

3.S - Criterion 3 - Summary

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Evidence

Henry Ford College has a strong focus on students and is committed to preparing students for their future. Conversations with faculty, staff, administrators, and students reveal that this core value forms a significant cultural thread underlying what HFC is and how it operates. In the last two years substantial efforts have been made to articulate program learning goals, align course learning with program outcomes, and facilitate student success. Although areas for improvement still exist and some of these areas are identified within this document, the people of HFC are actively engaged in improving program quality, developing methods for collecting valid data on which to make sound decisions, and identifying mechanisms to improve student success. The team encourages continued focus in improving the certificate and associate degree programs through analysis and review of student learning objectives. Tracking of graduates/transfer students and the success of those individuals, additional input from regional business and industry on specific competencies and skills, clean and valid data for projecting student success within the program, and articulating general studies program outcomes and integrating those general education outcomes within the programs (perhaps using the 'introduce-reinforce-master model') will all strengthen the college's effectiveness and success in teaching and learning.

4 - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

4.A - Core Component 4.A

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

Rating

Met

Evidence

The College has acknowledged that a new program review process was developed, in part, as a result of gaps identified in some areas outside of the career and technical programs. Program review for non-occupational programs was not developed until Fall 2013 and was fully implemented in Spring 2014. It appears that program review has been driven in large part by external mandates such as state reporting for Perkins funding and specialized accreditation. HFC faculty and staff report that the newly developed, comprehensive *Program Review Handbook* will be used in all areas and will replace for some programs the previous state Perkins reports, which did not provide meaningful data for program improvement. So, while HFC has not maintained a consistent and effective practice of regular program reviews, processes and plans are now in place to support meaningful review of all

programs on a regular five year review cycle.

The College plans to integrate student learning assessment data into the regular process of program review as evidenced by a draft document dated November 2014 which offers "Program Level Assessment Guidelines" and definitions (e.g. program outcomes and program objectives). Program reviews will now include a summary of assessment projects and their impact on student learning. Finally, the Vice President of Academic Affairs reported that program review will now include peer review, with more cross-disciplinary faculty involvement and review.

The College website provides information on credit for advanced standing and awarding credit for prior learning. HFC uses the American Council on Education recommendations to evaluate occupational and military training. In addition, the College has systems in place to assure consistent procedures are followed. While discipline/program faculty are responsible for evaluating credit, they must first identify eligible courses in writing and develop a written procedure for evaluating student learning for the course. In addition, the procedures established must ensure the prior learning addresses the course objectives as identified on the standard course master syllabus. HFC also assists students in developing a portfolio when that method is used to evaluate prior learning. Thus, the evidence indicates a thorough process is in place for evaluation of any credit that is transcribed.

Transfer policies are explained on the college website, and students may transfer in a maximum of 40 semester credit hours. Requirements such as transfer credit being accepted only for college level courses from a regionally accredited college or university help to assure quality. The Michigan Transfer Agreement also provides consistent quality assurance, and students reported that transfer within the state--both in and out of HFC--has been facilitated by this statewide agreement.

The College considers the prerequisites for courses, and maintains the rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. Evidence provided included an extensive *Curriculum Management Handbook* which references an Activities Classification Structure (ACS) Code, part of required reporting for the state of Michigan when courses are being proposed or changed as well as policies related to the credit hour, co and pre-requisites, curriculum development, and course masters. HFC's dual credit options—the Collegiate Academy and Early College--involve dual enrollment students who are taught almost exclusively by HFC instructors who use the College course masters. In addition, dual credit students must take the same placement tests and satisfy the same course prerequisites. Documents reveal and the faculty assert that HFC applies identical program and course learning goals and assessments regardless of location or delivery method.

The College provided a list of programs with specialized accreditation, the most recent review, and the current status. All programs have received continued accreditation and none appear to be under close scrutiny. Letters from accrediting bodies indicated HFC has maintained accreditation as appropriate to specific programs such as in health sciences and in the Culinary program.

Although the College has indicated that it measures the success of its students and graduates, it has also indicated that gathering concrete and complete information about the success of its graduates is a challenge. Surveys are administered to all graduates, but as the College acknowledges, the response rate is low. In addition, it is not clear how the results are used to improve programs or graduate placement, nor is it clear whether the results are analyzed and shared with internal stakeholders such as faculty. Finally, while the Nursing graduate surveys provide the "N," the other surveys do not reveal how many contacts were attempted against those actually made and what additional efforts (such as follow up calls or emails) are attempted. Limited information was provided about employer satisfaction with graduates. For graduates who transfer, the College uses the National Clearinghouse

to track students' transitions and the Michigan transfer agreements have helped HFC evaluate the success of transfer students. More recently, the College has participated in the Michigan Statewide Longitudinal Data System that tracks students from pre-school through a four-year college degree (P-20). Because these tracking mechanisms are relatively new, a thorough assessment of graduates' success is lacking.

Assessment of student learning at the course level--particularly summative assessment--has been well established in some subject areas such as Political Science, Biology, Business, English, and Math. In addition, evidence revealed changes made to curriculum to enhance student learning based on the Degree Qualifications Profile project. It is evident that HFC faculty and staff have consistently reviewed the prerequisites for courses, and recent efforts involve faculty across the college in examining the rigor of courses, the laddering of curriculum, and the expectations for student learning.

HFC has acknowledged that its Program Review process needed significant revision and the new process should produce more usable data and thorough analysis. The state-required Perkins reporting that has been conducted has been largely a matter of compliance and it does not appear that program review has informed program elimination or expansion. Recently, HFC submitted a change request seeking approval to offer a Bachelor's degree in Culinary Science. While the faculty and dean reported this was a direct result of industry need and an analysis of the labor market, the information and data provided in documents do not provide a convincing case. In addition, in a September 2014 Board Report on the Hospitality Studies department that includes two AAS programs (one in Culinary Arts and one in Hotel / Restaurant Management), no mention was made of an industry or student need for a Bachelors. Furthermore, two months later, the November 2014 Board Report proposing the Bachelors in Culinary Science provided scant rationale for adding the Bachelors and stated that fifteen current courses would be "re-numbered and re-named." In this case, therefore, it does not seem that the institution has used comprehensive program review for planning purposes, nor has it assured that the proposed degree is tied to employment rates and the success of its graduates. Finally, evidence was not provided to show the planned program expansion was based on development of higher level curriculum appropriate to the Bachelor's degree level.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.B - Core Component 4.B

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The College recently revised its general education goals (which will go into effect in Fall 2015), and adopted a policy that the General Education outcomes should be reviewed and revised every five years. Still, it appears general education assessment has taken place solely in identified general education courses and thus is based only in course-level assessment of those courses. The College provided evidence of an effective process for assessing student learning at the course level, and reports show faculty using assessment results to improve curriculum and instruction in some areas, but it is not clear the extent to which the College embeds and assesses students' achievement of general education outcomes in program courses. Assessment of student learning at the institutional level was not as well documented or understood by faculty and staff.

The 100-page annual report (2013-2014) of the Committee for the Assessment of Student Learning (CASL) describes the current membership of the two committees— the CASL: General Education and the CASL: Programs. The document details the committee charges and explains the recent re-focus on developing comprehensive strategies for General Education assessment. Teams of faculty developed rubrics which were completed in June 2014, but it appears that these were used to help identify a larger list of courses that can be used for assessing general education. Thus general education assessment still appears to be based solely in the distributed general education course model, without clear integration of general education outcomes in occupational programs. In addition, not all of the rubrics for general education are measurable.

While the College has been working to strengthen its processes for assessing student achievement of the learning outcomes for curricular programs, little evidence showed the integration of the curricular and co-curricular programming to develop students' achievement of the general education outcomes. The College did provide evidence, however, that the Student Affairs division has created a consistent method for assessment. Each area within Student Affairs has developed a mission statement and learning goals, and these are tied to an assessment plan which identifies outcomes (learning, engagement, or retention), activities or assignments, skill level (introduced or reinforced), and

measurement and training. Results were provided for Career Services, Inside Track (a Peer Mentoring Program), New Student Orientation, and Enrollment Services. Although the Student Activities' identified learning outcomes are not explicitly tied to the revised general education outcomes, a crosswalk is possible and might help Student Affairs staff and faculty work together to discover how the general education outcomes are developed--and can be assessed--both in and outside of the classroom.

HFC acknowledged that for a number of years, program level assessment was inconsistent and often did not provide meaningful or useful results that would lead to improvements. The College has now developed Program Level Assessment Guidelines to lead to greater consistency across programs and to produce meaningful results. The Guidelines include an assessment matrix and emphasizes the importance of aligning course and program learning objectives. The next step will be to incorporate the general education outcomes explicitly into program level assessment.

The institution is beginning to use the information gained from assessment to improve student learning, and some departments, such as English, have been engaged in the assessment cycle on a consistent basis over time. The College provided assessment results from licensure exams and standardized tests, and the Nursing program made changes to curriculum based on analysis of pass rates. The competency-based redesign of Welding courses also reveals faculty's use of assessment results to improve learning. In addition, given the high percentage of students placing into developmental education, the College has focused on transformations to developmental courses. Developmental math has been redesigned into competency-based modules, the ELI program has been rewritten, and the ALP redesign is in place for developmental writing and is showing positive results. Still, because assessment processes in many courses and programs have only recently been revived and formalized, the use of assessment results to improve student learning is uneven and sporadic.

Over the past few years, the faculty and staff have been developing more formalized and widely communicated processes and methodologies to assess student learning. The governance structure and the continuous improvement teams have led to increased involvement of adjunct faculty, and lead program faculty have conducted comprehensive reviews of course and program curricula. The Vice President of Academic Affairs is creating structures to ensure more peer review of curriculum and programs. In addition, staff spoke to increased collaboration between faculty and student services such as the Financial Literacy project that is tied to learning and retention; a plan is in place to assess the project goals. Still, the College appears to be at the beginning stages of this level of collaboration; increased communication across Academic Affairs and Student Services will be needed to make headway in assessment of learning across the curricular and co-curricular programs.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.C - Core Component 4.C

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

HFC's Retention Advisory Committee (RAC) has defined goals for student retention, persistence through a college-wide retention plan that drew baseline data and information from past retention reports. While goals are established, they are not necessarily tied to specific student populations; rather, they are derived from baseline data and comparisons with peer institutions. In part, because student intent is not currently identified, the College is unable to determine with any certainty why students decide to stay or go. The retention, persistence, and completion goals could be more nuanced and fine-tuned with detailed analysis of student cohorts in order to identify appropriate interventions.

The college has begun to collect and analyze information on student retention, persistence, and completion, as suggested by the Retention Plan. The members of the Retention Advisory Committee identified the high percentage of students needing developmental coursework as the greatest challenge to students' persistence and completion, and strategies have been developed to address these particular barriers to student success. Still, at this point, collection of information remains primarily at the course level with not as much definitive data collected for programs. Faculty and staff indicate that while some terms are defined (such as retention, persistence, completion), student *success*--which might best be measured against student intent--has not been defined. Thus, HFC is still working to identify goals that are both attainable and appropriate to the College and its unique context, which includes a high percentage of students who transfer out prior to completing a degree or program.

A number of improvement strategies have been implemented based on student retention, persistence, and completion data. The retention plan includes strategies to increase success in developmental

courses, and members of the committee identified improvements initiatives such as a resign of developmental courses, increasing communication to students about the importance of the Compass placement review, and a partnership with the Literacy Council to ease transitions for students who place into the lowest levels of Reading. Thus, the College is beginning to address the "low hanging fruit" -- those barriers that might be easiest to identify and resolve--while simultaneously examining some of the more systemic challenges to student persistence.

Methodologies for collecting persistence and completion data are not fully developed; faculty and staff commented on the need to clean the data to determine the validity of the information. Recognizing the importance of having meaningful data to inform decision-making and improvement efforts, the College is forming a Data Integrity Committee. As evidenced by the Retention Plan and as acknowledged by staff, HFC needs to refine data collection and analysis. Many of the goals identified in the plan are overly broad, not actionable, and not prioritized.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Evidence

The College is making headway in moving beyond formative assessment at the course level to implementing a more comprehensive assessment plan that produces student learning results at the course, program, and institutional level. HFC's participation in Achieving the Dream and its use of the Degree Qualifications Profile have helped faculty and staff focus efforts on assessment and on persistence, retention, and completion. The development and widespread use of the course master, the newly revised Program Review process, and the curriculum mapping efforts all reveal that the College is putting into place the necessary uniform procedures to assess and improve student learning.

The College has created an infrastructure (with committees such as CASL, the Academic Council, the Retention Advisory Committee, etc.) and procedures codified in documents to support ongoing assessment of student learning. In addition, HFC has purchased a software tool which will help with data tracking and analysis. Still, given that the revised general education goals, program review process, and re-activated retention committee are relatively new, HFC will need to ensure these improvement efforts are carried forward and sustained. Of all the continuous process improvement teams created in the past two years, those which focus on the quality of HFC's educational programs, learning environments, and support services will be most essential.

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

5.A - Core Component 5.A

The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Rating

Met

Evidence

In 2013, Henry Ford College experienced a financial crisis due to both internal and external factors including reduction in revenues sources, drop in enrollment, untimely capital projects, and lack of oversight in student bad debt. The college quickly responded with a turnover in leadership, contract concessions, institutional reorganization and procedural changes. The changes in operational and financial processes allowed the college to correct the financial deficit without increasing student tuition or using loans. Additionally, Dearborn approved a property tax increase of one mill adding an additional \$3,200,000 a year. HFC plans to create a reserve of \$21 million and is ahead of its goal.

Based upon the support of the entire college, the institution has the fiscal resources to support its entire operations.

Human Resources are sufficient to support programs and operations. The college analyzes multiple data sources to determine appropriate staffing for both on ground and online education. Major reorganization has occurred in Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Administrative positions to increase efficiency while maintaining quality.

In the recent past, deferred maintenance has resulted in wear in the physical environment and a student told the review team that some buildings and sidewalks were difficult to access for ADA.

Improvements to buildings are evident on campus with the new Welcome Center and state of the art Science Center, and updates to the Liberal Arts Building and reorganization of other sites. HFC has in place a Facilities Master Planning Committee and Plan for future initiatives and evaluation of existing infrastructure. The team discovered many areas have been created for students to congregate on campus and collaborate for engagement and academics.

Technological Infrastructure is sufficient to address administrative and academic needs. The college conducted an audit of classroom equipment, updated wireless capacity, and has a computer refresh plan in place. Appropriate policies and guidelines are being developed to enhance online learning and security.

A review of the budget and financial documents indicates that there are no elective resource allocations to other areas or revenue disbursement to a superordinate entity adversely affecting the educational purpose of the college. Auxiliary services generate their own funds and retain their fund balances.

HFC recently revised their mission statement. The strategic plan of 2013-2015 was based on their previous mission and established eight achievable goals. The college was able to make progress on the stated goals and implement its stated mission with the resources available.

Documentation and discussions with staff, faculty and administrators confirm that college employees are appropriately qualified and trained. Verification and updates are made to the job description during the hiring process. There is ongoing internal and external opportunities for training and professional development. Financial resources are budgeted in full time and part time contracts dedicated to development that includes conferences, professional memberships, tuition reimbursement, journals and more. Specialized training is available at the college for support areas and a new training and development program will be implemented in 2015.

The institution recently revised their processes for monitoring expenses and budgeting resources. The financial crisis brought to light the inadequate processes and lack of oversight in the budget. HFC brought in a consultant to provide an objective assessment of procedures, documentation and accountability. Many improvements such as increased reporting, personnel reorganization, forecasting and data management have resolved the previous issues and there is now a effective budget monitoring process.

Overall, there is evidence through documentation, physical review and conversations that show HFC has a resource base that supports its current educational programs. The resources are adequate to maintain and strengthen the quality of its institutional plans for the future.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.B - Core Component 5.B

The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.
2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.
3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The current governance and administrative structures are effective in enabling the institution to fulfill its mission in a collaborative process. This evidence was found in the institution's documentation and discussions with its members.

Meeting with the Board members during the site visit affirmed that the Board is knowledgeable about the institution. The members were reflective about their role with the institution and clearly stated the challenges and opportunities for the institution. Board members understood their responsibilities in the oversight of financial and academic policies and practices.

The college is shifting toward an inclusive shared governance that extends beyond full time faculty. Students, adjunct faculty and support staff all reported increased opportunities for engagement and leadership. The cabinet welcomed input from constituents. Staff and student services were involved with planning with the other governance groups. Several committees have representatives from full-time and part-time faculty, administrators, staff and students. Students were able to describe a process where they could send ideas and these suggestions were explored and valued. The enhancements to the shared governance system have been fairly rapid and the Team did hear from a number of individuals that there is some confusion and ambiguity regarding roles and responsibilities of various committees and some concern about possible overlapping of responsibilities among some committees. Of particular concern was the relationship of some newer committees including CPI teams with established standing committees of the Faculty Senate and the Academic Council. The Team recommends that the institution move quickly to better delineate roles of the various committees and entities and to employ effective strategies to communicate this information to the College community.

Administration, staff and students are not involved in setting academic policy. They are involved in creating procedures. American Federation of Teachers and Faculty Senate are exclusively responsible for creating and revising academic policy. There was some confusion on the delineation of what is

policy and what is procedure. Additionally, the institution is working on defining what is an academic policy and what is not an academic policy.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The current president focused his first two years in office in solving the financial crisis and was very successful in heading off this emergency. The priority during this time was to shore up the budget, build a cash reserve and work on shared governance. There was no real opportunity to allocate resources to strategic initiatives associated with the mission because all extra resources were being devoted to resolving the financial situation. The president has not yet put into place a new strategic plan and instead has continued with the one developed under the previous administration.

Currently there are not integrated links to assessment into planning and budgeting. Assessment of student learning is in its early stages. The college plans to address this with the purchase of new software with implementation planned for Fall 2015. There is a process for budget prioritization for the extra identified funds. These initiatives must include associated needs, such as staffing, technology, equipment and budget with a plan to include the number of students that would benefit.

Planning processes encompass the institution as a whole and consider both internal and external perspectives. All internal employee groups including students, full time and adjunct faculty, administrators, support staff and cabinet members, participate in strategic and operational planning.

External stakeholders include the Board of Trustees, community leaders and advisory board members. Planning and collaboration with four year colleges and universities can be seen in the new Welcome Center. Working closely with the needs of these colleges, HFC has created space for them to work with HFC students and has articulated a number of 3+1 agreements.

HFC demonstrated that it has an understanding of current capacity with its analysis of the cash flow reports and course enrollment reports. It anticipates the possible fluctuations in sources of revenue by establishing a cash reserve, creating enrollment scenarios, examining state changes in revenue, and staying abreast of higher education trends. The College Constitution is written to accommodate based

on academic need and demand.

There is evidence that HFC's planning examines data on enrollment and demographic trends. The student profile was updated through 2013. They have contracted for environmental scanning report that is not due until August 2015. HFC need to improve on anticipating future trends in technology, demographic shifts, and globalization and creating plans to accommodate these changes. It appears that there is an effort through CPI teams and state organizations to increase awareness of future trends and changes.

Overall, the institution fulfills the core component 5.C with evidence of systematic and integrated planning. There are some improvements that can be made with linking assessment and budget and investigating future trends in demographics, technology and globalization.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.
2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Rating

Met

Evidence

There are many areas where the institution works systematically to improve its performance and the evidence is sufficient.

The institution routinely collects and documents evidence of performance in its operations. There are monthly reports to the Board of Trustees that includes an analysis of the data available for the program. Both the CCSSE and an internal student satisfaction survey have been regularly administered and the results have been shared. Further dissemination and explanation of the results should occur as well as action steps for improvement based on this data.

Two Institutional Research Analysts have been added to assist in providing data for the college. Plans are in place to participate in the NCCBP and the Cost and Productivity Project to provide additional benchmarks in addition to what the college collects with IPEDs. Key Performance Indicators have been developed and will be shared in a dashboard format for additional communication.

The president started at HFC in 2013 and implemented his expertise in Continuous Process Improvement. Over 21 CPI teams were formed and employees trained to identify issues, create research findings and suggest improvements. While the HLC Team believes this is an efficient mechanism for handling quick fixes of issues, there needs to be a long term comprehensive plan to oversee the entire institution. More work needs to be completed in helping the institution use data for evaluation, improvement and decision making.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.S - Criterion 5 - Summary

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Evidence

HFC should be commended for its quick and effective recovery from its financial crisis. It showed evidence that it has the financial and human resources as well as physical and technological infrastructure to fulfill its mission. HFC has recently restructured its organization and is updating its committees and processes to reflect the changes. The college is routinely reviewing and updating its planning and budget review to improve the quality of its educational offerings. It has an understanding of its current capacity and the ability to manage fluctuations. There are currently plans in place to begin examining future trends and how they might impact the college.

Review Dashboard

Number	Title	Rating
1	Mission	
1.A	Core Component 1.A	Met
1.B	Core Component 1.B	Met
1.C	Core Component 1.C	Met
1.D	Core Component 1.D	Met
1.S	Criterion 1 - Summary	Met
2	Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct	
2.A	Core Component 2.A	Met
2.B	Core Component 2.B	Met
2.C	Core Component 2.C	Met
2.D	Core Component 2.D	Met
2.E	Core Component 2.E	Met
2.S	Criterion 2 - Summary	Met
3	Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support	
3.A	Core Component 3.A	Met
3.B	Core Component 3.B	Met
3.C	Core Component 3.C	Met
3.D	Core Component 3.D	Met
3.E	Core Component 3.E	Met
3.S	Criterion 3 - Summary	Met
4	Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement	
4.A	Core Component 4.A	Met
4.B	Core Component 4.B	Met
4.C	Core Component 4.C	Met
4.S	Criterion 4 - Summary	Met
5	Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	
5.A	Core Component 5.A	Met
5.B	Core Component 5.B	Met
5.C	Core Component 5.C	Met
5.D	Core Component 5.D	Met
5.S	Criterion 5 - Summary	Met

Review Summary

Conclusion

Henry Ford College has experienced dramatic changes over the past decade with wide fluctuations in enrollment and revenue and extensive administrative changes. The current administration faced a projected \$16 million budget deficit in FY 2013-14 and a 25% enrollment decline from 2010. The institution implemented processes to reduce student debt and used voluntary employee severance, layoffs, employee concessions and organizational restructuring to weather the crisis and begin rebuilding reserves. The institution has demonstrated a commitment to continuous improvement with implementation of continuous improvement process teams. In addition, the administration has implemented processes to make the governance system more inclusive with enhanced roles for staff, adjunct faculty, and students. HFC is implementing new strategies for enrollment growth including rebranding the College with the new name, moving to offer some bachelors programs, and expanding the potential student base.

The Team found that Henry Ford College meets the Five Criteria for Accreditation and all core components. The institution has overcome significant challenges and has implemented processes which appear to position it well for the future. However, the institution is still very much in transition as it implements strategies to increase enrollment and revenue and processes to improve student learning and student success. As noted throughout the report, at the time of the Team visit a number of significant processes are still relatively new and results were limited so the Team could not adequately evaluate their effectiveness. There will be some mission change and new support services will be needed if the institution adds baccalaureate programs. The changes in shared governance have resulted in some confusion. The College recognizes the need to enhance assessment and is implementing new processes but assessment and program review are not as mature as they should be. A new strategic planning process is being implemented and the College is taking steps to improve its institutional effectiveness processes.

After reviewing all evidence available to it, the Team concludes that Henry Ford College is aware of the challenges it faces and has both strategies and institutional capacity to address them. The Team believes that Henry Ford College is an excellent example of why the Pathways model was developed. While the Team has expressed a number of concerns throughout the report, none rise to the level where interim reports would serve the institution well. However, the mid-cycle “check point” that is built into the process provides the appropriate time to review institutional progress on the numerous processes which are now in their infancy. The Team recommends the Standard Pathway so that a visiting team can thoroughly assess change in mission, assessment, strategic planning, student success initiatives, finances and enrollment, and new governance and continuous improvement structures. In both the Assurance Argument and during the visit, the institution should document significant progress in the aforementioned areas with concrete evidence and appropriate data which demonstrates for the team that the processes are beyond the planning stages and are being implemented and evaluated for their effectiveness.

Further, the Team particularly notes the slow development of mature processes in assessment of student learning, including program review, and suggests that the institution consider assessment as its improvement project utilizing a systematic, institution-wide approach.

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation

Met

Pathways Recommendation

Limited to Standard

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.



Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

The team reviews each item identified in the Federal Compliance Guide and documents its findings in the appropriate spaces below. Teams should expect institutions to address these requirements with brief narrative responses and provide supporting documentation, where necessary. Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution's ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in appropriate sections of the Assurance Section of the Team Report or highlighted as such in the appropriate AQIP Quality Checkup Report.

This worksheet outlines the information the team should review in relation to the federal requirements and provides spaces for the team's conclusions in relation to each requirement. The team should refer to the Federal Compliance Guide for Institutions and Evaluation Teams in completing this worksheet. The Guide identifies applicable Commission policies and an explanation of each requirement. **The worksheet becomes an appendix to the team's report. If the team recommends monitoring on a Federal Compliance requirement in the form of a report or focused visit, it should be included in the Federal Compliance monitoring sections below and added to the appropriate section in the team report template.**

Institution under review: Henry Ford College

Assignment of Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Address this requirement by completing the "Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours" in the Appendix at the end of this document.

Institutional Records of Student Complaints

The institution has documented a process in place for addressing student complaints and appears to be systematically processing such complaints as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.

1. Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints as well as the history of complaints received and processed with a particular focus in that history on the past three or four years.
2. Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.
3. Verify that the evidence shows that the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this process into its review and planning processes.
4. Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.

5. Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.

6. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Transfer Policies

The institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.

1. Review the institution's transfer policies.
2. Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and program-specific articulation agreements.
3. Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its web site) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.

Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions and any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. Note whether the institution appropriately lists its articulation agreements with other institutions on its website or elsewhere. The information the institution provides should include any program-specific articulation agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution under Commission review: 1) accepts credit from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; 2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements that it accepts; or 3) both offers and accepts credits with the other institution(s).

4. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

___ The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Practices for Verification of Student Identity

The institution has demonstrated that it verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided to the student through distance or correspondence education and appropriately discloses additional fees related to verification to students and to protect their privacy.

1. Determine how the institution verifies that the student who enrolls in a course is the same student who submits assignments, takes exams, and earns a final grade. The team should ensure that the institution's approach respects student privacy.
2. Check that any fees related to verification and not included in tuition are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance courses (e.g., a proctoring fee paid by students on the day of the proctored exam).
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

___ The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Title IV Program Responsibilities

The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program.

This requirement has several components the institution and team must address:

- **General Program Requirements.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area.*
- **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as*

necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion Five if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)

- **Default Rates.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its three year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note for 2012 and thereafter institutions and teams should be using the three-year default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact Commission staff.*
 - **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.*
 - **Student Right to Know.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion One if the team determines that disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)*
 - **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook. Note that the Commission does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.*
 - **Contractual Relationships.** *The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require Commission approval and has not received Commission approval the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Contractual Change Application on the Commission's web site for more information.)*
 - **Consortial Relationships.** *The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require Commission approval and has not received Commission approval the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Consortial Change Application on the Commission's web site for more information.)*
1. Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.

2. Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution's compliance or whether the institution's auditor in the A-133 has raised any issues about the institution's compliance as well as look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.
3. If an institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the federal compliance portion of the team report and whether the institution appears to be moving forward with corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.
4. If issues have been raised with the institution's compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution's ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity (*Core Component 2.A and 2.B*).
5. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Required Information for Students and the Public

1. Verify that the institution publishes fair, accurate, and complete information on the following topics: the calendar, grading, admissions, academic program requirements, tuition and fees, and refund policies.
2. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information

The institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with the Commission and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.

1. Review the institution's disclosure about its accreditation status with the Commission to determine whether the information it provides is accurate and complete, appropriately formatted and contains the Commission's web address.
2. Review institutional disclosures about its relationship with other accrediting agencies for accuracy and for appropriate consumer information, particularly regarding the link between specialized/professional accreditation and the licensure necessary for employment in many professional or specialized areas.
3. Review the institution's catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, and information provided by the institution's advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate information to current and prospective students about its accreditation, placement or licensure, program requirements, etc.
4. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Review of Student Outcome Data

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether it is appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs it offers and the students it serves.
2. Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about academic programs and requirements and to determine its effectiveness in achieving its educational objectives.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

___ The team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Standing with State and Other Accrediting Agencies

The institution has documented that it discloses accurately to the public and the Commission its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditor and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.

The team has considered any potential implications for accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or loss of authorization in any state.

Important note: If the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is now or has been in the past five years under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action (i.e., withdrawal, suspension, denial, or termination) from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor or a state entity, then the team must explain the sanction or adverse action of the other agency in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report and provide its rationale for recommending Commission status in light of this action. In addition, the team must contact the staff liaison immediately if it learns that the institution is at risk of losing its degree authorization or lacks such authorization in any state in which the institution meets state presence requirements.

1. Review the information, particularly any information that indicates the institution is under sanction or show-cause or has had its status with any agency suspended, revoked, or terminated, as well as the reasons for such actions.
2. Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution’s capacity to meet the Commission’s Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the Commission staff liaison immediately.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team’s conclusions:

X The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.

___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

___ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

___ The team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment

The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comments. The team has evaluated any comments received and completed any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments. Note that if the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comment relate to the team's review of the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report.

1. Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including sample announcements, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.
2. Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow-up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list materials reviewed here:

HLC Federal Compliance Review Panel Report

Appendix

Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Program Length and Tuition, Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours

Institution under review: Henry Ford College

Part 1: Program Length and Tuition

Instructions

The institution has documented that it has credit hour assignments and degree program lengths within the range of good practice in higher education and that tuition is consistent across degree programs (or that there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).

Review the *“Worksheet for Use by Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours”* as well as the course catalog and other attachments required for the institutional worksheet.

Worksheet on Program Length and Tuition

A. Answer the Following Questions

Are the institution's degree program requirements within the range of good practice in higher education and contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

Yes No

Comments:

Are the institution's tuition costs across programs within the range of good practice in higher education and contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

Yes No

Comments:

B. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

Is any Commission follow-up required related to the institution's program length and tuition practices?

Yes No

Rationale:

Identify the type of Commission monitoring required and the due date:

Part 2: Assignment of Credit Hours

Instructions

In assessing the appropriateness of the credit allocations provided by the institution the team should complete the following steps:

1. Review the Worksheet completed by the institution, which provides information about an institution's academic calendar and an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats, and the institution's policy and procedures for awarding credit hours. Note that such policies may be at the institution or department level and may be differentiated by such distinctions as undergraduate or graduate, by delivery format, etc.
2. Identify the institution's principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level. The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:
 - Associate's degrees = 60 hours
 - Bachelor's degrees = 120 hours
 - Master's or other degrees beyond the Bachelor's = at least 30 hours beyond the Bachelor's degree
 - Note that one quarter hour = .67 semester hour
 - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.
3. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution.
 - At semester-based institutions courses will be typically be from two to four credit hours (or approximately five quarter hours) and extend approximately 14-16 weeks (or approximately 10 weeks for a quarter). The description in the catalog should indicate a course that is appropriately rigorous and has collegiate expectations for objectives and workload. Identify courses/disciplines that seem to depart markedly from these expectations.
 - Institutions may have courses that are in compressed format, self-paced, or otherwise alternatively structured. Credit assignments should be reasonable. (For example, as a full-time load for a traditional semester is typically 15 credits, it might be expected that the norm for a full-time load in a five-week term is 5 credits; therefore, a single five-week course awarding 10 credits would be subject to inquiry and justification.)
 - Teams should be sure to scan across disciplines, delivery mode, and types of academic activities.
 - Federal regulations allow for an institution to have two credit-hour awards: one award for Title IV purposes and following the above federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. Commission procedure also permits this approach.

4. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course. Pay particular attention to alternatively-structured or other courses with particularly high credit hours for a course completed in a short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor.
5. **Sampling.** Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution and the range of programs it offers.
 - At a minimum, teams should anticipate sampling at least a few programs at each degree level.
 - For institutions with several different academic calendars or terms or with a wide range of academic programs, the team should expand the sample size appropriately to ensure that it is paying careful attention to alternative format and compressed and accelerated courses.
 - Where the institution offers the same course in more than one format, the team is advised to sample across the various formats to test for consistency.
 - For the programs the team sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several of the courses in the program, identify the contact hours for each course, and expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.
 - The team should pay particular attention to alternatively-structured and other courses that have high credit hours and less frequently scheduled interaction between the students and the instructor.
 - Provide information on the samples in the appropriate space on the worksheet.
6. Consider the following questions:
 - Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution?
 - Does that policy address the amount of instructional or contact time assigned and homework typically expected of a student with regard to credit hours earned?
 - For institutions with courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy also equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the timeframe allotted for the course?
 - Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that the Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)
 - If so, is the institution's assignment of credit to courses reflective of its policy on the award of credit?
7. If the answers to the above questions lead the team to conclude that there may be a problem with the credit hours awarded the team should recommend the following:
 - If the problem involves a poor or insufficiently-detailed institutional policy, the team should call for a revised policy as soon as possible by requiring a monitoring report within no more than one year that demonstrates the institution has a revised policy and evidence of implementation.

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

Out of USA - Present Activity

Campuses: None.

Additional Locations: None.

Recommended Change:

Distance Education Programs:

Present Offerings:

Associate 13.1210 Early Childhood Education and Teaching Child Development Internet

Associate 38.0201 Religion/Religious Studies Religious Studies Internet

Certificate 19.0706 Child Development Child Development Internet

Associate 13.1202 Elementary Education and Teaching Pre-Elementary Education Internet

Associate 13.1205 Secondary Education and Teaching Pre-Secondary Education Internet

Associate 13.1001 Special Education and Teaching, General Pre-Special Education Internet

Associate 13.1210 Early Childhood Education and Teaching Children and Families Internet

Associate 52.0101 Business/Commerce, General Business, General Internet

Associate 52.1101 International Business/Trade/Commerce International Business Internet

Associate 24.0102 General Studies General Studies Internet

Certificate 52.0799 Entrepreneurial and Small Business Operations, Other Small Business Management and Entrepreneurship Internet

Associate 24.0101 Liberal Arts and Sciences/Liberal Studies Liberal Arts Internet

Associate 52.0201 Business Administration and Management, General Business Administration Internet

Recommended Change:

Correspondence Education Programs:

Present Offerings:

None.

Recommended Change:

Contractual Relationships:

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

Present Offerings:
None.

Recommended Change:

Consortial Relationships:
Present Offerings:
None.

Recommended Change:
