

**CONTRACTING FOR EDUCATIONAL DELIVERY
REPORT TEMPLATE**

# Background

The Distance Education Accrediting Commission requires every institution seeking to contract for educational delivery of up to 50 percent of its curriculum to obtain prior approval from the Commission. Prior approval serves two main purposes: (1) It provides the institution an opportunity to critically reflect on its operations, processes, and procedures prior to contracting for educational delivery and (2) it provides the Commission with an overview of the institution, its mission, and its processes that are integral to delivering quality distance education while contracting for educational delivery.

This report informs the Commission whether the institution meets, partially meets, or does not meet each of the DEAC accreditation standards and core components when contracting for educational delivery. Approximately four to six weeks following the off-site subject specialists’ review, 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. The report presents an overall determination of whether the institution adequately demonstrates it meets DEAC’s accreditation standards when contracting for educational delivery by completing the following report template.

Findings guidelines:

* **Meets Standard:** The institution’s educational offerings demonstrate compliance with the intent of the accreditation standard or core component.
* **Partially Meets Standard:** The institution’s educational offerings demonstrate compliance with some, but not all, of the elements contained in the accreditation standard or core component.
* **Does Not Meet Standard:** The institution’s educational offerings do not demonstrate compliance with a majority of the elements contained in the accreditation standard or core component.

The evaluator 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 evaluator should highlight within the Comments section the processes and procedures the institution followed that enabled it to demonstrate compliance. This report is part of the record that is provided to the Commission and must clearly indicate how the institution demonstrated compliance. Any direct quotes from the Educational Offering Report (EOR) should be indicated by quotation marks and any paraphrased materials should indicate that the source material is the EOR. In addition to narrative material sourced from the EOR, Comments should explain what exhibits/additional materials were reviewed to verify compliance.

**If an institution partially meets or does not meet a standard**, the evaluator must to adequately describe why the decision was reached and refer, as appropriate, to narrative sections and exhibits within the EOR that support the determination. The evaluator 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 off-site subject specialist 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.]” Alternately, “Standard XXX requires [Insert quotation of the specific Standard /Core Component]. [Insert Name of Institution] needs to [insert the action necessary by the institution to demonstrate compliance with the accreditation standard.]”

Again, the required action must clearly establish which specific parts of the standard were not met and provide discrete actions the institution must take to fix the issue(s) and demonstrate compliance with the referenced Standard. Comments should also provide context and discussion of the issues observed (e.g. Required Actions that seemingly come out of nowhere can be confusing for institutions and harder for the institution and Commission to understand).

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 off-site subject specialist 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 off-site subject specialist should begin each statement with, “[Insert Name of Institution] may want to consider [insert the recommendation for improvement.]

**Report Submission:** The off-site subject specialist emails the completed report to the DEAC manager of institutional development and assessment (Lissette.Hubbard@deac.org). Once all information is received, DEAC notifies the off-site subject specialist to appropriately dispose of all institutional materials.

Helpful Hints

* The off-site subject specialist’s 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 off-site subject specialist’s report represents an accurate, concise, factual, and thorough presentation of the individual findings as a result of the review. The off-site subject specialist clearly communicates findings to DEAC by providing evidence.
* When making a determination whether the institution meets, partially meets, or does not meet accreditation standards, the off-site subject specialist should include evidence of documents reviewed or analyzed in the program report and exhibits that led to the finding. Include specific examples.
* The off-site subject specialist’s report documents attributes and deficiencies using language found in the accreditation standards and core components. All deficiencies must be documented.
* The off-site subject specialist’s 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 off-site subject specialist’s 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 off-site subject specialist’s report accurately presents comments, required actions, and suggestions using direct quotations, references, data, and examples from the application.

The off-site subject specialist’s report does not make recommendations to the Commission concerning the overall accreditation of the institution.

DEAC Contracting for Educational Delivery Report (Confidential)

**Contracting for Educational Delivery:** Substantive change requirements for an institution that contracts with an unaccredited organization or organization not certified to participate in the Title IV HEA programs to provide more than 25% of one or more of the institution’s educational programs are applicable to:

[ ]  an accredited institution that enters into a contract with another accredited organization or unaccredited entity to provide more than 25 percent up to 50 percent of one or more of the institution’s educational programs,

[ ]  an institution certified to participate in Title IV HEA programs that enters into a contract with an institution or organization not certified to participate in Title IV programs to provide more than 25 percent up to 50 percent of one or more of the institution’s educational programs, or

[ ]  an institution seeking to improve or expand its educational offerings to students can enter into an agreement to incorporate or contract for educational delivery up to 50 percent of its curriculum with an approved AQC or Approved Quality Curriculum provider.
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Date of Review: Date of Review

Submitted By: Evaluator Name

Date of Report: Date of Report

# Accreditation Standards Findings

Standard VI: Curriculum Development

1. **Program Curricula Development**

Institutions have a documented process for curriculum development that clearly articulates the principles of learning and pedagogical foundations used to frame the program. The institution’s curricula are supported by reliable research and align with commonly accepted educational practices within the fields of practice. Qualified faculty and academic leadership hold the primary responsibility for all program content and instructional design and supervise staff, third-party providers, or consultants used in curricula development. Program curricula are reviewed on a periodic basis by academic leadership, program leadership, program faculty, and the Program Advisory Council. The review integrates program performance data collected on an annual basis with respect to student progression; student learning outcomes; faculty and student feedback; and content currency, accuracy, and comprehensiveness.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Standard VI.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 a 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.