

Call for Comments – August 2016

PROPOSED CHANGES

Key: **Delete**, **Add**

Policy and Procedures for Monitoring Annual Report Data

Introduction

Each year, ABHE ~~member~~ **applicant, candidate, and accredited** institutions are required to complete an **Online** Annual Report ~~Form due by~~ **Form due by** November 15 that provides ~~a great deal of~~ data relative to the institution's activities, enrollment, faculty, library, ~~and~~ financial resources, and **student achievement** results. ~~Upon receipt of the completed Annual Reports,~~ The ABHE staff assumes responsibility for monitoring the data presented, **requesting a written explanation from institutions outside the designated parameters,** and ~~bringing to the attention of the Commission on Accreditation any issues of concern arising from their findings for review at the Commission's subsequent February meeting~~ **placing the institutions on the agenda for review at the next scheduled meeting of the appropriate Commission on Accreditation committee.** The monitoring process used by the ABHE staff is outlined in the steps described below.

Institutional Data

The Commission **on Accreditation** staff monitors this data to ensure that the Association Directory is up-to-date with current information. It also seeks to ensure that institutions are properly following the Commission **on Accreditation's Policy on** Substantive Change ~~policies~~ with respect to teaching sites and educational modalities. In cases where it is apparent that an institution has reported extension locations, additional locations, branch campuses, and/or instructional modality that have not been previously approved under the Commission **on Accreditation's Policy on** Substantive Change, the staff will contact the institution to determine why there is no record of a required approval. Such instances will also be reported along with the institution's response to the Commission **on Accreditation's** Committee on Progress Reports and Substantive Change (PRSC – accredited institutions) or the Committee on Applicant and Candidate status (APCAN – candidate institutions).

Enrollment Data

The Commission **on Accreditation** staff monitors enrollment data with particular attention to institutions that have experienced a 50% or greater increase in enrollment on campus or through the use of the distance education or correspondence education modalities. Where an institution has experienced a 50% increase in enrollment, the ABHE staff will alert the Secretary (U.S. Department of Education). The staff will also alert the Commission **on Accreditation** regarding those institutions experiencing 50% or greater growth so that the Commission **on Accreditation** at its regular meeting will be able to determine any special steps that should be taken to ensure that the institution is taking appropriate measures to accommodate its rapid growth. Institutions suffering a loss of enrollment of ~~15~~ **20%** or greater ~~shall~~ **will** also be given

special attention by the appropriate Commission on Accreditation committee (PRSC – accredited, APCAN – applicant & candidate) to ensure that their stability is not jeopardized by the downturn in enrollment.

Student Achievement Data

The Commission on Accreditation staff will further monitor retention rates, program completion graduation rates, and participation in the institution's student ministries ministry formation program. Institutions having values ~~that are only half of the normative value for institutions in a given enrollment classification shall be brought to the attention~~ below the following thresholds will be asked to furnish an explanation and be placed on the agenda of the appropriate Commission on Accreditation Committee (PRSC – accredited, APCAN – applicant & candidate) for its review:

Retention rate – 20%

Graduation rate – 15%

Ministry participation rate – 50%

Where cohort data is small, the Commission on Accreditation will consider multi-year data in its review of institutional performance.

The Commission on Accreditation staff will also review information as it is made available by the U.S. Department of Education to determine institutions that may have performance concerns and report that information to the Commission on Accreditation in accordance with the analysis process for achievement data above. Factors considered from USDE data will include 150% graduation rate, first year retention rate, three-year debt repayment rate, and three-year cohort default rate.

Commission on Accreditation staff will also gather and report USDE data to the Commission on Accreditation on average annual net price for Title IV students, percentage of students borrowing federal loans, median debt of students who graduate, percentage of part-time students, percentage of Pell recipients, and percentage of students age 25 or above.

Educational Staff

The Commission on Accreditation staff will review the data submitted regarding the ~~extent of faculty resources and~~ the level of faculty credentials. ~~The Commission staff will report institutions having a faculty – student ratio greater than 25:1 or less than 10:1 shall be brought to the special attention of the appropriate Commission Committee (PRSC – accredited; APCAN – candidate) to determine if further monitoring is needed. Similarly, if it is apparent appears that 20% or more of faculty fail to meet expectations with respect to academic credentials, the reporting institution shall be brought to the attention~~ will be asked to furnish an explanation and be placed on the agenda of the appropriate Commission on Accreditation Committee (PRSC – accredited; APCAN – applicant and candidate) ~~to determine if further monitoring is needed for review.~~

Learning Resource Data

The Commission on Accreditation staff will review the data regarding learning resources. Institutions reporting an annual investment of 2% or less of their educational and general budget in learning resources will be ~~reported to~~ asked to furnish an explanation and be placed on the agenda of the appropriate Commission on Accreditation Committee (PRSC – accredited; APCAN – applicant and candidate) ~~to determine if further monitoring is warranted~~ for review. Institutions reporting a decrease in the size of their holdings of 20% or more without an increase in electronic resources ~~shall~~ will also be identified for ~~special Committee attention~~ review.

Financial Data

Institutions in the U.S. having a ~~total-weighted~~ financial responsibility composite score of less than 1.5 ~~where the highest possible score is 3.0 and the lowest possible score is a negative 1.0 shall be brought to the attention~~ will be asked to furnish an explanation and be placed on the Committee on Financial Exigency agenda for review ~~of the Commission's Committee on Financial Exigency for special monitoring~~. Canadian institutions failing to meet more than two of the financial ~~ratios expected by the form will be brought to the attention of the Committee on Financial Exigency~~ indicators queried on the Online Annual Report will be asked to furnish an explanation and be placed on the Committee on Financial Exigency agenda for review. At the COA Director's ~~(Commission on Accreditation)~~ discretion, an extreme negative score ~~shall~~ will be a sufficient reason to identify a need to submit a Canadian institution to the Committee on Financial Exigency for special ~~monitoring~~ attention.

Tenets of Faith

The failure of an institution to affirm the ABHE Tenets of Faith ~~shall~~ will be brought to the attention of the Commission on Accreditation.

The Commission on Accreditation's Responsibility

Upon receipt of notice that the staff has identified an institution for special attention, the Commission on Accreditation will carefully review the institution with respect to the element(s) that caused the staff to place the institution on the Commission on Accreditation agenda. Data involving accredited institutions will be reviewed by the Committee on Progress Reports and Substantive Change. Data involving applicant and candidate institutions will be reviewed by the Commission on Accreditation's Committee on Applicant Status. If, with respect to accredited institutions, the Commission on Accreditation concludes that special monitoring is required, the Commission on Accreditation may exercise a range of options that include the requirement of a progress report regarding the concern(s), a requirement that the institution host a staff visit for the purpose of investigating the concern(s), or a requirement that an institution host a focused visit by a team of evaluators. ~~A failure to cooperate with the Commission's request for a monitoring action will call into question an institution's status with the Commission. Should the Commission determine that an institution's data is unacceptable because of quality or stability issues, the Commission will take action to place the institution on sanction.~~

In the case of an applicant or candidate institution, any special monitoring function will normally be completed through a combination of the annual staff visit and the related annual progress report. A failure to address the Commission on Accreditation's concerns will jeopardize the institution's progress towards accreditation.

An institution that develops an action plan to address low performance indicators, has that plan approved by the appropriate Commission on Accreditation committee, and is achieving annual benchmarks for fulfillment of the action plan will be considered to be in compliance with this ABHE policy, and absent other indicators suggesting the contrary, in compliance with ABHE Standards. Institutions which fail to achieve benchmarks in the action plan may be found out of compliance with ABHE Standards and placed on sanction.

Failure to cooperate with the Commission on Accreditation's request for information and/or review will call into question an institution's status with the Commission on Accreditation. Should the Commission on Accreditation determine that an institution's data is unacceptable because of quality or stability issues, the Commission will take action to place the institution on sanction.

Adopted: April 2012; Revised PROPOSED August 2016