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1. Proposed Criteria Revisions

At its April 2017 meeting, the Council reviewed specific areas of the ACICS Accreditation Criteria outlined in this section as a result of its continuous process of systematic review, and approved the revisions as proposed for feedback from the field (new language is underlined, deleted language is struck). Proposed changes are reconsidered for final approval and implementation at the Council’s next meeting and incorporate the perspectives shared by the field. Public comment on these revisions is requested through the ACICS Comment Survey explained at the end of the memorandum. ACICS requests comments and recommendations from a broad cross section of ACICS stakeholders, including students, faculty, school administrators, policy advocates, and others.
A. Intent to Bar/Debarment Appeal

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes to clarify the language surrounding the debarment appeal process. The revised language clarifies the procedure that individuals or entities may only appeal the intent to bar. The current language on debarment could be interpreted that an individual or entity may also elect to appeal the debarment action, after an appeal of the intent. The revised language intends to remove this possible interpretation.

2-3-900 – DEBARMENT

... The intent to bar notice will inform the person(s) or entity that they are entitled to present information and materials in writing or in person to appeal the intent to bar at the next scheduled meeting of the Council. The notice will stipulate that if they intend to appeal the intent to bar, the person(s) or entity must inform the Council office in writing within ten days of receipt of the notice as to whether they will appeal the intent to bar in writing or in person. The Council’s decision is final if the person or entity elects not to appeal within ten days of the Council notification.

A debarment order may be issued by the Council as a result of its consideration of the facts presented in the appeal. The Council’s decision is final and will be sent to the person(s) or entity by electronic and certified mail following their appeal before the Council.

The Council’s decision is final if the person or entity elects not to appeal within ten days of Council notification. The Council’s decision is also final following appeal.

B. Review Board Members and Expenses of an Appeal

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes to clarify language regarding the Review Board of Appeals. The proposed language indicates that a panel of three persons will be selected from a pool of 15 members of the Review Board of Appeals. The order of the types of members has also been reorganized for consistency. In addition, the proposed language clarifies the remittance of a standard hearing fee.

2-3-600 – REVIEW BOARD APPEAL PROCESS

2-3-602. Appointment of Members. The Review Board of Appeals shall consist of a pool of fifteen (15) persons, all of whom have had experience in accreditation, who are appointed to three-year terms. An appointed person shall not have been a commissioner within one year prior to appointment. The Review Board of Appeals shall consist of at least two (2) academic representatives, two (2) administrative representatives, and three (3) public members, as defined in Appendix A.
A Review Board of Appeals panel of three to seven persons, depending on the scope and complexity of the matter or institution being reviewed, will be designated by the Council from the entire Review Board to hear an appeal from an institution. The Council will also designate one member of the Review Board Panel to serve as chair. The selection and actions of the panel are subject to ACICS conflict of interest policies. A Review Board Panel will consist of at least one (1) public, one (1) administrative, and one (1) academic, one (1) administrative, and one (1) public representative as defined in Appendix A.

2-3-608. Expenses of Appeal Hearing. The institution shall bear the following expenses in connection with the appeal:
(a) travel and subsistence of the Review Board panel members participating in the hearing; and
(b) cost of the hearing room and transcription.

An appeals fee deposit must be remitted to the Council at the time of the filing of the notice of appeal described in Section 2-3-604. This fee deposit shall be applied to the expenses listed above, and any excess deposit will be returned to the institution.

APPENDIX A     BYLAWS
ARTICLE VII
Appeals Process

Section 1 – Review Board of Appeals. A Review Board of Appeals shall be appointed by the Council. The purpose of the Review Board shall be to review, according to pre-established procedures and guidelines, appeals by members of final negative actions by the Council and in each case either to affirm the action of the Council, to remand the case to the Council for further review, or to amend or overturn the action. The Review Board shall consist of a pool of fifteen (15) persons, all of whom have had experience in accreditation. The Review Board shall include at least two (2) academic representatives, two (2) administrative representatives, and three (3) public members, as defined in Article III, Section 1 herein. Review Board panels will consist of a minimum of three (3) members and be comprised of at least one (1) public, one (1) academic, and one (1) administrative, and one (1) public representative. Members shall be appointed to terms of three years, with terms of initial appointees staggered so that one-third of the terms expire each year. A person appointed to the Review Board shall not have been a commissioner within one year prior to appointment. The President shall convene timely a panel of the Review Board when necessary.

C. Institutional Grant Length

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes to reinstitute the determination of grant length at the institutional, rather than at the campus level. That is, the institution (main and its branches) will be awarded a grant of accreditation given that a branch does not hold an accredited status; rather, it is approved within the accredited status of the main campus. While the Council
currently has the discretion on the length of an award across campuses, the proposed change would eliminate the ability to award a grant length to a branch campus independently of its main.

2-1-701. Maximum Length of Grants of Accreditation. The Council determines the grant lengths of each campus—institution that is accredited by ACICS. The maximum length of an initial grant of accreditation is three years. If an institution can demonstrate a record of having been in good standing with another institutional accrediting agency recognized by the United States Department of Education, the Council may award an initial grant of up to four years. The maximum length of a renewal grant of accreditation is six years.

2-1-702. Grant Lengths of Branch Campuses in Multiple Campus Institutions. The Council at its discretion may determine that the grant length and/or expiration date for a branch campus will not coincide with the grant length and/or expiration date for the main campus. In the event that the main campus fails to maintain its accreditation status with ACICS, the associated branches and learning sites are ineligible for accreditation by ACICS.

D. Unannounced Visit Fees

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes that the Criteria related to charges for unannounced visits be consistent with fees assessed for scheduled visits. Therefore, the proposed change is that unannounced visits will be assessed a flat visit fee, rather than based upon expenses. Failure to pay the fee would be subject to adverse action.

2-1-405. Expenses Fees. Visit expenses for all team members, including the ACICS staff member who accompanies the team, shall be paid by the institution. Expenses include an honorarium for members of the team. A fee will be assessed for this visit. Failure to remit payment for the visit fee may result in an adverse action.

Appendix B (in Criteria)

Expenses Fees

A fee will not be assessed for this visit, but each institution will be billed for expenses incurred during the visit. Failure to remit payment for expenses this fee may result in a directive to show cause why the accreditation of the institution should not be withdrawn. an adverse action.

E. Council Hearing Procedures

Explanation of Proposed Changes

At its December 2016 meeting, the Council moved to require all show-cause hearings to be in writing unless an in-person hearing is directed by the Council. For clarity, the notation “in-writing hearing” is being revised to an “institutional review” and hearings reserved for in-person appearances before the Council. For institutional reviews, the submission of documentation and fee would replace a notification of the institution’s acceptance as
confirmation of the understanding of its show-cause status. The proposed changes also include revisions to the procedures for when the Council requires a hearing in person.

...The issuance of a show-cause directive may be considered the basis for an institutional review or hearing in person, at the discretion of the Council, as defined in Section 2-3-500. A suspension order or denial action may be issued by ACICS as the result of this hearing, the Council’s review of the institution’s response or the hearing, and such action is considered a final action which may only be appealed to the Review Board of Appeals as described in Section 2-3-600. All institutions that are issued a show-cause directive by the Council will be directed to submit a school closure plan and may be required to submit a teach-out agreement as described in Section 2-2-303 of the Accreditation Criteria.

2-3-500 – COUNCIL HEARING REVIEW OR HEARING PROCEDURES
All institutional reviews and hearings will be in writing unless the Council exercises its sole discretion to require a hearing in person before the Council. The following procedures will govern reviews to be conducted by and hearings to be held before the Council:

(a) The acceptance of a hearing must be made by a date determined by the Council, which will not be less than 10 days from the date of receipt of the letter of notification of the show-cause directive. The acceptance of a hearing must be in writing and signed by the chief executive officer of the institution. Upon receipt of the acceptance of a hearing, the Council will notify the institution of the procedures to follow to prepare for the hearing.

(b) The institution shall have the right to respond with evidence and facts concerning the areas of noncompliance with which it has been charged, to raise all reasonable questions, and to present evidence in opposition to or extenuation of the charges of noncompliance. Such written evidence must be submitted by the date prescribed by the Council unless the institution can show that such information was not available before the submission date and that failure to make a timely submission was outside of the institution’s control.

(c) In the event that the Council requires a hearing in person, the institution’s acceptance of an in-person hearing must be made within ten (10) days from the date of receipt of the letter of notification of show-cause directive. The acceptance of the in-person hearing must be in writing and signed by the chief executive officer of the institution. Upon receipt of the acceptance of the hearing, the Council will notify the institution of the procedures to follow to prepare for the hearing. In the event that the Council allows a hearing in person, the institution may present only evidence not already considered. The institution may send one or more representatives, including legal or financial counsel, to present its argument in opposition to or extenuation of the Council action. The Council transcribes all such hearings for its records. A copy of the transcript is available to the institution upon request.

2-3-501. Institutional Review or Hearing Format. Institutional reviews conducted by and hearings before the Council resulting from a show-cause directive and involving areas of
noncompliance other than or in addition to financial concerns will take place before a panel of commissioners.

A review or hearing panel of at least three commissioners will be designated by the Council to review the written response and hear the presentation of the institution, if applicable. The panel will present its findings and its recommended action to the full Council, which will make the final decision within the time frames specified in Title II, Chapter 3.

2-3-502. Financial Reviews or Hearings. All reviews conducted by or hearings before the Council for financial concerns only will be deliberated or heard by a panel of at least three commissioners, which will include at least one representative of the Financial Review Committee. The panel will present its findings and its recommended action to the full Council, which will make the final decision within the time frames specified in Title II, Chapter 3.

F. Revision of Title - Change of Ownership/Control Action

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes a revision to the following title of the criterion to better reflect its content. The title clarifies the denial of reinstatement of accreditation after change of ownership or control, rather than a denial of the change of ownership/control itself.

2-3-302. Denial of Renewal of Accreditation or Denial of Reinstatement of Accreditation Following Change of Ownership/Control. An institution that objects to a Council decision to deny an application for a renewal of accreditation or reinstatement of accreditation following a change of ownership or control has the right to appeal the decision to the Review Board of Appeals pursuant to the procedures described in 2-3-604.

G. Institutional Show-Cause and Withdrawal of Approval

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes to clarify language regarding a show-cause directive on a branch campus. The revised language indicates that a show-cause action may result in the withdrawal of approval of a branch campus or the withdrawal of accreditation of the institution.

2-3-230. Show-Cause Directive. Show-cause is a status that the Council may impose on an institution when it determines that the institution or one of the campuses within the institution does not materially operate in accordance with the Accreditation Criteria. The Council will provide the institution with a written summary of the areas of noncompliance to the institution, and the institution which will be required to provide evidence of corrective action for review by ACICS. Following receipt of a show-cause directive, the institution must bring itself into compliance within the time frames specified in Title II, Chapter 3, or the institution will be subject to an adverse action.
The issuance of a show-cause directive may be considered the basis for a hearing, at the discretion of the Council, as defined in Section 2-3-500. A suspension order or denial action may be issued by ACICS as the result of this hearing, and such action is considered a final action which may only be appealed to the Review Board of Appeals as described in Section 2-3-600. All institutions that are issued a show-cause directive by the Council will be directed to submit a school closure plan and may be required to submit a teach-out agreement as described in Section 2-2-303 of the Accreditation Criteria.

2-3-231. Result of Show-Cause. The Council will not accept any applications for new programs or new campuses from any institution on show-cause unless the institution receives approval in advance to submit such an application.

2-3-400 – ACCREDITATION WITHDRAWN
“Withdrawal of accreditation” differs from “denial of accreditation” in that denial rejects an institution’s application for an initial grant of accreditation or for a renewal of accreditation to take effect upon the expiration of an existing grant of accreditation; withdrawal of accreditation takes away a current grant of accreditation before its expiration. Accreditation may be withdrawn from an institution or inclusion withdrawn from a branch campus through two types of Council action: “revocation of accreditation” or “suspension of accreditation.”

2-3-401. Revocation. Revocation occurs without a hearing for any of the following reasons:
(a) An institution or campus notifies the Council that it has closed and/or ceased operation.
(b) An institution fails to submit a written response to a show-cause directive by the indicated due date.
(c) An institution or campus whose accreditation has been summarily suspended does not challenge the suspension within 10 days of receipt of the suspension notice. (See Section 2-2-301.)
(d) The institution or campus fails to file an annual report as required by the Council. (See Sections 2-1-801 to 2-1-802.)
(e) The institution or campus fails to pay its annual fees, application fees, other assessed fees, or evaluation expenses. (See Section 2-1-804.)

A revocation action is not appealable. It requires an institution to start anew and to undergo the entire accreditation process to regain accreditation.

2-3-402. Suspension. Suspension of accreditation may occur when, in the judgment of ACICS, an institution or one of the campuses within the institution no longer complies with the criteria.

By way of illustration, ACICS might issue an order of suspension for reasons such as the following:
(a) The institution or any of its components (a branch or new program, for example), is evaluated as directed by ACICS and is determined not to be in compliance with the criteria.
(b) Periodic required reports filed by the institution/campus fail to conform to Council reporting requirements.

(c) The institution/campus makes substantial or significant change, without notice to ACICS, in its operation, structure, governance, ownership, control, location, facilities, or programs of study.

(d) The institution/campus fails to respond to or cooperate with attempts by the Council to make arrangements for a site evaluation.

(e) The institution/campus has deviated from the criteria or other directives of ACICS.

(f) The institution fails to disclose any agreements, options, or other contractual arrangements between the institution and other parties which bear on the management or control of the main campus or its nonmain campuses.

In all cases of suspension, the Council retains discretion to specify whether and under what conditions the institution might apply for an initial grant of accreditation or inclusion of a branch campus.

2-3-403. Procedural Guarantees for Withdrawal by Suspension. In all cases where accreditation is subject to withdrawal by suspension under Section 2-3-402, the institution is afforded the following procedural guarantees:

(a) Opportunity for a review or hearing before ACICS on all material issues in controversy.

(b) Written prior notice of the proceedings, the charges levied, and the standards by which the institution/campus ultimately is to be judged.

(c) A decision on the record alone and a statement of reasons for the ultimate decision.

(d) A right of appeal as provided in Section 2-3-600.

(e) If the Review Board of Appeals affirms the withdrawal of accreditation by way of suspension, the appeal shall be deemed to be finally disposed of upon issuance of the decision and publication will be made as described in Section 2-3-607.

H. Revocation for Failure to Respond to Show-Cause Directive

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes to add an additional reason for the revocation action - when an institution does not respond to a show-cause directive. The language also allows for withdrawal actions to also be taken at the campus level.

2-3-400 – ACCREDITATION WITHDRAWN

“Withdrawal of accreditation” differs from “denial of accreditation” in that denial rejects an institution’s application for an initial grant of accreditation or for a renewal of accreditation to take effect upon the expiration of an existing grant of accreditation; withdrawal of accreditation takes away a current grant of accreditation before its expiration. Accreditation may be withdrawn from an institution or inclusion withdrawn from a branch campus through two types of Council action: “revocation of accreditation” or “suspension of accreditation.”

2-3-401. Revocation. Revocation occurs without a hearing for any of the following reasons:
(f) An institution or campus notifies the Council that it has closed and/or ceased operation.
(g) An institution fails to submit a written response to a show-cause directive by the indicated due date.
(h) An institution or campus whose accreditation has been summarily suspended does not challenge the suspension within 10 days of receipt of the suspension notice. (See Section 2-2-301.)
(i) The institution or campus fails to file an annual report as required by the Council. (See Sections 2-1-801 to 2-1-802.)
(j) The institution or campus fails to pay its annual fees, application fees, other assessed fees, or evaluation expenses. (See Section 2-1-804.)

A revocation action is not appealable. It requires an institution to start anew and to undergo the entire accreditation process to regain accreditation.

I. Student Achievement Procedures

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes changes in the Criteria to reflect recent changes in standards and guidelines regarding student achievement. The proposed language will be consistent with other Council actions and provide clarity on its expectations with each action. In addition, two sections of the Criteria related to Student Achievement have been revised to remove redundant language. A revision was also made to procedural guarantees for withdrawals by suspension to include language for what is now an institutional review.

2-1-809. Student Achievement Review. The Council reviews the Campus Accountability Report (CAR) to monitor performance in terms of student achievement at both the campus and program levels. Measures will include retention, placement, and licensure examination pass rates, as applicable. When this review indicates that the achievement of an institution’s students is below benchmark, the Council will take action consistent with the guidelines outlined in Appendix L, Student Achievement Standards and Campus Accountability Reports. If the Council determines the institution no longer complies with the Council’s requirement for student achievement, the Council will issue a compliance warning or a show-cause directive, or otherwise take action and require the institution to demonstrate compliance within the time frames described in Title II, Chapter 3. If the Council deems an institution significantly out of compliance relative to student achievement outcomes with little or no chance of coming into compliance, then it will take an adverse action. Those with campus- or program-level plans are subject to additional reporting requirements, and additional restrictions may be imposed upon those that are out of compliance.

2-2-502. Program Show-Cause or Compliance Warning. When the Council determines that a program at a campus of the institution has fallen below the compliance standard for retention, placement, or licensure examination pass rates, the institution will be provided in writing with a show-cause directive or compliance warning regarding the alleged deficiency in accordance with the guidelines outlined in Appendix L, Student Achievement
Standards and Campus Accountability Reports. The show-cause or compliance warning will note that the program will have to come into compliance by meeting or exceeding the program-level standard prior to the expiration of the established time frame or be taught out and discontinued or otherwise conditioned.

A program show-cause or compliance warning is not a negative or conditioning action and is therefore not appealable. Rather, it is issued as an official notification to an institution that a program provided by the institution is out of compliance with agency standards. Following receipt of a program show-cause or compliance warning, the institution must bring itself into compliance within the time frames specified in Title II, Chapter 3, and Appendix L, or the institution will be subject to adverse action in the form of withdrawal of approval for inclusion of the program within the institution’s grant of accreditation as described in Section 2-2-503.

A program that is placed on show-cause status is required to notify its current and prospective students along with the public immediately and in writing of its show-cause status through appropriate means.

Appendix L Student Achievement Standards and Campus Accountability Reports

INTRODUCTION

ACICS defines academic quality in terms of the extent to which an accredited institution achieves its intended student learning and student success outcomes. Student learning outcomes involve assessment of skill and competency attainment, including licensure examination pass rates, where applicable. Student success outcomes include student retention or persistence and employment or placement.

Section 2-1-809 of the Accreditation Criteria requires periodic Council review of student achievement data, verified both by the institution as well as by the Council, submitted by the campus in the annual Campus Accountability Report (CAR) as required under Section 2-1-801. Appendix L provides an overview of the Council’s student achievement standards and Council actions that will be taken if the student achievement data show that a campus or program is out of compliance with these standards.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTATIONS

Student achievement standards outlined below apply to retention and placement rates at the campus and program levels, and licensure examination pass rates, where applicable, at the program level. Minimum standards are intended to ensure that a substantial majority of students at ACICS-accredited campuses are retained, pass licensure examinations where applicable, and find appropriate employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus-Level Student Achievement Elements (Effective 2013 Reporting Year)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Benchmark*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Rate</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program-Level Student Achievement Elements (Effective 2013 Reporting Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Benchmark*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Program length equal to or less than one (1) year</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program length more than one (1) year</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Rate\nLicensure Examination Pass Rates, where applicable**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A campus and/or program whose rates fall below Benchmark must develop and implement an improvement plan.

** Licensure examination pass rates standards apply where a licensure is required for employment to programs for which licensure or certification is required to practice in the specific career field. The program is also required to meet applicable licensure agency standards if higher rates are required any higher licensure agency standards.

DATA COLLECTION AND VERIFICATION OF DATA INTEGRITY
As required under Standard 2-1-801, each main campus and each branch campus must submit an annual Campus Accountability Report (CAR). These reports are due on or before November 1 annually. The CAR reporting year is July 1 to June 30. Placement is accepted through November 1 of the CAR reporting year. Based on the student-by-student data submitted by the campus, the Council calculates the various student achievement rates. All data reported to ACICS for any purpose is expected to reflect an accurate and verifiable portrayal of institutional performance and is subject to review for integrity, accuracy, and completeness (see Standard 3-1-203). In addition to the Council review of data on an annual basis, placement information is reviewed via monthly submissions, and all CAR data is subject to review and verification at any time, including during an on-site evaluation visit.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT REVIEW AND COUNCIL ACTIONS
The Council reviews student achievement data for each campus on an annual basis and takes appropriate action. The Council reserves the right to take immediate adverse action once a campus and/or program is found out of compliance and will exercise its judgment in applying the guidelines outlined below: The Council will follow the guidelines listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Reporting</th>
<th>Rates Reporting</th>
<th>Campus and/or Program^ Status**</th>
<th>Council Directed Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Submission</td>
<td>60-69.9%</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>• Development and Implementation of an Improvement Plan (IP) and inclusion into the Campus Effectiveness Plan (CEP) (campus and/or program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Attendance at ACICS’S’s Retention and Placement Workshop (campus level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Reporting</td>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>Campus and/or Program^ Status**</td>
<td>Council Directed Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                | 50-59.9% | Compliance Warning | • Institutional review before the Council (campus level)  
• Development and Implementation of an Improvement Plan (IP) and inclusion into the Campus Effectiveness Plan (CEP) (campus and/or program level)  
• Submission of a partial Campus Accountability Report (CAR) which includes backup documentation to support the rate(s) reported for the specified period Mid-year rate and backup documentation of the activities occurring between July 1 and December 31 (campus and/or program level)  
• Submission of all communication and reporting with the oversight agency on licensure performance (program-level licensure)  
• Submission of updated licensure information as provided by the oversight agency, or a reliable third-party, or as collected and compiled by the campus with supporting backup documentation (program-level licensure) |
|                | Below 49.9% | Show-Cause | • Institutional review before the Council  
• Submission of evidence of a corrective action plan to the Council along with documentation of implementation and effectiveness (campus and/or program level)  
• Submission of a partial Campus Accountability Report (CAR) which includes backup documentation to support the rate(s) reported for the specified period Mid-year rate and backup documentation of the activities occurring between July 1 and December 31 (campus and/or program level)  
• Notification of its status to its current and prospective students on its website, internal student communication system, and appropriate admissions forms and reference materials (campus and/or program level)  
• Submission of a prepared campus closure plan and/or program termination plan that includes an audit of students currently enrolled along with a plan for teach out (campus and/or program level)  
• Submission of all communication and reporting with the oversight agency on licensure performance (program-level licensure)  
• Submission of updated licensure information as |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Reporting</th>
<th>Rates</th>
<th>Campus and/or Program Status**</th>
<th>Council Directed Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Submission</td>
<td>50-59.9%</td>
<td>Show-Cause</td>
<td>provided by the oversight agency, or a reliable third-party, or as collected and compiled by the campus with supporting back up documentation (program-level licensure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement an ACICS approved Submission of a Campus Closure Application with a teach-out plan and agreements, if applicable (campus and/or program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutional review before the Council Appealable to the Review Board of Appeals (campus and/or program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submission of a Program Termination Application Plan with teach-out or transfer-out agreements for ACICS approval (program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Immediate cessation of new enrollment (program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutional review before the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submission of Submit evidence of a corrective action plan to the Council along with documentation of implementation and effectiveness (campus and/or program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submission of a partial Campus Accountability Report (CAR) which includes backup documentation to support the rate(s) reported for the specified period (campus and/or program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Notification of its status to its current and prospective students on its website, internal student communication system, and appropriate admissions forms and reference materials (campus and/or program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submission of a prepared campus closure plan and/or program termination plan that includes an audit of students currently enrolled along with a plan for teach out (campus and/or program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submission of all communication and reporting with the oversight agency on licensure performance (program-level licensure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submission of updated licensure information as provided by the oversight agency, or a reliable third-party, or as collected and compiled by the campus with supporting back up documentation (program-level licensure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Attendance at ACICS’s Retention and Placement Workshop (campus level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Reporting</td>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>Campus and/or Program Status**</td>
<td>Council Directed Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Year 1</td>
<td>Below 459.9%</td>
<td>Adverse Action</td>
<td>• Implement an ACICS approved Submission of a Campus Closure Application with a teach-out plan and agreements, if applicable (campus and program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutional review before the Council Appealable to the Review Board of Appeals (campus and/or program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submission of a Program Termination Plan Application with teach-out or transfer-out agreements for ACICS approval (program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Immediate cessation of new enrollment (program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Year 2</td>
<td>Below 59.9%</td>
<td>Adverse Action</td>
<td>• Implement an ACICS approved Submission of a Campus Closure Application with a teach-out plan and agreements, if applicable (campus and program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutional review before the Council Appealable to the Review Board of Appeals (campus and/or program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submission of a Program Termination Plan Application with teach-out or transfer-out agreements for ACICS approval (program level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Immediate cessation of new enrollment (program level)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If the Council deems an institution or an individual program significantly out of compliance relative to student achievement outcomes with little or no chance of coming into compliance within the maximum time frame, it will take an adverse action.

In the event that the Council finds an institution or an individual program to be out of compliance at a level that, in its judgement, determines that the institution or program can come into compliance can be remedied within a period of time not to exceed the maximum time frames specified in Title II, Chapter 3, Introduction, in a reasonable period of time, it will take action appropriate to the circumstances such as compliance warning or show-cause directive.

**For any campus institution or program that receives a compliance warning or show-cause directive, the institution must bring itself come into compliance within a period of time not to exceed the maximum time frames specified in Title II, Chapter 3, Introduction (i.e. an institution whose longest program is less than one year in length has a time frame of twelve months to come into compliance).

^A program show-cause directive or compliance warning is not an adverse action and is therefore not appealable. It is issued as an official notification to an institution that a program provided by the institution is out of compliance with agency standards. Following receipt of a program show-cause or compliance warning, the institution must bring itself into compliance within the time frames specified in Title II, Chapter 3, and Appendix L, or the institution will be subject to adverse action in the form of
withdrawal of approval for inclusion of the program within the institution’s grant of accreditation as described in Section 2-2-503.

Description of Student Achievement Review Actions

**Immediate Adverse Action:** The Council reserves the right to take immediate adverse action if the institution or one of its campuses is significantly out of compliance with the Council standards with little or no chance of coming into compliance within the maximum time frame. An adverse action for an institution campus is a withdrawal by suspension of the institution’s accreditation, or withdrawal of inclusion of the branch campus’s approval within the accredited status of the institution. An adverse action and for a program is the withdrawal of that program’s approval termination of the program, except for teach-out purposes for the currently enrolled students. An institution, in accordance with Section 2-3-403(a), will be allowed the opportunity for a review before the Council hearing prior to the issuance execution of a withdrawal by suspension an adverse action.

**Withdrawal by Suspension or Termination of a Program:** If an institution or one of its campuses does not come into compliance within the time frames specified by the Council, then the Council will issue an intent to show-cause will be issued to allow for a review before the Council. The Council will require the campus to submit an ACICS-approved teach-out plan and teach-out agreement, if applicable. If a program does not come into compliance within the time frames specified for compliance warning or show-cause, it will be required to cease enrollment and terminate the program of study.

**Withdrawal of Program Approval:** If a program does not come into compliance within the time frames specified by the Council, then a withdrawal of program approval will be issued and the institution will be required to immediately cease new enrollments and terminate the program. Due to the limited nature and narrow scope of the withdrawal of program approval, the appeal to the Council may be in writing only and is not appealable to the review board.

**Show-Cause:** The Council will issue a show-cause directive against any campus or program that is materially below the Council standard, as defined as below 50% for any student achievement indicator in its current submission. The show-cause directive is an action by which the Council determines that the campus and/or program is materially out of compliance and provides the institution an opportunity for a review before the Council concerning the deficiencies identified. The campus must submit evidence to the Council of the corrective actions planned and implemented to improve performance and come into compliance. Further, the campus must prepare a campus closure and/or program termination plan. In addition, the campus and/or program must provide notification of its status to all current and prospective students. If the show-cause directive is as a result of licensure examination pass rate performance, the campus must also provide updated pass rate information and all communication from the oversight agency concerning the monitoring of its performance. As a result of being found out of compliance, the campus
and/or program will have one year to bring themselves into compliance with the applicable standard.

**Compliance Warning:** Following the CAR submission if a campus and/or program reports student achievement retention or placement rates or program-level licensure examination pass rates between 50-60%, the Council will issue a compliance warning, and the campus and/or program will be found out of compliance. A campus and/or program on compliance warning is required to evaluate, analyze, and if necessary, revise the Improvement Plan implemented while on student achievement reporting. The Council reserves the right to request the submission of the evaluation and analysis of the Improvement Plan for Council review. The campus will be given the opportunity for a review before the Council to provide evidence of improvement at the campus level. As a result of being found out of compliance, the campus and/or program must come into compliance within a period of time not to exceed the maximum time frames specified in Title II, Chapter 3, Introduction.

**Reporting:** Following the CAR submission if a campus and/or program reports student achievement retention or placement rates or program-level licensure examination pass rates between 60-70%, it is considered on student achievement review and reporting. The campus and/or program is required to show improvement and must develop and implement an Improvement Plan that is fully incorporated into the Campus Effectiveness Plan (CEP). The Improvement Plan must identify the factors negatively impacting the student achievement outcome, the specific activities to be implemented or being implemented to address the deficiency, and an analysis of any changes realized since its implementation. This plan may be reviewed during any on-site evaluation visit. In addition, those campuses must attend an ACICS Retention and/or Placement Workshop.

**Data Collection and Verification:** ACICS standards are applied by the Council to data collected from each main and branch campus through the annual Campus Accountability Report (CAR). The Council reviews campus- and program-level retention and placement rates and program-level licensure examination pass rates where licensure is required for employment in the state where the campus is located. The CAR reporting year is July 1 to June 30, and placement is accepted through November 1 of the CAR reporting year.

*Please refer to Campus Accountability Report (CAR) Guidelines and Instructions for details regarding online submission of the annual report, instructions, types of information collected, and calculation formulas.*

**2-3-403. Procedural Guarantees for Withdrawal by Suspension.** In all cases where accreditation is subject to withdrawal by suspension under Section 2-3-402, the institution is afforded the following procedural guarantees:

(a) Opportunity for a review or hearing before ACICS on all material issues in controversy.

(b) Written prior notice of the proceedings, the charges levied, and the standards by which the institution/campus ultimately is to be judged

(c) A decision on the record alone and a statement of reasons for the ultimate decision.
(d) A right of appeal as provided in Section 2-3-600.
(e) If the Review Board of Appeals affirms the withdrawal of accreditation by way of suspension, the appeal shall be deemed to be finally disposed of upon issuance of the decision and publication will be made as described in Section 2-3-607.

J. Initiation of Distance Education

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council seeks to clarify the language regarding the approval needed to initiate distance education or other new instructional delivery methods. The new language would allow for an institution to directly offer a new online course or program once they have submitted and received approval of a distance education application without having to first have approval of the program residentially.

2-2-106. Initiation of Distance Education (Online) or New Instructional Delivery Method. Any institution that intends to initiate courses or programs delivered through an instructional method not currently included in the institution’s scope of accreditation must secure approval from the Council. It is the responsibility of the institution to secure such approval from the Council of the intention to initiate online delivery. Any significant change in instructional delivery method requires prior Council approval.

An institution seeking to initiate a distance education course or program, including hybrid/blended instruction or other new instructional delivery methods, must submit a distance education application and the required documentation for Council review and approval before distance education is included in the institution’s current scope of accreditation. The approval of distance education for an institution includes all of its campuses; however, any campus seeking to initiate a new distance education course or program must complete a new program application and the required documentation.

The institution or campus must initiate the approval process through the submission of a new program application and required documentation information for Council review and approval before being included into the institution’s current scope of accreditation.

K. Denial Actions Not Affecting Overall Accreditation

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes a revision to the language that clarifies the institution’s right to object to other denial actions of requested substantive changes.

2-3-303. Other Denial Actions Not Affecting Overall Accreditation. An institution that objects to a Council decision to deny an application for the addition of a program within the institution’s current scope of accreditation for branch-to-freestanding status or new program inclusion will be given the opportunity to present its case to a panel of the Council and to be heard at a subsequent regularly scheduled meeting of the Council.
institution may offer new evidence that will be considered by the Council if timely submitted, or any substantive change addressed in Standard 2-2-101, will be given the opportunity to present its case to the Council.

L. Substantive and Non-Substantive Changes

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes to recognize that a 25 percent decrease to a program’s clock or credit hours is also a substantive change. The revised wording would include a 25 percent or greater change (to include increase and decrease). In addition, the Council proposes that campuses must notify ACICS of non-substantive changes prior to implementation and notify ACICS when a change has not been implemented within a year.

2-2-101. List of Substantive Changes. The following institutional changes will be considered substantive and require Council approval before they can be included in the institution’s scope of accreditation:

…(g) a 25% percent or greater change increase in the number of clock or credit hours awarded for successful completion of a program as described in Standard 2-2-109;…

It is required that the change will occur within one year of approval. If the institution does not implement the change in this time frame, it shall notify the Council, and reapply for the change if it still seeks implementation. Requests to extend the proposed start date beyond one year of the initial date must be submitted to the Council.

2-2-109. Increasing or Decreasing the Number of Clock or Credit Hours. It is the responsibility of the institution to secure approval from the Council of the intention to initiate an change increase of 25 percent or greater in the number of clock or credit hours awarded for successful completion of a program. If the percentage is less than 25 percent but results in a change in the credential level, the credential level will must be evaluated to be included within the institution’s scope of accreditation.

The institution or campus must initiate the approval process through the submission of a new program application and required documentation for Council review and approval before being included into the institution’s scope of accreditation. The institution shall notify the Council if it does not implement the changes within one year of approval. Requests to extend the proposed start date beyond one year of the initial date must be submitted to the Council.

2-2-121. Changes to Existing Programs. Changes to existing or currently approved programs fall under (a) extensive changes and (b) non-substantive changes.

(a) Extensive Changes. An extensive change to an existing program application process must be initiated and approval received prior to implementation. Failure to do so will result in a compliance warning for offering an unapproved program. The following
changes will be considered substantive changes to the institution’s scope of accreditation and require approval per Section 2-2-100 — Substantive Changes:

i. a 25% percent change increase in the number of clock or credit hours awarded for successful completion of an existing program; and

ii. a change from clock hours to credit hours.

(b) Non-substantive Changes. These include minor changes to existing programs which do not substantially alter the scope, objectives and nature of the programs as described in Standard Section 2-2-151.

If the percentage is less than 25 percent but results in a change in the credential level, the credential level must be evaluated to be included within the institution’s scope of accreditation.

2-2-151. Non-Substantive Program Changes. Institutions and campuses are required to notify the Council of all non-substantive changes to existing programs. Changes in the program name, clock/contact hours, credits awarded, or program length will be disclosed to the public via the ACICS website prior to implementation. The following non-substantive changes will be acknowledged:

(a) less than 25% percent change in existing contact hours; credits awarded, curriculum content (courses offered), or program length of a currently approved program within a 12-month period;

(b) a change in the name of an existing program that does not change the overall objective of the program; and

(c) a change from semester to quarter credit hours or vice versa.

If the institution applies for acknowledgment of non-substantive program changes prior to implementation but chooses not to implement the changes within one year of approval, it must notify the Council. Requests to extend the proposed start date beyond one year of the initial date must be submitted to the Council.

M. Renewal of Accreditation Application Submission

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes to allow campuses to submit all renewal applications and fees three months before the start of the campus’s assigned review cycle rather than September 30th prior to the renewal year. Information submitted closer to the visit would give ACICS a more accurate picture of the campus. In addition, Council proposes that once self-study materials are submitted, substantive changes would not be allowed before the visit.

2-1-300 − RENEWAL OF ACCREDITATION

It is the responsibility of the institution to file an application and remit the appropriate fees for a renewal of accreditation three months prior to the start of the assigned review cycle, by September 30th of the year prior to the last year of the grant of accreditation. This also involves submission of the institution’s renewal self-study, with supporting documents. Institutions that have not submitted a renewal self-study at least two months prior to the start of the assigned review cycle by December 1st of the year preceding expiration of the
grant, and have not requested and received an appropriate extension or notified the Council of intent to voluntarily withdraw its accreditation, will be subject to late fees and may be issued a show-cause directive compliance warning. The accreditation previously granted to an institution expires automatically with the passage of time unless extended by an action taken by ACICS. An extension of the previous grant cannot exceed one year, and not more than one extension may be given except for extraordinary circumstances over which the institution has no control.

2-1-301. Application. The process of application for a renewal of accreditation is the same as for initial accreditation except that institutions are not required to undergo another resource visit. One the self-study has been submitted, no substantive changes to the institution shall be allowed until after the campus site visit takes place. Multiple campus institutions that are applying for renewals of accreditation will be required to submit a separate self-study for each branch campus.

N. Advertising – Third Party Services

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes to eliminate one element of Appendix C referencing disclosure of third party services for advertising, due to being irrelevant.

Appendix C

ADVERTISING Any advertisement or promotional literature written or provided by an institution through any type of media shall be completely truthful and dignified. The material shall be presented in a manner which avoids leaving any false, misleading, or exaggerated impressions with respect to the institution, its personnel, its courses and services, or the occupational opportunities for its graduates. An English translation for advertising that is in a language other than English must also be available.

...5. An institution shall not use the words “free” and “guarantee” for advertising or marketing purposes in a manner that is misleading to prospective or current students. A disclosure must be made for services which are funded by third parties that are offered at no cost to students.

O. Criterion Description – Integrity

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes to revise the language for the criterion regarding integrity of an institution to include capability of management since the subsections include the assessment of both the integrity and capability of the institution’s administration.

3-1-202. Institutional Integrity and Capability. The integrity and capability of an institution is manifested by the professional competence, experience, personal
responsibility, and ethical practices demonstrated by all individuals comprising the
ownership, control, or management.

P. “Centrally Controlled Institutions” and “Distributed Enterprise”

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Council proposes to remove all references to “Centrally Controlled Institutions” and
“Distributed Enterprises” given that ACICS is no longer pursuing the recognition of this
type of entity. The deletion of all references of these terms will provide clarity and
consistency related to classifications of institutions.

1-3-200. Classification of Institutions. The Council classifies institutions into three two
categories: single campus, and multiple campus, and distributed enterprise. Classification
depends upon the number of locations included within the institution and the nature of
administrative control over educational activities at the institution.

1-3-203. Centrally Controlled Institution. A centrally controlled institution is an
institution that provides educational programs at multiple locations operating within the
context of an administrative system.

*Implementation of this section of the Criteria and all references to Centrally Controlled Institution is not yet effective. The effective date will be announced as soon as it has been determined by the Council.*

(a) The centrally controlled institution must include one main campus with branch
campuses and an academic administrative center. The institution must demonstrate its
capacity to add and to successfully control educational activities at multiple locations.

(b) The academic administrative center is the primary location of a centralized academic
administrative system by which educational activities at a centrally controlled
institution are controlled. These educational activities include development and
delivery of instructional programs, hiring and evaluation of faculty, establishment and
maintenance of facilities, selection and purchasing of instructional equipment and
library resources, provision of academic and student support systems, and maintenance
of financial stability. The physical address of an academic administrative center may
be identical to or separate from that of a main campus. Some administrative activities
not directly related to design and delivery of educational programs may be controlled
at other locations affiliated with the academic administrative center.

(c) To be classified as a centrally controlled institution, an institution must have

(i) been accredited for at least ten consecutive years; and
(ii) a main campus and at least three branch campuses that are currently accredited by
ACICS and have been accredited by ACICS for at least the last four years.

(d) To be classified as a centrally controlled institution, an institution must provide
satisfactory evidence of a well-established and highly centralized administrative
system to ensure and enhance quality at all the campuses of the institution that
includes the following:

(i) clearly identified academic control;
(ii) regular evaluation of the compliance of all the campuses with Council standards;
(iii) adequate faculty, facilities, resources, and academic and student support systems;
(iv) financial stability; and
long-range planning, including planning for expansion.

Compliance of a centrally controlled institution with the Accreditation Criteria is 
evaluated by the Council at the system level and also subsequently at the individual 
campus level. Accreditation is granted to the institution, with the specific inclusion of the 
main campus and all branch campuses.

Title II Chapter 1
2-1-100 − Accreditation Workshop Requirements
The Council schedules accreditation workshops each year. Applicants for initial or 
renewals of accreditation are required to attend a workshop. During these workshops, 
Council representatives will consult with institutional representatives to help them 
understand and complete the process. Institutional representatives are required to attend an 
accreditation workshop within 18 months prior to the final submission of the evaluation 
visit materials, which are due two weeks prior to an on-site visit. For initial applicants, the 
chief on-site administrators of main campuses and all branch campuses are required to 
attend. For currently accredited institutions, the chief on-site administrators or the renewal 
self-study coordinators for single campus institutions and multiple campus institutions, and 
representatives of centrally controlled institutions are required to attend. Currently 
accredited centrally controlled institutions are responsible for providing workshop 
information to the chief on-site administrators and renewal self-study coordinators of all 
main campuses and branch campuses.

2-1-300 − Renewal of Accreditation
2-1-301. Application. The process of application for a renewal of accreditation is the same 
as for initial accreditation except that institutions are not required to undergo another 
resource visit. Multiple campus institutions that are applying for renewals of accreditation 
will be required to submit a separate self-study for each branch campus. Institutions 
classified as centrally controlled institutions may submit a consolidated self-study with an 
appropriate supplement for each location. The Council will not consider an application for 
a renewal of accreditation unless all reports are current and all fees are paid. (See Sections 
2-1-801 and 2-1-802.)

2-1-400 − Visiting Teams, Selection and Composition
2-1-402. Composition of Teams. The size and qualifications of the team are determined at 
the discretion of the Council based on the type and size of the institution, the type and 
number of programs being offered, the mode of educational delivery, the location of the 
campus, student enrollment, credentials offered, and other special circumstances such as 
visits to centrally controlled academic administrative centers. Full-team on-site evaluation 
visits will consist of individuals serving as academic, administrative, public, or member 
representatives as defined in Appendix A, Bylaws.

2-1-500 − Team Functions and Procedures
2-1-503. Procedures. Institutions are provided in advance with a checklist of materials and 
documents that should be current and readily available for review by the team. Prior to the 
visit, institutions are required to update the self-study where significant changes have 
occurred since its submission to ACICS. Teams visiting an academic administrative center
will generate a report that will be shared with teams conducting visits to the individual campuses within the centrally controlled structure.

2-1-600 – Post-Visit Procedures
2-1-601. Opportunity to Respond. The ACICS office sends a copy of each evaluation team report to the designated representative at the centrally controlled academic administrative center or main campus or to the chief on-site administrator of the respective multiple or single campus institution. These individuals are invited to respond in writing within the specified time frame.

2-1-800 – Maintaining Accreditation
2-1-801. Annual Accountability Reports. The Annual Accountability Reports must be submitted on Council forms, comply with Council guidelines, and be certified by the chief executive officer of the institution. Data must be submitted separately on the Campus Accountability Report (CAR) for each main campus and for each branch campus. A centrally controlled institution must also submit a consolidated Institutional Accountability Report (IAR) containing information and data on the institution as a whole. These reports are due on or before November 1st annually. Failure to submit the Annual Accountability Reports in a timely manner will result in the revocation of accreditation.

2-1-802. Annual Financial Report. The Annual Financial Report must be submitted on Council forms and be certified by an officer or stockholder of the corporation. Data must be submitted separately for each campus included in a grant of accreditation. A centrally controlled institution must also submit a consolidated report containing data on the institution as a whole. It is due no more than 180 days after the end of the institution’s fiscal year. Failure to submit the Annual Financial Report in a timely manner will result in the revocation of accreditation.

2-2-200 – Redesignation of Campuses
2-2-203. Designation of Centrally Controlled Institution. An institution may apply for classification as a centrally controlled institution by submitting an application and attachments on forms provided by the Council. Upon review of these materials, an evaluation visit will be conducted at one or more administrative sites and designated campuses to verify the information submitted and assess the eligibility of the institution for this classification. A full report will be submitted to the Council for review and approval.

3-1-202. Institutional Integrity and Capability. ...
(a) Emphasis shall be placed upon the efficiency and effectiveness of the overall administration of the institution. Attention shall be given to educational activities, admissions, student financial aid, financial operations, plant and equipment, student services, and compliance with applicable local, state, and federal laws. The degree of institutional compliance with the criteria in these areas is a measure of the administrative capability of the chief on-site administrator of a main campus or branch campus and, for a distributed enterprise, the designated chief administrator of the institution.

Glossary
Institution, Distributed Enterprise. An institution that provides educational programs at multiple locations operating within the context of a well-established and highly centralized administrative system. (See Section 1-3-203.)

2. For Information Only

A. Moratorium on Doctoral Programs

At the April 2017 meeting, the Council voted unanimously that, effective April 4, 2017, the moratorium approved by the Council on December 5, 2016, is now permanent and ACICS will no longer accept applications for doctoral programs. All current institutions with existing doctoral programs have until December 31, 2019, to: 1) teach-out their currently enrolled doctoral students in an orderly manner or 2) move from ACICS to another institutional accrediting agency. Further, these institutions will be required to prominently post and distribute notice to current and prospective students to advise them of this course of action, with a credible plan and path to completion for all enrollees going forward. If any of these conditions are not satisfied, the institution will be subject to an adverse action.

B. Automated Withdrawal of Aged Applications

In its continued to attempt to ensure that campuses receive a timely review and processing of all applications, ACICS has conducted a comprehensive assessment of all its in-process applications and determined that a large of number of applications are still pending, requiring additional information or response from the campus. The Council has concluded that the documents in such applications to be outdated and unusable for consideration.

Therefore, all institutions are advised that any applications submitted prior to May 1, 2016, that have had no activity from the institution within the past year, will be marked for withdrawal.

C. Placement Verification Program (PVP) Update

ACICS has recently updated the Placement Verification System to allow campuses to contest placements that ACICS has marked as INVALID. While previously this was done via e-mail, ACICS has now added the capability to contest and upload the supporting documents within the PVP. Please be advised that a placement may only be contested once and the decision of the review panel is final. The campus can expect to be notified within 30 days following their request. Instruction on contesting the placements can be found on the PVP web site.

D. The Quarterly Accountability Report

The need for more timely, informative, and usable data concerning student achievement outcomes at our accredited institutions continues to receive increased attention as ACICS
works diligently to enhance the focus on continuous improvement for both the institutions and the Council relative to these mission-critical outcomes. To that end, the CAR has undergone revisions to provide more informative and timely feedback at the program-level to enhance data collection processes and monitoring in regards to retention, placement, licensure and, eventually, graduation rates to the benefit of both your schools and your students. A pilot-test for the new CAR process was undertaken by the Institutional Council Members earlier this year. Further benefit of this more frequent self-monitoring and reporting has already been realized with mid-year 2017 CAR submissions required from more than 100 campuses under a student achievement actions that were in a number of cases mitigated with more recent data than that available in last year’s CAR.

Beginning with the first quarter of the 2018 reporting period, all campuses will be required to submit a quarterly accountability report. The report will be due four months following the conclusion of the quarter. That is, July – September 2017 (due February 1, 2018); October – December 2017 (due May 1, 2018); January – March 2017 (due August 1, 2018); and April – June 2018 (due November 1, 2018).

E. Annual Meeting – June 21, 2017, from 1pm – 3pm EDST

An invitation will be sent to the membership within 30 days prior to the scheduled meeting.

F. Informational Webinar – Campus Accountability Reporting (CAR) (2017 and quarterly) & the Placement Verification Program (PVP)

ACICS will conduct an informational webinar on May 25, 2017 concerning this new quarterly reporting process to ensure that all campuses are comfortable with the expectations and that an opportunity for feedback and dialogue is provided. The CAR’s interaction with the PVP will also be discussed. An invitation to participate will be forthcoming.

3. Comment Survey – Proposed Criteria Revision

The Council encourages students, faculty, administrators, evaluators, employers, and other interested parties to provide feedback regarding proposed revisions to Council policies and procedures. Comments on the proposed Criteria revisions are due by Friday, June 30, 2017. ACICS is collecting all comments from the field on proposed Criteria revisions through an electronic survey. Please find the survey link below:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/ACICS52017

****

In preparation for the scheduled AWARE Webinar to discuss these proposed changed and informational procedures, please send your questions to https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/WEBQA to ensure that we are able to provide as much guidance as possible.
For any other questions, please contact:

Ms. Karly Zeigler  
Manager of Institutional Compliance 
kzeigler@acics.org