

Becoming Accredited:

**A Guide to Eligibility, Candidacy, and Initial
Accreditation for Free-Standing Institutions Abroad**

**Commission on
Institutions of
Higher Education**



Copies of this guide are available on-line at
<http://cihe.neasc.org>
Printed copies are \$7.00 and may be ordered from the
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education,
New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC),
3 Burlington Woods Drive, Suite 100, Burlington, MA 01803, U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Accreditation of Overseas Institutions.....	1
<i>Requirements of Affiliation for Free-Standing Institutions Abroad</i>	2

OVERVIEW

U.S. Regional Accreditation.....	4
New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC).....	5
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.....	5
Peer Evaluators	5

CHAPTER 1 ELIGIBILITY

Meaning of Eligibility.....	6
Eligibility Process.....	6
Public Representation of Eligibility.....	8

CHAPTER 2 CANDIDACY

Meaning of Candidacy	9
Criteria for Candidacy.....	9
Applying for Candidacy	9
Self-Study for Candidacy.....	9
On-Site Evaluation for Candidacy.....	10
Commission Action on Candidacy Application.....	12
Public Statements on Candidate Status	12
Benefits and Responsibilities of Candidacy	13
Costs of Candidacy	13
Loss of Candidacy.....	13
Biennial Review of Candidacy	14

CHAPTER 3 INITIAL ACCREDITATION

Evaluation for Initial Accreditation.....	15
Public Statement on Initial Accreditation.....	15
Cost of Affiliation.....	16
Responsibilities of Newly Accredited Institutions.....	16
Denial of Initial Accreditation.....	16

APPENDIX

The Report of Eligibility: Responding to the Commission's <i>Requirements of Affiliation For Free-Standing Institutions Abroad</i>	17
--	----

INTRODUCTION

ACCREDITATION OF OVERSEAS INSTITUTIONS

American regional accreditation is a system of regular oversight and ongoing self-evaluation designed to promote institutional improvement and provide an assurance of quality to the public. Over several decades, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education has developed standards, policies, and procedures to carry out a process of peer review leading to accreditation. The Commission accredits over 235 colleges and universities in the six New England states. It also, through a process described below, is open to consideration of certain free-standing institutions abroad that meet specified eligibility requirements and adhere to the same *Standards for Accreditation* and policies as U.S. institutions. Overseas institutions have special responsibilities to assure that they can participate in an essentially American process, given their long distance from the U.S., different cultures, and varied educational structures.

The Commission has adopted a formal process to consider potential membership applications by American-style overseas higher education institutions that are independent (non-governmental) and offer their degrees entirely or predominantly through on-ground instruction in English. Institutions seeking accreditation by the Commission must complete a three-step process to demonstrate that they meet the Commission's *Requirements of Affiliation for Free-Standing Institutions Abroad* and will be able to engage in an ongoing relationship with the Commission focused on public accountability and institutional improvement.

The three steps are:

1. Eligibility
2. Candidacy
3. Initial Accreditation

Each step has specific criteria, required institutional reports, evaluation processes, associated costs, and timeframes. An institution considering the accreditation process should carefully consider the requirements for all three steps to ensure that it understands the criteria that will have to be met and the likely timeframe for completion of each step.

The Commission strongly believes that the process of pursuing U.S. regional accreditation is a capacity-building exercise for the institution. There is great value to be gained from attending Commission workshops, working closely with Commission staff, and getting feedback on draft documents. As the institution evaluates itself against the *Standards for Accreditation*, it will have a good preview of the activities involved in a system of self-regulation. Commission staff will provide advice throughout the process; there is no need to hire outside consultants.

Successful completion of the three-step process depends on the Commission's ongoing evaluations. An application for eligibility or candidacy does not constitute a formal application for initial accreditation, nor does it commit the Commission to an eventual affiliation with the applicant institution. Questions may be directed to the Director of the Commission.

Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC)
3 Burlington Woods Drive, Suite 100
Burlington, MA 01803, U.S.A.

Direct line to Commission offices: 781-425-7785

Fax: 781-425-1001

E-mail: cihe@neasc.org

Website: <http://cihe.neasc.org>



**NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES
COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

3 Burlington Woods Drive, Suite 100, Burlington, MA 01803

Voice: (781) 425 7785 Fax: (781) 425 1001 Web: <http://cihe.neasc.org>

Requirements of Affiliation for Free-Standing Institutions Abroad

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education will consider for eligibility interested independent institutions of higher education that declare themselves to be American-style institutions.

To be declared eligible to apply for candidacy with the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, an institution operating entirely outside the United States and its territories must meet the following requirements. Candidate and accredited institutions must continue to fulfill these requirements as specified in the *Standards for Accreditation*.

Independence

1. The institution has formally adopted a statement of mission, which demonstrates that the fundamental purposes of the institution are educational, and which is also appropriate to a degree-granting institution and appropriate to those needs of society it seeks to serve;
2. Has a charter and/or other formal authority from the appropriate government agency authorizing it to grant all degrees it awards; has the necessary operating authority for each jurisdiction in which it conducts its activities, and is operating within its authority. If the institution is not legally eligible for local government approval, it otherwise documents its standing and significant support from the local community and other relevant communities of interest;
3. Has sufficient organizational and operational independence to be held accountable for meeting the Commission's standards;
4. Has a governing board that includes representation reflecting the public interest that oversees the institution, working to assure the fulfillment of its mission and advance the institution's level of quality; assures that fewer than one-half of the board members have any financial interest in the institution, including as employee, stock-holder, or corporate director;
5. Has a chief executive officer, appointed by and responsible to the governing board, whose full-time or major responsibility is to the institution and who possesses the requisite authority;
6. Devotes all, or substantially all, of its gross income to the support of its educational purposes and programs.

American-Style

7. The institution publicly declares itself to be an American-style institution, for example, through its name, mission statement, catalog, and other declarations and actions that reflect its commitment to offering an American-style education abroad;
8. Has a governing board, administration, faculty, and professional staff including a significant proportion of Americans and others with experience in American higher education who are collectively prepared to ensure the institution offers an American-style education and meets the Standards for Accreditation;
9. Uses English as a principal language of instruction and operation, sufficient to permit an evaluation by the Commission and to ensure the ability of its graduates to continue their education in other regionally accredited U.S. institutions;
10. Offers academic programs that are comparable in terms of length, curriculum, objectives, learning outcomes, and degrees awarded to those offered by regionally accredited institutions in the United States;
11. In addition to study of the areas of specialization proper to its principal educational programs, requires a coherent and substantive program of general education at the postsecondary level, comparable to those

offered by institutions in the United States, as either a prerequisite to or a clearly defined element in those programs; documents a commitment and resource base sufficient to facilitate students' achievement of the goals of general education;

12. Has financial records that relate clearly to the institution's educational activities and has these records externally audited annually; if auditing procedures differ from those generally used in the United States, provides financial records reconciled to accounting practices common to American higher education.

Educational Mission and Programs

13. The institution offers one or more collegiate-level education programs, consistent with its mission, that lead to a degree in a recognized field of study and requires at least one year to complete;
14. Awards the associate's or bachelor's degrees in three or more liberal arts areas or requires that all undergraduates take 50% or more of their credits in the liberal arts and sciences. May also award the master's or doctor's degree;
15. Has, for each of its educational programs, clearly defined and published objectives appropriate to higher education in level, standards, and quality, as well as the means for achieving them, including a designated course of studies acceptable for meeting degree requirements, adequate guidance to degree candidates in the satisfaction of requirements, and adequate grading or evaluation procedures;
16. Awards only degrees appropriate to each graduate's level of attainment;
17. Offers its instructional programs entirely or predominantly through coursework that includes face-to-face instruction;
18. Has adopted a statement specifying the potential students it wishes to serve, and admits qualified students to its programs under admission policies consistent with this statement and appropriate to those programs;
19. Has students enrolled in and pursuing its principal educational programs at the time of the Commission's evaluation;
20. Has graduated at least one class in its principal educational programs before the Commission's evaluation for accredited status. If the institution has graduated its first class not more than one year before the Commission's evaluation, the effective date of accreditation will be the date of graduation of that first class.

Resources

21. The institution documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to carry out its stated purposes;
22. Has faculty sufficient in number, qualifications, and experience to support the academic program offered, including an adequate number of faculty whose time commitment to the institution is sufficient to assure the accomplishment of class and out-of-class responsibilities essential to the fulfillment of institutional mission and purposes;
23. Has sufficient staff, with appropriate preparation and experience, to provide the administrative services necessary to support its mission and purposes.

Transparency

24. The institution has available to students and the public a current and accurate website and catalog or comparable official publication setting forth purposes and objectives, entrance requirements and procedures, rules and regulations for student conduct, programs and courses, degree completion requirements, full-time and part-time faculty and degrees held, costs, refunds, and other items related to attending or withdrawing from the institution.

*September 2004
March 2007
November 2008
Editorial revisions September 2009*

OVERVIEW

U.S. REGIONAL ACCREDITATION

In the United States, accreditation is the primary process for assuring and improving the quality of higher education institutions. Accreditation of nearly 3,000 colleges and universities is carried out through a process known as 'regional accreditation': seven commissions operate in six geographic regions of the country through non-governmental, non-profit voluntary associations.

Accreditation is a self-regulatory, non-governmental peer review process based on rigorous standards. Colleges and universities are judged based on self-evaluations analyzing how well they meet these standards, in light of their mission. Following a review by a team of peers, accrediting commissions determine the accreditation status of the institution and use a variety of means to ensure follow-up as appropriate and further evaluation in the case of substantive change on the part of the institution.

Regional accreditation oversees the quality of research universities; community colleges; liberal arts colleges; state colleges; religiously affiliated institutions; special-purpose institutions in the arts, sciences, and professional fields; military academies; historically black and Hispanic-serving institutions; and tribal colleges. Regionally accredited institutions are public and private, for-profit and not-for-profit, secular and religious, urban and rural, large and small, old and new, traditional and non-traditional. Collectively, they enroll over 18 million students in programs ranging from associate through doctoral level degrees. The quality of these colleges and universities – and the talent they have contributed to develop regional accreditation over the decades – means that regional accreditation is highly regarded around the world. In the United States, each of the regional commissions is recognized by the United States Secretary of Education and by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA).

Regional accreditation is overseen by a professional staff for each commission, totaling slightly over 100 full-time employees nationally. Annually the work of accreditation is carried out by approximately 3,500 volunteers who serve on visiting teams and on the commissions. These volunteers include college and university presidents, academic officers, faculty, and campus experts in finance, student services and library/technology. At least one of every seven Commissioners is a member of the public unconnected with higher education.

Regional accreditation traces its roots to 1885. Today's enterprise is based on decades of experience and refinement, both leading and reflecting the development of American higher education. Today's standards go beyond inputs and processes – for example, Do students have access to learning resources and are they using them? – to focus increasingly on outcomes: How well are students gaining skills of finding, evaluating, and using information? Over the past decade, regional accreditation commissions have been leaders in helping colleges and universities develop trustworthy and useful ways to understand what and how their students are learning and use the results for improvement.

American higher education is known for its diversity. *The Economist's* 2005 global survey of higher education praised the American system, noting, "A sophisticated economy needs a wide variety of universities pursuing a wide variety of missions [and] the more that the state's role contracts, the more educational variety will flourish." Regional accreditation has provided the conditions and framework under which diversity – and quality – have flourished.

NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES (NEASC)

Founded in 1885, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) is the nation's oldest regional accrediting association. NEASC's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education as a reliable authority on the quality of education for the institutions it accredits. The Commission is also recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), affirming that its *Standards for Accreditation* and processes are consistent with the quality, improvement, and accountability expectations that CHEA has established.

COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The Commission has adopted the following statement affirming its mission:

The Commission develops, makes public and applies criteria for the assessment of educational effectiveness among institutions of higher education leading to actions on their institutional accreditation. By this means, the Commission assures the educational community, the public and interested agencies that accredited institutions have clearly defined objectives which meet criteria published by the Commission; and that they have the organization, staffing, and resources to accomplish, are accomplishing, and can continue to accomplish these objectives. In addition, through its process of assessment, the Commission encourages and assists in the improvement, effectiveness, and excellence of affiliated institutions.

The Commission consists of twenty-four members, who are elected at the NEASC annual meeting for staggered three-year terms. A Commissioner may be elected for a second three-year term. Membership on the Commission is drawn from different types of institutions and the general public. By federal regulation, one of every seven Commissioners must be a member of the public without connection to higher education. Commissioners serve without compensation and meet in four regularly scheduled meetings each year, as well as at an annual retreat for discussion of topics critical to higher education. Various sub-committees may meet more frequently to facilitate the Commission's work.

PEER EVALUATORS

U.S. accreditation is a system of peer review. The Commission has a database of about 2,000 evaluators -- full-time faculty members and administrators at accredited institutions who are qualified by their credentials and experience to apply Commission standards.

Commission staff consult with the institution being evaluated to determine the composition of the visiting team, in light of each institution's specific situation and the Commission's requirement that all standards receive appropriate coverage. The team as a whole is chosen to represent diverse groups and talents from comparable institutions, as well as both experienced and new evaluators.

Evaluators are provided with intensive training prior to the evaluation visit. They are expected to make sound professional judgments, based on the *Standards for Accreditation*, that will help the Commission evaluate and enhance the quality of higher education in New England. All evaluators are responsible for excusing themselves from participating in any review that might represent or be perceived as a conflict of interest. For further information how the institution and its self-study are evaluated by peer evaluators, consult the *Evaluation Manual*, which is available on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>.

CHAPTER 1 ELIGIBILITY

MEANING OF ELIGIBILITY

Eligibility is a finding by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education that the institution substantially meets the *Requirements of Affiliation for Free-Standing Institutions Abroad* and may, if it chooses, apply for candidacy for accreditation within the next two years.

Eligibility is a preliminary finding. It is not candidacy or accreditation, nor does it assume that a future application will be successful. It does not indicate any affiliation with the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.

ELIGIBILITY PROCESS

1. In-person meeting with Commission staff

If an institution believes that it currently meets the Commission's *Requirements of Affiliation for Free-Standing Institutions Abroad* and wishes to explore the possibility of accreditation through the Commission, its chief executive officer should contact the Commission Director and arrange an in-person meeting and presentation of institutional materials at the Commission offices in Burlington, Massachusetts.

The purpose of the in-person meeting is twofold: to help the Commission learn about the institution and to help the institution understand the accreditation process. Following a brief presentation by the institution about its mission, the context in which it operates, the programs it offers, and its own assessment of how it meets the eligibility requirements, Commission staff will provide an overview of Commission policies and procedures, offer a preliminary review of the *Requirements of Affiliation for Free-Standing Institutions Abroad* and *Standards for Accreditation*, and discuss next steps.

Following this initial discussion, if the institution believes it currently meets the *Requirements of Affiliation for Free-Standing Institutions Abroad*, it prepares a draft report of eligibility for review by the Director of the Commission. (Specific instructions on preparing the report of eligibility can be found in the Appendix to this booklet.)

2. Director's visit and advice to institution

If review of the draft report suggests that the institution may be eligible, a visit to the institution by the Commission Director will be scheduled. Meetings with the institution's senior leadership, governing board, faculty, and students will provide an in-depth introduction to the institution. The Director will also consult with local U.S. and in-country education officials in order to further understand the context in which the institution operates. The institution may wish to use the opportunity of this visit to promote on its campus a broader understanding of accreditation processes, standards, and expectations.

Travel and accommodation costs for the Director's visit are invoiced to the institution; there is no other fee at this stage.

Following the Director's visit, confidential written feedback on the draft report and the site visit will be provided to the institution. It will include advice on whether it would be appropriate for the institution to pursue eligibility at this time or whether there are conditions that must be met first. This report is provided to the institution only; it does not go to the Commission.

3. Report of Eligibility

Based on the feedback from the Director, the institution may prepare a revised report of eligibility. The report of eligibility addresses the institution's compliance with the *Requirements of*

Affiliation for Free-Standing Institutions Abroad and includes a letter of intent stating that the institution's governing board has authorized seeking eventual affiliation with NEASC's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.

Four hard copies and one electronic (pdf) version of the report of eligibility, along with four institutional catalogs, should be sent to the Commission offices. Commission staff will review the report of eligibility. If that review finds that the report is complete and shows probable compliance with the *Requirements of Affiliation for Free-Standing Institutions Abroad*, an eligibility visit to the institution will be scheduled.

4. Eligibility Visit

The eligibility visit is undertaken by two peer evaluators and a member of Commission staff. Its purpose is to prepare a report validating the contents of the institution's report of eligibility and to make a confidential recommendation to the Commission regarding whether the institution is eligible to make a formal application for candidacy.

The institution will be asked to identify convenient dates during the academic year for the team visit, which normally begins on Sunday evening and finishes on Wednesday morning. An additional day prior to the campus portion of the visit should be scheduled to orient the team to the educational landscape of the country. In consultation with the institution, Commission staff may identify local officials outside the institution (e.g., Ministry of Education, the U.S. Embassy, USAID) who will be asked to meet with the visiting team.

The on-campus visit includes a number of required meetings with the governing board, open meetings with students and faculty, and individual meetings with senior leadership. The *Evaluation Manual* for use by peer evaluators is available on the Commission website and offers a useful introduction to the team visit. Procedures for team visits to overseas institutions will be provided at the time of the scheduling of the visit.

The eligibility visit and the resulting team recommendation do not constitute an evaluation for candidacy, nor does a finding of eligibility result in any affiliation with the NEASC's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.

5. Cost of the Eligibility Visit

Members of evaluation teams are volunteers and serve without honoraria. Their transportation and accommodation costs are the responsibility of the institution.

In addition, an evaluation fee for the eligibility visit is charged to the institution prior to the visit. The current fee for the eligibility visit can be found on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>.

6. Commission Decision on Eligibility

At one of its regularly scheduled meetings, the Commission will consider the report of eligibility and the team report and confidential recommendation to determine if the institution should be declared eligible to apply for candidacy. Normally, the Commission will convey the expectation that consideration for candidacy will occur within two years. Should the application for candidacy take longer than two years, the Commission reserves the right to revisit the institution's eligibility for candidacy.

The Commission decision on eligibility applies to the institution as it exists at the time of the evaluation visit. New programs, degree levels, sites, and other substantive changes, as defined in Commission policy, must be reported in advance to the Commission, which may require further

evaluation before the institution may apply for candidacy. The policy on Substantive Change can be found on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>.

If the Commission determines that the institution is not eligible, the institution will be so notified and given the reasons for the decision. This decision is not subject to appeal. An institution denied eligibility may resubmit a report of eligibility one year following the Commission's notification.

PUBLIC REPRESENTATION OF ELIGIBILITY

A determination of eligibility is not a formal status or affiliation with the Commission. It is a preliminary finding that the institution is potentially accreditable by NEASC's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, and that it may proceed with the process for candidacy within two years.

In order to ensure that there is no misunderstanding by the public, institutions must use only Commission-approved language about a finding of eligibility on their websites and in other public communications.

If the Commission issues a favorable decision following the eligibility visit, the institution may use only the following public statement in its entirety:

"NEASC's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education has determined that [Name of institution] is eligible to proceed with an application for candidacy for accreditation within two years. A determination of eligibility is not candidacy or accreditation, nor does it indicate a likelihood of eventual accreditation. Questions about eligibility and the accreditation process should be directed to the Director of the Commission."

Use of other language will be viewed as a breach of institutional integrity. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in termination of the eligibility process.

CHAPTER 2 CANDIDACY

MEANING OF CANDIDACY

Candidacy is a pre-accreditation status of affiliation that indicates an institution has met the Commission's *Criteria for Candidacy*, is progressing toward accreditation, but does not yet meet the Commission's *Standards for Accreditation*.

The *Standards for Accreditation* are an articulation by the higher education community of what a college or university must do in order to deserve the public trust. They also function as a framework for institutional development and self-evaluation. Covering eleven areas of institutional academic and administrative operations, the Standards are largely qualitative, in keeping with their need to apply to a variety of institutions with different missions. The Standards are available on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>.

A candidate institution has a maximum period of five years, from the effective date of candidacy, within which to achieve initial accreditation status. It is not mandatory that candidate institutions remain in candidate status for the maximum period of five years. However, early applications are appropriate only when encouraged by the results of evaluation visits and Commission action.

CRITERIA FOR CANDIDACY

To be granted candidacy status, an overseas institution must demonstrate that it:

1. meets all the *Requirements of Affiliation for Free-Standing Institutions Abroad*;
2. has, with the intention of meeting the Commission's *Standards for Accreditation*, effectively organized sufficient human, financial, learning, and physical resources into educational and other activities so that it is accomplishing its immediate educational purposes;
3. has established and is following realistic plans to acquire, organize, and appropriately apply any additional resources needed to comply with the Commission's *Standards for Accreditation* within the candidacy period;
4. currently meets the Commission's standard on *Integrity*.

APPLYING FOR CANDIDACY

An institution may apply for candidacy only after the Commission has reviewed the report of eligibility and the visiting team's report and determined that the institution is eligible to do so. Once the Commission has determined that the institution is eligible, Commission staff will work closely with the institution on the formal application for candidacy.

An application for candidacy in no way establishes any affiliation with NEASC's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. An institution's public statements about its pursuit of accreditation must be limited to Commission-approved language as provided in this booklet.

SELF-STUDY FOR CANDIDACY

The self-study undertaken for a candidacy application serves both internal and external purposes. It encourages institutional improvement through rigorous self-analysis. It also creates a basis for the Commission's evaluation in respect to the *Requirements of Affiliation for Free-Standing Institutions Abroad*, the *Criteria for Candidacy*, and the *Standards for Accreditation*.

As indicated in the *Criteria for Candidacy*, the institution should demonstrate in the self-study how it is organizing its current resources to accomplish immediate educational purposes and how it is planning to acquire future resources necessary to fulfill the *Standards for Accreditation*.

The self-study for candidacy is organized in eleven chapters, corresponding to the eleven standards. In each chapter, the institution discusses what it currently does to meet the standard. It analyzes candidly what areas need to be improved and what plans exist to accomplish that improvement. Included with the self-study narrative are data forms and supplementary materials. For a fuller discussion of the self-study, institutions may consult the *Self-Study Guide*, which is available on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>.

Commission staff will provide guidance as the institution undertakes the comprehensive self-study to address each of the Commission's *Standards for Accreditation*. The institution should plan to attend the self-study workshop offered by the Commission each October. It is also strongly recommended that the institution seek Commission staff review of a draft of the self-study in order to ensure that the document meets Commission expectations. A draft may be sent in hard copy or electronically. Normally, staff can provide feedback within two weeks.

In addition to the self-study, the institution submits its report of eligibility, updated to respond to Commission questions and requests. Once the final self-study and updated report of eligibility are prepared, four hard copies and one electronic (pdf) version should be sent to the Commission offices.

ON-SITE EVALUATION FOR CANDIDACY

Further information about the on-site evaluation can be found in the *Evaluation Manual*, which is available on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>.

1. Selection of Visiting Team

Institutions are asked to select dates for the visit from several possibilities during the academic year. (Team visits are typically from Sunday to Wednesday.) Well in advance of the campus visit, Commission staff, with consideration for the nature of the institution, propose a visiting team chair to the chief executive officer of the institution. If the selection of the chair is approved by the chief executive officer, the chair is invited to serve. Team chairs are normally institutional presidents and provosts from comparable institutions with extensive experience in accreditation activities. To ensure objectivity in the evaluation process, institutions are asked to review the proposed chair and team members for any actual or perceived conflicts of interest.

After the team chair has been confirmed, a visiting team (typically about 5-7 individuals) is selected from the Commission's database of peer evaluators. While the Commission always reserves the right to appoint the visiting team, the views of the institution are important in ensuring the appropriateness and effectiveness of the visiting team and in preventing conflicts of interest. The Commission relies on the personal and professional integrity of individuals to refuse any assignment where even the slightest potential for conflict of interest exists. As soon as all team members have accepted appointment, Commission staff inform the institution.

2. Preliminary Visit by the Team Chair

Three to six months prior to the evaluation visit, the chair of the visiting team makes a preliminary visit to the institution. This visit, typically two days in length, is designed to help the institution understand how the team will operate and to enable the chair to assess the institution's self-study progress and discuss the institution's arrangements for the visit. The chair communicates with the institution's chief executive officer to discuss the upcoming visit, the team's time of arrival, schedule, accommodations, and related matters. In consultation with

Commission staff, the institution is asked to help determine the best way to orient the team to the educational context of the country.

The institution should arrange for charges for the visiting team's lodging and meals to be billed directly to the institution. The visiting team members are guests on campus but they are also outside evaluators with a job to do, and objectivity is crucial to their work. Hospitality should be considerate, but it need not be lavish. Gifts are not appropriate.

3. Candidacy Visit

Depending on flight times, the team usually arrives on a Saturday. The on-campus evaluation is typically scheduled for a three-day period, from Sunday afternoon through Wednesday afternoon. The team's work begins on Sunday afternoon to review team assignments and the protocol for the visit. That evening, the team meets with senior administrators, faculty, and board members over dinner. The following days of the visit are spent conducting a review of the institution and preparing the team's report and recommendations. Classroom observations are not necessary and typically are not helpful. The exact schedule of the team is arranged in advance through discussions between the team chair and institutional staff.

On the final day, the team chair first meets privately with the chief executive officer of the institution to discuss the team's findings. The chief executive officer and team chair determine who, in addition to the full visiting team, will be present to hear those findings presented at a meeting known as the "exit report." The session may be an open one for the entire institutional community or a gathering of just the senior leaders of the institution. At the exit report, the team chair provides an oral preview of major points that will be included in the team's written evaluation.

4. Team Report and Confidential Recommendation to the Commission

The visiting team chair, with the assistance of the other team members, is responsible for the preparation of a written report for submission to the Commission. This report is essentially an assessment of the extent to which the institution meets the *Criteria for Candidacy* and its potential for attaining initial accreditation within a maximum of five years.

After the chair has completed a first draft of the report and has sent it to the other team members for correction, the chair forwards it to the institution's chief executive officer, who is allowed a brief interval to identify any factual errors. Commission staff also review the draft team report to make sure it is complete and in keeping with Commission requirements.

When the chair completes the final draft of the report, it is sent to the chief executive officer. The institution duplicates the report and sends a copy to each team member, along with 35 hard copies and an electronic version (pdf) to the Director of the Commission.

In a separate communication, the team submits to the Commission a confidential recommendation on whether the institution should be granted candidacy. This confidential recommendation is not shared with the institution. Specific reasons based on the *Criteria for Candidacy* must be set forth in support of the committee's recommendation to grant or deny candidacy.

Prior to the Commission's consideration of the report, the chief executive officer is invited to submit an institutional response to the team report.

5. Cost of the Candidacy Visit

Members of evaluation teams serve without honoraria. Transportation and accommodation costs for the visiting team are the responsibility of the institution. In addition, an evaluation fee for the

candidacy visit is charged to the institution prior to the visit. The current fee for the candidacy visit can be found on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>.

COMMISSION ACTION ON CANDIDACY APPLICATION

At one of its regularly scheduled meetings in the semester following the evaluation visit, the Commission considers the institution's application for candidacy, reviewing all relevant information available: the self-study, the updated report of eligibility, the report of the visiting team, the institutional response to the report, and the team's confidential recommendation. The institutional chief executive officer and team chair are asked to meet in person with the Commission at this meeting.

Following the meeting, the Commission notifies the institution in writing of its decision. The policy on the Range and Meaning of Commission Actions describes the possible outcomes of the Commission's deliberations and is available on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>

If candidate status is granted, the effective date (unless otherwise specified) is the last day of the evaluation visit that resulted in the Commission's action.

An institution denied candidate status is free to reapply when it can demonstrate that it has substantially improved those areas cited as reasons for the denial.

PUBLIC STATEMENTS ON CANDIDATE STATUS

In order to ensure that there is no misunderstanding by the public, institutions are asked to use only Commission-approved language about candidacy. An institution granted candidacy status must use only the following statement whenever it makes reference to its affiliation with NEASC's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education on its website or in print publications. Use of other language will be viewed as a breach of institutional integrity. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in termination of the candidacy process.

[Name of institution] has been granted candidate for accreditation status by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) through its Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.

Candidacy is not accreditation nor does it assure eventual accreditation. Candidacy is a formal affiliation with NEASC's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. It indicates that the institution has achieved initial recognition and is progressing toward accreditation.

Inquiries regarding an institution's affiliation status with the Commission should be directed to:

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC)
3 Burlington Woods Drive, Suite 100
Burlington, MA 01803, U.S.A.
Direct line to Commission offices: (781) 425 7785
E-mail: cihe@neasc.org
Website: <http://cihe.neasc.org>

Upon inquiry about a candidate institution, the Commission will release the date when candidacy was granted, the date of the next review, and certain other information described in the Policy on Public Disclosure of Information About Affiliated Institutions.

BENEFITS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CANDIDACY

1. Candidacy is a formal status of affiliation with the Commission that can be mentioned on the institution's website using the Commission-approved language above.
2. Candidate institutions are listed on the Commission website and in its printed roster of affiliated institutions.
3. Candidate institutions may nominate senior members of its faculty and administration to serve on evaluation teams. Such service is selective and dependent on finding an appropriate match for the individual's expertise.
4. Candidate institutions are invited to provide comments to the Commission on revisions to policies and other relevant matters.

Candidate institutions also have the following responsibilities:

Annual Report. All affiliated institutions are asked to complete and submit an on-line data form in the spring of each year.

Notification of Substantive Change. Candidate status encompasses only those aspects of the institution in existence at the time of the evaluation visit. New programs, degree levels, sites, and other substantive changes, as defined in Commission policy, must be reported in advance and approved by the Commission before the institution can claim inclusion of such changes in its candidate status. The policy on Substantive Change can be found on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>.

Biennial Review. Two years after candidacy has been granted, the institution submits an updated self-study reflecting developments since the time of the initial visit, including steps taken to respond to identified concerns. The report is followed by a brief focused evaluation visit conducted by a small team of two or three evaluators. The purpose of this biennial review is to determine if the institution continues to meet the *Criteria for Candidacy* and is making reasonable progress toward accreditation. The biennial review does not serve as an evaluation for initial accreditation.

COSTS OF CANDIDACY

If the institution is accepted as a candidate, it pays annual dues based on its full-time equivalent enrollment. The current schedule of dues and fees is available on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>.

LOSS OF CANDIDACY

Candidacy lapses when an institution fails to achieve accredited status by the end of the five-year period. Extensions of candidacy beyond the fifth year are granted only rarely and require action by the Commission.

Termination of candidacy within the five-year period can occur, following procedures outlined in the policy on the Range and Meaning of Commission Actions, as a result of a determination that the institution no longer meets one or more of the *Criteria for Candidacy* or that conditions at the institution have been radically altered since it was admitted to candidacy. An institution removed from candidacy may reapply for candidate status when it can demonstrate that the conditions leading to the lapse or termination of candidacy have been corrected. However, in no case will the Commission consider such application prior to the effective date of loss of candidacy.

BIENNIAL REVIEW OF CANDIDACY

The purpose of the biennial review during candidacy is to determine if the institution continues to meet the Commission's *Criteria for Candidacy* and is making reasonable progress toward accreditation. The steps in the biennial review process are:

1. preparation of a report by the candidate institution;
2. on-site evaluation to validate the contents of the report;
3. visiting team report and confidential recommendation on continuation of candidacy;
4. Commission action to continue or terminate candidate status.

1. Preparation of the Institution's Biennial Report

In order that the institution's preparation for biennial review may be more productive than burdensome, the Commission specifies that the report be an update of the self-study submitted for the institution's candidacy application. The institution should consider the biennial review a phase of its planning process, an opportunity to measure its progress toward meeting the Commission's *Standards for Accreditation*. If the institution's biennial self-assessment is effective, the self-study it will prepare for initial accreditation will be an updating of its biennial report.

Therefore, the most useful biennial report will be both a progress report and a planning document, addressing each of the Commission's *Standards for Accreditation* as well as its *Criteria for Candidacy*. Like the self-study for candidacy, the report should be a comprehensive and coherent narrative accompanied by the required supportive materials. Where progress has occurred, it should be documented. Where problems remain, they should be candidly acknowledged and plans for their solution should be detailed.

2. On-Site Evaluation

For the biennial review, the process for scheduling the visit and appointing the evaluation team is essentially the same as that for the candidacy application. Two or three team members, spending two or three days on campus, will examine materials, conduct interviews, and present an "exit report" – an oral preview of their findings. As with the candidacy application, the host institution is responsible for travel and accommodation expenses for the team, as well as for a focused evaluation fee. The current schedule of dues and fees is available on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>.

3. Visiting Team Report

The steps in the preparation of the team report and distribution are the same as those prescribed for other evaluation reports. The institution is asked to provide to the Commission a written response to the team's report.

4. Commission Action on Biennial Review

At one of its regularly scheduled meetings in the semester following the evaluation visit, the Commission considers the institutional materials, the report of the visiting team, the institutional response to the report, and the team's confidential recommendation. The institutional chief executive officer and team chair are asked to meet in person with the Commission at this meeting.

The Commission's decision whether or not to continue candidate status is final. Should the Commission determine that candidacy should be terminated, it will provide the institution an opportunity to appear before it in person and show cause why that action should not be taken. The Commission's final decision is subject to the appeal process then in effect.

CHAPTER 3 INITIAL ACCREDITATION

Accreditation is not a one-time event but an ongoing relationship with the Commission. For the relationship to be effective as both a framework for institutional improvement and a means of assuring the public of institutional quality, institutions must commit to regular monitoring through reports and on-site visits. An open and candid dialogue with peer evaluators and the Commission is the hallmark of the U.S. accreditation system of self-regulation. The five years of candidacy provide sufficient opportunity for the institution to understand Commission expectations fully and for the Commission to develop trust that the future relationship will be a good one. Decisions about initial accreditation and the acceptance of an institution into membership are taken with the utmost seriousness.

EVALUATION FOR INITIAL ACCREDITATION

An evaluation for initial accreditation normally occurs during the fifth year of candidate status. In special circumstances, a candidate institution may apply for an earlier review. Institutions contemplating an early application should consult the Director of the Commission.

The components of the application and evaluation for initial accreditation – self-study, team visit, team report and confidential recommendation, institutional response, Commission decision – are the same as those for candidacy, but the requirements are different: all eleven *Standards for Accreditation* must be met at least minimally. Commission staff provide appropriate materials and advice on preparing for the evaluation for initial accreditation. Institutions may also consult the *Self-Study Guide* and the *Evaluation Manual*. Both are available on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>.

PUBLIC STATEMENT ON INITIAL ACCREDITATION

An institution granted initial accreditation is asked to use only the following statement in its entirety when it announces its new status on its website or in printed publications.

[Name of institution] has been granted initial accreditation status by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) through its Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.

Accreditation by the Commission indicates that the institution meets or exceeds criteria for the assessment of institutional quality periodically applied through a peer review process. An accredited college or university has been found to have the necessary resources to achieve its stated purposes through appropriate educational programs. It also gives reasonable evidence that it will continue to do so in the foreseeable future.

Accreditation by the Commission is not partial but applies to the institution as a whole. As such, it is not a guarantee of every course or program offered, or the competence of individual graduates. Rather, it provides reasonable assurance about the quality of opportunities available to students who attend the institution.

Inquiries regarding an institution's affiliation status with the Commission should be directed to:

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC)
3 Burlington Woods Drive, Suite 100
Burlington, MA 01803, U.S.A.
Direct line to Commission offices: (781) 425-7785
E-mail: cihe@neasc.org
Website: <http://cihe.neasc.org>

Upon inquiry about an affiliated institution, the Commission will release the date when initial accreditation was granted, the date of the next review, and certain other information described in the policy on Public Disclosure of Information About Affiliated Institutions. If an institution releases information that misrepresents its affiliation, the institution will be notified and asked to take corrective action. Should it fail to do so, the Commission will take appropriate action.

COSTS OF AFFILIATION

Accreditation is a system of peer review. In New England it is conducted largely by volunteers who serve without honoraria. Fees and annual dues paid by affiliated institutions cover the cost of services provided by the Commission and Association and are the means by which independent, non-governmental accreditation is sustained.

All affiliated institutions pay annual dues based on their full-time equivalent enrollment. In addition, evaluation fees are charged for every site visit by a review team. The current schedule of affiliation and evaluation fees is available on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF NEWLY ACCREDITED INSTITUTIONS

Annual Report. All affiliated institutions are asked to complete and submit an on-line data form in the spring of each year.

Notification of Substantive Change. Accreditation status encompasses only those aspects of the institution in existence at the time of the evaluation visit. New programs, degree levels, sites, and other substantive changes, as defined in Commission policy, must be reported in advance and approved by the Commission before the institution implements the change. The policy on Substantive Change can be found on the Commission website <http://cihe.neasc.org>.

Next comprehensive evaluation. Newly accredited institutions undergo a comprehensive evaluation after five years. Following that evaluation, the Commission will establish the date of the next comprehensive evaluation and any further monitoring it may deem appropriate.

DENIAL OF INITIAL ACCREDITATION

An institution denied initial accreditation is free to reapply when it can demonstrate that it has substantially improved those areas cited as reasons for the denial. An applicant for initial accreditation may withdraw its request for affiliation at any time prior to action by the Commission. Denial of initial accreditation is subject to the Commission's appeal process then in effect.

APPENDIX

THE REPORT OF ELIGIBILITY:

RESPONDING TO THE COMMISSION'S REQUIREMENTS OF AFFILIATION FOR FREE-STANDING INSTITUTIONS ABROAD

An institution operating entirely outside the United States must meet all 24 *Requirements of Affiliation for Free-Standing Institutions Abroad*.

The report of eligibility should respond specifically to each of the numbered requirements below. The Commentary states the rationale for the requirement and identifies specific factual information that should be included in the response to the numbered item. (Each requirement should be stated in the report. It is not necessary to repeat the commentary.) The report of eligibility should be concise, no longer than thirty (30) pages, and should be accompanied by relevant supporting documents in an appendix.

Providing the report of eligibility does not constitute a formal application for candidacy, nor does it commit the Commission to an evaluation of the institution for affiliation.

Independence

1. *The institution has formally adopted a statement of mission, which demonstrates that the fundamental purposes of the institution are educational, and which is also appropriate to a degree-granting institution and appropriate to those needs of society it seeks to serve;*

Commentary: The term "mission" refers to a general, relatively unchanging broad purpose that the institution seeks to fulfill. Statements of institutional mission provide the basis for the Commission's evaluation process, since institutions are evaluated against their stated purposes.

The Commission limits its accreditation activities to degree-granting institutions. The mission of an institution seeking to establish affiliation with the Commission must conform generally to those of institutions within the traditions of American higher education. Furthermore, because education serves the end of meeting the needs of society, the purposes of educational institutions should be directed toward that goal.

- ✓ State the institutional mission and indicate where the mission statement is published in the institution's catalog and website (specific page number and URL).
 - ✓ Indicate when the mission was adopted and by what body.
2. *Has a charter and/or other formal authority from the appropriate government agency authorizing it to grant all degrees it awards; has the necessary operating authority for each jurisdiction in which it conducts its activities, and is operating within its authority. If the institution is not legally eligible for local government approval, it otherwise documents its standing and significant support from the local community and other relevant communities of interest;*

Commentary: By this requirement, the Commission is assured that affiliated institutions are operating legally. The Commission understands that some institutions operating outside the United States may be ineligible for legal approval by the local government. In such circumstances, the Commission seeks assurance

that the institution has strong support from the local community and other relevant communities of interest.

- ✓ Indicate the source or sources of the institution's degree-granting or operating authority for all jurisdictions in which the institution provides instruction.
- ✓ If the institution is ineligible for legal approval by the local government, document the sources of significant community support and describe the nature of the support received.
- ✓ Include a copy of the charter, translated into English, in the appendix.

3. *Has sufficient organizational and operational independence to be held accountable for meeting the Commission's standards;*

Commentary: In order to ensure that member institutions are free from regulations that may be incompatible with the *Standards for Accreditation*, the Commission does not accredit institutions abroad that are part of a governmentally sponsored system. All institutions must demonstrate that they will be able to comply with the Standards without interference.

- ✓ Provide evidence that the institution operates, in its academic, administrative, and financial affairs, in a manner independent of governmental authority.
- ✓ Describe and document any relationship with a sponsoring entity such as a religious order or corporation (e.g., source of funding, bylaw provisions, oversight, etc.).

4. *Has a governing board that includes representation reflecting the public interest that oversees the institution, working to assure the fulfillment of its mission and advance the institution's level of quality; assures that fewer than one-half of the board members have any financial interest in the institution, including as employee, stock-holder, or corporate director;*

Commentary: An affiliated institution must demonstrate the existence of a properly constituted entity responsible for its governance that has the requisite powers to see that purposes of the institution are fulfilled. The requirement of representation of the public interest on governing boards recognizes that educational institutions serve a public purpose; their graduates not only should have personal gains from their education, but should also enhance the public good by being well-educated citizens and workers.

- ✓ Summarize the source and extent of the governing board's authority.
- ✓ Provide the names and affiliations of the members of the governing board, indicating the nature of any relationship individual trustees have with the institution apart from their membership on its governing board.
- ✓ Identify the members of the board who have a financial interest in the institution and the nature of that interest.
- ✓ Provide a copy of the board bylaws, statement of board responsibilities, and a copy of the board conflict of interest policy.

5. *Has a chief executive officer, appointed by and responsible to the governing board, whose full-time or major responsibility is to the institution and who possesses the requisite authority;*

Commentary: This requirement ensures that affiliated institutions have a governing and administrative structure, including a chief executive office whose primary task is to direct the affairs of the institution. Furthermore, it assures the Commission of an authoritative point of contact with the institution.

- ✓ Identify the bylaws or other organizational document(s) that outline the authority and responsibilities of the institution's chief executive officer.
- ✓ Describe the duties of the chief executive office and identify the positions in the institution that report directly to him/her.
- ✓ Indicate the appointment and evaluation procedure for the institution's chief executive officer.

6. *Devotes all, or substantially all, of its gross income to the support of its educational purposes and programs.*

Commentary: The purpose of this requirement is to guarantee that the educational purposes of affiliated institutions are paramount and are not subverted for the achievement of other goals.

- ✓ Provide the current year's budget showing revenue and expenses for all areas of operations.
- ✓ Describe how any operating surpluses are used.

American-Style

7. *The institution publicly declares itself to be an American-style institution, for example, through its name, mission statement, catalog, and other declarations and actions that reflect its commitment to offering an American-style education abroad;*

Commentary: Many traditions can produce excellent higher education institutions. The Commission does not in any way suggest that only American-style institutions are worthy. However, U.S. regional accreditation is a system of peer review, with evaluation teams composed of faculty and administrators from U.S. or other American-accredited institutions. The Commission seeks assurance that the visiting team will be competent to evaluate the institution fairly according to this system.

- ✓ Describe the institution's understanding of what it means to be "American-style."
- ✓ Indicate where in the catalog and website the institution describes itself and its educational programs as American-style.
- ✓ Give example of actions that indicate the institution is American-style.

8. *Has a governing board, administration, faculty, and professional staff including a significant proportion of Americans and others with experience in American higher education who are collectively prepared to ensure the institution offers an American-style education and meets the Standards for Accreditation;*

Commentary: Through this requirement, the Commission asks the institution to provide evidence that its understanding of U.S. higher education is sufficient to ensure its ability to meet the *Standards for Accreditation*.

- ✓ Create a comprehensive chart identifying members of the institution's governing board, faculty, administration, and professional staff who meet any of the following criteria. Indicate which criteria each person meets.
 - are U.S. citizens;
 - have earned degrees in U.S. institutions of higher education (identify the degree and awarding institution)
 - have taught or held professional positions in U.S. institutions of higher education (indicate the position and the institution)
 - have had experience with U.S. regional accreditation (specify)

9. *Uses English as a principal language of instruction and operation, sufficient to permit an evaluation by the Commission and to ensure the ability of its graduates to continue their education in other regionally accredited U.S. institutions;*

Commentary: This requirement provides assurance that students who graduate from the institution have sufficient proficiency in English to be able to enroll in advanced programs offered by regionally accredited institutions in the United States. In addition, all evaluations of the institution undertaken by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education will be conducted in English. Thus, institutional reports to the Commission and supporting documents provided to the evaluators must be in English. Examples of such documents include the catalog, course syllabi, faculty CVs, planning documents, personnel handbooks, financial statements, brochures, and other promotional materials.

- ✓ Identify the primary language(s) of instruction and operation.
- ✓ If languages other than English are used in instruction, indicate the nature and extent.
- ✓ Indicate the level of proficiency in English required for admission and for graduation. Indicate where these requirements can be found in the institution's catalog and website.
- ✓ Identify other languages, if any, that are used in the operations of the institution, among professional staff or at Board meetings.

10. *Offers academic programs that are comparable in terms of length, curriculum, objectives, learning outcomes, and degrees awarded to those offered by regionally accredited institutions in the United States;*

Commentary: Through this requirement, the Commission seeks assurance that the academic programs offered by the institution are comparable to those generally offered in the United States. Since graduates of the institution may seek employment or additional education in the United States, it is important that the academic programs offered by the institution resemble, in length, structure, content, and depth, comparable programs available in the U.S.

- ✓ For each degree or other academic credential awarded by the institution, identify the comparable degree or credential offered in the United States. (It would be particularly helpful to identify U.S. programs that have been used as models.) Provide a brief explanation of how the degrees and credentials are comparable.
- ✓ Include descriptions of program curricula, objectives and learning outcomes sufficiently detailed that an evaluator may determine comparability to programs offered in the United States.

11. *In addition to study of the areas of specialization proper to its principal educational programs, requires a coherent and substantive program of general education at the postsecondary level, comparable to those offered by institutions in the United States, as either a prerequisite to or a clearly defined element in those programs; documents a commitment and resource base sufficient to facilitate students' achievement of the goals of general education;*

Commentary: This requirement ensures that a defined general education component is an essential element of an undergraduate degree program. The Commission's standard on *The Academic Program* further stipulates that at least 40 semester credit hours of an undergraduate program leading to a bachelor's degree (or 20 semester credit hours for an associate's degree) consist of courses in arts and the humanities, the sciences (including mathematics), and the social sciences. To ensure that the recognized purposes of general education in a degree program are fulfilled, the Commission requires that it be offered at the collegiate level and that it not be a random collection of courses but rather have coherence as a whole.

- ✓ Briefly describe the institution's general education requirement. Include the number of courses and credit hours students are required to take as well as the fields of study encompassed in the general education component.
- ✓ Indicate where information regarding the general education requirement can be found in the institution's catalog and website.
- ✓ Indicate the number of general education courses offered and the number of faculty who teach general education courses.
- ✓ Identify the library and technology resources and physical facilities (e.g., labs, studios) available to support the general education curriculum.

12. *Has financial records that relate clearly to the institution's educational activities and has these records externally audited annually; if auditing procedures differ from those generally used in the United States, provides financial records reconciled to accounting practices common to American higher education;*

Commentary: The students' welfare is the concern of the Commission in this requirement. When students enroll, making a substantial commitment of time and money, they should be assured that the institution has the financial means of carrying out its programs and services now and into the future. The Commission understands that auditing procedures used in some countries may differ substantially from those used in the United States. In such instances, it will be difficult for evaluators from the United States to reach an adequate understanding the financial situation of the institution without a second set of financial records reconciled to U.S. accounting practices.

- ✓ Provide 3 years of audited financial statements and management letters in English.

Educational Mission and Programs

13. *The institution offers one or more collegiate-level education programs, consistent with its mission, that lead to a degree in a recognized field of study and require at least one year to complete;*

Commentary: The Commission deals only with degree-granting institutions. Institutions offering only short courses are excluded from its scope. (The Commission does, however, regard as appropriate the offering of short courses in a context established by the presence of degree programs.) The institution's mission gives general direction to its academic programs; programs should be consistent with the mission.

- ✓ Summarize the programmatic offerings of the institution, including their relationship to the mission, and the anticipated time to complete each degree.
- ✓ Indicate where detailed information about the institution's academic programs can be found in the institution's catalog and website.

14. *Awards the associate's or bachelor's degrees in three or more liberal arts areas or requires that all undergraduates take 50% or more of their credits in the liberal arts and sciences. May also award the master's or doctor's degree;*

Commentary: This requirement limits the range of degree-granting institutions that may be found eligible. Specifically, the Commission's purview is limited to institutions that provide students with the opportunity to complete academic programs that will prepare them to pursue degrees at a higher level at regionally accredited institutions in the United States.

- ✓ Identify all degrees awarded, indicating those offered in the liberal arts.
- ✓ Indicate where information about liberal arts offerings can be found in the institution's catalog and website.

15. *Has, for each of its educational programs, clearly defined and published objectives appropriate to higher education in level, standards, and quality, as well as the means for achieving them, including a designated course of studies acceptable for meeting degree requirements, adequate guidance to degree candidates in the satisfaction of requirements, and adequate grading or evaluation procedures;*

Commentary: This requirement speaks to the need to assure the public that each program offered by the institution has a purpose, plan, and objectives; that each student is following a purposeful course of study and receives guidance in ensuring fulfillment of the course requirements; and that the grading and evaluation systems are appropriate, fair, and consistent.

- ✓ Summarize the institution's policies on the development of program objectives and curricula.
- ✓ Indicate where program objectives and curricula are published in the institution's catalog and website.
- ✓ Summarize advising activities and resources available for students.

- ✓ Summarize the institution's grading or evaluation procedures. Indicate where information on the evaluation of student work is available in the institution's catalog and website.

16. *Awards only degrees appropriate to each graduate's level of attainment;*

Commentary: The concern addressed here is the integrity of the institution's degrees. The institution should assure that credentials are awarded only to students who have fulfilled all program requirements at a satisfactory level of achievement.

- ✓ Indicate how the institution guarantees the integrity of its degrees, including the protection of academic freedom, the acceptance of transfer credit, and the prevention of plagiarism.
- ✓ Indicate any degree audit processes or other means by which the institution can demonstrate that its graduates' level of attainment is acceptable to graduate schools and future employers.

17. *Offers its instructional programs entirely or predominantly through coursework that includes face-to-face instruction;*

Commentary: The Commission limits its activities with overseas institutions to those that offer primarily classroom-based instructional programs.

- ✓ Indicate if any degree or certificate programs are offered in formats other than face-to-face. (Classroom-based courses with an on-line component that is less than 50% of the course need not be identified.)

18. *Has adopted a statement specifying the potential students it wishes to serve, and admits qualified students to its programs under admission policies consistent with this statement and appropriate to those programs;*

Commentary: This requirement ensures that an institution has given consideration to the characteristics of its potential student population and that the statement indicating the students it wishes to serve is compatible with the institution's mission and programs. It also obligates institutions to admit students who are capable of successfully completing its programs.

- ✓ Provide the institution's statement about the students it serves.
- ✓ Summarize institutional admission policies and practices. Provide data on the most recently admitted class demonstrating that only qualified students are admitted.
- ✓ Indicate where a description of the current student body can be found in the institution's catalog and website.

19. *Has students enrolled in and pursuing its principal educational programs at the time of the Commission's evaluation;*

Commentary: The Commission considers for eligibility only institutions that are currently in full operation.

- ✓ List current degree programs with the number of students enrolled in each.
20. *Has graduated at least one class in its principal educational programs before the Commission's evaluation for accredited status. If the institution has graduated its first class not more than one year before the Commission's evaluation, the effective date of accreditation will be the date of graduation of that first class.*

Commentary: Since accreditation covers the entire institution, up to and including the awarding of degrees, the Commission must be able to evaluate a complete cycle of the institution's principal program as it actually operates. The provision that accreditation be retroactive to the date of graduation of the first class (if not more than one year before the Commission's evaluation) is designed to eliminate the difficulties that graduates of that first class might have with professional licensure and admission to certain graduate programs if their degrees were from an unaccredited institution.

- ✓ Provide the date of the first graduating class.
- ✓ Provide the numbers of graduating students by program over the past five years.

Resources

21. *The institution documents a funding base, financial resources, and plans for financial development adequate to carry out its stated purposes;*

Commentary: The Commission wishes to be assured that institutions have the financial capacity to support their educational objectives and that their fiscal stability is not unduly dependent on a vulnerable or narrow base of funding support now or in the future.

- ✓ Describe financial plans and include projected budgets for the next three years.
 - ✓ Identify all external funding sources, foundation grants, public subsidies, etc.
 - ✓ Include fundraising and financial planning documents.
22. *Has faculty sufficient in number, qualifications, and experience to support the academic program offered, including an adequate number of faculty whose time commitment to the institution is sufficient to assure the accomplishment of class and out-of-class responsibilities essential to the fulfillment of institutional mission and purposes;*

Commentary: The Commission wishes to be assured that faculty numbers and credentials are appropriate to sustain and enhance the academic program and the institution as a whole.

- ✓ Provide a chart of full-time and part-time faculty by department, indicating their degrees and years of experience at the institution.
 - ✓ Describe faculty responsibilities for curriculum development, scholarship, student advising, and institutional governance. Include in the appendix any documentation where such responsibilities are described.
23. *Has sufficient staff, with appropriate preparation and experience, to provide the administrative services necessary to support its mission and purposes.*

Commentary: The Commission seeks assurance that the non-academic functions of the institution are staffed by individuals with the expertise to fulfill their responsibilities effectively for the ongoing sustainability and improvement of the institution.

- ✓ Provide a list of the senior leadership team and their titles, indicating the degrees and experience of each, as well as the number of years at the institution.
- ✓ Provide a list of full-time and part-time professional staff, indicating their qualifications.
- ✓ Provide the full-time equivalent numbers of support staff by function.
- ✓ Provide an organizational chart.

Transparency

24. *The institution has available to students and the public a current and accurate website and catalog or comparable official publication setting forth purposes and objectives, entrance requirements and procedures, rules and regulations for student conduct, programs and courses, degree completion requirements, full-time and part-time faculty and degrees held, costs, refunds, and other items related to attending or withdrawing from the institution.*

Commentary: The Commission believes that each institution must operate openly, providing to its prospective and enrolled students and the general public all necessary information about its programs, activities, and procedures.

- ✓ Provide a copy of the English-language version of the printed catalog. If no printed catalog exists, provide a link to the institution's on-line catalog.
- ✓ Include a chart indicating where the items listed above can be found (specific page numbers in the catalog and URLs on the institution's website).