The following action regarding your institution was taken at the December 2009 meeting of the Board of Trustees of SACS Commission on Colleges:

The Commission on Colleges reaffirmed accreditation with a request for a Monitoring Report due **September 7, 2010**, addressing the visiting committee’s recommendations applicable to the following referenced standards of the *Principles*:

**CS 3.3.1.1 (Institutional Effectiveness – Educational Programs), Recommendation 6**
Expected outcomes for each educational program are being developed for every location where the program is being offered but this process has not been completed. The institution should document the extent to which program outcomes and student learning outcomes are achieved and provide evidence of improvement in educational programs based on this assessment. The institution should provide this information for all of its programs at each location.

**CS 3.3.1.2 (Institutional Effectiveness – Administrative Support Services), Recommendation 7**
The institution should document that proposed assessment plans slated to be completed by December 2009 have, in fact, been completed, and also document evidence of improvement based upon the assessment.

**CS 3.3.1.3 (Institutional Effectiveness – Educational Support Services), Recommendation 8**
The institution should document that proposed assessment plans slated to be completed by December 2009 have, in fact, been completed, and also document evidence of improvement based upon the assessment.

**CS 3.3.1.4 (Institutional Effectiveness – Research), Recommendation 9**
The institution should document that it assesses its research program and provides evidence of improvement in the institution’s research productivity and effectiveness, including research centers, institutes and sponsored research programs.
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CS 3.3.1.5 (Institutional Effectiveness – Community/Public Services), Recommendation 10
The institution should document that it assesses its public service units beyond the two examples cited and include evidence of improvement similar to those identified for the Rosa Parks Museum and Children’s Wing.

CS 3.4.4 (Acceptance of Academic Credit), Recommendation 11
Documentation of the institution’s compliance with the Joint Curricular Ventures Policy and Transfer Credit Policy was not evident. The institution should document the implementation of an acceptable transfer policy with all of its international partners and joint curricular ventures.

CS 3.4.7 (Consortial Relationships/Contractual Agreement), Recommendation 12
The Consortia Relationship Review Committees were not projected to be fully implemented for all overseas consortia relationships until June 2010. The institution should document and provide evidence of the quality and ongoing quality control of all of its off-shore degree programs, including the portions of each academic program offered by the institution in concert with its partners to offer degree programs. Each consortium relationship should be evaluated against the mission of the institution.

CS 3.4.10 (Responsibility for Curriculum), Recommendation 13
The institution should document and provide evidence of the faculty’s involvement in reviewing the content, quality, and effectiveness of the overseas degree programs with respect to each location.

CS 3.4.14 (Technology), Recommendation 14
The institution should demonstrate how the use of technology enhances learning and how students have access to and demonstrate training in the use of technology in all locations.

CS 3.7.1 (Faculty Competence), Recommendation 15
The review of faculty credentials in all locations has not been completed. The institution should document and demonstrate that it hires qualified faculty in all locations where its programs and courses are offered. The information provided indicates that corrective actions currently underway will be completed in 2009-2010. In addition, the institution should document that the qualifications of its international partners’ faculty are in compliance with the Commission’s Joint Curricular Venture policy.

Please submit to your Commission staff member a one-page executive summary of your institution’s Quality Enhancement Plan. The summary is due February 15, 2010, and also should include: (1) the title of your Quality Enhancement Plan, (2) your institution’s name, and (3) the name, title, and email address of an individual who can be contacted regarding its development or implementation. This summary will be posted to the Commission’s Web site as a resource for other institutions undergoing the reaffirmation process.

Your institution’s next reaffirmation will take place in 2019 unless otherwise notified.
Dr. Jack Hawkins Jr.  
January 12, 2010  
Page Three  

All institutions are requested to submit an “Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan on Student Learning” as part of their “Fifth-Year Interim Report” due five years after their reaffirmation review. Institutions will be notified one year in advance by the President of the Commission regarding its specific due date.

Guidelines for the additional report are enclosed. Because it is essential that institutions follow these guidelines, please make certain that those responsible for preparing the report receive the document. If there are any questions about the format, contact the Commission staff member assigned to your institution. When submitting your report, please send four copies to your Commission staff member.

Please note that Federal regulations and Commission policy stipulate that an institution must demonstrate compliance with all requirements and standards of the Principles of Accreditation within two years following the Commission’s initial action on the institution. At the end of that two-year period, if the institution does not comply with all the standards and requirements of the Principles, representatives from the institution may be required to appear before the Commission, or one of its standing committees, to answer questions as to why the institution should not be removed from membership. If the Commission determines good cause at that time, the Commission may extend the period for coming into compliance for a minimum of six months and a maximum of two years and must place the institution on Probation. If the institution has been placed on Probation within the two-year period, extension of accreditation beyond the two-year period for good cause is dependent on the amount of time the institution has already been on Probation. An institution may be on Probation for not more than two years. If the Commission does not determine good cause or if the institution does not come into compliance within two years while on Probation, the institution must be removed from membership. (See enclosed Commission policy "Sanctions, Denial of Reaffirmation, and Removal from Membership.")

We appreciate your continued support of the activities of the Commission on Colleges. If you have questions, please contact the Commission staff member assigned to your institution.

Sincerely,

Belle S. Wheelan, Ph.D.  
President  

BSW:atn  
Enclosures  

cc: Dr. Joseph H. Silver