

**DEAC CHANGE of CORE MISSION or OBJECTIVES
REPORT TEMPLATE**

## Background

Given that an institution’s accreditation is predicated on its core mission, the Distance Education Accrediting Commission requires every institution seeking to substantively depart from its core mission or objectives to obtain prior approval from the Commission and undergo an on-site visit. Prior approval serves two main purposes: (1) It provides the institution an opportunity to critically reflect on its operations, processes, and procedures prior to changing its core mission or objectives and (2) it provides the on-site team with a comprehensive overview of the institution, its new mission, and its processes that are integral to delivering quality distance education.

The Distance Education Accrediting Commission’s accreditation process is grounded on the fundamental principle of peer review that enables faculty and administrative staff from within higher education to make recommendations essential to ensuring the quality of learning and institutional operations for all students. The process is guided by transparent standards that are established collaboratively by professional peers and member institutions.

The on-site visit provides an opportunity for evaluators to meet with key staff members, faculty/instructors, principal managers, outside accountants, governing board members, and advisory council members. The evaluators verify that the institution is meeting its mission and can demonstrate successful student achievement.

This report informs the Commission whether the institution meets, partially meets, or does not meet each of DEAC’s accreditation standards and core components in changing its core mission or objectives. Approximately four to six weeks after the on-site visit, the report is provided to the institution for response. Both the report and the institution’s response are submitted to the Commission for review prior to final decision making.

## Instructions

It is the evaluator’s responsibility to review and assess the accuracy of the information presented in the application and during the on-site visit. By completing the following report template, evaluator presents an overall determination of whether the institution adequately demonstrates it meets DEAC’s accreditation standards in changing its core mission or objectives.

Findings guidelines:

* **Meets Standard:** The institution demonstrates compliance with the intent of the accreditation standard or core component.
* **Partially Meets Standard:** The institution was able to demonstrate compliance with some, but not all, of the elements contained in the accreditation standard or core component.
* **Does Not Meet Standard:** The institution was unable to demonstrate compliance with a majority of the elements contained in the accreditation standard or core component.

The Chair should provide clear and concise descriptions within the “Comments” section of the report to support each determination that a standard or core component is met, partially met, or not met. If an institution meets the accreditation standard, the Chair may want to consider highlighting within the Comments section the processes and procedures the institution followed that enabled it to demonstrate compliance. If an institution partially meets or does not meet a standard, the Chair needs to adequately describe why the evaluation team reached this decision and refer, as appropriate, to narrative sections and exhibits within the SER that support the determination.

The Chair must also indicate the required actions necessary for the institution to demonstrate compliance with the partially met or unmet accreditation standard. Each required action must be tied back to an accreditation standard or core component.

For required actions, the Chair should begin each statement with, “[Insert Name of Institution] needs to [insert the action necessary by the institution to demonstrate compliance with the accreditation standard.]”

As part of the peer review process, it is important that institutions receive suggestions for improving their educational offerings and support services. The accreditation process allows the institution to benefit from an external review and perspective. The Chair is encouraged to provide suggestions within the report. Suggestions are those recommendations that are not required to meet minimum accreditation standards but are provided to the institution as an opportunity for growth and improvement.

For suggestions, the Chair should begin each statement with, “[Insert Name of Institution] may want to consider [insert the recommendation for improvement.]”

It is the Chair’s responsibility to review the merits and evidence presented for each determination. It is within the Chair’s discretion to choose a finding based on the institution’s response and evidence presented during the on-site visit.

**Report Submission:** The Chair emails the completed report to DEAC’s director of accreditation four weeks after the on-site visit. Once all information is received, DEAC notifies the Chair to appropriately dispose of all institutional materials.

Helpful Hints

* The report should be objectively written in third person, narrative format using declarative sentences and simple verbs. The report should avoid broad generalities and speculative views.
* The report represents an accurate, concise, factual, and thorough presentation of the findings during the on-site visit.
* When making a determination whether the institution meets, partially meets, or does not meet accreditation standards, the Chair should include evidence of documents reviewed on site or analyzed in the report that led to the finding. Include specific examples.
* The report documents attributes and deficiencies using language found in the accreditation standards and core components. All deficiencies must be documented.
* The report should not require an institution to implement a new program or procedure in order to demonstrate compliance with a partially met or unmet accreditation standard. The report states the required action necessary to provide evidence or demonstrate compliance. The institution bears responsibility for demonstrating compliance with DEAC’s accreditation standards.
* The report accurately presents comments, required actions, and suggestions using direct quotations, references, and data.
* The report does not make recommendations to the Commission concerning the overall accreditation of the institution.

## DEAC Change of Core Mission or Objectives Report (Confidential)

Name of Institution: Name of Institution

Date of On-site Visit: Date of On-site Visit

Submitted By: Evaluator Name

Date of Report: Date of Report

On-site Team Members

**Chair**

Name
Title
Institution or Affiliation

**DEAC Staff Observer**

Name
Title

Institution or Affiliation

On-site Visit Background and Summary

**Visit Summary:** Provide an overview of the on-site visit including how well the institution was prepared.
**Institutional Overview:** Provide an overview of the applicant institution, including founding, organizational structure, target student population, legal form and governance, and status of state authorization.

## Accreditation Standards Findings

## Standard I: Institutional Mission

1. **Description of the Mission:** The institution’s mission communicates its purpose and its commitment to providing quality distance educational offerings appropriate to the level of study offered. The mission establishes the institution’s identity within the educational community and guides the development of its educational offerings.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Standard I.A. – Meets, Partially Meets, Does Not Meet, or Not Applicable** | Choose a finding. |

**Comments:** Provide comments to support the finding based on the institution’s responses and evidence provided prior to and during the on-site visit.

**Required Actions:** Provide the required actions necessary for the institution to demonstrate compliance with the Accreditation Standards. Each required action must correspond to an Accreditation Standard or core component.

**Suggestions:** Suggestions are those recommendations that are not required to meet minimum Accreditation Standards but are provided to the institution as an opportunity for growth and improvement.

1. **Review and Publication of the Mission:** The institution’s leadership, faculty, staff, administrators, and other stakeholders regularly review the mission to assure continued institutional quality and viability. The published mission statement is readily accessible to students, faculty, staff, other stakeholders, and the public.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Standard I.B. – Meets, Partially Meets, Does Not Meet, or Not Applicable** | Choose a finding. |

 **Comments:** Provide comments to support the finding based on the institution’s responses and evidence provided prior to and during the on-site visit.

**Required Actions:** Provide the required actions necessary for the institution to demonstrate compliance with the Accreditation Standards. Each required action must correspond to an Accreditation Standard or core component.

**Suggestions:** Suggestions are those recommendations that are not required to meet minimum Accreditation Standards but are provided to the institution as an opportunity for growth and improvement.

1. **Information on Achievement of the Mission:** The institution identifies key indicators it uses to demonstrate that it is effectively carrying out its mission. The institution documents the achievement of its mission and shares appropriate information on this achievement with relevant groups (e.g., advisory councils, faculty, staff, students, and the public).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Standard I.C. – Meets, Partially Meets, Does Not Meet, or Not Applicable** | Choose a finding. |

**Comments:** Provide comments to support the finding based on the institution’s responses and evidence provided prior to and during the on-site visit.

**Required Actions:** Provide the required actions necessary for the institution to demonstrate compliance with the Accreditation Standards. Each required action must correspond to an Accreditation Standard or core component.

**Suggestions:** Suggestions are those recommendations that are not required to meet minimum Accreditation Standards but are provided to the institution as an opportunity for growth and improvement.

## Standard II: Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning

1. **Institutional Effectiveness Planning:** The institution demonstrates a commitment to its educational offerings and administrative operations through processes that monitor and improve institutional effectiveness. The institution engages in sound research practices; collects and analyzes evidence about its effectiveness; and develops action plans that are used to improve operations, educational offerings, and services.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Standard II.A. – Meets, Partially Meets, Does Not Meet, or Not Applicable** | Choose a finding. |

**Comments:** Provide comments to support the finding based on the institution’s responses and evidence provided prior to and during the on-site visit.

**Required Actions:** Provide the required actions necessary for the institution to demonstrate compliance with the Accreditation Standards. Each required action must correspond to an Accreditation Standard or core component.

**Suggestions:** Suggestions are those recommendations that are not required to meet minimum Accreditation Standards but are provided to the institution as an opportunity for growth and improvement.

1. **Strategic Planning:** The institution has a systematic process of planning for the achievement of goals that supports its mission. The institution’s planning process involves all areas of the institution’s operations (e.g., admissions, academics, technology, etc.) in identifying strategic initiatives and goals by evaluating external and internal trends as they affect the future. At a minimum, the strategic plan addresses finances, academics, technology, admissions, marketing, personnel, and institutional sustainability. The strategic plan is reviewed and updated annually using established metrics designed to measure achievement of strategic planning goals and objectives. The plan helps institutions set priorities, manage resources, and set goals for future performance.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Standard II.B. – Meets, Partially Meets, Does Not Meet, or Not Applicable** | Choose a finding. |

**Comments:** Provide comments to support the finding based on the institution’s responses and evidence provided prior to and during the on-site visit.

**Required Actions:** Provide the required actions necessary for the institution to demonstrate compliance with the Accreditation Standards. Each required action must correspond to an Accreditation Standard or core component.

**Suggestions:** Suggestions are those recommendations that are not required to meet minimum Accreditation Standards but are provided to the institution as an opportunity for growth and improvement.