all units for progressive success. The Dean should address the concerns by engaging the entire faculty in a series of meetings, workshops, and exercises to motivate all administrators (chairpersons, co-chairpersons, leaders, program coordinators) in every department to enhance the understanding of the scope and content involved in accreditation. The first meeting established should be an educational intervention meeting to enhance motivation and morale among participants (faculty and staff) for cohesiveness and unity for cooperation through the accreditation process. The process of the meetings, workshops and exercises should be to develop a team spirit and a stronger collegial working relationship as a prerequisite to the re-development of a consensus conceptual framework. To redevelop a consensus conceptual framework through team spirit and teamwork, the Dean must include a meeting on teambuilding. The meeting should incorporate a PowerPoint presentation of teambuilding to the administration, faculty, and staff of HBCU. In addition, handouts of a questionnaire should be issued to the participants (faculty and staff) on teambuilding to measure their effectiveness as a team member. An example questionnaire can be found in Appendix A. A test can be given to measure leadership objectives such as, showing how relying on others promotes the goals of the team. An example of a test, known as *Lessons from Geese* by Donald Clark (1998) and called "Teamwork and Geese" can be found in Appendix B. The *Lessons from Geese* have been transcribed from a speech given by Angeles Arrien at the 1991 Outward Bond Organizational Development Network Conference, and was based on the work of Milton Olson.

Committees should be organized according to the six NCATE Standards and a Steering Committee should be established to guide specific processes. Although a considerable amount of work was accomplished over the years. The School of Education must mandate addressing all of the concerns and issues relating to the NCATE and State Department of Education accreditation process to be an asset.

In response to the mandate, the leadership of the Steering Committee must assign a senior professor with considerable experience in accreditation to proceed with action. Under his leadership, the Steering Committee, in collaboration with the faculty, should refine the conceptual framework, develop guidelines for committee operations, establish formats and models for course syllabi, set deadlines for reports, and establish mechanisms for maintaining open communication between and among the various participants in the process of preparing for re-accreditation; however, the academic administrators in all units must constantly be reminded of the scope and content of accreditation and that a leadership developmental plan for accreditation is strongly needed.

To assure broad knowledge of and/or widespread involvement in the development of the conceptual framework for the Teacher Education program, the Dean, Director of Field Experiences, and the Executive Director of the NCATE process should meet with local school superintendents, curriculum directors, principals, and teachers in the School of Education's service area to discuss the scope and content of accreditation. Information regarding the conceptual framework must be shared with faculty and feedback must be used to further develop the components of the framework. These individuals must provide considerable input in the field experience component of the conceptual framework; also, involving the understanding of the scope and content of accreditation.

The Steering Committee must read, discuss, and provide feedback for revisions on each section of the conceptual framework. In periodic meetings of the entire School of Education, sections of the conceptual framework must be presented for discussion and feedback to assure widespread involvement in the development process. The process of presenting sections of the conceptual framework for discussion and revision must be used with all internal committees as well as with committees and stakeholders external to the School of Education and to the University.

Results of this research show that a gaping chasm exists between academic administrators with regard to the understanding of the scope and content involved in a leadership developmental plan. However, the administrators still perceived accreditation as a priority, and more significant activity than anything else within the University.

In addition, the results of this research revealed that HBCU academic administrators do understand that accredited institutions produce competent, caring, and qualified teachers and other professional school personnel who can help all students learn, which is a segment of the scope and content of accreditation necessary to build a strategic developmental plan for the accreditation re-affirmation process. Moreover, the administration understands that accrediting bodies are non-profit, non-governmental organizations. It was also revealed that the administrators do understand the scope and content involved in a leadership developmental plan, and that professional education units must include in its accreditation the review of all initial teacher preparation and advanced programs offered by the institution for the purpose of preparing teachers and other professional education personnel to work in primary grades through collegiate settings. Moreover, the units must include off-campus programs, distance learning

programs, and alternate route programs for the preparation of professional education in the accreditation review for re-affirmation.

Research Question 2

To develop a leadership development plan to improve the accreditation process at HBCUs, do the academic administrators have input to achieve the breadth and content necessary for the leadership development plan to be successful?

A published organizational structure of administrative responsibilities should clearly define and publish a blueprint for success (Focus 2015: Blueprints to Excellence, 2003). The Board of Trustees regularly approves the appointment of key administrative officers of the University (Presidents and Vice Presidents). University policies are administered through this delineated administrative structure. The reporting lines and profiles of responsibilities should be written and presented in the University Faculty and Staff Handbooks. The Unit organizational structure and policies should be reviewed by the President and a designated system of advising and standing committees should be in place. The President's Cabinet also should receive input and recommendations from specialized committees of the Board of Trustees for all major areas. The additional representative advisory bodies are the Faculty and Staff Senate and the Student Government Association. The entities delineated within the organizational structure should provide input to various functions and activities of the University. The academic administrators must assess key performance indicators, monitor external and internal environment assessments, perform a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats analysis, and access ideas that work with cross impact analysis, strategies, best practices and benchmarks. In addition, the administration leadership development check, innovative strategies, best practices and benchmarks, which exemplify the academic administrators input to achieve the breadth and

content necessary for the leadership development plan to be successful. The administrative responsibilities must be clearly established where the academic administration has input to achieve the breadth and content necessary for the leadership development plan to be successful An example can be found in Appendix C, which consists of the primary goals and objectives for success established by the administration.

The President serves as the primary liaison between faculty, staff and students of the institution with the Alabama Commission on Higher Education and with the State's legislative bodies. The President should function as the primary contact for the reception of federal funding and functions as the person ultimately responsible for implementing federal, state and locally determined policies and regulations. In executing such functions, the President must delegate responsibility to managerial areas of the university including the Provost and Vice Presidents and special representatives with roles that they execute within and beyond the confines of the University. The President must also establish goals and time frames for university advancement and regularly evaluates the vice presidents and other administrators who directly report to his office. These statements clearly exemplify input by the academic administration (President) to achieve the breath and content necessary for the leadership development plan to be successful.

The Provost, who also serves as the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) is the Chief Academic Officer of the University. The Provost, through deans and directors, should provide oversight to insure high quality programs of study at the graduate and undergraduate levels. The Provost's responsibilities include supervision of the following schools: Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering and Technology, a cross-disciplinary School of Graduate Studies and a University College. Additional academic entities (e.g., Admissions, Registrar, the Learning Resource Center, the

State Black Archives Research Center and Museum, as well as International Programs) report through the Provost/VPAA (Focus 2015: Blueprints to Excellence, 2003; Faculty/Administrative Staff Handbook, 2003). The offices of Cooperative Education, Institutional Research, Title III and Retention also report to the Provost/VPAA. The Provost's office is so widespread throughout the HBCUs, it should assist in the achievement of the breadth and content necessary for the leadership development plan to be successful.

The Vice President for Student Affairs should be responsible for the Financial Aid Office, the Health Center, Career Placement and Cooperative Education, the Student Activities Center, Student Counseling and Development, Residential Life, and the Dean of Students. The Vice President for Student Affairs also should serve as a liaison between student organizations and the university administration. As can be seen, this position is critical for student life and for the well being of the undergraduate and graduate students on campus. Established procedures and policies of interest to students should be regularly updated and published.

In addition, the Vice President for Research and Development should assist the President and serve as the key individual in matters pertaining to research and development. This office is also responsible for Development and Alumni Affairs, Public Relations, the Telecommunications Center, Grants and Contracts, the University Foundation, and the Research Institute. The Vice President for Research and Development should maintain active contact with the professional, governmental, and business communities as well as with non-profit foundations in an effort to promote scholarship, an advanced learning environment, and sponsored research of mutual interest to extramural and university communities within their respective specializations.

The Vice President of Business and Finance should be responsible for administering and managing university accounting and financial operations, including the budget, the Comptroller

Office, Auxiliary Enterprises, Computer Services, Human Resources, Physical Facilities, Purchasing, Public Safety, Printing Services, and Property Management. The support services provided by the Vice President of Business and Finance should be critical for a fiscally sound and efficient operation of the university.

Research Question 3

To develop a leadership development plan to improve the accreditation process at HBCUs, do the faculty and staff have a perception of the process of accreditation and inclusion in the process? As a result of this research, most of time, faculty and staff do not have a complete perception of the process of accreditation and lack inclusion in the process. The education program and related units at HBCUs are conceptualized as four interrelated processes which supposedly involve faculty and staff. The four interrelated processes of planning, preparing, performing, and assessing proficiency are major components of the conceptual framework.

On a majority basis the faculty and staff need to be more involved and educated in reference to the planning, preparing, performing, and proficiency process geared to accreditation.

The faculty and staff should feel included in the assessing processes through special meetings and workshops addressing these specific proficiencies, such as motivation and team building. These workshops prepare the participants for the accreditation process at HBCUs by consulting agencies called Quality Management Presenters of Accreditation Process.

Research Question 4

To develop a leadership development plan to improve the accreditation process at HBCUs, do the academic administrators have a plan for the process of planning and evaluation? After careful study it was revealed that the academic administration does have a plan for the process of planning and evaluation. The Dean and Accreditation Director should distribute a

form to the Board of Examiners (BOE), and the BOE team members and chairs must complete the planning instrument as they read the institutional report and reviewed exhibits prior to the on-site visit. Using the evidence for the conceptual framework and the rubrics for the standards, the instrument allows team members to note questions to be pursued and evidence to check during the on-site visit. It also allows them to keep notes that can be transferred to the written BOE report. It is designed to focus team discussions on the standards and determine what additional data would be needed during the BOE team's work session during the on-site visit. It also helps the team plan what other informational needs should be sought on campus.

The instrument must be completed before the first team meeting on Saturday or Sunday of the visit. Team members should be expected to record on an overhead transparency or newsprint their pre-visit ratings for each area of evidence for the conceptual framework and each element of the standards listed on the rubric. For review of the conceptual framework, team members must ask to rate how adequately each area of evidence is addressed based on the information (i.e., institutional report and exhibits) available prior to the on-site visit.

BOE members must ask to evaluate the other national and state members on the team immediately after the visit. They must also ask to evaluate the performance of the team chair and NCATE procedures. The evaluation forms should be returned to NCATE with the expense voucher. The items on the Evaluation of the NCATE procedures change periodically to solicit feedback on new procedures that have been implemented. Ratings of the quality of institutional reports and institutions' preparation and readiness for visits should be valuable in identifying practices that have worked. The feedback on this form may lead to adjustments in BOE training and the evaluation process for both team members and institutions.

Research Question 5

To develop a leadership development plan to improve the accreditation process at HBCUs, do the academic administrators have a developmental plan to address the conceptual framework for faculty to better understand how it is implemented into the accreditation process? As a result of this research the conceptual framework has been the focus of the entire accreditation process. It was found in this study that the conceptual framework ensures coherence of curriculum and instruction, field and clinical experiences, and assessment across the professional education component as well as across each teaching field component of the program. Every teacher education program, whether initial or advanced, shares the theme of the Educator as Service Professional, the vision of "producing highly competent providers of professional educational services," and the institutional standards (outcomes) expected of all graduates. In addition, every program is supported by INTASC, which is applicable to all initial teachers. Each graduate program is supported by the propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Alignment of institutional, INTASC, and National Board for Professionals Teaching Standards. The academic administrators do not have a developmental plan to address the conceptual framework for faculty to better understand how it is implemented into the accreditation process, but it has been presented to the faculty to read and understand on their own terms.

Research Question 6

To develop a leadership development plan to improve the accreditation process at HBCUs, do the administrators have a role in implementing the accreditation process? The academic administrators were found to have a role in the implementation of the accreditation process. The administrators are the chief executives in every aspect for initiating all progressive

activities in every capacity of the accreditation process. These roles are as follows: (a) first time visit; (b) setting the stage; (c) responding to program standards; (d) preparing the institutional report; (e) hosting the pre-visit; (f) finalizing preparations for the visit; (g) hosting the on-site review; (h) after the visit; (i) Board of Examiners Report; and (j) evaluation.

Research Question 7

To develop a leadership development plan to improve the accreditation process at HBCUs, do the administrators have an institutional plan to become flexible and resilient concerning change with economic forces requiring new strategic emphasis?

The "Blueprints to Excellence" document continues, provides focus and guidance for the long view (2015) and the immediate view 2008-2011. The Vice President of Academic Affairs should gather input from all segments of the campus community, the University Board of Trustees, and external consultants through surveys and other data. The President should then organize various planning committees to begin to address various aspects of the near and distant future of HBCUs. The overarching framework for the plan is the mission, vision, core values, and identification of challenges and opportunities.

Administrators must develop an institutional plan to become flexible and resilient concerning change when economic forces require new strategic emphasis. An example of an Executive Report can be found in Appendix C.

Research Question 8

To develop a leadership development plan to improve the accreditation process at HBCUs, does the academic administration have a problem for examining its programs to ensure that current programs are needed, effective, and have appropriate and understandable requirements? It was found that the academic administration of HBCUs does not have a problem

in examining its programs to ensure that current programs are needed, effective, and have appropriate and understandable requirements. A summary of current program trends, effectiveness, and appropriate understandable requirements can be found in Appendix E.

Research Question 9

To develop a leadership development plan to improve the accreditation process at HBCUs, does the academic administration have a procedure for the evaluation of the overall accreditation process? As a result of the implementation of this plan the academic administration should have a procedure for the evaluation of the overall accreditation process. All faculty and staff should be involved in the evaluation process.

The university evaluation process should include faculty and staff. The first step in the evaluation process should cover conditions for effective evaluation processes for accreditation. The second step in the evaluation process should cover the characteristics of the evaluation processes for accreditation. The third step in the evaluation process should cover the required evaluations for accreditation by the accrediting agencies, including assessment responsibilities. The fourth step in the evaluation process should cover the designed outcomes from the evaluation process for accreditation. The fifth step in the evaluation process should cover the inventory of information sources for evaluation. The sixth step in the evaluation process should include the responsibilities of the formative and summative committees. The seventh step in the evaluation process should include the faculty and staff surveys including how they feel about certain aspects of the university, by responding yes or no to questions asked concerning the accreditation process. The eighth step in the evaluation process should include the faculty and staff performance appraisal rating scale to determine the faculty's involvement and dedication toward teaching, and other major duties and assignments such as accreditation.

As a result of this work the evaluation should focus on the effectiveness of the educational and non-academic programs of the HBCU. A program effectiveness process has been developed and installed. The process should include the definition and delineation of the educational and nonacademic support program outcomes that have been attained as well as a system for ascertaining if the desired results have been achieved. The formative and summative committees should be utilized.

Conclusion

Historically Black Colleges and Universities function in an environment of unprecedented turbulence and change, and that technological, environmental, education, and political sectors all have an impact on these institutions. More leadership development plans will have to be implemented to enhance proper advancement and progressive processes of issues such as accreditation. Regardless of the methods employed to improve any accreditation process, it is apparent that the topic warrants further research. The 21st century emphasizes accountability, assessment, and learning outcomes by all accrediting bodies which is needed in today's changing society.

References

Adams, B.A., Arleque, L., Deutscher, N., Felski, G., Jones, C., McCarthy, C., Perry, J., & Zaia, D. (1998). *Managing people: Lead your staff to peak performance.* Holbrook, MA: Adams Media Corporation.

Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Institutional Effectiveness Plan. (1994, April). Normal, AL: Alabama A&M University.

Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Undergraduate Bulletin. (2001-2002). Normal, AL: Alabama A&M University.

Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Undergraduate Bulletin. (1998-2000). Normal, AL: Alabama A&M University.

Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Undergraduate Bulletin. (1996-1998). Normal, AL: Alabama A&M University.

Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University Website. (2003). www.aamu.edu.

Alabama Commission on Higher Education, October 1, 2001-September 30, 2002. (2002). Paper submitted to Alabama Legislature January 1, 2003, Montgomery, AL.

Alston, J.G. (2003). *The leadership toolkit*. Fort Lauderdale, FL: Nova Southeastern University.

Ashley, W., & Morrison, J. (1997). *Anticipatory management tools for better decision making*. Retrieved February 9, 2004, from http://horizon.unc.edu/courses/papers/Anticipatory_Manageemnt.asp.

Banks, J.A. (1994). *Multiethnic education: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bennet, W.J. (1984). *To reclaim a legacy: A report on the humanities in higher education*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities.

Bennis, W.G., & Goldsmith, J. (2000). *Learning to lead* Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.

Billick, B., & Peterson, J.A. (2001). *Competitive leadership: Twelve principles for success*. Chicago, IL: Triumph Books.

Bowen, H.R. (1980). *The cost of higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bowser, B.P., Jones, T., & Young, G.A. (1995). *Toward the multicultural university*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publisher.

Breneman, D.W., & Taylor, A.L. (1996, Summer). *New directions for higher education: Strategies for promoting excellence in a time of scarce resources*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. (ERIC 94)

Brethower, D., & Smalley, K. (1998). *Performance based instruction: Linking training to business results*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bright, D.F., & Richards, M.P. (2001). *The academic deanship*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Brubacher, J.S., & Rudy, W. (1976). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities, 1636-1976* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Bruce, A. (2003). *Building a high morale workplace*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.

Bryant, D.W., & Varcoe, K.E. (2002). *Contemporary challenges in higher education leadership*. Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Nova Southeastern University.

Buhler, P. (2002). *Human resources management*. Avon, MA: Streetwise Publication.

Button, H.W., & Provenzo, E.F. (1983). *History of education and culture in America*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Caples, V. (2002). *Alabama A&M University institutional self-study for reaffirmation of accreditation*. Normal, AL: Alabama A&M University.

Caples, V. (2001, August 16). *Alabama A&M University institutional self-study*. Paper presented at the Alabama A&M University Faculty/Staff Conference, Normal, AL.

Caples, V. (1996). *Institutional effectiveness plan*. Normal, AL: Alabama A&M University.

Charles, C.M., & Mertler, C.A. (2002). *Introduction to educational research*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Chawla, & Renesch, J. (Eds.). (1995). *Learning organizations: Developing cultures for tomorrow in the workplace*. Oregon: Productivity Press.

Cohen, A.M. (1998). *The shaping of American higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cohen, S. (1974). *Education in the United States: A documentary history* (Vol. 5). New York, NY: Random House.

Creating an informal learning organization. (2000, July). A newsletter from Harvard Business School Publishing. *Harvard Management Update*. Article reprint no. U0007A.

Criteria for accreditation (6th ed.). (1989-1990). Decatur, GA: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Deighton, L.C. et al. (1971). *Encyclopedia of education* (Vols. 1 & 4). New York, NY: Macmillan Co.

Diamond, R.M. (2002). *Field guide to academic leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

DiBella, A.J. (2001). *Learning practices: Assessment and action for organizational improvement*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Duderstadt, J.J. (2000). *A university for the 21st century*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Ernest, P. (1995). The one and the many. In L. Steffe & J. Gale (Eds.). *Constructivism in education* (pp. 459-486). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Ewell, P.T. (1999). Assessment of higher education quality: Promise and politics. In Samuel J. Messick (Ed.), *Assessment in Higher Education: Issues of Access, Quality, Student Development, and Public Policy* (pp. 147-156). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ewell (1994). A matter of integrity: Accountability and the future of self-regulation. *Change, 26*, (6), 25-29.

Faculty/administrative staff handbook. (2003, June). Normal, AL: Alabama A&M University.

Focus 2015: Blueprints to excellence. (2003). Normal, AL: Alabama A&M University.

Fosnot, C. (1996). Constructivism: A psychological theory of learning. In C. Fosnot (Ed.). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice* (pp. 8-33). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Frarrel, E. (2003, October 31). Public college tuition rise is largest in three decades. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, L*(10), A1.

Gallick, S. (1998, February). Technology in higher education: Opportunities and threats. *UCLA Faculty Association Newsletter*.

Gardner, J.R., Rachlin, R., & Sweeny, H.W.A. (1986). *Handbook of strategic planning*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Gibson, J.T. (2002, September). *Strategic planning for the years 2002-2007*. Normal, AL: Alabama A&M University.

Gibson, J.T. (2000). *Strategic planning for the year 2000 and beyond "A new beginning: A new attitude."* Normal, AL: Alabama A&M University.

Gilbert, S.W., & Ehrmann, S.C. (2002). Dealing with technology: Administrative issues. In R.M. Diamond (Ed.), *Field guide to academic leadership: A publication of the National Academy for Academic Leadership* (pp. 329-356). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Boss.

Gillett-Karam, R. (1999, Spring). *New directions for community college: Preparing department chairs for their leadership roles*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. (ERIC 105)

Goonen, N.M, & Blechman, R. . (1999). *Higher education administration: A guide to legal, ethical, and practical issues*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Greer, C.R. (2001). *Strategic human resource management: A general managerial approach* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Grensing-Pophal, L. (1999). *The HR book: Human resources management for small business*. North Vancouver, BC: International Self-Counsel Press Ltd.

Handbook for accreditation visits. (2002). Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Harcleroad, F.F. (1996). The hidden hand: External constituencies and their impact. In P.T. Altbach, R.O. Berdahl, and P.T. Gumport (eds.), *American higher education in the 21st century: Social, political, and economic challenges*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College, Center for International Higher Education, School of Education.

Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., & Beckhard, R. (Eds.). (1996). *The leader of the future: New visions, strategies and practices for the new era*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Husen, F. (1985). *The international encyclopedia of education*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Johnson, J.A., Dupuis, V.L., Musial, D., Hall, G.E., & Gollnick, D. . (1999). *Introduction of American education* (11th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Jones-Wilson, F.C. et al. (1996). *Encyclopedia of African-American education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Kerr, C. (1994). *Troubled times for American higher education: The 1990s and beyond*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kim, D. (1993, Fall). The link between individual and organizational learning. *Sloan Management Review*, 37-50.

Knowles, M.S., Holton, E.F., & Swanson, R.A. (1998) *The adult learner* (5th ed.). Woburn, MA: Butterwork-Heinemann.

Kolb, D.A., Osland, J.S., & Rubin, I. M. (2001). *The organizational behavior reader*. (7th ed.). New York, NY: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Kolb, D.A., Osland, J.S., & Rubin, I.M. (2001). *Organizational behavior: An experiential approach*. (7th ed.). New York, NY: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Kotter, J.P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.A. (1996). *The leadership challenge*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kroeger, O., & Thuesen, J. (1992). *Type talk at work: How the 16 personality types determine your success on the job*. New York, NY: Dell Publishing.

Legget, G., Mead, C.D., & Kramer, M. G. (1995). *Prentice Hall handbook for writers*. (12th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Marbury, C. H. (1989). *Summary progress report – November 1987-April 1989*. Normal, AL: Alabama A&M University

Metcalk, J.K. (2001, May). *Faculty and academic administrator perceptions concerning institutional effectiveness importance in selected colleges and universities accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville, Kentucky.

Mitzel, H.E. et al. (1982). *Encyclopedia of educational research* (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

Morgan, G. (1996). *Images of organizations*. (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Morrison, A.H. (1999). *The new leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Morrison, G.S. (1997). *Teaching in America*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing.

National Council on Accreditation for Teacher Education. (2000). *Board of examiners report*. Washington, DC: National Council on Accreditation for Teacher Education.

Nevis, I., DiBella, A., & Gould, J. (1995, Winter). Understanding organizations as learning systems. *Sloan Management Review*, 73-85.

Non academic staff handbook. (1993). Normal, AL: Alabama A&M University.

Nonaka, I., Arthur, B., & Denning, S. (2000). Ikujiro Nonaka on 'Ba': A place for knowledge creation. *Perspectives on Business Innovations*. Issue 2. Ernst & Young. www.businessinovation.ey.com.

O'Toole, J. (1995). *Leading change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Osland, J.S., Kolb, D.A., & Rubin, I. M. (7th ed.). (2001). *Organizational behavior: An experiential approach.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Penn, & Schoen (2002). *In which states are institutions required to submit program reports to NCATE as part of the accreditation process?* Retrieved February 18, 2003, from http:///www.ncate.org/accred/programreviews/ apr02_state_submissions1.htm.

Piaget, J. (1963). *The origin of intelligence in children*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Professional standards for the accreditation of schools, colleges, and departments of education. (2002). Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Publication manual of the American Psychological Association. (5th ed.). (2001). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Quehl, G.H., Bergquist, W.H., & Subbiondo, J.L. (1999). Fifty years of innovations in higher education: Change and stasis in the pursuit of quality. *New Agenda Series, 1*(4).

Ratcliff, J.L., Lubinescu, E.S., & Gaffney, M.A. (2001, Spring). *How accreditation influences assessment, implementing the plan in higher education.*

Richard, D., & Engle, S. (1986). After the vision: Suggestions to corporate visionaries and vision champions. In J.D. Adams (Eds.), *Transforming leadership*. Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.

Robbins, S.P., & Coulter, M. (2002). *Management* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Rodenhouse, M.P. (1997). *Higher education directory*. Falls Church, VA: Higher Education Publication.

Rossett, A. (1999). *First things fast: A handbook for performance analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Pfeiffer.

Rothwell, W.J., Hohne, C.K., & King, S.B. (2000). *Human performance improvement: Building practitioner competence.* Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.

Rowley, D.J. & Sherman, H. (2001). *From strategy to change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schein, E.H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., Roth, G., & Smith, B. (1999). *The dance of change*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Seymour, D. (1993). *On Q causing quality in higher education*. New York, NY: ACE MacMillian.

Sheahan, P.M. (1997). *The accreditation process and definitions of quality*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois at Chicago.

Smith, D.G., Wolf, L.E., & Levitan, T. (1994, Spring). *New directions for institutional research: Studying diversity in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. (ERIC 81)

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (2003). *Board of examiners report.* Decatur, GA: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Stevens, E. (1999). *Due process and higher education: A systemic approach to fair decision-making*. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Sutton, T.P., & Bergerson, P.J. (2001). *Faculty compensation systems*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Thomas, J.P. (1997). *Innovation conditions and processes used in the adoption of institutional effectiveness in two-year colleges of the southern association of colleges and school accreditation region*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh.

Thompson, A.A., & Strickland, A.J. (2001). *Strategic management: Concepts and cases* (12th ed.) New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Tierney, W.G. (1998). *The responsive university: Restructuring for high performance*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Van Scotter, R.D., Hass, J.D., Kraft, R.K., & Schott, J.C. (1985). *Social foundations of education* (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Von Glasersfeld, E. (1995). A constructivist approach to teaching. In L. Steffe & J. Gale (Eds.). *Constructivism in education* (pp. 3-16). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Vickers, J., & Boyer, J (2003, October). *Institutional report*. Normal, AL: Alabama A&M University.

Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W.H., Montez, J., & Nies, C.T. (2001). *The changing nature of the academic deanship*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Appendix A

Participants Effectiveness as Team Members

Are You a Good Team Member?

Rate yourself on a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, on your effectiveness as a team member. Use the results to strengthen your participation as a member of the group in support of the team.

1. _____ Do I actively share responsibility for the group's effectiveness?
2. _____ Do I help the leader to succeed?
3. _____ Do I help to ensure that all viewpoints are explored?
4. _____ Do I provide open, honest and accurate information?
5. _____ Do I support, protect and defend both the group and the group leader?
6. _____ Do I act in a positive and constructive manner?
7. _____ Do I provide appropriate feedback?
8. _____ Do I understand my role on the team?
9. _____ Do I accept ownership for team decisions?
10. _____ Do I participate and take on roles voluntarily?
11. _____ Do I maintain confidentiality?
12. _____ When stating a problem, do I provide alternative solutions/options?
13. _____ Do I give praise and recognition generously?
14. _____ Do I operate within the organization's rules?
15. _____ Do I diplomatically point out to others when their behavior is not helping the team?
16. _____ Do I share ideas and opinions freely and enthusiastically?
17. _____ Do I encourage others to express their ideas fully and do I listen to them?
18. _____ Do I criticize ideas, not people?
19. _____ Do I avoid disruptive behavior during meetings, such as side conversations and jokes?
20. _____ Do I attend meetings regularly and promptly?
21. _____ Do I budget my time in order to stay for the entire meeting?
22. _____ Do I avoid defensiveness when fellow team members disagree with my ideas?
23. _____ Do I prepare myself for meetings – review the agenda, complete my assignments?
24. _____ Do I practice active listening – acknowledging and building on others' comments?
25. _____ Do I carry out responsibilities assigned?
26. _____ Do I leave my personal agenda outside the group?

Appendix B

Leadership: Lessons from Geese

Leadership: Lessons from Geese
By Donald Clark ©1998

Teamwork and Geese

Objective: to show how relying on others promotes the goals of the team

"Lessons from Geese" was transcribed from a speech given by Angeles Arrien at the

1991 Outward Bond Organizational Development Network Conference, and was based

on the work of Milton Olson.

FACT 1 – As each goose flaps its wings, it creates an "uplift" for the birds that follow. By flying in a "V" formation, the whole flock adds 71% greater flying range than if each bird flew alone.

LESSON – People who share a common direction and sense of community can get where they are going quicker and easier because they are traveling on the thrust of each other.

FACT 2 – When a goose falls out of formation, it suddenly feels the drag and resistance of flying alone. It quickly moves back into formation to take advantage of the lifting power of the bird immediately in front of it.

LESSON – If we have as much sense as a goose, we stay in formation with those headed where we want to go. We are willing to accept their help and give our help to others.

FACT 3 – When the lead bird tires, it rotates back into the formation to take advantage of the lifting power of the bird immediately in front of it.

LESSON – It pays to take turns doing the hard tasks and sharing leadership. As with geese, people are interdependent on each others' skills, capabilities, and unique arrangements of gifts, talents, or resources.

FACT 4 – The geese flying in formation honk to encourage those up front to keep up their speed.

LESSON – We need to make sure our honking is encouraging. In groups where there is encouragement, the production is much greater. The power of encouragement (to stand by one's heart or core values and to encourage the heart and core values of others) is the quality of honking we should seek.

FACT 5 – When a goose gets sick, wounded or shot down, two geese drop out of formation and follow it down to help and protect it. They stay with it until it dies or is able to fly again. Then, they launch out with another formation or catch up with the flock.

LESSON – If we have as much sense as geese, we will stand by each other in difficult times as well as when we're strong.

Appendix C

Goals and Objectives for Success

Goals and Objectives for Success

Goal 1:   To assess employees respect and to listen to their questions, concerns, and ideas.

Objective 1:   to establish that each and every employee will be heard and 100 percent listen to whatever they have to say.

Goal 2:   To review the availability of the leader or supervisors.

Objective 2:   To establish an open-door policy where employees can feel free to speak to supervisors or leaders. Circulation should exist to enhance visuality as to what is going on in the workplace.

Goal 3:   To help employees share information.

Objective 3:   To establish involvement in the organization. Improve communication through flyers, telephone up-dates, letters, and postcards. Have regular meetings scheduled to enhance shared information.

Goal 4:   Determine if a job is well done and receive recognition for it.

Objective 4:   To establish a recognition program of accomplishments. This should be done through staff meetings, company newsletters, news releases, and local papers. Incentives of certificates, plaques, flowers, dinner, and other opportunities.

Goal 5:   To help provide opportunities for personal growth.

Objective 5:   To establish a system where employees can grow professionally and personally in their jobs. Mandate that all employees belong to professional organizations related to their current jobs; send employees to courses to enhance their skills and develop new skills.

Goals 6:   to help cope with stress both mentally and physically.

Objective 6:   To develop a plan for building self-esteem by treating employees as individuals, understanding criticism, taking breaks, involving employees in goal setting, and open for new ideas to build self motivation.

Appendix D

Executive Report

Executive Report

The title of our QEP, "Blueprints to Excellence" is derived from the commitment to excellence adopted from the University's overall planning process. The central focus of the QEP is the quality of the first-year experience for students matriculating at the University. The intent is to conduct a thorough review of the current elements associated with the first-year college experience and to determine the impact of institutional structures on the effective delivery of programs and services.

The overall goal is to establish an environment that engages students in a comprehensive, coordinated set of experiences that will provide opportunity and encourage participation in educationally productive activities. In order to achieve this goal, reviews are planned for a variety of qualitative and quantitative assessments designed to examine all aspects of the students' first-year experience.

Some key areas to be reviewed include:
- The relationship between socio-economics, demographics and academic performance of students
- The role of University College in the transitioning of students from high school or transfer from other institutions
- The nature and quality of the social experiences inherent in campus life
- The identification of perceived needs of various segments of student population
- Academic advising
- Student support services such as financial aid and financial services
- Faculty assigned to provide instruction for freshmen
- Policies and practices related to academic placement
- Class size in relationship to student performance
- Residence hall policies and procedures
- Campus safety
- Intervention strategies

The decision to focus on these areas is derived from a number of sources:
a) The HBCUs Universities-wide focus group discussions that provide opportunities for faculty, students and staff to identify major issues, problems and strengths regarding all aspects of programs and activities.
b) Institutional enrollment and retention trend data.
c) Student academic progress reports (probations, suspensions, honors, etc.).
d) Student disciplinary reports.
e) Student Satisfaction Surveys

Appendix E

Summary of Current Trends: Effectiveness, and

Appropriate Requirements for Accreditation

Summary of Current Trends Effectiveness, and Appropriate Requirements for Accreditation

According to Ashley and Morrison (1995), in *Anticipatory Issues Management Strategic Planning Workshops and Seminars*, it was stated that "educational organizations of higher education function in an environment of unprecedented turbulence and change, and that technological, environmental, educational, and political sectors all have an impact on higher education. More developmental strategic plans will have to be increased to enhance proper advancement and progressive processes of issues such as accreditation.

These trends are based on the assumptions that we are living in an increasingly global environment and we must have an international outlook in fulfilling the teaching, research, and service responsibilities. These trends are based on the rapid pace of technological change, particularly changes within information and communication. The assumption that the budget is unlikely to increase substantially over the next few years, the conditions of the economy, real limits on students' ability to absorb tuition increases, and reductions in federal expenditures all point toward serious financial problems which impact accreditation.

Trends identified that can be used as scenarios to address the issues or changes, examination of programs to ensure that current programs are needed, effective, and have appropriate and understandable requirements in the interpretation of the trends of accreditation are: assessment in higher education, administrators, faculty, and staff development workshops, strategic planning, and accountability.

For Future Strategic Planning

Assessment (Strategic Planning)
Focus is on improving student learning and academics
Tool for organizational learning
Setting appropriate criteria and high standards for student learning qualities
Systematically gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence to determine how
well performance matches those expectations and standards
Respond to demands for accountability from legislatures, governing boards, the
general public, and federal aid
Capstone courses and projects
Accrediting agencies
Continuous quality improvement
Related to other planning and budgeting processes
Mission/goals/objectives/outcomes/interpretations, decisions, and changes
Data collection and analysis/plan and timelines

Administrative, Faculty, and Staff Development Workshops; Strategic Planning (Future Trend)

Continuous education
Engage in developing a shared vision of long term success
Identify types of external events that can be analyzed as learning opportunities
Incorporate indicators in all production and performance plans
Involve leadership, develop seminars, workshops conferences and conventions
Encourage faculty and staff to work in partnership with others on change
      initiatives
Sponsor training programs and courses in systems dynamics and systems thinking
      tools
Build teams and commitment to learning by addressing felt needs or critical
      problems
Action plans; human resource policies that accommodate different faculty and
      staff needs
Technology updates, distance learning
Planning, preparing, performance, processes

Accountability (Future Trend) Strategic Planning

Standards of excellence
Commitment to professional and ethical conduct
Knowledge, skills, and disposition
Assessment system and unit evaluation
Learning strategies and techniques
Field experience and clinical practice
Diversity
Qualifications, performance, and development
Leadership
Enrollment, graduation rates, retention
Viability of programs

According to Ashley and Morrison (1995) at the World Future Annual Conference focusing on the 21st century that education, challenges, economics, science/technology, and tutoring in higher education will result a winner if we are prepared for changes in its clientele and market imaginative in its repositioning strategy and proactive in its execution. We must be prepared for technological developments in telecommunications and computers which will transform the way we live, work, present, and educate. Futuring will allow leaders to be ready for the impact of accreditation in higher education through developmental strategic planning to address issues in our changing society.