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Policy on Accrediting Decisions of Other Agencies

Explain Purpose of the Policy:

**Policy:** The BOT of Larkin University supports the SACSCOC Policy on Accrediting Decisions of Other Agencies, which indicates conditions under which it would not grant candidacy, initial accreditation, or reaffirmation to an institution. Larkin University will disseminate information and notify SACSCOC of any of these accrediting decisions which apply to Larkin University or any of its respective degree programs. A full copy of the SACSCOC policy is attached for reference.

**Implementation Date:** May 1, 2019

Maintenance and Review of the Policy:
The President/CEO is responsible in his role as Chief Academic Officer for Larkin University is responsible for the monitoring and oversight of this policy. The President or his designee is responsible for the dissemination and notification of information of other accrediting bodies to the regional accreditor for the University, SACSCOC. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness.
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ACCREDITING DECISIONS OF OTHER AGENCIES

Policy Statement

In accord with Federal code §602.28, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) observes the following policy concerning the accrediting decisions of other agencies:

SACSCOC does not grant candidacy, initial accreditation, or reaffirmation to an institution if the Commission knows, or has reason to know, that the institution is the subject of the following:

1. A pending or final action brought by a State agency to suspend, revoke, withdraw, or terminate the institution’s legal authority to provide postsecondary education in the State;

2. A decision by another United States Department of Education (USDOE) recognized agency to deny accreditation or candidacy;

3. A pending or final action brought by another USDOE recognized accrediting agency to suspend, revoke, withdraw, or terminate the institution’s accreditation or candidacy; or

4. Probation or an equivalent status imposed by a USDOE recognized accrediting agency.

Procedures

1. If the Commission is notified that an institution is a subject of any of the provisions outlined above, Commission staff will request that the institution provide all reports from the agency referred to in any of the points 1-4 above, and will consider whether the other agency’s action resulted from a deficiency which calls into question the institution’s compliance with the Principles of Accreditation.

2. If, after reviewing the materials, the Commission acts to grant candidacy or initial accreditation to the institution, the President of SACSCOC will provide to the U.S. Secretary of Education, within 30 days of the SACSCOC Board of Trustees action, a thorough and reasonable explanation why the action of the other agency did not preclude SACSCOC from awarding candidacy or initial accreditation. If, after reviewing the materials, the Commission finds that the deficiencies cited by the other agency calls into question the institution’s compliance with standards applicable to its status with the Commission, the President of SACSCOC may refer the case to C & R or authorize a Special Committee to review the institution. Action regarding the institution’s continuing candidacy or any future recognition will be made by SACSCOC Board of Trustees.

3. If the Commission learns that a candidate or member institution is the subject of adverse action by another USDOE recognized accrediting agency or has been placed on Probation, or an equivalent status,
by another USDOE recognized accrediting agency, Commission staff will request that the institution provide all related reports from the agency. Following review of the reports, the Commission will determine one of the following: (1) that the reasons for adverse action or Probation or equivalent status do not support a recommendation of adverse action or the imposition of Probation or Warning, (2) that the reasons for adverse action or Probation or equivalent status warrant the authorization of a Special Committee or referral to the SACSCOC Board of Trustees for consideration of adverse action or the imposition of Probation or Warning.

Institutional Responsibility

The Commission requires candidate and member institutions holding accredited or candidacy (pre-accredited) status from more than one U.S. Department of Education recognized institutional accrediting agency (https://ope.ed.gov/accreditation/Agencies.aspx) to keep each agency apprised of any change in its status with one or another agency. Any institution seeking or holding accreditation from more than one USDOE recognized institutional accrediting agency must describe itself in identical terms to each agency with regard to purpose, governance, programs, degrees, diplomas, certificates, personnel, finances, and constituents, and must keep each USDOE recognized accrediting body, including SACSCOC, apprised of any change in its status with one or another accrediting agency.
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Policy on Accreditation Procedures for Applicant Institutions

Purpose: The Board of Trustees has determined that Larkin University will pursue accreditation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). This policy is to confirm that LU will follow the appropriate procedures to achieve this objective as outlined in the approved strategic plan.

Policy: The Board of Trustees will pursue accreditation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). As such, Larkin University accepts and commits to follow the Accreditation Procedures for Applicant Institutions document approved in June 2018. A full text of this document is attached to this policy as reference.

Implementation: May 1, 2019

Maintenance and Review of the Policy: The Office of the CEO and Senior Leadership Team is responsible for the implementation and monitoring of this policy in a systematic and effective manner. The BOT will provide oversight of this policy. This policy will be reviewed every year for its effectiveness. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.
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SACS\COC™
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges
1866 Southern Lane
Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097

ACCREDITATION PROCEDURES FOR APPLICANT INSTITUTIONS

Policy Statements

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) is a regional accrediting agency which accredits institutions in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Latin America and other international institutions approved by SACSCOC that award associate, baccalaureate, master’s and/or doctoral degrees. SACSCOC accepts applications from institutions which are located in these areas. Applications, including narrative and documents demonstrating compliance with the Principles of Accreditation, must be in English. Audits must be presented in U.S. dollars and all notes in the audits must be in English.

Note to International Institutions: SACSCOC will not send committees to institutions located in countries which are under a Level 3, or 4 travel advisory issued by the U.S. Department of State (www.travel.state.gov) and thus will not accept applications for accreditation from institutions located in such countries until the travel advisory is lifted.

The accreditation procedures outlined in this document apply to degree-granting institutions of higher education seeking accreditation with SACSCOC. Former SACSCOC-accredited institutions seeking to regain membership must also follow these same procedures.

Entities which are a part of an institution accredited by SACSCOC and which wish to seek separate accreditation should refer to the SACSCOC Policy Statement “Separate Accreditation for Extended Units of a Member Institution” on its website, www.sacscoc.org.

The Application for Membership and the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement may be found on the SACSCOC website under Application Information. Communication concerning membership may be addressed to the President of SACSCOC and/or to the staff member assigned to work with pre-applicant and applicant institutions.

The SACSCOC philosophy of accreditation precludes denial of membership to a degree-granting institution of higher education in its region or an international institution on any basis other than failure to comply with the Core Requirements and Standards of the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement established by the College Delegate Assembly or failure to comply with the policies and procedures of SACSCOC. The Board of Trustees of SACSCOC uniformly applies the Principles of Accreditation to all applicant, candidate, and member institutions.
An institution seeking SACSCOC membership must complete an application documenting its compliance with the following Core Requirements and Standards of the Principles of Accreditation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Requirements</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 (Integrity)</td>
<td>4.2.c (CEO evaluation/selection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 (Institutional mission)</td>
<td>4.2.d (Conflict of interest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.a (Degree-granting authority)</td>
<td>5.4 (Qualified administrative/academic officers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.b (Coursework for degree)</td>
<td>6.2.a (Faculty qualifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.c (Continuous operation)</td>
<td>6.2.b (Program faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 (Governing board characteristics)</td>
<td>7.3 (Administrative effectiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 (Chief executive officer)</td>
<td>8.2.a (Student outcomes: educational programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 (Full-time faculty)</td>
<td>8.2.b (Student outcomes: general education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 (Institutional planning)</td>
<td>8.2.c (Student outcomes: academic and student services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 (Student achievement)</td>
<td>10.2 (Public information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 (Program content)</td>
<td>10.5 (Admissions policies and practices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 (Program length)</td>
<td>10.6 (Distance and correspondence education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 (General education requirements)</td>
<td>10.7 (Policies for awarding credit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1 (Library and learning/information resources)</td>
<td>11.2 (Library and learning/information staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1 (Student support services)</td>
<td>11.3 (Library and learning/information access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1 (Financial resources)</td>
<td>12.4 (Student complaints)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2 (Financial documents)* (see note below)</td>
<td>13.6 (Federal and state responsibilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.7 (Physical resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.1 (Publication of accreditation status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3 (Comprehensive institutional reviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.4 (Representation to other agencies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.5 (Policy compliance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Required Financial Information for Applicant and Candidate Institutions (Core Requirement 13.2)*

In addition to providing narrative describing its compliance with Core Requirement 13.1, an institution must include with its application the following financial information:

1. separate institutional audits and management letters (audits opinioned on the institution) for its three most recent fiscal years, including the audit for the most recent fiscal year ending prior to the date of the application. Should the end of another fiscal year occur during initial review of the application by SACSCOC staff, that audit must be submitted before review of the application can be completed. In addition, the audit for the most recently completed fiscal year must be provided when seeking authorization by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees to receive a Candidacy Committee visit.

2. an annual budget that is preceded by sound planning, is subject to sound fiscal procedures, and is approved by the governing board.

3. a statement of financial position of unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant assets and plant-related debt (short and long term debt attached to physical assets) which represents the change in unrestricted net assets attributable to operations for the most recent year.

Further, throughout the remainder of the process the institution must provide a separate audit and management letter for the most recently completed fiscal year ending prior to any committee visit or Board of Trustees review for Candidacy, Candidacy renewal, or initial Membership.

All audits must be conducted by independent certified public accountants or an appropriate governmental auditing agency.

An applicant or Candidate institution may not show an annual or cumulative operating deficit at any time during the application process or at any time during Candidacy.

The completed application constitutes a primary source of information used by SACSCOC to determine apparent
compliance with the requirements and standards listed above, which are basic expectations of institutions seeking Candidacy, the initial status with SACSCOC. Compliance with these requirements and standards, however, is not sufficient to warrant initial membership. After gaining Candidacy status, institutions must demonstrate both continued compliance with these requirements and standards and compliance with all of the remaining Standards of the Principles of Accreditation.

Note: An application which fails to provide evidence of degree-granting authority as required by the state or country in which the institution submitting the application is located will not be accepted and the institution will be notified by the President of SACSCOC that the application has been withdrawn from consideration. The institution may submit another application when it can provide appropriate evidence of degree-granting authority.

After initial review of the application by SACSCOC staff, the process is as follows: the SACSCOC Committee on Compliance and Reports makes recommendations concerning an institution’s status to the Executive Council of SACSCOC which, in turn, makes its recommendation to the SACSCOC Board of Trustees which takes final action on the institution’s status.

An institution may withdraw its application or its status as a Candidate institution at any time prior to a decision of the SACSCOC Board of Trustees. If an institution withdraws its application and later decides to again seek membership, it must submit a new application and follow the procedures outlined below as they apply to institutions seeking status with SACSCOC.

An applying institution bears the cost of application fees as well as the direct and indirect costs of visits. See the section of this policy entitled “Fees and Other Expenses for Applicant and Candidate Institutions.”

After awarding of initial Membership, an institution must undergo reaffirmation in five years. This reaffirmation process will require completion of a Compliance Certification, development of a Quality Enhancement Plan (Standard 7.2), and both Off-Site and On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviews. Thereafter, the institution is reaffirmed every ten years.

Note: Substantive Change

An applying institution describes itself in its initial application. Therefore, from the date of submission of an application to the date of awarding of Membership, the institution must not undertake a substantive change as defined by the SACSCOC policy, Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions. Should the institution find it necessary to initiate a substantive change, that action may have significant impact on the accreditation process as follows:

If an institution chooses to implement a substantive change after submitting an application, but prior to gaining authorization to receive a Candidacy Committee visit, the institution may be required to submit a new application which includes the change. If an institution implements a substantive change after it has been authorized to receive a Candidacy Committee visit but prior to the granting of Candidacy, its authorization may be revoked at the discretion of the President of SACSCOC. If an institution implements a substantive change during its Candidacy period, the status of Candidacy may be revoked at the discretion of the President of SACSCOC. Should Candidacy be revoked, the institution may reapply at any time.
Steps in the Process for Achieving Membership with SACSCOC

1. Mandatory Attendance at Workshops for Pre-Applicant Institutions

Prior to submission of an application for membership, an institution must attend a mandatory two-day Pre-Applicant Workshop and Pre-Applicant Institutional Effectiveness Workshop at the SACSCOC offices in Atlanta, Georgia. Information concerning registering for the workshops may be obtained by visiting the SACSCOC website (www.sacscoc.org) under Application Information. Institutions interested in understanding the process in order to determine whether to apply or not may also wish to attend the workshops. The workshops acquaint attendees with the accreditation process and with the Core Requirements and Standards of the Principles of Accreditation.

2. Submission of an Application and Initial Review of the Application

An institution seeking membership must first submit an application describing the characteristics of the institution and documenting its compliance with the above listed Core Requirements and Standards as well as the required financial documents noted above. The application should be submitted to the President of SACSCOC.

3. Review of the Application by SACSCOC Staff and Submission of Additional Information by the Institution

SACSCOC staff members will conduct an initial review of the application within six months of receipt and will provide the institution with a written assessment of the application. If additional information is needed before review can be completed, SACSCOC staff will hold a conference call with representatives of the institution to discuss the application, the requests for additional information, and the timeline for next steps in the process.

The application review process (beginning with receipt of the completed application and ending with authorization of the Candidacy Committee) can, on average, be accomplished within a period of twelve to eighteen months. The maximum period from the time the initial application is received by SACSCOC to the time that the Candidacy Committee is authorized should not exceed 18 months. Should the institution not receive authorization to receive a Candidacy Committee visit within 18 months after submitting its initial application materials, its application may be withdrawn at the discretion of the President of SACSCOC. Should the institution wish to reapply at a future time, it will be required to submit a new application along with the appropriate application fee.

4. Authorization of a Candidacy Committee Visit and the Granting of Candidacy Status

In order to be authorized to receive a Candidacy Committee visit, the institution must demonstrate through narrative and documentation in the application compliance with the above listed Core Requirements and Standards including financial resources requirements noted above in this document.

After review of the application and review of requested additional information submitted by the institution, if SACSCOC staff members determine that the institution appears to have documented compliance with the Core Requirements and Standards listed above, the President of SACSCOC can authorize the Candidacy Committee visit.

If the institution does not appear to SACSCOC staff to have clearly documented compliance with all of the requirements and standards as required in the application, the institution will be given the option of withdrawing the application or requesting that it be referred to one of the SACSCOC Committees on Compliance and Reports (the standing review committees of the SACSCOC Board of Trustees) seeking authorization of a Candidacy Committee visit.

Upon recommendation of the Committee on Compliance and Reports, the SACSCOC Board of Trustees will either authorize or deny a Candidacy Committee visit. If the Commission determines that the institution is not in compliance with any of the requirements and standards required in the application, authorization of a Candidacy Committee visit will be denied. If a Candidacy Committee visit is denied, the application process ends. The institution may submit another application in the future at its discretion. Denial of a Candidacy Committee visit is not appealable.

If the SACSCOC Board of Trustees determines that the institution has demonstrated in the application apparent compliance with the requirements and standards required in the application, it will authorize a Candidacy Committee visit.

5. The Candidacy Committee Visit, the Granting of Candidacy Status, and Authorization of an Accreditation Committee Visit
If a Candidacy Committee visit is authorized, a SACSCOC staff member is assigned to the institution and he/she will consult with the institution concerning a date for the Candidacy Committee visit. The Candidacy Committee visit and subsequent decision of the SACSCOC Board of Trustees may take a maximum of twelve months after authorization.

The Candidacy Committee will consist of at least five committee members who will verify on site that the institution complies with the Core Requirements and Standards as required in the application. The Committee will write a report describing its findings and this report will be forwarded to the Committee on Compliance and Reports of the SACSCOC Board of Trustees for a determination of whether to recommend to the SACSCOC Board of Trustees that Candidacy status be awarded to the institution. The institution has a minimum of two weeks after receiving the report of the Candidacy Committee to respond to the Candidacy Committee Report. That response will be forwarded to the SACSCOC Committee on Compliance and Reports as well.

The Candidacy Committee Report and the institution’s response to the report, should it wish to provide one, will be reviewed by the SACSCOC Committee on Compliance and Reports and that Committee will recommend to the SACSCOC Board of Trustees either that the institution be granted Candidacy or that the institution be denied Candidacy.

If the institution is denied Candidacy, the application process ends. The institution may submit another application along with application fees at its discretion. Denial of Candidacy is appealable. If the appeal is denied, the institution may submit another application at its discretion. If the appeal is upheld, the institution will be granted Candidacy status. (See the SACSCOC policy, “The Appeals Procedures of the College Delegate Assembly” on the SACSCOC website, www.sacscoc.org.)

The awarding of Candidacy status indicates that the institution has demonstrated compliance with the requirements and standards required in the application and that this compliance has been verified by a Candidacy Committee which has visited the institution. If the institution is awarded Candidacy status, it will be authorized to receive an Accreditation Committee visit. It must complete a Compliance Certification documenting compliance with all remaining Standards with the exception of Standard 7.2 (the institution does not complete a Quality Assurance Plan until reaffirmation five years after the granting of membership) and documenting continued compliance with the requirements and standards addressed in the application. It must then host the Accreditation Committee visit and, subsequently, if requested, appear before the SACSCOC Board of Trustees seeking Membership or Continued Candidacy.

In order for an institution to maintain Candidacy status, the Accreditation Committee visit and subsequent action by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees must occur within two years of the date that the institution was granted Candidacy.

Candidacy is effective on the date that the SACSCOC Board of Trustees takes action to grant Candidacy. An institution may remain in Candidacy status for a maximum of four years with renewal within two years of the date when it was granted Candidacy.

6. The Accreditation Committee Visit and Subsequent Actions

The SACSCOC staff member assigned to the institution will visit the institution to discuss the date and arrangements for the Accreditation Committee visit and to discuss completion of the Compliance Certification. The chair of the Accreditation Committee will make a preliminary visit to the institution, usually approximately two months prior to the visit, to determine the institution’s readiness and discuss arrangements for the visit.

After completion of the Compliance Certification, the institution will host the Accreditation Committee visit. This Committee will evaluate the institution’s compliance with the Principles of Accreditation and write an Accreditation Committee Report which will be sent to a Committee on Compliance and Reports and to the institution. The chief executive officer of the institution will be invited to review the report and the institution will be invited to prepare a written response to any recommendations made by the Accreditation Committee. The response must be submitted no later than the date requested by staff, and the Accreditation Committee Report, the response by the institution, and the Committee Chair’s written review of the institution’s response will be submitted for consideration at either the Board’s Summer Meeting in June or its Annual Meeting in December. Action on the report of a visiting committee must take place no later than the second Board of Trustees meeting following the committee visit.

The institution may be requested to send representatives from the institution for a meeting on the record with the
Committee on Compliance and Reports.

Possible actions following the first Accreditation Committee visit are as follows: Award Membership (Initial Accreditation), Remove from Candidacy (an appealable action), or Grant Continued Candidacy. If an institution is Continued in Candidacy, the possible actions following a second Accreditation Committee visit are: Award Membership (Initial Accreditation) or Deny Membership and Remove from Candidacy (an appealable action). These actions are described below.

The Awarding of Membership after the First Accreditation Committee Visit

The SACSCOC Board of Trustees may award Membership after review of the Accreditation Committee Report, the institution’s response, and the committee chair’s review of the response. The awarding of membership occurs if the SACSCOC Board of Trustees and its standing committees judge that the institution has documented compliance with the Core Requirements and Standards of the Principles of Accreditation, and met the Financial Requirements listed above in this document and has been in operation, i.e., has without interruption enrolled students in degree programs through at least one complete degree program cycle, and has graduated at least one class at the level of the highest degree offered by the institution prior to the action by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees. When an institution is awarded Membership, there can be no substantial reliance on subsequent corrective actions to bring the institution into compliance.

Membership is effective on the date of SACSCOC Board of Trustees action to grant initial accreditation.

Denial of Membership and Removal from Candidacy after the First Accreditation Committee Visit

After review of the report of the Accreditation Committee, the institution’s response to the report, and the review of the response by the chair of the Accreditation Committee, the SACSCOC Board of Trustees may remove an institution from Candidacy if the institution has failed to comply with Core Requirements of the Principles of Accreditation and/or has failed to provide strong evidence that it is making adequate progress toward complying with the Standards of the Principles of Accreditation. Upon removal from Candidacy, the process ends. An institution removed from Candidacy may submit another application at its discretion. Removal from Candidacy is appealable. (See the SACSCOC policy, “The Appeals Procedures of the College Delegate Assembly” on the SACSCOC website, www.sacscoc.org.) If the decision is upheld by the Appeals Committee, the process ends and the institution may submit another application along with fees at its discretion. If the Appeals Committee’s final decision is to reverse the SACSCOC Board’s decision to remove the institution from Candidacy, the institution remains in Candidacy status, receives another Accreditation Committee visit, and within two years is again considered for Membership by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees.

The Granting of Continued Candidacy and Subsequent Action after the First Accreditation Committee Visit

The SACSCOC Board of Trustees may grant Continued Candidacy status after review of the Accreditation Committee Report, the institution’s response, and the committee chair’s review of the response. The granting of Continued Candidacy will occur if the institution has not yet demonstrated compliance with requirements and/or standards such that subsequent substantial documentation of compliance is necessary. The institution must have provided strong evidence that it is making adequate progress toward complying with the Principles of Accreditation and that it will fully comply with the requirements and standards within four years of being granted Candidacy despite findings of non-compliance cited by the Accreditation Committee.

If Continued Candidacy is granted after the first Accreditation Committee visit, a second Accreditation Committee visit will be authorized to visit the institution after which the institution will be placed on the agenda of the SACSCOC Board of Trustees and its review committees no later than four years after the date the institution was granted Candidacy. In preparation for the second Accreditation Committee visit, the institution will address issues of non-compliance cited by the first Accreditation Committee and will update information in its Compliance Certification.

The second Accreditation Committee report, the institution’s response, and the committee chair’s review of the response will be sent to the SACSCOC Board of Trustees and its standing review committees for action. Representatives from the institution will be invited for a meeting on the record. The possible actions following a second Accreditation Committee visit are: Award Membership (Initial Accreditation) or Deny Membership and Remove from Candidacy (an appealable action).
The Awarding of Membership after the Second Accreditation Committee Visit

If the SACSCOC Board of Trustees, based on recommendation of the Committee on Compliance and Reports and the Executive Council, finds that the institution has documented compliance with the requirements and standards and met all requirements as listed above for membership, it will award Membership. The effective date of Membership is the date on which Membership is awarded.

Denial of Membership and Removal from Candidacy after the Second Accreditation Committee Visit

If the SACSCOC Board of Trustees denies Membership, the institution will be removed from Candidacy and the application and Candidate process ends. The decision is appealable. If the institution appeals and the decision is upheld by the Appeals Committee, the institution may submit another application at any time at its discretion. If the Appeals Committee reverses the SACSCOC Board of Trustee’s decision to deny Membership and remove the institution from Candidacy, the institution is awarded Membership status.

Fees and Other Expenses for Applicant and Candidate Institutions

Because of staff and SACSCOC involvement with applicant institutions beginning at the time an institution submits an application, the following fees apply:

For national institutions:
- Application Fee $10,000
- Candidacy Fee $2,500 (This also applies to units seeking separate accreditation)

For international institutions:
- Application Fee $15,000
- Candidacy Fee $2,500

The Application Fee must accompany the application submitted by the institution. It covers costs associated with the application review and consultation with staff. When an institution is authorized to receive a Candidacy Committee visit, it is assessed the Candidacy Fee. This fee covers costs associated with staff involvement in the accreditation process and assembling a Candidacy Committee.

The institution also incurs the following direct visit expenses: travel, meals, and lodging for members of a Candidacy Committee and members of all subsequent Accreditation Committees and the accompanying Commission staff representative; $200 to the chair of the committee and $100 to each Committee member for miscellaneous expenses incurred during the visit; and clerical expenses necessary for the chairs of committees to complete reports. The total cost of visits is billed to the institution by SACSCOC following the visit.

In addition, candidate and member institutions are assessed annual dues using a formula based on enrollment and educational and general expenditures beginning with the term in which candidate or membership status is awarded. (See the SACSCOC policy, “Dues, Fees, and Expenses.”)

Document History

Approved: Commission on College, December 2002
Updated and Edited for the Principles of Accreditation: Commission on Colleges, December 2003
Updated: January 2007
Revised: Commission on Colleges, June 2008
Revised: Board of Trustees, January 2009, July 2011, December 2013
Reformatted: August 2014
Revised: Board of Trustees, December 2015
Revised: SACSCOC Board of Trustees, June 2017
Updated: January 2018
Updated: June 2018
Larkin University
18301 N. Miami Ave.
Miami, FL 33169

Policy on Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards

Purpose: There are times when institutions accredited by SACSCOC, choose to offer degrees, diplomas or certificates with either accredited or non-accredited institutions of higher education around the world. The purpose of this policy is to refer the reader to the policy and procedures outlined in the current approved SACSCOC document on this topic which is dated July, 2018.

Policy: Joint or Dual Academic Awards are not currently offered by Larkin University. Should they become available, Larkin University will commit to follow all procedures and policies outlined in the current SACSCOC document. A full text document of the Policy on Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards is attached to this policy for review and reference.

Implementation: May 1, 2019

Maintenance and Review of the Policy: The President/CEO and Larkin University Senior Leadership is responsible for the implementation and compliance of this mandatory policy. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.
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AGREEMENTS INVOLVING JOINT AND DUAL ACADEMIC AWARDS:
POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Policy Statement

This policy pertains to agreements between institutions accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) and accredited or non-accredited degree-granting institutions of higher education throughout the world for purposes of awarding academic completion awards, e.g., certificates, diplomas, or degrees.

For the purposes of review by SACSCOC, the following definitions apply:

- An agreement by two or more institutions to grant dual academic awards is one whereby students study at two or more institutions and each institution grants a separate academic award bearing only its name, seal, and signature.
- An agreement by two or more institutions to grant a joint academic award is one whereby students study at two or more institutions and the institutions grant a single academic award bearing the names, seals, and signatures of each of the participating institutions.

While SACSCOC member institutions may use alternative terms for agreements involving dual or joint academic awards (for example, “affiliations” or “partnerships” or “collaborations”) for purposes of reporting agreements involving dual or joint academic awards, they are responsible for using the above definitions and for following the appropriate procedures described below.

For the reporting of other arrangements or agreements not involving dual or joint academic awards, member institutions should consult the Substantive Change Policy and reporting requirements for other reviews by SACSCOC.

Responsibilities of SACSCOC Member Institutions

Provide Appropriate Information to SACSCOC: Member institutions are responsible for providing notification to SACSCOC of agreements involving dual or joint academic awards, providing signed copies of the agreements, and providing any other documentation or information required by SACSCOC policies and procedures for review. Specific required documentation is listed below.

Ensure Access to Partner Institutions’ Information: The member institution is responsible for ensuring that SACSCOC has timely access to the partner institutions’ materials, physical site(s) and personnel in conjunction with accreditation activities.

Ensure the Integrity of their Accreditation and their Awards: Because the SACSCOC accreditation that has been awarded to a member institution is not transferable to a partner institution – either in actuality or appearance
- SACSCOC prohibits the use of its accreditation to authenticate courses, programs, or awards offered by organizations not so accredited with which it has formed partnerships. Likewise, member institutions are responsible for ensuring the quality of courses, programs, or awards offered through relationships with other institutions, particularly those resulting in dual or joint academic awards.

Provide a Disclaimer Statement: Member institutions entering into agreements with institutions not accredited by SACSCOC for the awarding of either dual or joint academic awards and their non-SACSCOC partner institutions must use the following disclaimer statement in any materials describing the relationship. The member institution is responsible for reviewing, approving, and monitoring the non-SACSCOC partner institutions’ statements of relationship to ensure conformity with the disclaimer:

[Name of SACSCOC member institution] is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges to award [state degree levels]. [Name of partner institution] is not accredited by SACS Commission on Colleges and the accreditation of [name of member institution] does not extend to or include [name of partner institution] or its students. Further, although [name of member institution] agrees to accept certain course work from [name of partner institution] to be applied toward an award from [name of member institution], that course work may not be accepted by other colleges or universities in transfer, even if it appears on a transcript from [name of member institution]. The decision to accept course work in transfer from any institution is made by the institution considering the acceptance of credits or course work.

Ensure Appropriate Percentages of Work Offered by the Member Institution: To receive an undergraduate academic award, students must earn 25 percent or more of the credits required for the award through the SACSCOC member institution’s own direct instruction. To receive a graduate academic award, students must earn one-third or more of the credits through the SACSCOC member institution’s own direct instruction.

Avoid Use of the SACSCOC Logo: Neither member nor partner institutions may use the SACSCOC logo in any of their materials or on websites. Use of the logo is reserved exclusively for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges.

Ensure the Quality of Credits Recorded on Transcripts: When evaluating, accepting, and transcripting credits awarded through an agreement involving dual or joint academic awards, the member institution must ensure the following:

- Examine courses transferred in and transcripted from partner institutions to ensure that they meet the requirements of the member institution and the requirements of The Principles of Accreditation. (See a list of applicable requirements below.)
- Assess and monitor effectively courses and components completed through instruction by partner institutions. The assessment and monitoring should be accomplished by academically-qualified persons.
- Record on the academic transcript the name of the institution from which a course is taken. If a member institution desires to transcript as its own a course taken through an agreement with a partner institution, it must be able to demonstrate that the instruction was provided under the member’s supervision and included approval of the academic qualifications of each instructor in advance and that regular evaluation of the effectiveness of each instructor occurs.
- Disclose fully the nature of the agreement on the transcript of the institutions awarding the degree.
- Reflect accurately in its catalog the courses being offered through the agreement if they are available to its own students as part of an educational program.
- Ensure that qualified and competent faculty members at each participating institution agree on the content and teaching methodologies of courses and education programs and on the qualifications of the faculty members who teach in the programs. Qualifications of teaching faculty must comply with the faculty competence requirements of the Principles of Accreditation.
• Ensure that the educational outcomes of a major or concentration offered as part of dual or joint award agreements are (1) comparable to the outcomes of the same major or concentration offered by the institutions or, if not offered by any of the participating institutions, (2) comparable to the outcomes of a peer institution external to the agreement that offers the same educational program's major or concentration.

• Ensure that, within the agreement, there is appropriate faculty accountability to the institutions accepting the credit, perhaps through dual faculty appointments or other approaches that include evaluation by the accepting institution.

Ensure Compliance with Appropriate SACSCOC Requirements: Standards in the Principles of Accreditation which affect the implementation of agreements involving dual and joint academic awards are listed below. They should be considered when developing the agreement, documentation of compliance, and, if relevant, a substantive change prospectus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR 1.1</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 2.1</td>
<td>Institutional mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 6.1</td>
<td>Full-time faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.a</td>
<td>Faculty qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.b</td>
<td>Program faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.a</td>
<td>Student outcomes: educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 9.1</td>
<td>Program content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 9.2</td>
<td>Program length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Institutional credits for an undergraduate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Institutional credits for a graduate/professional degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Public information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Academic governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Admissions policies and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Distance and correspondence education (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Policies for awarding credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Evaluating and awarding academic credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>Cooperative academic arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 11.1</td>
<td>Library and learning/information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>Student complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Student records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>Physical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>Substantive change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACSCOC Policies</td>
<td>“Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Substantive Change for Accredited Institutions”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Distance and Correspondence Education” (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reporting Responsibilities and Procedures
When Developing Agreements for Dual Academic Awards

Prior Notification: Entering into an agreement with a member or non-member institution involving a dual academic award is a substantive change that requires an institution to submit a letter of notification six months prior to implementation of the agreement and a final signed copy of the agreement. Formal, written acceptance of that notification and agreement by SACSCOC is required before implementation of the provisions of the agreement. (See note at the end of this policy for additional requirements if the agreement involves a new program which is significantly different from currently offered programs or an off-campus site where students may earn 50 percent or more of the credit in a program.) Expectations are that the agreement will reflect assumption of responsibility on the part of the member institution for the academic quality of any course work or credit recorded on the institution’s transcript and accepted toward a dual academic award. The following should be submitted to SACSCOC:

- A notification letter that includes a statement of intent, the anticipated beginning date of the agreement, a description of the agreement, the complete address/location of the parties involved in the agreement, and information for contact persons at each participating institution regarding the agreement.
- A copy of the final signed agreement.

Reporting Responsibilities and Procedures
When Developing Agreements for Joint Academic Awards

Participating in agreements involving the offering of joint academic awards (as defined above) falls into three categories. Reporting responsibilities differ depending on the accreditation status of the institutions which are partnering with the SACSCOC member institution.

Category One: A SACSCOC member institution and partner institutions that are all SACSCOC accredited

Prior Notification by Each Member Institution: Entering into a joint academic award agreement with partner institutions which are all SACSCOC accredited institutions is a substantive change that requires (1) submission of prior notification at least six months in advance of implementation of the agreement and (2) a final signed copy of the agreement. Formal, written acceptance of the agreement by SACSCOC is required before implementation of the provisions of the agreement. (See note at the end of this policy for additional requirements if the agreement involves a new program which is significantly different from currently offered programs or an off-campus site where students may earn 50 percent or more of the credit in a program.) Expectations are that the agreement will reflect assumption of responsibility on the part of the member institution for the academic quality of any course work or credit recorded on the institution’s transcript and accepted toward a joint academic award. The following should be submitted to SACSCOC:

- A notification letter that includes a statement of intent, the anticipated beginning date of the agreement, a description of the agreement, the complete address/location of the parties involved in the agreement, and information for contact persons at each participating institution regarding the agreement.
- A copy of the final signed agreement.

Category Two: A SACSCOC member institution and at least one partner institution that is accredited by a U.S. Department of Education-recognized accreditor other than SACSCOC

Prior Notification by SACSCOC Member Institution: Entering into a joint academic award agreement with at least one partner institution which is accredited by a USDOE-recognized accreditor other than SACSCOC is a substantive change that requires (1) submission of prior notification at least six months in advance of
implementation of the agreement along with the required documentation listed below and (2) a final signed copy of the agreement. Formal, written approval of the agreement by SACSCOC is required before implementation of the provisions of the agreement. (See note at the end of this policy for additional requirements if the agreement involves a new program which is significantly different from currently offered programs or an off-campus site where students may earn 50 percent or more of the credit in a program.) Expectations are that the agreement will reflect assumption of responsibility on the part of the member institution for the academic quality of any course work or credit recorded on the institution's transcript and accepted toward a joint academic award. The following should be submitted to SACSCOC:

- A letter of notification that includes a statement of intent, the anticipated implementation date for the agreement, a description of the proposed agreement, the address/location of each institution involved in the agreement, and information for the contact person at each participating institution.
- A copy of the final signed agreement.
- Documentation that the non-SACSCOC partner institution is not on a public sanction with its accreditor.
- Documentation that the courses or programs of the non-SACSCOC Partner institution(s) are consistent with the educational purpose and goals of the SACSCOC-accredited institution(s).
- Documentation that the institution meets the provisions of Standard 10.9 (Cooperative academic arrangements), including the analysis of credits accepted in transfer.
- A plan to monitor and ensure that the quality of contributions made by the partner institution(s) meets SACSCOC expectations.
- A plan and process produced by the SACSCOC-accredited institution(s) ensuring that the agreement and awarding of a joint award does not result in the appearance of extending SACSCOC accreditation to partner institutions through promotional materials, academic publications, student transcripts, credentials verifying program completion, and releases to the news media. (See the disclaimer statement above.)
- Prototypes of official academic documents (e.g. student transcript, degree, diploma, certificate) involved in the agreement.

**Category Three:** A SACSCOC member institution and at least one partner institution that is not accredited by a USDE-recognized accreditor

**Prior Notification by SACSCOC Member Institution:** Entering into a joint academic award agreement with at least one partner institution which is not accredited by a USDE-recognized accreditor is a substantive change that requires (1) submission of prior notification at least six months in advance of implementation of the agreement along with the required documentation below and (2) a final signed copy of the agreement. Formal, written approval of the agreement by SACSCOC is required before implementation of the provisions of the agreement. (See note at the end of this policy for additional requirements if the agreement involves a new program which is significantly different from currently offered programs or an off-campus site where students may earn 50 percent or more of the credit in a program.) Expectations are that the agreement will reflect assumption of responsibility on the part of the SACSCOC member institution for the academic quality of any course work or credit recorded on the institution’s transcript and accepted toward a joint academic award. The following should be submitted to SACSCOC:

- A notification letter that includes a statement of intent, the anticipated beginning date for the agreement, a description of the proposed agreement, the address/location of each institution involved in the agreement, and information for the contact person(s) at each participating institution.
- A copy of the final signed agreement.
- A description of (1) any external governmental or accrediting agency approval for the institution(s) or program(s) involved in the agreement, excluding the SACSCOC institution(s), (2) the process of quality assurance used by the agency granting this approval, and (3) any required legal or licensing approvals.
• Documentation that the courses or programs of the non-SACSCOC Partner institution(s) are consistent with the educational purpose and goals of the SACSCOC-accredited institution(s).

• Documentation that the institution meets the provisions of Standard 10.9 (Cooperative academic arrangements), including the analysis of credits accepted in transfer.

• Documentation that faculty involved in the collaboration are qualified to teach assigned components or courses and a description of the means by which the SACSCOC-accredited institution(s) will monitor these qualifications (Submit a completed SACSCOC Faculty Roster Form.)

• Documentation describing the physical and learning resources that will support the collaboration.

• A plan and process to monitor and ensure that the quality of contributions made by the partner institution(s) meets applicable SACSCOC requirements A plan and process produced by the SACSCOC-accredited institution(s) ensuring that the agreement does not result in the appearance of extending SACSCOC accreditation to partner institutions through promotional materials, academic publications, student transcripts, credentials verifying program completion, and releases to the news media. (See the disclaimer statement above).

• Prototypes of official academic documents (e.g. student transcript, degree, diploma, certificate) involved in the agreement.

When necessary to ensure compliance with SACSCOC requirements, SACSCOC may request additional information concerning any of these agreements involving joint and dual academic awards.

Note: If the joint or dual academic award arrangement involves offering 50 percent or more of a program at a previously unapproved off-campus site by a member institution or involves offering a new program which is significantly different from currently offered approved programs, notification is due six months prior to the implementation date with a prospectus for approval due at least three months prior to implementation.
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Policy on Board Dismissal/Removal

Purpose: The fundamental purpose of the Board of Trustees (BOT) is to provide sound governance, fiduciary and strategic oversight and direction to the university. It must ensure all trustees operate with the highest degree of ethical, legal & professional standards to ensure the public’s trust. Failure to do so puts the university at risk. Therefore, the BOT must establish a policy to remove a trustee for cause.

Policy: A Trustee may be removed by majority vote of the Board of Trustees only for appropriate reason and by a fair process. Any removal for cause, including, without limitation, for failure to perform duties, failure to attend regular board meetings, incompetence, malfeasance, or conduct inconsistent with or detrimental to the mission of the University, may take place only after due notice in writing and an opportunity to respond has been given to the Trustee in question. Members of the Board must attend two thirds of all board meetings in any year. Additional information can be found in the BOT By-Laws document.

Implementation Date: May 1, 2019

Maintenance and Review of the Policy: The Chairman of the Board of Trustees is responsible for the implementation and monitoring of this policy in collaboration with University Counsel and following protocol in the approved By-Laws of Larkin University. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.

Document History
Date adopted by Board of Trustees: 4/19
Date reformatted: 4/19
Date reviewed:
Next scheduled review date:
Larkin University
18301 N. Miami Ave.
Miami, FL 33169

Policy on Board Self Evaluation

**Purpose:** The fundamental purpose of the Board of Trustees (BOT) is to provide sound governance, fiduciary and strategic oversight and direction to the university. The BOT must ensure that it functions effectively and meets its responsibilities. Therefore, the BOT must establish a policy for self-evaluation on an annual basis.

**Policy:** All University Board members are required to complete an annual self-evaluation. This will be completed at the end of each academic year. The President/CEO will assist in meeting this policy by providing materials and support.

**Implementation:** May 1, 2019

**Maintenance and Review of the Policy:** The Chairman of the Board of Trustees is responsible for the implementation and monitoring of this policy in collaboration with Governance Committee. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness.

---
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Policy on Budget and Budget Process

Purpose: The Larkin University budget process is designed to be the vehicle that brings together all planned activities into one master set of actions to meet the university mission. The budget provides administrators and managers with a planning tool that assists in the determination of departmental goals.

Policy:

Budget Policy: The annual budget is developed consistent with the overall mission of the University as well as the goals of each respective department and area. The approved annual University budget summarizes approved University operating expenses for the fiscal year. The approved budget has appropriate detail by department and expense for operational purposes. The departmental budget serves as a tool for decision-making and planning. The University’s budget is developed at the departmental level and approved by the appropriate members of the University administration. Once developed, the budget is combined with revenue and enrollment projections and submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Budget Policy Process: Budget worksheets that contain actual prior expenses are made available in advance of the new fiscal year. The appropriate Deans, Department Heads, and Academic Chairpersons, in conjunction with the faculty and support staff, work with the anticipated expense data to create a proposed expense budget for the subsequent fiscal year. Both the department head and chairperson, or dean, of the appropriate college must approve this proposed (line item) expense budget. The proposed expense budget is then submitted to the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) to be compiled into the University’s budget for review and consideration by the President/CEO and ultimately the Board of Trustees. In the event, the budget is not balanced, the departments may be asked in writing to change their proposed departmental operating budget by a specified dollar amount or percentage.

Implementation Date: May 1, 2019

Maintenance and Review of the Policy: The Chief Financial Officer is responsible for the implementation and monitoring of this mandatory policy. The Budget Planning Process is evaluated every two years through various methodologies, including survey of users of the
budget process, to determine its effectiveness. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness.
Policy on Campus Environment

**Purpose:** To ensure a safe, healthy and secure environment for all members of the Larkin community.

**Policy:** Larkin is committed to taking all necessary steps to ensure a safe, secure, healthy environment. The employee handbook provides details of benefits and procedures to regulate our campus environment to meet this commitment. These include: campus security, parking compliance, smoke & drug free environment, anti-discrimination & harassment, work place organization, appropriate attire, technology use, and others. It is the responsibility of each member/person to be familiar with campus regulations as well as their implementation. We are accountable for our environment. Larkin University has also committed to follow regulations and guidelines of the Cleary Act. The Facilities Manager and Senior Management are available for assistance and suggestions to make Larkin University a safe place to work and study. Larkin is committed to open feedback, so remember, “See Something, Say Something”. Survey data on our campus environment will be reported bi-annually to the administration to measure our effectiveness in providing an excellent campus environment.

**Implementation Date:** May 1, 2019

**Maintenance and Review of the Policy:**
The Director of Facilities and Senior Management are responsible for the implementation of this mandatory policy. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department. This policy will be reviewed every two years for its effectiveness.
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Policy on Conflict of Interest

**Purpose:** The Conflict of Interest Policy refers to any case where a personal interest might contradict the interest of the company. This is an unwanted circumstance as it may have heavy implications on your judgement and commitment to the Larkin University and by extension to the realization of the goals of Larkin University. The policy applies to all members of the Board of Trustees, Employees, and independent contractors affiliated with Larkin University.

**Policy:** The relationships of a company should be based on mutual trust. In general, members of the Board of Trustees, Employees, and Independent Contractors are advised to refrain from letting personal and/or financial interests and external activities come into opposition with the company’s fundamental interests.

Conflict of interest may occur whenever an employee’s interest in a particular subject may lead them to actions, activities or relationships that undermine the company and may place it to disadvantage. Conflict of interest may take many different forms that include, but are not limited to:

- The ability to use your position with the University for your personal advantage
- Engaging in activities that will bring direct or indirect profit to a competitor
- Using connections obtained through the University for your own private purposes
- Using Larkin University equipment or means to support an external business
- Acting in ways that may compromise the University legally (taking bribes, or bribing others legal authorities, making promises violate requirements)
- Engaging in paid activities or other projects with co-affiliates or research institutions

The possibility that a conflict of interest may occur can be addressed and resolved before any actual damage is done. Therefore, when you understand or suspect that a conflict of interest exists, bring this matter to someone’s attention so corrective actions may be taken. In the case of a member of the BOT, please contact the Chairman of the Board. All Employees and Independent Contractors should bring matters to the attention of the next level supervisor. All conflicts of interest will be resolved as fairly as possible. In cases where a conflict of interest is deliberately concealed or when a solution cannot be found, disciplinary action may be invoked up to and including termination or dismissal from the BOT. Additional details regarding conflict of interest can be found in the Larkin University By-Laws or Employee Handbook.
Implementation Date: May. 1, 2019

Maintenance and Review of the Policy:
BOT and Senior Management have the responsibility for the monitoring of this policy and will review the policy for its effectiveness every two years. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.
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Policy on Degree Granting Authority  

Purpose: The By-Laws of Larkin University grant the authority to the Board of Trustees to confer degrees to students who complete all requirements in their academic discipline.

Policy: Larkin University is proud and privileged to recognize persons who have successfully completed all requirements within their academic discipline and educational program. Upon approval of the Faculty and recommendation of the Dean of the College, the Board of Trustees will confer their degree at our annual commencement ceremony. An Institutional Policy on Degree Granting Authority has been adopted by the BOT to reflect this authority. On behalf of the BOT, the President/CEO will issue the diploma upon completion of all degree requirements.

Implementation Date: May 1, 2019  

Maintenance and Review of the Policy:  
This is a mandatory policy. The individual college granting a degree is responsible for implementing this policy and ensuring the completion of all degree requirements for each student who is recommended for degree conferral. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness.
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Policy on Degrees and Programs  

Purpose: The purpose of this policy is to provide a process for approval, and review of all degrees and programs offered by Larkin University. The expectation is that all degrees and programs align with the mission of LU, have obtained appropriate approval and meet the highest standard of organization and program policy. The policy affirms LU’s commitment to annual review of its outcomes and periodic reviews of its programs/degrees.  

Policy: All degrees and programs offered by Larkin University must fall within the scope of the mission of Larkin University. All programs as well as proposals for new degrees/programs must be completed in collaboration with the Dean of the respective college. New proposals must be supported by the President/CEO. The BOT will make final decisions on the development and continuation of all degrees and programs offered by LU. Larkin University will commit to tracking achievements and outcomes of its students and programs on an ongoing basis. An annual review of each degree/program will be submitted to the senior administration. Results of the annual review will be submitted to the BOT.  

Implementation: May 1, 2019  

Maintenance and Review of the Policy:  
The implementation and monitoring of this mandatory policy will be the responsibility of the Dean of each respective. The annual review of each degree/program shall serve to monitor the progress and outcomes of each program and be shared with other leaders at Administrative Council for guidance and advice. This policy will be reviewed every two years for its effectiveness. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.
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Policy on Dissemination of Policies and Program Information

**Purpose:** The role of Communication in an organization is vital to its overall success. To that end, Larkin University has adopted a policy of Dissemination of Policies and Program Information. It is intended that everyone is aware of institutional policies as well as program information within the broader Larkin community. It is the responsibility of everyone to share information and keep everyone informed of changes through honest, open communication.

**Policy:**

The university recognizes that in order to be successful, it must communicate clearly and be understood by members of the entire university community. It is the responsibility of the President/CEO and the Senior Administration to coordinate internal and external dissemination of program information and policies.

Internal dissemination of information includes the following:

- Development of policy manuals, catalogs and employee and student handbooks accessible to everyone
- Policy & Program changes be circulated in memoranda to all deans, departmental heads, supervisors, and students (when appropriate)
- Special meetings with deans, departmental, supervisors and students (when appropriate) to discuss the intent of the policies and individual responsibility for effective implementation.
- Electronic copies of all policies, handbooks and catalog be available on the Larkin University website
- Hard copy of the Policy Manual, Catalog and all Handbooks be available in the Human Resources Department.

External dissemination of information includes:

- Informing all recruiting or vendor sources of applicable university policies.
- Including policy clauses in all contracts of the university when applicable.

**Implementation Date:** May 1, 2019
Maintenance and Review of the Policy:
The President/CEO and Senior Leadership of Larkin University are held accountable for ensuring that policies and program information is disseminated to everyone. This is a mandatory policy and will be closely monitored by employee and student survey. The policy will be reviewed annually to measure our effectiveness in communicating policies and program information. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.
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Policy on Frequency of Review of Mission

**Purpose:** The purpose of this policy is to define the procedure and responsibilities for periodically reviewing and revising as needed the university’s mission and vision statements.

**Policy:** The mission statement of Larkin University mission as approved by the Board of Trustees shall be reviewed annually who will make a recommendation to the President that the statement remain unchanged pending the next scheduled review or that a broader review involving the campus community be undertaken if it appears advisable.

**Implementation Date:** May 1, 2019

**Policy Maintenance and Review:**
The Office of the CEO is responsible for implementation and monitoring of this policy. This policy and procedure will be reviewed every four years by the Administrative leadership of Larkin University for its effectiveness with recommendations for revision presented to the president/CEO. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.com or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.

**Document History**
Date adopted by Board of Trustees: Dec. 2018
Date reformatted: Dec. 2018
Date reviewed:
Next scheduled review date:
Larkin University  
1830 N. Miami Ave.  
Miami, FL 33169  

Policy on Institution Related Entities

**Purpose:** The purpose of this policy is to ensure that any additional entities, organizations or activities formed support the mission of Larkin University and operate within university guidelines.

**Policy:** All entities or organizations formed to support Larkin University will align with the mission of Larkin University. These organizations/activities (ie. fund-raising) are under the control of the CEO of Larkin University. For any entity organized separately from the institution and formed primarily for the purpose of supporting the institution or its programs, it must meet the following criteria:

1. the legal authority and operating control of the institution will be clearly defined;
2. the relationship between that entity to the institution as well as any liability arising out of that relationship is described in a formal, written manner; and
3. the chief executive officer controls any fund-raising activities of that entity.

**Implementation:** May 1, 2019

**Maintenance and Review of the Policy:** The BOT and President/CEO will have the responsibility to implement and monitor this mandatory policy. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.

---
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Date reformatted: 4-19
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Larkin University  
18301 N. Miami Ave.  
Miami, FL 33169

Policy on Institutional Integrity

**Purpose:** Institutional Integrity is essential to the purpose of higher education. It functions as the basic covenant defining relationships in which all parties agree to deal honestly and openly with their constituents and with one another.

**Policy:** In pursuing our mission, the Larkin University attempts to promote and conform to the highest standards of academic excellence, ethical research, scholarly conduct and professional behavior. Each of us is responsible to perform our position functions at the highest standards and operate from a position of honesty and openness with all members of the Larkin community.

**Implementation Date:** May 1, 2019

**Policy Maintenance and Review:**
Everyone affiliated with Larkin University is expected to adhere to the Policy on Integrity. Each of us has the responsibility to ensure compliance with this mandatory policy. Violations of this policy should be submitted in writing directly to Human Resources who will review and investigate this matter. The University will seek to protect and preserve the reputation and positions of those who have made allegations of misconduct in good faith, and also the reputations and positions of those who have been the object of allegations found to be false. Accusers and the accused will have appropriate opportunities to respond to findings. A good faith effort will be made to keep the procedures of inquiry and identities of those involved confidential.

All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department. This policy will be reviewed for effectiveness every two years.

**Document History**

Date adopted by Board of Trustees: 4/2019  
Date reformatted: 4/2019  
Date reviewed:  
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INTEGRITY AND INSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATIONS TO SACSCOC

Policy Statement

Institutional integrity serves as the foundation of the relationship between the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) and its member and candidate institutions. This fundamental philosophy is reflected in the Principles of Accreditation.

Integrity, essential to the purpose of higher education, functions as the basic contract defining the relationship between the Commission and each of its member and candidate institutions. It is a relationship in which all parties agree to deal honestly and openly with their constituencies and with one another. Without this commitment, no relationship can exist or be sustained between the Commission and its member and candidate institutions.

Integrity in the accreditation process is best understood in the context of peer review, professional judgment by peers of commonly accepted sound academic practice, and the conscientious application of the Principles of Accreditation as mutually agreed upon standards for accreditation. The Commission’s requirements, policies, processes, procedures, and decisions are predicated on integrity.

SACSCOC expects integrity to govern the operation of institutions and for institutions to make reasonable and responsible decisions consistent with the spirit of integrity in all matters. Therefore, evidence of withholding information, providing inaccurate information to the public, failing to provide timely and accurate information to the Commission, or failing to conduct a candid self-assessment of compliance with the Principles of Accreditation and to submit this assessment to the Commission, and other similar practices will be seen as the lack of a full commitment to integrity. The Commission’s policy statement “Integrity and Institutional Obligations to SACSCOC” gives examples of the application of the principle of integrity in accreditation activities. The policy is not all-encompassing nor does it address all possible situations. Failure of an institution to adhere to the integrity principle may result in a loss of accreditation or candidacy.

The Principles includes the following requirement:

CR 1.1 The institution operates with integrity in all matters.

As a condition of candidacy or membership in SACSCOC, the institution agrees to document its compliance with the requirements of the Principles of Accreditation; to comply with Commission requests, directives, decisions and policies; and to make complete, accurate and honest disclosure to the Commission.

The SACSCOC’s policy “Sanctions, Denial of Reaffirmation, and Removal from Membership” states that SACSCOC requires a member institution to comply with the Principle of Integrity, Core Requirements, Comprehensive Standards, Federal Requirements, and SACSCOC’s policies and procedures, and to provide information as requested by the Commission in order to maintain membership and accreditation.
In order to comply with these requirements for integrity and accuracy in reporting in its relationships with the Commission, the president of the institution is obligated to review and ensure the accuracy and integrity of materials submitted by the institution, such as the Compliance Certification and Quality Enhancement Plan. In addition, an institution shall meet the following expectations:

1. Ensure that all documents submitted to SACSCOC are candid and provide all pertinent information, whether complimentary or otherwise. With due regard for the rights of individual privacy, every institution applying for candidacy, extension of candidacy, accreditation, or reaffirmation of accreditation, as well as every candidate and accredited institution, provide the Commission with access to all parts of its operations, and with complete and accurate information about the institution's affairs, including reports of other accrediting, licensing, and auditing agencies.

2. Respond in a timely manner to requests by SACSCOC for submission of dues, fees, reports, or other information.

3. Ensure that information submitted to SACSCOC (such as that provided in the annual institutional profile, institutional responses to visiting committee reports, and monitoring reports) is complete, accurate, and current. An institution is obligated to notify the Commission office of any bankruptcy filing.

4. Cooperate with the Commission in preparation for visits, receives visiting committees in a spirit of collegiality, and complies with SACSCOC's requests for acceptable reports and self-analyses.

5. Report substantive changes, including the initiation of new programs or sites outside the region, or new sites within the region in accordance with SACSCOC's policy on substantive change.

6. Provide counsel and advice to the Commission, and agree to have its faculty and administrators serve, within reason, on visiting teams and on SACSCOC committees.

7. Provide SACSCOC or its representatives with information requested and maintain an openness and cooperation during evaluations, enabling evaluators to perform their duties with maximum efficiency and effectiveness.

SACSCOC accredits institutions, not individuals. Therefore, any individual who reports to SACSCOC on behalf of an institution—either by virtue of his or her office or as delegated by the chief executive officer of the institution—obligates the institution in all matters regarding institutional integrity.

**Document History**

Approved: Commission on Colleges, June 1993  
Revised in accord with the Principles of Accreditation: February 2004  
Revised in accord with the Principles: December 2006, December 2012  
Edited March 2014  
Reformatted: August 2014  
Revised: SACSCOC Board of Trustees, June 2017  
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Policy on Institutional Obligation for Public Disclosure

Purpose: The purpose of this policy is to ensure that all communications to the students, constituents and the public regarding Larkin University are timely, complete, accurate and broadly disseminated consistent with our policy of integrity and requirements of accreditation.

Policy: Larkin University adheres to the SACSCOC policy on Institutional Obligations for Public Disclosure. The policy states, "A candidate or accredited SACSCOC institution is obligated to provide to its students, constituents, and the public information about itself that is complete, accurate, timely, accessible, clear and sufficient."

Policy Sections

- Larkin University's catalog and handbooks describe the University consistent with its mission statement and are available in print and on the university website.
- Larkin University's print and electronic communications consistent and accurately portray the conditions and opportunities available at the University.
- Larkin University publishes the location and programs with a description of programs and services in both the catalog and handbooks.
- Larkin University publishes goals for student achievement in the student handbook and success of students in achieving goals on the website.
- Larkin University provides valid documentation for any statements and promises regarding matters such as program excellence, learning outcomes, success in placement, and achievements of graduates or faculty.
- Larkin University publishes its current accredited status accurately and explicitly.

Implementation: May 1, 2019
Maintenance and Review of the Policy:
The CEO and Dean of each respective college working collaboratively are responsible for the implementation and monitoring of this mandatory policy. An annual review of university documents and website will confirm alignment of content. This policy will be reviewed every three years for its effectiveness. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.
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INSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATIONS FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

Policy Statement

A candidate or accredited SACSCOC institution is obligated to provide to its students, constituents, and the public information about itself that is complete, accurate, timely, accessible, clear and sufficient. Information provided to the public includes the following:

- The institution’s current catalogue describes the institution consistent with its mission statement and sets forth the obligations and responsibilities of both students and the institution. Institutions relying on electronic catalogues ensure the availability of archival editions sufficient to serve the needs of alumni and former and returning students.

- All forms of print and electronic communications officially representing the institution are consistent with catalogue content and accurately portray the conditions and opportunities available at the institution. (See also SACSCOC’s policy “Student Advertisement and Recruitment.”)

- The institution publishes the locations and programs available at branch campuses, and other off-campus instructional locations, including those overseas operations at which students can enroll for a degree, along with a description of the programs and services available at each location.

- The institution publishes statements of its goals for student achievement and the success of students in achieving those goals. Information on student success may include reliable information in retention, graduation, course completion, licensure examinations, and job placement rates and other measures of student success appropriate to institutional mission.

- The institution has readily available valid documentation for any statements and promises regarding such matters as program excellence, learning outcomes, success in placement, and achievements of graduates or faculty.

Representation of status with SACSCOC

The institution is expected (1) to be accurate in reporting to the public its status with SACSCOC and (2) to publish the name of its primary accreditor and its address and phone number in accordance with federal requirements. In order to meet these requirements, the institution publishes one of the following statements in its catalog or website:

Statement for Accredited Institutions

(Note of member institution) is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges to award (name specific degree levels, such as associate, baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate). Contact the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges at 1866 Southern Lane, Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097 or call 404-679-4500 for questions about the accreditation of (name of member institution).

Statement for Candidate Institutions
(Name of candidate institution) is a candidate for accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges to award (name specific degree levels, such as associate, baccalaureate, masters, doctorate). Contact the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges at 1866 Southern Lane, Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097 or call 404-679-4500 for questions about the status of (name of candidate institution).

In all cases, when accredited status is affirmed in institutional catalogs and other official publications, it is stated accurately and is not misrepresented.

- Accreditation granted by an institutional accrediting body has reference to the quality of the institution as a whole. Because institutional accreditation does not imply specific accreditation of any particular program in the institution, statements like “this program is accredited,” or “this degree is accredited,” are incorrect and misleading.

- “Free-standing” institutions offering programs in a single field (e.g., a school of art, engineering, or theology) and granted accreditation by a regional or national institutional accrediting body alone, clearly state that this accreditation does not imply specialized accreditation of the programs offered.

- No statement may be made about the possible future accreditation status with SACSCOC (e.g. “(Name of institution) has applied for candidacy with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges”).

- The phrase “fully accredited” is not used, since partial accreditation is not possible.

Use of the SACSCOC Logo and Stamp of Accreditation

The SACSCOC “flame” Logo is trademarked, and its use by any member institution or other entity other than SACSCOC, Inc., is strictly prohibited. SACSCOC has also developed a trademarked Stamp of Accreditation for the exclusive use of member institutions. This Stamp may be used in conjunction with the full statement regarding accreditation provided above. Member institutions which have provided that full statement in the appropriate document(s) may choose to make reference to their accreditation status in flyers and other recruiting materials. In that case, the Stamp may appropriately be used with such abbreviated references, as well.

Document History
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Policy on Roles & Responsibilities of the Board of Trustees

**Purpose:** The fundamental purpose of the Board of Trustees (BOT) is to provide sound governance, fiduciary and strategic oversight and direction to the university. It is essential that Trustees understand their role and service to the University. This policy serves as a guide for trustees to understand their roles and responsibilities and how it is distinctive from administration of the college.

**Policy:** The roles and responsibilities of the BOT are detailed in Article III of the approved By-Laws of Larkin University. To fully comprehend the scope of the role and responsibility of a trustee, reference should be made to that document. John W. Nance identified core responsibilities of a BOT member which are reflected in the Larkin By-Laws. For convenience, they are provided below.

- Appoint, support, and assess the performance of the president/CEO.
- Clarify the institution’s mission.
- Approve long-range plans.
- Approve the educational program.
- Ensure the well-being of faculty, students, and staff.
- Ensure strong financial management.
- Ensure adequate financial resources.
- Preserve institutional autonomy.
- Interpret the campus to the community.
- Interpret the needs of society to the campus.
- Assess their own performance.

**Implementation:** May 1, 2019

**Maintenance and Review of the Policy:** The Chairman of the Board of Trustees is responsible for the implementation and monitoring of this policy in collaboration with Governance Committee. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.

**Document History**
*Date adopted by Board of Trustees: April 2019*
*Date reformatted: April 2019*
*Date reviewed:*
*Next scheduled review date:*
Larkin University  
18301 N. Miami Ave.  
Miami, FL 33169

Policy on Selection & Evaluation of the President/Chief Executive Officer

Purpose: The Larkin University Board of Trustees, has identified the "President/Chief Executive Officer" as the organizational position that is primarily responsible to carry out the strategic plans and policies as established by the board of trustees. The purpose of this policy is to provide for the selection of a President/CEO as well as mandate an annual evaluation of the President/CEO.

Policy: The Bylaws of the Larkin University Board of Trustees specifies that the Board has the power and duty, “to appoint the President/Chief Executive Officer of the University; to delegate his responsibilities, evaluate his performance, provide for his leadership and welfare, and set appropriate conditions of employment, renewal, or termination”. The BOT recognizes the President/CEO is the most important role in the management of the organization. The BOT will review and select a President/CEO who is best able to partner with them to execute the strategic plan and policies of Larkin University. The President/CEO must meet or maintain requirements for a faculty appointment in an appropriate department. The BOT, under the leadership of the Executive Committee, will also complete a formal and documented evaluation of the President/CEO which meets standards of fairness and practicality. The goal of the evaluation is to ensure that the President/CEO is meeting responsibilities and effectively leading the organization. The evaluation will be done annually based on the date of hire. In the event, performance issues are perceived, the BOT may initiate an evaluation.

Implementation:  May 1, 2019

Maintenance and Review of the Policy: The Larkin University BOT is responsible for implementation and monitoring of this mandatory policy through its annual President/CEO evaluation. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.
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Policy on Selection, Evaluation and Dismissal of Administrators

**Purpose:** The success of Larkin University is dependent on an environment of mutual trust and confidence. The administrative leadership team is critical to the environment and implementation of the mission and strategic plan of the university. This policy provides guidance in the selection, evaluation and dismissal of university administrators.

**Policy:** The selection of University administrators is a matter of great importance to the University. The President normally seeks advice on such matters through a variety of appropriate channels, individuals, and groups. Participation of faculty and students in the selection of those administrators who significantly affect the academic programs of the University is highly recommended.

**Selection**
Academic excellence is essential to the educational mission of Larkin University. Such excellence is achieved in an environment of mutual confidence, collegial participation, effective leadership, and strong academic programs. To foster that environment, it is University policy that the faculty are expected to participate in the selection of deans and departmental chairpersons and that the advice of the faculty shall be actively sought concerning possible improvements in academic programs and in administrative leadership of academic divisions and departments. Working in coordination with Human Resources, approval of any open position must have been approved in the budget, have a developed job description, and receive the approval of the CFO and President/CEO. The President/CEO will then initiate the selection process, by establishing a search committee. Working with Human Resources, the President/CEO will monitor the selection and hiring process through to completion. It is the responsibility of the President/CEO to inform the Board of Trustees of administrative appointments.

**Evaluation.**
It shall be the practice to evaluate all administrators periodically. It is the responsibility of the President/CEO to evaluate all direct reports at the university level, with the respective college Dean evaluating administrators at the college level. Performance reviews will be done annually as a “formative” process for all administrators as an opportunity to identify areas for potential growth and improvement. Reappointment reviews will be completed near the end of the stated contract period and have direct bearing on the question of continuation in the administrative position. This evaluation should be global in nature and
include input from all stakeholders and constituents. The President/CEO or the direct supervisor will have the final decision on the evaluation of administrators.

**Dismissal**
If it has been determined that an administrator will not be offered a continued contract for the position, they must consult with the President/CEO and Human Resources. The process for dismissal must follow the protocol for faculty/staff dismissal detailed in the Employee Handbook or the specific contract agreement and must include due process for the administrator. The termination should be communicated verbally and in writing. Because Florida employment is “at will”, a reason for termination may not be provided. Department leadership is strongly advised to request assistance from Human Resources in all matters dealing with termination including composing the letter of termination.

**Implementation:** May 1, 2019

**Maintenance and Review of the Policy:** The President/CEO and Human Resources are responsible for the implementation and monitoring of this policy. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.
Policy on Selection & Evaluation of the President/Chief Executive Officer

**Purpose:** The Larkin University Board of Trustees, has identified the "President/Chief Executive Officer" as the organizational position that is primarily responsible to carry out the strategic plans and policies as established by the board of trustees. The purpose of this policy is to provide for the selection of a President/CEO as well as mandate an annual evaluation of the President/CEO.

**Policy:** The *Bylaws of the Larkin University Board of Trustees* specifies that the Board has the power and duty, "to appoint the President/Chief Executive Officer of the University; to delegate his responsibilities, evaluate his performance, provide for his leadership and welfare, and set appropriate conditions of employment, renewal, or termination". The BOT recognizes the President/CEO is the most important role in the management of the organization. The BOT will review and select a President/CEO who is best able to partner with them to execute the strategic plan and policies of Larkin University. The President/CEO must meet or maintain requirements for a faculty appointment in an appropriate department. The BOT, under the leadership of the Governance Committee, will also complete a formal and documented evaluation of the president/CEO which meets standards of fairness and practicality. The goal of the evaluation is to ensure that the President/CEO is meeting responsibilities and effectively leading the organization. The evaluation will be done annually based on the date of hire. In the event, performance issues are perceived, the BOT may initiate an evaluation.

**Implementation:** May 1, 2019

**Maintenance and Review of the Policy:** The Larkin University BOT is responsible for implementation and monitoring of this mandatory policy through its annual President/CEO evaluation. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.

**Document History**
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Policy on Selection of Board Members

**Purpose:** Larkin University recognizes that the University and the Board are best served by having a Board comprised of members with complementary skills and experience. Below are characteristics that help to determine whether a potential candidate satisfies the criteria for trusteeship.

- Financial acumen
- Knowledge of nonprofit organizations
- Experience in higher education
- Appreciation of the diverse constituencies of the University
- Familiarity with the regulatory and political processes
- Fundraising, and
- Familiarity with the needs of the community and the state.

Not all trustees will have each of these skills, but as a collective they provide the skills needed to implement the mission of the university. The University By-Laws define the number and offices of the BOT whereas, this policy serves as a guide when evaluating and selecting members.

**Policy:** The Governance Committee of the BOT leads recruitment and orientation of all Board Members working together with the President/CEO to provide information and support. Referrals of potential trustees can be made through the President/CEO for consideration by the Governance Committee. In determining its selection of new Trustees, the Board will consider criteria to complement and strengthen the composition of the current Board, such as diversity and areas of expertise. Any vacancy which occurs on the BOT should follow the procedures outlined in the University By-Laws Article III.

**Implementation:** May 1, 2019

**Maintenance and Review of the Policy:** The Chair of the BOT working with the Governance Committee is responsible for implementing and monitoring this policy. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department.
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Policy on Substantive Change

Purpose: To obtain and maintain SACSCOC accreditation, Larkin University must obligate itself to follow the policies and procedures required by SACSCOC which includes any substantive changes. Larkin University obligates itself to the policy and procedures required for substantive change.

Policy:
As a member of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), Larkin University is committed to accreditation by ensuring that it meets its mission in accordance with all policies and procedures required by the SACSCOC, including the requirement to notify the SACSCOC of substantive changes, and, when required, to seek approval prior to the initiation of changes.

Procedure:
Substantive change is a significant modification or expansion of the nature and scope of an accredited institution and includes, among others, the following:

- Any change in the established mission or objectives of the institution
- Any change in legal status, form of control, or ownership of the institution
- The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, either in content or method of delivery, from those that were offered when the institution was last evaluated
- The addition of programs or courses of study at a degree or credential level different from that which is included in the institution’s current accreditation or reaffirmation
- A change from clock hours to credit hours
- A substantial increase in the number of clock or credit hours awarded for successful completion of a program
- The establishment of an additional location geographically apart from the main campus at which the institution offers at least 50 percent of an educational program
- The establishment of a branch campus
- Closing a program, off-campus site, branch campus, or institution
- Entering into a collaborative academic arrangement such as a dual degree program or a joint degree program with another institution
- Acquiring another institution or a program or location of another institution
- Adding a permanent location at a site where the institution is conducting a teach-out program for a closed institution
• Entering into a contract by which an entity not eligible for Title IV funding offers 25% or more of one or more of the accredited institution’s programs.

The SACSOC Board of Trustees has approved additional substantive changes that require notification and, in some cases, approval prior to implementation. This policy and its procedures address substantive changes identified through Federal regulations and Board approval.

Note: The following link (http://sacsoc.org/SubstantiveChange.asp) will provide a more complete list of possible substantive changes with applicable time frames.

Questions and proposed recommendations regarding changes which may be classified as substantive should be referred to the President/CEO.

Implementation: May 1, 2019

Maintenance and Review of the Policy: This mandatory policy is implemented and monitored by the President/CEO of Larkin University through the BOT and Administrative Council. Compliance is confirmed annually through the review of the Strategic Plan. All administrative policies of Larkin University can be accessed electronically at ularkin.org or can be obtained from the Human Resources Department. This policy will be reviewed every four years for its effectiveness.
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SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE FOR SACSCOC ACCREDITED INSTITUTIONS

Policy Statement

Institutional Obligations:

1. Member institutions are required to notify the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) of changes in accordance with the substantive change policy and, when required, seek approval prior to the initiation of changes.

2. Member institutions are required to have a policy and procedure to ensure that all substantive changes are reported to the Commission in a timely fashion.

Definition: Substantive change is a significant modification or expansion of the nature and scope of an accredited institution. Under federal regulations, substantive change includes:

- Any change in the established mission or objectives of the institution
- Any change in legal status, form of control, or ownership of the institution
- The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, either in content or method of delivery, from those that were offered when the institution was last evaluated
- The addition of courses or programs of study at a degree or credential level different from that which is included in the institution’s current accreditation or reaffirmation.
- A change from clock hours to credit hours
- A substantial increase in the number of clock or credit hours awarded for successful completion of a program
- The establishment of an additional location geographically apart from the main campus at which the institution offers at least 50% of an educational program.
- The establishment of a branch campus
- Closing a program, off-campus site, branch campus or institution
- Entering into a collaborative academic arrangement that includes only the initiation of a dual or joint academic program with another institution
- Acquiring another institution or a program or location of another institution
- Adding a permanent location at a site where the institution is conducting a teach-out program for a closed institution
- Entering into a contract by which an entity not eligible for Title IV funding offers 25% or more of one or more of the accredited institution’s programs

The SACSCOC Board of Trustees has approved additional substantive changes that require notification and, in some cases, approval prior to implementation. This policy and its procedures address substantive changes identified through Federal regulations and Board approval.
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Glossary of Terms

Branch campus - a location of an institution that is geographically apart and independent of the main campus of the institution. A location is independent of the main campus if the location is
  • permanent in nature
  • offers courses in educational programs leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential
  • has its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization and
  • has its own budgetary and hiring authority

Contractual Agreement – typically is one in which an institution enters an agreement for receipt of courses/programs or portions of courses or programs (i.e., clinical training internships, etc.) delivered by another institution or service provider.

Consortial Relationship - A consortial relationship typically is one in which two or more institutions share in the responsibility of developing and delivering courses and programs that meet mutually agreed upon standards of academic quality.

Correspondence education - a formal educational process under which the institution provides instructional materials, by mail or electronic transmission, including examinations on the materials, to students who are separated from the instructor. Interaction between the instructor and the student is limited, is not regular and substantive, and is primarily initiated by the student; courses are typically self-paced.

Degree completion program – a program typically designed for a non-traditional undergraduate population such as working adults who have completed some college-level course work but have not achieved a baccalaureate degree. Students in such programs may transfer in credit from courses taken previously and may receive credit for experiential learning. Courses in degree completion programs are often offered in an accelerated format or meet during evening and weekend hours, or may be offered via distance learning technologies.

Direct Assessment Competency-Based Educational Programs - Federal regulations define a direct assessment competency-based educational program as an instructional program that, in lieu of credit hours or clock hours as a measure of student learning, uses direct assessment of student learning relying solely on the attainment of defined competencies, or recognizes the direct assessment of student learning by others. The assessment must be consistent with the accreditation of the institution or program using the results of the assessment.

Distance education - a formal educational process in which the majority of the instruction (interaction between students and instructors and among students) in a course occurs when students and instructors are not in the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. A distance education course may use the internet; one-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices; audio conferencing; or video cassettes, DVD’s, and CD-ROMs if used as part of the distance learning course or program.

Dual degree – separate program completion credentials each of which bears only the name, seal, and signature of the institution awarding the degree to the student.

Educational program – a coherent course of study leading to the awarding of a credential (i.e., a degree, diploma or certificate).

Geographically separate - an instructional site or branch campus that is located physically apart from the main campus of the institution.

Joint degree - a single program completion credential bearing the names, seals, and signatures of each of the two or more institutions awarding the degree to the student.

Modified prospectus - a prospectus submitted in lieu of a full prospectus for certain designated substantive changes. When a modified prospectus is acceptable, the Commission specifies requested information from the institution.

Notification - a letter from an institution’s chief executive officer, or his/her designated representative, to SACSCOC President summarizing a proposed change, providing the intended implementation date, and listing the complete physical
address if the change involves the initiation of an off-campus site or branch campus. The policy and procedures for reporting and review of institutional substantive change are outlined in the document “Substantive Change for Accredited Institutions of the Commission on Colleges.”

**Significant departure** – a program that is not closely related to previously approved programs at the institution or site or for the mode of delivery in question. To determine whether a new program is a “significant departure,” it is helpful to consider the following questions:

- What previously approved programs does the institution offer that are closely related to the new program and how are they related?
- Will significant additional equipment or facilities be needed?
- Will significant additional financial resources be needed?
- Will a significant number of new courses will be required?
- Will a significant number of new faculty members will be required?
- Will significant additional library/learning resources be needed?

**Teach-out agreement** - a written agreement between institutions that provides for the equitable treatment of students and a reasonable opportunity for students to complete their program of study if an institution, or an institutional location that provides 50% or more of at least one program offered, ceases to operate before all enrolled students have completed their program of study. This applies to the closure of an institution, a site, or a program. Such a teach-out agreement requires SACSCOC approval in advance of implementation.

**Teach-out plan** - a written plan developed by an institution that provides for the equitable treatment of students if an institution, or an institutional location that provides 50% or more of at least one program, ceases to operate before all students have completed their program of study, and may include, if required by the institution’s accrediting agency, a teach-out agreement between institutions. This applies to the closure of an institution, a site, or a program. Teach-out plans must be approved by SACSCOC in advance of implementation.
The Policy

Commission Responsibilities

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) accredits an entire institution and its programs and services, wherever they are located or however they are delivered. It is responsible for reviewing all substantive changes that occur between an institution’s decennial reviews, determining whether the changes have affected the quality of the total institution, and assuring the public that all aspects of the institution continue to meet defined standards.

SACSCOC is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education as an agency whose accreditation enables its member institutions to seek eligibility to participate in Title IV programs. To maintain its recognition with the U.S. Department of Education, SACSCOC has incorporated federal requirements into its substantive change policy and procedures. Some of those requirements specify that an institution seek and receive approval prior to the initiation of a substantive change so that the change can be included in the institution’s scope of accreditation.

Institutional Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of an institution to follow SACSCOC substantive change procedures and inform SACSCOC of substantive changes as specified in those procedures. If an institution is unclear as to whether a change is substantive in nature, it should contact SACSCOC staff for consultation. SACSCOC accredits institutions, not systems. While a system may provide SACSCOC with important information regarding changes planned or underway at its institutions, it is expected that each institution will follow the reporting requirements of the substantive change policy. Failure of an institution to gain approval for substantive changes involving programs that qualify for federal financial assistance could result in the institution jeopardizing such funding.

Procedures for Reporting: An Overview

There are three procedures for addressing the different types of substantive changes included in this document:

• Procedure One for the Review of Substantive Changes Requiring Approval Prior to Implementation (Notification may also be required).

• Procedure Two for the Review of Substantive Changes Requiring Only Notification Prior to Implementation (some changes also require submission of additional documents).

• Procedure Three for Closing a Program, Site, Branch Campus or Institution.

Procedures for the following types of changes are included in a separate document, “Merger/Consolidation, Acquisition, Change of Ownership, and Change of Governance, Control, Form, or Legal Status – Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions Policy Statement” --

• initiating a merger or consolidation;
• acquiring an institution or location (including programs) of another institution;
• initiating a change of ownership;
• initiating a change of governance, control, form, or legal status; and
• adding as a permanent off-campus instructional site a location at which the institution is conducting a teach-out for students of another institution;

Procedures for approval of direct assessment competency-based education programs are in a separate document, “Direct Assessment Competency-Based Educational Programs.”

The initiation or revision of programs not offered for academic credit and that are not eligible for federal financial aid does not require reporting; however, such programs are subject to review at the time of reaffirmation.
Reporting the Various Types of Substantive Change

The different types of substantive change, the specific procedure to be used for each, their respective approval/notification requirements, and their reporting time lines are included in the table that follows. Please read the full text under the appropriate procedure for details regarding reporting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Change</th>
<th>Procedure or Policy</th>
<th>Prior Notification Required</th>
<th>Prior Approval Required</th>
<th>Documentation and Time Frame for Contacting SACSCOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating coursework or programs at a different level than currently approved</td>
<td>Procedure 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Application for Level Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating off-campus sites where student can obtain 50% or more credits toward a program (including but not limited to Early College High School, dual enrollment programs offered at a high school, and certificate programs that are not at employer's request and not on short notice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OURSE dates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 15 (for June review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>September 1 (for December review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding at current degree level (<em>significant departure from current programs</em>).</td>
<td>Procedure 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cover Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding program offerings at previously approved off-campus sites by adding programs that ARE significantly different from current programs at the site AND at the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prospectus (See Appendix B of this document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating degree completion programs</td>
<td>Procedure 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>Due dates:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating a branch campus (See definition of “branch campus” on p. 3 of this document.)</td>
<td>Procedure 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>January 1 for 7/1-12/31 implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating distance learning by offering 50% or more of the first program for the first time</td>
<td>Procedure 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>July 1 for 1/1-6/30 implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocating a main or branch campus</td>
<td>Procedure 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering into a contract with an entity not certified to participate in USDHE Title IV programs if the entity provides 25% or more of an educational program offered by the SACSCOC accredited institution</td>
<td>Procedure 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Change</td>
<td>Procedure or Policy</td>
<td>Prior Notification Required</td>
<td>Prior Approval Required</td>
<td>Documentation and Time Frame for Contacting SACSCOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating dual or joint degrees involving program expansion (significant departure) or initiating a new site where student can obtain 50% or more credits toward a program</td>
<td>See SACSCOC policy &quot;Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards&quot;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cover Sheet Prospectus (See Appendix B of this document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due dates: January 1 for 7/1-12/31 implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July 1 for 1/1-6/30 implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy of signed agreement, contact information for each institution, and additional details on non-SACSCOC institution(s) involved. See Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating dual or joint degree with at least one institution not accredited by SACSCOC</td>
<td>See SACSCOC Policy &quot;Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards&quot;</td>
<td>At least 6 months prior to implementation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Acceptance of notification, copy of signed agreement, contact information for each institution, and additional details on non-SACSCOC institution(s). See Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating a direct assessment competency-based program</td>
<td>See SACSCOC Policy &quot;Direct Assessment Competency-Based Educational Programs&quot;</td>
<td>Yes - Screening Form</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Submit &quot;Screening Form&quot; with letter of notification. If Prospectus is required, Due dates: March 15 (for June review) September 1 (for December review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating a merger/consolidation with another institution</td>
<td>See SACSCOC Policy: &quot;Merger/Consolidation, Acquisition, Change of Ownership, and Change of Governance, Control, Form, or Legal Status - Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions Policy Statement&quot;</td>
<td>Yes: December 15 (for June review); June 1 (for December review)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cover Sheet Institutional Summary Form Prospectus (See Appendix in SACSCOC Policy: &quot;Merger/Consolidation, Acquisition, Change of Ownership, and Change of Governance, Control, Form, or Legal Status - Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions Policy Statement&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing governance, ownership, control, or legal status of an institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due dates: March 15 (for June review); September 1 (for December review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring an institution or location (including programs) of another institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding a permanent location at a site where the institution is conducting a teach-out for students from another institution that is closing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Change</td>
<td>Procedure or Policy</td>
<td>Prior Notification Required</td>
<td>Prior Approval Required</td>
<td>Documentation and Time Frame for Contacting SACSCOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating a certificate program at a new off-campus site at employer’s request and on short notice (previously approved program)</td>
<td>Procedure 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cover Sheet Modified prospectus Contact Commission Staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating a certificate program that is a significant departure from previously approved programs at employer’s request and on short notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding a site under a U.S. military contract for a previously approved program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altering significantly the length of a program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altering significantly the educational mission of the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing from clock hours to credit hours</td>
<td>Procedure 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Justify reasons for change, indicate calculation of equivalency, and other pertinent information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving an off-campus instructional site (serving the same geographic area)</td>
<td>Procedure 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Letter of notification with old address, new address, and implementation date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating dual or joint degrees with other SACSCOC accredited institution(s)</td>
<td>See SACSCOC Policy “Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards”</td>
<td>At least 6 months prior to implementation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Acceptance of notification, copy of signed agreement and contact information for each institution. See Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating programs or courses offered through contractual agreement or consortium</td>
<td>Procedure 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Letter of notification and copy of signed agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering into a contract with an entity not certified to participate in USDOE Title IV programs if the entity provides less than 25% of an educational program offered by the SACSCOC accredited institution</td>
<td>Procedure 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Change</td>
<td>Procedure or Policy</td>
<td>Prior Notification Required</td>
<td>Prior Approval Required</td>
<td>Documentation and Time Frame for Contacting SACSCOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating off-campus sites where student can obtain 25-49% of credits toward a program (including but not limited to Early College High School, dual enrollment programs offered at a high school, and certificate programs that are not at employer’s request and not on short notice)</td>
<td>Procedure 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Letter of notification including street address and implementation date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating distance learning by offering 25-49 of the first program for the first time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing a program, approved off-campus site, branch campus, or institution where the institution plans to teach out its own students</td>
<td>Procedure 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Description of teach-out plan included with letter of notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing a program, approved off-campus site, branch campus, or institution where the institution plans contracts with another institution(s) to teach-out students (Teach-out Agreement)</td>
<td>Procedure 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Description of teach-out plan, copy of signed teach-out agreement(s) detailing terms included with notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Change</td>
<td>Procedure or Policy</td>
<td>Prior Notification Required</td>
<td>Prior Approval Required</td>
<td>Documentation and Time Frame for Contacting SACSCOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating a certificate program at employer’s request and on short notice using existing approved courses and location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating certificate program (not at employer’s request and not on short notice) using existing approved courses and location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating off-campus sites (including Early College High School and dual enrollment programs offered at the high school) where student can obtain 24% or less of credits toward a program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding program offerings at previously approved off-campus sites by adding approved programs that ARE NOT significantly different from current programs at the site</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding program offerings at previously approved off-campus sites by adding approved programs that ARE significantly different from current programs at the site but NOT at the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating distance learning by offering 24% or less of any program for the first time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Required Committee Visits

The following six types of substantive changes require on-site committee reviews within six months after implementation. The President of SACSCOC also is authorized to appoint a Substantive Change Committee to review an institution for any change requiring a more in-depth evaluation beyond the prospectus submitted by the institution. In all cases, the ensuing Report of the Substantive Change Committee will be used by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees to determine the ongoing accreditation status of an institution.

1. The initiation of an additional off-campus site/location at which a student can earn at least 50% of the credit toward an educational program, if any of the following applies: (a) the institution has a total of three or fewer additional locations, or (b) the institution has not demonstrated, to the satisfaction of SACSCOC, that it has a proven record of effective educational oversight of additional locations, or (c) the institution has been placed on sanction by SACSCOC or is subject to some limitation on its accreditation, or (d) the institution has been accredited by SACSCOC for less than ten years.

SACSCOC will conduct visits to the first three off-campus locations initiated by an institution that offer 50% or more of the credit for at least one program.

When an institution initiates its fourth off-campus site/location where 50% or more of a program’s credits are offered, SACSCOC may, at its discretion, choose not to conduct visits to any of these additional sites at the times of their initiation if the institution has previously demonstrated a record of effective oversight of its off-campus educational locations and has not been placed on sanction. However, SACSCOC will require visits to a representative sample of sites at the fifth-year interval between scheduled reaffirmations if (1) the additional sites have been initiated since the last scheduled reaffirmation and (2) the sites have not been visited.

At any time, SACSCOC may choose to authorize visits to new sites developed between the fifth-year review and the next scheduled reaffirmation of accreditation.

At the time of reaffirmation, SACSCOC will conduct a thorough review of a representative sample of additional locations/sites where a student can obtain 50% or more of course work toward an educational program. The extent of the review will depend, in part, on whether there has been a recent review of the site(s).

2. The initiation of a branch campus. A branch campus is defined as a location of an institution that is geographically apart and independent of the main campus of the institution. A location is independent of the main campus if the location is:
   • permanent in nature
   • offers courses in educational programs leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential
   • has its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization and
   • has its own budgetary and hiring authority

If it is determined that a branch campus has sufficient autonomy, the institution may be directed to seek separate accreditation for the unit. (See SACSCOC policy “Separate Accreditation for Units of a Member Institution.”)

3. The initiation of a change in governance/ownership with a change in control. (See SACSCOC policy “Merger/Consolidation, Acquisition, Change of Ownership, and Change of Governance, Control, Form, or Legal Status – Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions Policy Statement”)

4. The initiation of mergers/consolidations. (See SACSCOC policy “Merger/Consolidation, Acquisition, Change of Ownership, and Change of Governance, Control, Form, or Legal Status – Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions Policy Statement”)

5. The initiation of coursework, credit certificates, or degree programs at a different level than currently approved by SACSCOC. (Depending on the existing related programs offered by an institution, a committee visit may not be required for institutions moving from Levels III to IV or from Levels V to VI. See level classifications on page 14 of this document.)
6. The initiation of a direct assessment competency-based education program (at least 50% direct assessment)

**Policy Statements Regarding Substantive Change**

1. The *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement* applies to all programs and services of SACSCOC-accredited institutions wherever they are located or however they are delivered. Failure to comply with the *Principles* or with procedures referred to in this policy could result in the institution being placed on sanction or being removed from membership.

2. Denial of approval of substantive change is not appealable. An institution that fails to gain approval of the substantive change may resubmit a revised prospectus or application following the guidelines and time frames described in the Table on pages 6-10 of this document.

3. An accredited institution in the appeals process or in litigation with SACSCOC is not eligible for consideration of substantive change.

4. The SACSCOC substantive change policy applies only to SACSCOC-accredited institutions. Applicant and candidate institutions may not initiate substantive change.

5. Procedures One, Two, and Three may not address all substantive changes that SACSCOC will review in the interim between an institution's reaffirmation cycles. Therefore, the SACSCOC reserves the right to classify significant changes other than those described above as substantive in nature and to follow up accordingly. The follow-up procedure may include a committee visit.

6. An institution may withdraw its prospectus/application or may discontinue substantive change at any time during the review process by submitting a formal letter of withdrawal to the President of SACSCOC.

7. Once an institution submits its prospectus or application and the document is reviewed by either the Committee on Compliance and Reports or by SACSCOC staff, any information included therein that indicates possible non-compliance with any of the *Principles of Accreditation* may lead SACSCOC to further review the institution, even if the prospectus is withdrawn or approval of the change is denied.

8. SACSCOC staff review all substantive changes requiring notification prior to implementation and conduct a preliminary review of all changes requiring approval. All substantive changes described in Procedure One require approval. If there is a favorable staff review, the staff makes recommendations to the SACSCOC Executive Council for action between dates of SACCOC Board of Trustee meetings. SACSCOC staff may also refer a case to the full Board of Trustees for review at the June or December Board meeting. The following cases require review by the full Board in June or December:

   - a proposed substantive change requiring prior approval submitted by an institution currently on sanction. Proposals to close a program or an off-site instructional site by an institution on sanction will be reviewed and, if appropriate, approved by Commission staff.

   - a proposed substantive change submitted by an institution recently removed from sanction with particular attention to those involving non-compliance with Standards 13.1 (Financial resources), 13.2 (Financial documents), or 13.3 (Financial responsibility)

   - a proposed substantive change submitted by an institution currently on reimbursement for Title IV federal funding

   - the prospectus of an institution planning a merger/consolidation, change of legal status, governance, ownership or form of control. (See SACSCOC Policy "Merger/Consolidation, Acquisition, Change of Ownership, and Change of Governance, Control, Form, or Legal Status – Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions Policy Statement")

   - the prospectus for approval of a direct assessment competency-based educational program (50% or more of a program) (See SACSCOC Policy “Direct Assessment Competency-Based Educational Programs.”)
9. If an institution fails to report or to gain approval of a substantive change prior to its implementation and the nature of that change is not described in the list in item 8 above or those listed under Procedure One, the substantive change will be reviewed and, if possible, acted upon by staff. The issue of late submission, however, will be referred to the SACSCOC Board of Trustees for action. If an institution fails to report or to gain approval of a substantive change prior to its implementation and the proposed change is among those included in the list in item 8 above or those listed under Procedure One, both the prospectus/application and the issue of late submission will be referred to the SACSCOC Board of Trustees for action.

10. All final decisions regarding the accreditation status of an institution are made by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees. Denial of substantive change and the imposition of sanctions are not appealable actions.

11. Substantive changes of the types described in Procedures One and Two normally will not affect an institution’s cycle of reaffirmation of accreditation.

12. Following the approval of a degree level change by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees, an institution may not initiate additional programs at the new degree level until after the Board takes positive action on its continued accreditation following the Substantive Change Committee visit authorized at the time of approval.

13. The date of the letter of approval of a substantive change is considered the date on which the change is included as part of the institution’s accreditation.

14. Substantive changes must be implemented within two years of approval. If an institution does not implement within two years of the SACSCOC Board of Trustees approval date, then a new prospectus or application must be submitted and approved by the Board prior to implementation.

15. Extensive substantive changes by an institution may accelerate the date for the institution’s next reaffirmation. Examples of triggers for an accelerated reaffirmation include the following changes: proliferation of branches or off-campus sites, frequent mergers or consolidations with other institutions, significant increases in enrollments, or rapid proliferation of new educational programs.

16. If an institution fails to follow SACSCOC substantive change policy and procedures, it may lose its Title IV funding or be required by the U.S. Department of Education to reimburse it for money received by the institution for programs related to the unreported substantive change. In addition, the institution’s case may be referred to SACSCOC Board of Trustees for the imposition of a sanction or for removal from membership. (See also Appendix A regarding standards and policies addressing unreported substantive change.)

17. If an institution has educational programs and off-campus instructional sites that are inactive but not closed, the following applies:

- If an institution does not enroll students in an educational program for five years, then after five years of no students enrolled and no major course offered for the educational program (if that educational program is a significant departure from other educational programs currently offered by the institution), the institution must submit a prospectus to reinstate the educational program prior to admitting students into and offering major courses for the educational program.

- If an institution does not offer courses or programs at an approved off-campus instructional site for five years, then, after five years of no students enrolled and no courses offered at the off-campus instructional site, the institution must submit a prospectus for approval of the off-campus instructional site to reinstate any educational program at the off-campus instructional site whereby a student can obtain 50 percent or more credits toward any educational program offered by the institution.

The Commission will use information collected on the institution’s completed “Institutional Summary Form Prepared for Commission Review,” submitted as part of the fifth and decennial year reviews, as the mechanism for reporting the above educational programs and instructional sites that are deemed by the institution to be inactive but not closed.

Fees and Expenses
1. The following fees will be assessed to institutions for the review of an application or prospectus:

$500 For an institution seeking review of a substantive change prospectus or application for level change

An institution may submit a single prospectus covering up to 10 off-campus sites that offer dual enrollment programs as long as the program offerings are identical. The assessment for the prospectus will be the same $500 as for a prospectus for a single site. Additional sites would need to be submitted individually unless the program offerings at the additional sites are identical (again, up to 10 sites).

$500 Per SACSCOC member institution for a substantive change involving multiple institutions (e.g., merger/consolidation, acquisition, change of ownership, or collaborative program)

$7,500 Per non-SACSCOC member institution for a substantive change involving multiple institutions (e.g., merger/consolidation, acquisition, change of ownership, or collaborative program). The SACSCOC accredited institution(s) are responsible for ensuring payment.

2. Fees related to Substantive Change Committee visits

In addition to the fee assessed for reviewing the substantive change prospectus, the following total cost will be assessed to an institution hosting a Substantive Change Committee visit:

The actual cost of the committee
(Includes travel, lodging, food, Incidental Fee for each reviewer, and related expenses), and

$2,000 administrative fee

---
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PROCEDURE ONE
The Review of Substantive Changes Requiring Approval Prior to Implementation

Changes Requiring Approval

Substantive changes requiring submission of an application or a prospectus, and approval by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees prior to implementation by the institution are as follows:

1. **Initiating coursework, certificates, or programs of study at a different level than those previously approved by SACSCOC.** Institutions may not offer individual credit courses or programs at a degree level that has not been approved by SACSCOC. Examples of level changes requiring approval include: an associate degree-granting college initiating bachelor's degrees or a four-year institution initiating degrees at the master's level; a graduate-level-only institution initiating degrees at the undergraduate level, a baccalaureate degree-granting institution initiating occupational and technical degrees at the associate degree level. An institution requesting a level change should complete an “Application for Members Seeking Accreditation at a Higher or Lower Degree Level.”

   **Note: Repackaging of an existing approved curriculum** to create a new degree level, such as an institution that offers a full 120-hour baccalaureate program creating an associate degree from its lower-division offerings, usually requires only advance notification, not approval.

SACSCOC classifies institutions according to the highest degree level offered by an institution. Those classifications are as follows:

- **Level I** Offers the associate degree as the highest degree
- **Level II** Offers the baccalaureate degree as the highest degree
- **Level III** Offers the master’s degree as the highest degree
- **Level IV** Offers the master’s and specialist degree as the highest degrees
- **Level V** Offers three or fewer doctorate degrees as highest degrees
- **Level VI** Offers four or more doctorate degrees

An institution adding a fourth doctorate degree, causing it to be reclassified from Level V to Level VI, is required to request the level change in writing in order for SACSCOC to reclassify the institution within its database.

Applications for a change from Level III to Level IV and Level V to Level VI will be reviewed and, if possible, approved by staff.

2. **Initiating certificate programs for workforce development.** These are typically offered at the request of an employer, either on campus or at the workplace. Offering previously approved certificate programs at an unapproved off-campus site requires approval of the site prior to implementation. Similarly, offering a certificate program that is a significant departure from existing approved certificate programs, either on or off campus, requires approval of the program prior to implementation. SACSCOC will accept a modified prospectus consisting of the name of the certificate, date of implementation, the complete physical address of the off-campus site (if applicable), a faculty roster, a discipline-specific description of library/learning resources, a description of physical facilities, and descriptions of courses to be offered at the site.

3. **Initiating other certificate programs.** Certificate programs consisting of courses drawn from the existing approved curriculum for a degree or diploma program do not require separate approval; they are considered to be included in the institution’s current accreditation. However, to offer such a certificate at a new site requires approval of the site. A certificate that is a significant departure from previously approved programs must be approved in advance—the same as any other new educational program.
4. **Initiating an off-campus (additional) site (site-based/classroom group instruction) at which students can earn at least 50% of the credits toward an educational program.** Locations at which instruction is offered by distance delivery, but students must be present on-site to access such instruction, are considered off-campus instructional sites and must be approved in advance.

Approval of an off-campus site is effective for a maximum of five years and will be reviewed again in the context of the fifth-year or decennial review.

For an institution replicating an approved educational program that is already offered at three or more approved sites, a modified prospectus consisting of a faculty roster, descriptions of the courses to be offered at the site, a description of discipline-specific library resources, a description of student support services, and a description of physical resources will suffice in lieu of responding to the requirements of a full prospectus.

5. **Adding a site for a previously approved program under a U.S. military contract.** Institutions that enter into contracts with the U.S. military to offer programs at off-campus instruction sites must obtain approval for the curricula and delivery systems prior to entering into the contract if the programs and delivery systems are not already approved. Thereafter, SACSCOC will accept a modified prospectus that includes the date of the program start, the physical location of the site (including street address), a listing of the approved programs that will be offered at the site, a brief description of academic (library/learning resources, etc.) and student support services available at the site, and a faculty roster identifying qualified instructors for courses offered through at least the first full term at the site.

6. **Initiating degree completion programs.** Degree completion programs usually include a compressed format with classes offered evenings or weekends to accommodate working adults, a requirement to transfer in some amount of previous college credit, and may include offering credit for career or life experience. The prospectus should include a discussion of how the degree completion program differs from the same program offered in traditional form, and how the institution will ensure that student learning outcomes are the same for both offerings. An example of such a change is adult or accelerated programs in management or organizational leadership.

7. **Initiating a branch campus.** A branch campus is defined as a location of an institution that is geographically apart and independent of the main campus of the institution. A location is independent of the main campus if the location is (1) permanent in nature, (2) offers courses in educational programs leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential, (3) has its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization, and (4) has its own budgetary and hiring authority. The prospectus for a proposed branch campus must include a business plan for the branch campus that describes:
   - The educational program(s) to be offered at the branch campus;
   - The projected revenues and expenditures and cash flow at the branch campus; and
   - The operation, management, and physical resources at the branch campus.

8. **Initiating distance learning or correspondence courses and programs by which students can earn at least 50% of a program’s credits through delivery in a format other than face-to-face.** Institutions must demonstrate that a student who registers for a distance or correspondence course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives academic credit. Means of verification might include a secure login and pass code, proctored examinations, or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identification. Processes used to verify student identity must also protect student privacy. Please see also the SACSCOC policy “Distance and Correspondence Education.”

9. **Expanding at the institution's current degree level** (significant departure from current programs). What constitutes a "significant departure" from existing programs depends on what related programs are currently in place at a given institution. Refer to the Glossary of Terms for more specificity. Examples include the following: developing a new general education program, adding a master's degree in nursing when the institution is accredited at Level III but currently offers only a master's degree in education; an institution accredited at Level II (bachelor's degrees), offering only a bachelor's degree with a major in religion, adding three new bachelor's degrees with majors in biology, business administration, and computer science.

10. **Initiating a significant change in the established mission of the institution.** Significant changes in mission are those that lead to a fundamental shift in the nature of the institution. Examples include the following: the transformation of a technical college into a comprehensive community college, the initiation by a seminary of significant liberal arts offerings, the addition by a medical college of general education offerings, the initiation of an
engineering school at a liberal arts institution. Editorial changes in the language of a mission statement are not substantive and need not be reported. See Commission staff regarding the prospectus. The change in mission may dictate a mix of required documentation.

11. **Changing from clock hours to credit hours.** The prospectus must include a clear explanation of the formula used to calculate equivalency of credit awarded. Please see also the SACSCOC policy “Credit Hours.”

12. **Changing significantly the length of a program, substantially increasing or decreasing the number of clock or credit hours awarded for successful completion of a program.** Significant changes in program length are those with noticeable impact on the program’s completion time. Examples include the following: expanding a certificate program from 250 contact hours to 450 contact hours; increasing a baccalaureate degree from 124 hours to 150 hours.

13. **Relocating a main or branch campus.** The prospectus should demonstrate that the new facilities maintain the institution’s compliance with Standards 13.7 (Physical resources) and 13.8 (Institutional environment).

14. **Initiating a collaborative academic program with another institution not accredited by SACSCOC.** The prospectus should demonstrate compliance with the SACSCOC policy “Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards.” Examples include joint degree or dual degree programs.

15. **Entering into a contract with an entity not certified to participate in USD OE Title IV programs.** This applies if the entity provides 25% or more of an educational program offered by the accredited institution. The prospectus must include a copy of the signed agreement.

**The Procedure for Approval**

**Time of Notification**

An institution undergoing substantive change requiring prior approval must provide written notification of the change to the President of SACSCOC in accord with the designated times outlined in the table on pages 6-9 of this document. In some cases, prior notification is not required.

*If an institution is unclear as to whether a change is substantive in nature, it should contact SACSCOC staff for consultation.*

**Submission of a Prospectus or an Application**

**Prospectus:** Prospectuses may be submitted in print form or on flash drive, CD or DVD (submit one copy). Once the prospectus has been submitted, the institution may advertise and recruit students to a new program or site as long as all materials clearly state that the program or site is pending approval by SACSCOC. Prospectuses will not be accepted via email. In addition, all transmittals must include the required cover sheet and state the planned date of implementation. There is a different prospectus for changes governed by these policies:

- "Mergers, Consolidations, Change of Ownership, Acquisitions, and Change of Governance, Control, Form, or Legal Status"
- "Direct Assessment Competency-Based Educational Programs"

**Application for Member Institutions Seeking Accreditation at a Higher or Lower Degree Level:** The application for change of degree level must be submitted by **March 15** for consideration at the June meeting of the SACSCOC Board of Trustees, or by **September 1** for consideration at the December meeting of the SACSCOC Board of Trustees to allow ample time for review and approval. Four copies of the completed application should be submitted to the President of SACSCOC as a print document or on flash drive, CD or DVD. Applications must include the required cover sheet and must include the planned date of implementation.

**Staff Options**

Upon receipt of a substantive change prospectus, a SACSCOC staff member will review the prospectus and any supporting material submitted by the institution and will recommend to the SACSCOC Board of Trustees one of the actions listed below:
1. approve the substantive change or

2. refer the substantive change to the SACSCOC Committee on Compliance and Reports for review and a final recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

**Options of the Committees on Compliance and Reports**

**Following Review of the Prospectus or of the Application**

**Prospectus:** The Committee will review the prospectus and any additional material submitted, and will recommend one of the following actions:

1. accept the prospectus and recommend approval of the program, with or without a site visit. A site visit is required within six months after the initiation of the following approved substantive changes:
   (a) consolidation/merger; a change of ownership resulting in a change of control; change of governance, ownership, legal status
   (b) a branch campus
   (c) an off-campus site at which a student can earn at least 50% of the credit toward an educational program, if any of the following applies: the institution
      • has a total of three or fewer additional locations at which 50% or more of a programs credits are offered, or
      • has not demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the SACSCOC Board of Trustees, that it has a proven record of effective educational oversight of additional locations, or
      • has been placed on sanction by SACSCOC or is subject to some limitation on its accreditation

2. defer action and seek additional information

3. recommend denial of approval of the substantive change and continue the institution's accreditation. The reason for denial of approval may have been caused by an institution’s current non-compliance with a standard or requirement. Consequently, denial may be accompanied by monitoring or imposition of a sanction.

**Application for Member Institutions Seeking Accreditation at a Higher or Lower Degree Level:**

An application for offering programs at a level different from that for which the institution is approved is automatically referred to the Committees on Compliance and Reports, except for a change in degree levels from III to IV and from V to VI which are reviewed by staff. The Committee will review the application and any additional material submitted, and will recommend one of the following actions:

1. accept the application and approve the program, with a site visit within six months after initiation of the substantive change

2. defer action and seek additional information

3. deny approval of the substantive change and continue the institution's accreditation. The reason for denial of approval may have been caused by an institution’s current non-compliance with a standard or requirement. Consequently, denial may be accompanied by monitoring or imposition of a sanction.

**Preparation for a Substantive Change Committee Visit**

When a Substantive Change Committee is authorized, it is charged with determining the institution’s continued compliance with the *Principles of Accreditation* following the initiation of the change. The visit will occur within six months after initiation of the change. In preparation for this visit, the institution will complete the appropriate substantive change documentation template which cites relevant Standards and the roster of faculty members who will be teaching in the program or at the site. Both the template and the Faculty Roster form are available on the SACSCOC Web site (*www.sacscoc.org*) under “Substantive Changes”. The institution’s SACSCOC staff representative will inform the institution of the composition and schedule for the Committee.

**Options of the Committees on Compliance and Reports**
Following Review by a Substantive Change Committee

The report of the Substantive Change Committee, together with the response of the institution to the recommendations contained in that report (due within five months of the Committee visit), will be reviewed by the Committee on Compliance and Reports. The Committee on Compliance and Reports may recommend one of the following actions:

1. continue the institution in accreditation, with or without a monitoring report

2. continue the institution in accreditation, impose a sanction, and request a monitoring report, with/without a special committee visit (mandatory visit if placed on Probation)

3. discontinue accreditation
PROCEDURE TWO

The Review of Substantive Changes
Requiring Only Notification Prior to Implementation

Changes Requiring Notification Only

Substantive changes requiring an institution to notify the President of SACSCOC prior to implementation by the institution are as follows:

1. For site-based/classroom group instruction (where the instructor is present)
   a. Initiating an off-campus site at which a student may earn at least 25% but less than 50% of credits toward a program. The letter of notification must include the starting date and complete physical address of the new site.
   b. Moving an approved off-campus instructional site within the same geographic area to serve essentially the same pool of students. The letter of notification must include the complete physical address of the old site, the complete physical address of the new site, and the starting date of the new site.

2. For distance learning/technology-based group or individual instruction (where the instructor and student are geographically separated), offering for the first time credit courses via distance learning/technology-based instruction by which students can obtain at least 25% but less than 50% of their credits toward an educational program.

3. Initiating program/courses delivered through contractual agreement or a consortium. This provision does not apply to articulation agreements with other institutions, clinical agreements, or internship agreements. The notification must include (1) a letter with the starting date of the agreement and the names of the institutions and programs involved and (2) a copy of the signed agreement.

4. Entering into a contract with an entity not certified to participate in USDOE Title IV programs if the entity provides less than 25% of an educational program offered by the accredited institution. A copy of the signed agreement must be provided.

5. Repackaging of an existing approved curriculum to create a new degree level, such as an institution that offers a full 120-hour baccalaureate program creating an associate degree from its lower-division offerings, usually requires only advance notification, not approval

Review Procedure

Time of Notification

An institution undergoing substantive change must provide written notification of the change to the President of SACSCOC prior to implementation. The letter must include the date of implementation of the proposed change, and for an off-campus site, the complete physical address of the location. If an institution is unclear as to whether a change is substantive in nature, it should contact SACSCOC staff for consultation.

Staff Options

Upon receipt and review of the substantive change notification, SACSCOC staff will recommend one of the following options to the President of SACSCOC:

1. acknowledge receipt of the notification and indicate that the change will be included in the scope of the institution’s accreditation

2. acknowledge receipt of the notification and request additional information
Upon receipt and review of additional information, if requested, SACSCOC staff may recommend one of the following options to the SACSCOC President:

1. acknowledge receipt of the additional information and include the change in the scope of the institution’s accreditation,

2. refer the substantive change to the Board of Trustees of SACSCOC for review,

3. authorize a substantive change visit,

4. take other action as may be appropriate.
PROCEDURE THREE

Closing a Program, Instructional Site, Branch Campus or an Institution:
Teach-Out Plans and Teach-Out Agreements

In accordance with Federal regulations, an institution is required to submit a teach-out plan to SACSCOC for approval if any of the following occurs:

1. The USDOE notifies the Commission that it has initiated an emergency action against an institution or an action to limit, suspend, or terminate an institution participating in any Title IV, HEA program.

2. The Commission terminates accreditation or candidacy.

3. The institution notifies the Commission that it intends to cease operations entirely or close a location that provides at least 50% of at least one program.

4. A State Licensing or authorizing agency notifies the Commission that an institution’s license or legal authorization to provide an educational program has been or will be revoked.

If an institution decides to close an educational program, approved instructional site, branch campus, or the entire institution, it must submit to SACSCOC a teach-out plan for approval. If the plan includes teach-out agreements, then the agreements must also be approved prior to implementation.

Teach-out plans and teach-out agreements must be approved by SACSCOC prior to implementation. See also the SACSCOC Good Practices document “Closing a Program, Site, Branch or Institution”

Teach-out Plans

A teach-out plan is a written plan developed by an institution that provides for the equitable treatment of students if an institution, or an institutional location that provides fifty percent or more of at least one program, ceases to operate before all students have completed their program of study, and may include, if required by the institution's accrediting agency, a teach-out agreement between institutions. Teach-out plans must be approved by SACSCOC in advance of implementation.

To be approved, a teach-out plan must include the following information:

1. Date of closure (date when new students will no longer be admitted)

2. An explanation of how affected parties (students, faculty, staff) will be informed of the impending closure

3. An explanation of how all affected students will be helped to complete their programs of study with minimal disruption

4. An indication as to whether the teach-out plan will incur additional charges/expenses to the students and, if so, how the students will be notified

5. Copies of signed teach-out agreements with other institutions, if any

6. How faculty and staff will be redeployed or helped to find new employment

7. If closing an institution, arrangement for the storing of student records, disposition of final financial resources and other assets

Following review and approval of a teach-out plan that includes a program that is accredited by another accrediting agency, the Commission will notify that accreditor of its approval.


**Teach-out Agreements**

A teach-out agreement is a written agreement between institutions that provides for the equitable treatment of students and a reasonable opportunity for students to complete their program of study if an institution, or an institutional location that provides fifty percent or more of at least one program offered, ceases to operate before all enrolled students have completed their program of study. Such a teach-out agreement requires SACSCOC approval in advance of implementation.

For approval by SACSCOC, the agreement must be between institutions that are accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency, be consistent with applicable standards in the *Principles of Accreditation* and with SACSCOC policies, and provide for the equitable treatment of students by ensuring that:

1. the teach-out institution has the necessary experience, resources, and support services to provide an educational program that is of acceptable quality and reasonably similar in content, structure, and scheduling to that provided by the closed institution; and

2. the teach-out institution demonstrates that it can provide students access to the program(s) and services without requiring them to move or travel substantial distances.

Please see the SACSCOC Good Practices document “Closing a Program, Site, Branch or Institution” for additional discussion of issues regarding closing of programs, sites, branch campuses or institutions.

**Closing an institution without an agreement**

If an institution accredited by SACSCOC closes and is no longer accredited, SACSCOC will seek assistance from the United States Department of Education and appropriate state agencies to help its students find reasonable opportunities to complete their education without additional expense.

**Approval Process**

**Time of Notification**

As soon as the decision to close is made, the institution should provide to SACSCOC at the same time the following two pieces of information: (1) notification of the intended closing of a program, site, branch campus, or institution and (2) a teach-out plan for approval (including any teach-out agreements with other institutions).

**Staff Options**

Upon receipt and review of the notification of impending closure, SACSCOC staff will recommend that the President of SACSCOC acknowledge receipt of the notification and request the teach-out plan if was not included with the notification. Upon receipt and review of the teach-out plan, SACSCOC staff may recommend one of the following options to the SACSCOC President:

1. request additional information for the teach-out plan
2. approve the teach-out plan
Appendix A:
Current Standards and Policy Statements Addressing
Unreported Substantive Change


The institution has a policy and procedure to ensure that all substantive changes are reported in accordance with SACSCOC policy.

2. “Reaffirmation of Accreditation and Subsequent Reports” – Policy Statement

If an institution fails to report a substantive change that requires prior approval or prior notification, the committee will take the following actions:

a) If discovered during the off-site review. The Off-Site Review Committee will mark Standard 14.2 out of compliance. The institution will be able to address the omission in its Focused Report and before the on-site review.

b) If discovered during the on-site review. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee will mark Standard 14.2 out of compliance and write a recommendation. The institution will address the recommendation in its response to the Commission.

3. Policy Statement on Unreported Substantive Change

Unreported substantive changes requiring prior notification or prior approval come to the attention of the Commission through two means: (1) information discovered by the institution or by the Commission between periods of formal review by the Commission and (2) information discovered during an off-site or an on-site review by the Commission. The procedure for handling such unreported substantive changes is as follows:

a) Upon discovery, the institution formally notifies the SACSCOC President of the unreported substantive change. The letter of notification must include the date of the original implementation of the change. A completed prospectus or application should accompany the letter for cases outlined in Procedure One of this document.

b) Commission staff will review the substantive change prospectus, if required; and any additional information that may have been requested. Following analysis, Commission staff will recommend to the SACSCOC Board of Trustees one of the following actions:

1. approve the program, with or without a site visit;
2. refer the prospectus to the Committee on Compliance and Reports for review at its next meeting (June or December); or
3. acknowledge receipt of the notification and indicate that the change will be included in the scope of the institution’s accreditation (an option only if prior notification is required).

c) The issue of failure to comply with Standard 14.2 of the *Principles of Accreditation* (Substantive change) will be forwarded automatically to the Commission’s Board of Trustees for action at its next meeting, if the change required prior approval. If the change required prior notification only, the issue of failure to report will be addressed in correspondence from the SACSCOC President.

d) If the unreported substantive change requiring prior notification or prior approval is discovered during the institution’s off-site or on-site review for reaffirmation, SACSCOC will follow its policy as described on page 1 of “Reaffirmation of Accreditation and Subsequent Reports”. If it is discovered during review by another type of SACSCOC committee, the review committee will write a recommendation. The recommendation will ask the institution to report the change in writing to SACSCOC and to provide in its response to the Committee Report a statement describing internal procedures established that would ensure
future substantive change reporting and evidence that the procedures have been implemented. The institution's response will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees of SACSCOC for action on failure to report a substantive change.

Failure to Comply with Reporting Requirements

If an institution fails to follow SACSCOC substantive change policy and procedures, it may lose its Title IV funding or be required by the U.S. Department of Education to reimburse it for money received by the institution for programs related to the unreported substantive change. In addition, the institution's case may be referred to SACSCOC Board of Trustees for the imposition of a sanction or for removal from membership.
Appendix B:
The Substantive Change Prospectus

Use this information to determine the content and process for submitting a prospectus for a “Procedure One” substantive change requiring approval prior to implementation.

The Prospectus must be accompanied with a completed Cover Sheet.

Do not use this information for
- mergers, consolidations, change of ownership, acquisitions, and change of governance, control, form, or legal status (http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/Mergers.pdf),
- direct assessment competency-based educational programs (http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/DirectAssessmentCompetencyBased.pdf), or
- level changes (http://www.sacscoc.org/subchs/policy/ApplicationLevelChange.docx).

Before developing a prospectus, please review all of the information below concerning the content of the prospectus and how to submit the prospectus. When developing a prospectus, respond to all of the applicable requests for information.

Please remember that the prospectus should address the specific substantive change for which you are requesting approval. For example, if you are seeking approval for an off-campus site where adult, employed students will be enrolled in a graduate degree program, address specifically only the student support services that those students will need and describe how the support will be provided. Do not describe student support services that those students will not need such as athletic programs, dormitories, cafeterias, and other on-campus services that they cannot access.

How to Submit the Prospectus

- Each submission must include the following in the order listed:
  1. Transmittal letter signed by an institutional representative which briefly explains the submission
  3. Name, telephone number, and email address of the person who may be contacted concerning questions about the prospectus.
  4. A list of degrees and majors which the institution is authorized to grant (photocopy from the catalog is acceptable)
  5. A list of existing approved off-campus sites and their addresses. Note: an approved site is one for which a prospectus has been submitted and which SACSCOC has approved to offer 50% or more of a program. A site where 25-49% of a program is offered is not considered to be an “approved” site; it is a site for which only notification has been accepted by SACSCOC.
  6. Prospectus (should be no longer than 25 pages plus appendices)

- Submit only one copy of the above materials to the President of SACSCOC at the address listed on the Cover Sheet.

- Submit the Transmittal Letter and Cover Sheet in hard copy (paper).

- Submit the body of the prospectus itself in hard copy (paper), flash drive, CD or DVD.

Documents will not be accepted via e-mail.

Special Note: SACSCOC will accept documentation submitted for approval to a system office or to a state coordinating or governing board, provided such documentation includes all the information required in a prospectus.
as listed below. **However,** the submission must include the completed Cover Sheet and Transmittal Letter and **must contain an index** correlating the documentation submitted to another entity with the corresponding information required in a prospectus.

Submissions lacking a clear, easily used index will not be accepted and will be returned to the institution without review. Faculty qualifications must be documented using the Faculty Roster Form, utilizing the Faculty Roster instructions. Curriculum vitae submitted in lieu of a faculty roster will not be accepted and will result in the submission being returned to the institution without review.

**Please note** that SACSCOC reserves the right to make amendments to the requirements outlined below for certain types of changes.

### Required Components of the Prospectus

1. **ABSTRACT** (limit to one page or less)
   - Describe the proposed change with its date of implementation.
   - If a new program, identify where it will be offered.
   - If a new off-campus site or branch, list its complete physical address.
   - Provide projected number of students, if applicable.
   - Indicate the projected life of the program or site, if applicable (single cohort or ongoing).
   - Describe the primary target audience.
   - Describe the instructional delivery methods to be used.
   - Describe strengths of the institution to undertake this change.

2. **DETERMINATION OF NEED FOR THE CHANGE/RELATIONSHIP TO MISSION/PLANNING AND APPROVALS FOR THE CHANGE**
   - Describe how the change is consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.
   - Describe the rationale and need for the program to include how the institution determined need.
   - Provide evidence of legal authority for the change if approval is required by the governing board or the state.
   - Provide documentation that faculty and appropriate other groups were involved in planning for and approval(s) of the change.

3. **REQUIRED INFORMATION FOR THE SPECIFIC SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE**
   (SELECT THE CHANGE RELEVANT TO THE PROSPECTUS AND PROVIDE ALL INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR THAT PARTICULAR CHANGE)

   **For a NEW PROGRAM provide the following information:**
   - Provide the curriculum for the program and a projected schedule of course offerings.
   - Provide specific programmatic goals (objectives) and specific student learning outcomes for the program.
   - Describe how the student learning outcomes for the program will be assessed.
   - Provide course descriptions for all courses in the proposed program.
   - Describe admissions and graduation requirements for the program.
   - Demonstrate compliance with Standard 10.7 (Policies for awarding credit) of the Principles of Accreditation.
   - Describe administrative oversight to ensure the quality of the program.
   - For a program offered in compressed time frames, describe the methodology for determining that levels of knowledge and competencies comparable to those required in traditional formats have been achieved.
• Follow instructions in item 4 below for providing information concerning number and qualifications of faculty scheduled to teach in the program.

For a **NEW OFF-CAMPUS SITE OR BRANCH CAMPUS** provide the following information:

• Identify whether the site is a branch campus or an instructional site. The definitions of “branch campus” and “instructional site” may be found on pages 5-6 of the *Principles of Accreditation*. See also Procedure One in the policy entitled “Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions”. Note: An institution is required to present itself and its sites to SACSCOC in the exact way it presents itself to the U.S. Department of Education.

• Describe the educational program(s) to be offered at the site or branch. If a program to be offered at the site or branch is a new program requiring approval, also respond to the requirements for a new program listed above.

• Describe any differences in admission, curriculum, or graduation requirements for students enrolled at the new site or branch or any special arrangements for grading, transcripts, or transfer policies.

• Describe how programs at the new site or branch will be monitored and evaluated and how they will be incorporated into the institutional evaluation and assessment processes.

• Describe the administrative structure for overseeing the site or branch campus.

• Describe how services and operations at the new site or branch will be evaluated.

• Follow instructions in item 4 below for providing information concerning number and qualifications of faculty scheduled to teach at the site or branch campus.

For the **OFFERING OF PROGRAM(S) VIA DISTANCE METHODOLOGY (ELECTRONIC OR CORRESPONDENCE) DELIVERY FOR THE FIRST TIME** provide the following information:

• Describe the infrastructure to support distance delivery methods to include the learning management system and administrative structure for electronic delivery.

• Describe how faculty members will be trained in distance delivery methodology and how courses will be developed.

• Describe technical support for students enrolled in courses delivered by distance methods and technical support for faculty members.

• Describe how effectiveness of programs offered via distance delivery will be assessed.

• Document compliance with Standard 10.6 (Distance and correspondence education).

• Follow instructions in item 4 below for providing information concerning number and qualifications of faculty scheduled to teach courses provided by distance methodology.

• Describe processes in place to ensure that students have structured access to faculty members.

For the **INITIATION OF DEGREE COMPLETION PROGRAMS** provide the following information:

• Describe the degree completion program to include a description of how the degree completion program differs from the same program offered in traditional format.

• Describe how the institution ensures that student learning outcomes are the same for the program offered as a degree completion program as those for the program offered in traditional format.

• Describe assessment methods for determining achievement of student learning outcomes for the degree completion program.

• Describe admission requirements for students entering the degree completion program.

• Describe the format for offering the degree completion program (for example, compressed format, accelerated format, etc.).

• Follow instructions in item 4 below for providing information concerning number and qualifications of faculty members scheduled to teach in the degree completion program.

4. **FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS**

• Complete the [Faculty Roster Form](#) for faculty members scheduled to teach in the new program, in a degree completion program, at a new site or branch campus, or in programs to be offered by distance
methodology for the first time. Follow directions for completing the form which requires that the institution present the qualifications of each faculty member to teach the courses assigned to them. The form and instructions may be accessed at www.sacsoc.org under Institutional Resources or from a link on the Substantive Change page.

- For a new program, the institution must demonstrate that it has at least one qualified faculty member to develop and/or teach discipline courses in the new program. Refer to Standard 6.2.a in the Principles concerning the determination of appropriate qualifications.
- Provide narrative with supporting evidence that the number of full-time faculty members will be adequate to support the initiative and describe the impact on faculty workload of the new program, new site, or distance delivery.
- Document scholarship and research capability of faculty members teaching in graduate programs and document faculty experience in directing student research.

5. LIBRARY AND LEARNING RESOURCES

- List and describe discipline-specific learning resources to support a new program. Please do not list all resources located in the library if they do not relate to the specific change.
- Document discipline-specific refereed journals and primary source materials.
- If the institution is reliant on agreements with other libraries, provide a signed copy of each formal agreement and describe how the collections support the program(s).
- Describe specifically how students enrolled in a new program and/or enrolled in a program at an off-campus location and/or enrolled in a distance education program access these discipline-specific learning resources.
- Describe how students and faculty members will access information electronically.
- Describe how faculty and students are instructed in the use of online resources as well as on-site library resources.
- Describe resources to support students in access to and use of learning resources.

Note: If electronic databases are listed, describe the discipline-specific suites of resources and not just the name of the database or the consortium through which it is accessed (such as Viva, TexShare, Galileo, Louis, etc.).

6. STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

- Describe specific programs, services, and activities which will support students enrolled in the new program and/or enrolled at a new off-campus site and/or enrolled in distance education programs. Do not list student support services which are not relevant to the specific change.

7. PHYSICAL RESOURCES

- Describe the adequacy of physical facilities which will support the change.
- Describe equipment which will be available for a new program or available at a new site.
- Describe the impact that the proposed change will have on physical facilities and equipment for existing programs and services.

8. FINANCIAL SUPPORT

- Provide a business plan that includes all of the following (NOTE: This applies to ALL submissions

(a) a description of financial resources available to support the proposed change, including a budget for the first year of the proposed change (a three-year budget is required for a new branch campus). Do not send a copy of the entire institutional budget.
(b) projected revenues and expenditures and cash flow for the proposed change
(c) the amount of resources going to institutions or organizations for contractual or support services for the proposed change
(d) the operational, management, and physical resources available for the change.

• Provide contingency plans in the event that required resources do not materialize.

The institution must disclose if it is currently on reimbursement for Title IV funding.

Institutions currently on sanction with SACSCOC for financial reasons must provide a copy of the audit for the most recently completed fiscal year.

9. DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT PROCESSES FOR THE CHANGE

• Provide a brief description of institutional assessment processes.
• Describe how the institution will incorporate the change (program, site, distance education or other change) into the institution-wide review and assessment processes.

10. APPENDICES

• Appendices may be used in hard copy (print) submissions to provide documentation supporting the narrative in the prospectus.

• NOTE: In hard copy submission tabs must be provided identifying each appendix (by name or number) referenced in the narrative.

• Links may be provided in electronic submissions to link to documentation supporting the narrative in the prospectus. Be sure links allow reviewers to return to the narrative.
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