The Principles of Accreditation:

What Is Different about Draft #2?

Stephen L. Pruitt, Ph.D.
President

The Principles of Accreditation:

Comparing the Drafts

June Draft vs. September Draft

Summary of Changes

31
numbered standards in both drafts (plus new sub-standard 3.1)

3
new standards: Shared Governance, Research Integrity, Intellectual Pluralism

2
consolidations: financial standards and program content standards

26
standards now flagged * as aligned with federal requirements or AIM

Also changed across the document

- **Three sections, not four:** “Compliance with Regulations” standards now sit under Student Success
- **Rationale statements** now open several standards (e.g., 7, 11, 23)

Changes by Type

New	3.1 Shared Governance · 18 Research Integrity · 25 Intellectual Pluralism
Consolidated	6 Financial Stability (June 6 + 7) · 10 Academic Program Content (June 11 + 12)
Substantively revised	3.2 Governing Authority · 5 Planning · 9 General Education · 11 Workforce · 14 Transfer Credits · 15 Assessment · 20 Faculty Qualifications · 21 Academic Freedom · 22 Student Success
Minor wording or new title	2, 4, 7, 8, 12, 23, 27, 28, 31
Essentially unchanged	1, 13, 16, 17, 19, 24, 26, 29, 30

New Standards

3.1 Shared Governance

- Published shared governance policies that are clearly articulated, communicated, and consistently followed
- Clear distinction between the board's function and the responsibilities of administration and faculty

18 Research Integrity

- Policies and documented procedures that promote sound research practices for faculty, staff, and students
- Internal mechanisms to identify and remediate questionable research practices

25 Intellectual Pluralism

- Policies that support, promote, and prioritize intellectual diversity and civil exchange of ideas
- Periodic measurement of student and faculty perceptions of the range of viewpoints offered

Governance and Leadership

JUNE DRAFT

3. Governing Board | 4. CEO

- One governing board standard, items (a)–(f)
- Board “focuses on approval of policies”
- (d) Board’s first duty is to the institution
- CEO standard defines roles of both the CEO and the governing authority

SEPTEMBER PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

3. Governance (3.1 + 3.2) | 4. CEO

- Split into 3.1 Shared Governance (new) and 3.2 Governing Authority
- Board “focuses on creating and approving governing policies”
- “First duty” clause removed
- Institution “has a CEO” responsible for mission and student success; board role now handled in 3.1

What changed: Governance now names the faculty’s role explicitly and separates board, administration, and faculty responsibilities, responding to the “Role of Faculty” feedback.

Planning and Financial Stability

JUNE DRAFT

5. Planning | 6. Financial Planning | 7. Financial Documents

- Planning framed as continuous improvement at strategic and key operational levels
- Financial plan covering at least 3 fiscal years, updated annually, approved by the board
- Audited financial statements across multiple years (separate standard)

SEPTEMBER PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

5. Sound Institutional Planning | 6. Financial Stability

- Multi-year, data-informed planning for long-term sustainability, with an approved plan
- Plan must connect deliberately to a financial plan with realistic revenue and expense assumptions
- Audited or independently reviewed statements, sound budgeting, and financial controls

What changed: Three standards become two. The prescriptive 3-year, annually updated, board-approved financial plan is gone; financial planning now lives inside institutional planning.

Curriculum and Program Content

JUNE DRAFT

10. Gen Ed | 11. Program Content | 12. Post-Bacc | 13. Workforce

- Gen ed supports lifelong learning, citizenship, “and/or” future employment
- Separate post-baccalaureate standard: literature of the discipline; research and/or practice and training
- Workforce: a process to review programs against industry standards

SEPTEMBER PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

9. Gen Ed | 10. Academic Program Content | 11. Workforce

- Gen ed must address all of these (“and”), adding career adaptability
- Program content and post-bacc merged; new (e) programs designed and revised with faculty input
- Workforce adds (b): use the review to inform the curriculum

What changed: Verbs matter: “and/or” became “and.” Graduate rigor is now part of program content, and the explicit literature and research expectations were dropped.

Assessment of Student Learning

JUNE DRAFT

17. Assessment of Student Learning

- Continuous improvement through direct and indirect measures
- (a) Establish program outcomes, including general education
- (b) Collect data, (c) analyze it, (d) use findings to improve each program

SEPTEMBER PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

15. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

- (a) Specific, measurable outcomes for each educational program
- (b) Periodic review so outcomes stay current and aligned with professional and licensure standards
- (c) Provide examples of the processes used to judge whether students achieve outcomes

What changed: The focus moves from a prescribed collect-analyze-improve cycle to well-defined, current outcomes and examples of evidence. “Use of results” and gen ed inclusion are no longer stated.

Faculty Standards

JUNE DRAFT

21. Faculty Qualifications | 22. Freedom of Inquiry

- Policies and procedures for approving faculty qualifications
- Documented rationale for exceptions to policy
- Freedom of Inquiry: protect “free inquiry and intellectual autonomy”

SEPTEMBER PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

20. Qualifications and Evaluation | 21. Academic Freedom

- Qualifications and exception documentation kept
- New (c): faculty regularly evaluated on their roles or defined performance criteria
- Retitled Academic Freedom: clearly articulated policies protecting “the faculty’s academic freedom”

What changed: Faculty evaluation is back as an explicit expectation, and academic freedom is named directly, responding to the “Academic Freedom” and “Role of Faculty” feedback.

Student Success and Achievement

JUNE DRAFT

23. Student Success and Achievement Outcomes

- Measures disaggregated by the nature of students served
- Example measures listed (graduation progress, licensure, job placement, financial indicator, completion)
- (c) Publish goals and outcomes for each measure

SEPTEMBER PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

22. Student Success for Institutions and Programs

- Disaggregated by mission and nature of students; applies to institution and its programs
- Key completion indicator plus measures from multiple categories, so no single metric stands in for overall performance
- Evaluate and report progress; implement strategies to strengthen success where possible

What changed: Scope extends to the program level, the list of example measures is dropped, and “publish goals for each measure” becomes “evaluate and report progress.”

Other Targeted Revisions

Standard	Change from June draft
2 Mission	Appropriate to “the institution and credentials offered”
7 External Funds	Retitled “Control and Oversight…”; opening rationale statement added
8 Facilities	“Technology” becomes “Infrastructure” in the title; scope list trimmed
12 Credit Hour	“Regardless of format or mode of delivery” language replaced
14 Transfer Credits	Retitled; verifying quality of credit recorded on transcripts removed
23 Support Services	Rationale added; library resources “consistent with the mission”
27 Admissions	Institution must publish and implement admissions policies
28, 31	Retitled: Publicly Disclosed Information; Compliance with New Policy or Obligations