

AILG Accreditation Progress Report

Herman L. Marshall
AILG Vice-chair 2006-7

Statement of Purpose

- Serve MIT
 - Review assures MIT that every chapter is healthy
 - Health indicators include behavior, finances, organization, as well as physical plant
- Serve ALG members
 - Review collects and publishes “best practices”
 - Review elucidates problems and lessons learned across FSILG system
 - Community shares experiences privately

Review Status

- 33 AILG chapters reviewed in two years
 - No occupancy: ΦΓΔ, ΣΑΕ, ΣΦΕ
 - Remaining: ΑΕΦ, ΠΛΦ, ΤΕΦ
- All reviewed chapters are recommended for accreditation
 - 4-6 chapters have “reservations” to recommendation
 - Not all reports are done (2 absent, 8 final, rest are in draft form) and no Board reviews yet
 - Reports are being distributed

Some Best Practices

- Process promotes communication to improve ALG chapters
- Membership development includes assisting officers
- Maintaining officer “bibles” using a wiki
- Alumni support Rush in the background
- Setting up alumni advisory boards to be independent of house corporations
- Commitment to member diversity
- Chapter executive committee established that meets regularly

Some Lessons Learned

- Process communication helps ALLG chapters avoid problems
- Alumni benefit from accreditation review interaction by sharing methods
- Recruitment improvement is possible with specific training and value assessment
- Highly focused recruitment is risky over the long term
- Risks of summer boards can be mitigated

Plans

- This year
 - Complete and distribute reports
 - Develop interaction with FSILG office to pass data to review teams
 - Conduct reviews
 - Complete 3 chapters not yet visited
 - Revisit those “with reservations”
- Summer
 - Document process, hand off
 - Store current and last year’s data
- Next year (2007-8)
 - Revisit 10-15 chapters
 - Set aside about 20 chapters for 2008-9

Issues and Suggestions

- Handling chapters not recommended for accreditation
 - Suggest passing to FSILG office for intervention
- Reticent chapters
 - Suggest FSILG office intervention and ALLG help
- Late reviewer reports
 - Process change helps but not yet enough
 - Could pay reviewers upon receipt (~ \$200)
 - Could hire ALLG staff, support by reviewers
- Organizing effort is large — ~ 100 hr
 - Suggest ALLG staff and FCI handle 70% of effort

Summary

- Accreditation by ALG works
 - MIT purpose is served — DSL should support
 - Benefits to ALG are clear and immediate
 - Best practices documented, improves operations
 - Lessons learned helps chapters avoid problems
- ALG supports in many ways
 - Chapters welcome reviewers generally
 - 20 alumni volunteered for reviews

Backup Material

Process Overview I

- ALG Vice-chair is coordinator
 - Person changes, so process must be documented
 - Coordinator sets up reviews, receives reports
- Review teams are ALG alumni volunteers
 - 3-4 alumni per team, 3-4 reviews in one day
- Reviews are confidential, not judicial
 - Alumni and chapter representation required
 - Reviews held biennially — annual if needed
 - Discussion focussed using 4-page questionnaire
 - Reviews last about 90 min

Process Overview 2

- Review team writes 1-2 page report
 - One member each team leads write-up
 - Reports are simple, with public and private parts
 - Consensus built in 20 min after review
 - Reports sent to coordinator
- Report distribution
 - Living group reviews first, see total report
 - AILG Board examine cases w/o full recommendation to accredit
 - MIT and AILG see “public” part of report

Process Improvements

- Questionnaire takes < few hr to complete
- Spreadsheet responses encouraged
 - Allows data to be recorded to database
 - Database used to seed response for next review
- Draft reports done < 1 wk after review
- Treating reviews like inspections
 - Set dates > 3 wk in advance
 - Schedule 4 reviews per team per day
 - Run 1-2 review teams at a time

Process Concerns I

- Report uniformity & timeliness
 - Coordinator reviews and needles
 - Reviewer experience improves both
- Assigning “recommend accreditation with reservations” uniformly
 - Criteria should be clearer
 - Review by ALG Board to endorse result
- Privacy still desired
 - Develop and use information release table

Process Concerns 2

- Panel differences with IFC and LGC
 - Reviewers are mostly from fraternities and need more Panel method education
 - Adding Panel rep to all Panel reviews
 - Using more experienced reviewers for Panel
- Unhoused sororities
 - Less interested in physical plant, housecorp
 - Review questionnaire should address Panel issues: e.g., membership development
 - General AILG membership issue

Privacy Control Matrix

	Web	ILG Alumni and Chapter	Review team	AILG Board	MIT admin
Recommendation	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
Public	Lessons Learned and Best Practices, attributed to chapter at their approval	OK	OK	OK	OK
Private	No	OK	OK	If reservations on recommendation to accredit, some data may be released with chapter approval	No
Process	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK