Andrews University - MI

HLC ID 1309

STANDARD PATHWAY: Reaffirmation Review

Visit Date: 3/13/2017

Dr. Andrea Luxton
President

Mary Vanis
HLC Liaison

Mary Moore
Review Team Chair

Neil Pagano
Federal Compliance Reviewer

Jeff Ankrom
Team Member

Diane Fladeland
Team Member

Matt Smith
Team Member
Context and Nature of Review

Visit Date

3/13/2017

Mid-Cycle Reviews include:

- The Year 4 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Biennial Review for Applying institutions

Reaffirmation Reviews include:

- The Year 10 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Review for Initial Candidacy for Applying institutions
- The Review for Initial Accreditation for Applying institutions
- The Year 4 Review for Standard Pathway institutions that are in their first accreditation cycle after attaining initial accreditation

Scope of Review

- Reaffirmation Review
- Federal Compliance
- On-site Visit
- Multi-Campus Visit (if applicable)

There are no forms assigned.

Institutional Context

Andrews University is a Seventh-day Adventist institution in the Protestant Christian tradition. The campus is situated on 1,600 acres in Michigan near Lake Michigan. The University has 26 instructional buildings, four residence halls, four apartment complexes, an astronomy observatory, a produce and dairy farm, a 50,000-watt FM radio station, three museums and an airpark.

Andrews is the only Adventist university ranked in the top "National Universities" on US News and World Report, and is recognized as the flagship institution for the Seventh-day Adventists with twenty doctoral degrees, including ten in religion.

Andrews offers approximately 173 undergraduate and graduate programs ranging from one-year certificates to doctoral degrees. Academic programs are offered through the College of Arts & Sciences, the School of Architecture & Interior Design, the School of Business Administration, the School of Education, the School of Health Professions, the Department of Aviation, the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, and are supported by the School of Graduate Studies and the School of Distance Education & International Partnerships.

Figures provided to the team indicate that Andrews University has around 3400 students studying on the main campus, via distance, and at US locations each fall. Annually, Andrews serves over 4500 students in these categories. Approximately half are undergraduates and half are graduate students. During the 2015-2016 school
year, there were at least 550 additional students, mostly graduate level, studying at international locations, and almost 1000 taking one or more teacher education professional development courses. Andrews is a very diverse institution and prides itself on national recognition for this diversity.

The institution has more than thirty additional locations in the US and internationally through which it offers courses, and at some locations entire degrees.

**Interactions with Constituencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Chemistry &amp; Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Undergraduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Student Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, International Student Services &amp; Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Education Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Distance &amp; Non-Traditional Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Public Health, Nutrition &amp; Wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Center for Adventist Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, History &amp; Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment System Coordinator, Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, School of Architecture &amp; Interior Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Vice President, Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director, Graduate Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Teaching, Learning &amp; Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Enrollment Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Coordinator, Seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Undergraduate Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant, Institute of Hispanic Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Facilities Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Student Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President, University Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President, Campus &amp; Student Life and Title IX Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Speech-Language Pathology &amp; Audiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director, International Student Services &amp; Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/Psychologist, Counseling &amp; Testing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Graduate Psychology &amp; Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director, Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean, School of Distance Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, World Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President, Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Psychology &amp; Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Compliance for School of Distance Education &amp; International Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Alumni Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Andrews University Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, InMininstry Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/Coordinator of Advising Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Public Health, Nutritional &amp; Wellness/Dietetics Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Undergraduate Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean, Online Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services Head, Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator/Faculty, Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems &amp; Multimedia, Systems Manager, Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services/Instructional Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, English &amp; Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Provost, Andrews Core Experience/General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus &amp; Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Provost, Institutional Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, School of Architecture &amp; Interior Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, L.I.F.E. Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Registrar, Undergraduate Off-Campus Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Strategic Marketing Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor Pioneeer Memorial Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Director, Institute of Hispanic Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference/Database/Off-Campus Services, Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Physical Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Integrity &amp; Compliance Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Master of Divinity Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant for MA in Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President/Creative Director, Integrated Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Coach, Doctor of Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, International Languages &amp; Global Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, UG Honors Program &amp; Faculty, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Planned Giving &amp; Trust Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Visual Art, Communication &amp; Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant for Marketing &amp; Enrollment, Doctor of Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant, MA Leadership Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean, Seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant for Administration &amp; Finance, Doctor of Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Visual Art, Communication &amp; Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, School of Health Professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Religion &amp; Biblical Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President, Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Curriculum &amp; Instructional Design Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Manager, International Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Creative Director/Editorial Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, School of Distance Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, School of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, School of Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Systems Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, School of Architecture &amp; Interior Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, University Health &amp; Wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean for Student Life/Diversity, AUSA Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditations &amp; Assessment Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Associate Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Registrar, Teaching, Learning &amp; Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, History &amp; Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Graduate Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President, Student Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Faculty Meeting, Approximately 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Staff Meeting, Approximately 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Student Meeting, Approximately 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Documents

Visitor's Guide Andrews University 2016-2017
Community Resources at Andrews University
Fall/Summer 2017 Undergraduate FTIAC Admissions Report
International Institutional Agreements for Student Tuition Rates document
Enrollment and Registration Survey Fall 2016
Board Materials, Academic Programs & Education Services Committee -- March 6, 2017
Student Visits Comparisons
Andrews Enrollments by location-modality- fall 2016
"Come to Andrews" Marketing Materials
Andrews Enrollment Summary 2015-2016
General Education Committee Minutes, 9/10/2010
2016 Andrews University Financial Statement - Long Form
1 - Mission

The institution’s mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution’s operations.

1.A - Core Component 1.A

The institution’s mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
2. The institution’s academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
3. The institution’s planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

1. Andrews University has a mission statement suited to its role as a leading educational institution for the Seventh-day Adventist World Church:

Andrews University, a distinctive Seventh-day Adventist Christian institution, transforms its students by educating them to seek knowledge and affirm faith in order to change the world.

This mission statement was refined in 2011 as—Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith, Change the World, and it was operationalized in the 2012-17 Strategic Plan through seven Strategic Pillars (2012)—six Strategic Initiatives (2012)—and four Core Strengths (2014). As part of the strategic planning process, these updates to mission were approved by university bodies including the Board of Trustees.

In the visiting team's conversation with various groups, the mission of the University was widely known, frequently cited, and repeatedly referenced. When students were asked why they chose to attend Andrews University, many indicated that it was the mission that drew them. Eighty-five percent of the student body are Seventh-day Adventists. Similarly the faculty, who are almost entirely Seventh-day Adventists, cited decisions to leave other institutions or to remain in their positions at Andrews University, as motivated by opportunities to "seek knowledge" in the context of their faith community. In an open meeting with the visiting team, staff described their work as a calling and described Andrews as a special community, at the same time recognizing opportunities for their contributions as staff to be more fully recognized.

2. Andrews University is the only comprehensive Seventh-day Adventist doctoral research university. The mission is carried out through undergraduate and graduate programming in the College of Arts & Sciences, the School of Architecture & Interior Design, the School of Business Administration, the
School of Education, the School of Health Professions, the Department of Aviation; and through graduate programs in the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. These academic programs are supported by the School of Graduate Studies and the School of Distance Education & International Partnerships.

Student services support the mission through the creation of a residential and co-curricular environment that incorporates the tenets of the Seventh-day Adventists. Committed to develop the whole person, co-curricular life includes chapel, service learning, student clubs and associations, worship and mission work. As part of the admission process, students sign a statement affirming their willingness to abide by expected behaviors.

3. Budgeting and planning align with the University's mission and reflect its relationship with the Church. Resources are allocated in line with the institutional strategic plan. The institution’s operating budget partly depends on subsidies from international, national, and regional divisions of that church organization. The University invests its funding in essential academic programs and in the ongoing operations of the University. As reported in the assurance argument, "On the whole, the University aims to allocate 59.5% of income for direct educational expenses, including faculty salaries, and the remaining 40.5% for institutional and academic support."

Through the absorption of Griggs University in 2009, and the subsequent development of the School of Distance Education & International Partnerships, the University has enhanced its capacity to deliver educational programs world-wide. Half of Andrews University’s headcount enrollment is from affiliated, online and extension programs, located in the US and abroad, in educational programs that have been developed in response to requests from the world-wide church.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
1. B - Core Component 1.B

The mission is articulated publicly.

1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution’s emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Rating

Met

Evidence

1. The University consistently communicates its mission through publications, advertisements, and electronic communications. The mission is integrated within branding and marketing, for example with the AU wordmark and through banners displayed on campus.

Visitors to campus receive a Visitor's Guide, which prominently publishes the mission, and articulates how Andrews University students will seek knowledge, affirm faith, and change the world as part of that mission. An overview of the institution (who are we), fast facts, a sample of faith development programs, and a tour of campus facilities, all serve to inform visitors about the institution's identity and its constituents.

2. The University’s mission documents—bylaws, Board Policy Manual, Working Policy, bulletin, and Strategic Plan—clearly identify Andrews University as a distinctive Seventh-day Adventist Christian institution whose mission is to transform its students by educating them to seek knowledge and affirm faith in order to change the world. The University’s vision, as published in the Board Policy Manual, is to be “the center of Adventist intellectual life as it demonstrates the transformative power of faith and learning, excellence through diversity, collaborative scholarship, leadership development, and generous service” and to “be the Seventh-day Adventist university of choice for students, parents and employees alike, as it educates men and women who will demonstrate their faith by utilizing scholarly competencies and leadership skills to transform local and global communities.”

3. A review of documents, including the Bulletin, clearly identify the institutions programs and degrees, and this view is supported by the component of the federal compliance review that focused on accuracy in marketing and advertising materials. In an open meeting, students shared that they selected Andrews University based upon its strong reputation and its outreach to them as an Adventist institution. They felt informed and prepared for the academic programs and campus life based upon promotional materials, campus visits, and website information.
Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
1.C - Core Component 1.C

The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
2. The institution’s processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Rating

Met

Evidence

1. Andrews University is nationally recognized for its diversity and multiculturalism. The University's diversity reflects that of the worldwide Seventh-day Adventist Church. In the University's on-campus student body, for fall 2016 enrollment, 30% of enrolled students were White, Non-Hispanic, 20% were Black, 16% were Hispanic, 10% were Asian, and 19% were International students. Faculty and staff also are diverse, although to a lesser extent than students. In 2015 among faculty: 66% were White, Non-Hispanic, 11% were Black, 10% were Hispanic, and 8% were Asian.

The institution values hospitality and seeks to demonstrate respect for all religions. For example in the evidence file, materials were included on a forum initiated by students in the Doctor of Physical Therapy program, and supported by the campus community, to create greater understanding and awareness of the Muslim faith.

It was shared with the visiting team that the institution has developed a statement on Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual identities that affirms the institution's desire to be a safe, inclusive and welcoming place for all students within the context of the Seventh-day Adventist religious beliefs.

2. There is a 17-member Institutional Diversity Council, which meets monthly, made up of student, faculty, staff, and administrative representatives. This Council tackles issues of inclusiveness and multiculturalism at all levels within the institution, including a wide range of social and current affair issues, with accompanying recommendations, that are relevant to the student and campus community.

Another group was formed on campus focused on race relations. As a result of this groups' work, recommendations were made for the future hiring of a diversity officer, and for the required training session titled “The Andrews Mirror: A Workshop on Diversity” offered during the Faculty Institute in August 2016.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
1.D - Core Component 1.D

The institution’s mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
2. The institution’s educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Rating

Met

Evidence

1. Andrews University, according to its bylaws, is operated as a non-profit higher education institution by the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and works to serve as part of the “educational ministry” of that church. Its primary purpose is educational.

2. Andrews University serves the surrounding area of Benton Harbor; it serves regional needs in Michigan, and it serves the national and international Seventh-day Adventist community. Numerous examples were provided to the visiting team of co-curricular service projects in the near-by communities, national projects designed to serve urban and rural communities, and international projects organized as mission trips. The commitment to doing good works and being of service was affirmed in meetings with faculty and students and evidenced in the Assurance System.

The campus also serves as a cultural and social anchor in the rural community of Berrien Springs offering programs and activities in which the local community is invited to participate. A publication entitled, Community Resources at Andrews University, outlines the many educational experiences and social services made available to the surrounding community including counseling services, an airpark, a dairy farm, fresh food market, an arboretum, banquet services, campus museums, conference facilities, children's center, fitness facilities, international food fair, and more.

3. One of the public communities served by Andrews University is the larger Seventh-day Adventist community. Andrews University exists for the purpose of education, and does so in the context of the Seventh-day Adventist church. The University develops both committed individuals who will serve the Church, and as well as it cultivates graduates who will serve the broader society. Andrews University recognizes that it has a role with assisting in the education of Adventists throughout the world, and to this end it partners with Adventist institutions across the US and abroad.
Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
1.S - Criterion 1 - Summary

The institution’s mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution’s operations.

Evidence

The institution's mission is clearly articulated, widely published, and well known by the campus community and Board of Trustees. The mission of Andrews University is preeminently educational in the context of the Seventh-day Adventist faith tradition and world church. It is a comprehensive, doctoral granting institution which includes a School of Theology as part of its academic structure. Outreach is accomplished through the School of Distance Education and International Partnerships, which were strengthened by the take-over of Griggs University, an educational interest of the Adventists.

Diversity is highly valued by Andrews University. While highly diverse in its student population, the institution seeks to build on this diversity, including the creation of a Diversity Committee and future plans for a chief diversity officer. The team notes that the opportunities to improve cited by the institution include, focus on diversity and service outreach. Andrews University seeks to be a welcoming campus where hospitality is offered to those who differ, as long as they are accepting of the Adventist tenets and lifestyle.
2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

2.A - Core Component 2.A

The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Andrews University provided evidence that it operates with financial integrity through reference to internal policies and related procedures. For example, the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees contain a conflict of interest policy to which all members must adhere. This view of financial integrity is supported by the eternal auditor, BKD, LLP, which indicated in its 2016 Independent Auditor’s Report and Consolidated Financial Statements that no deficiencies in internal controls were found for the purposes of the audit.

There is open communication about financial trends and the annual budgeting process as reported to the team. When faculty and staff compensation was held at a zero or small percentage increase in the past two years, this was accompanied by information about financial need and planning to improve the financial situation in the future. The assurance argument provides sample evidence that the University administration communicates with faculty and staff through various venues to ensure transparency and accountability about University operations. Opportunities to communicate occur at faculty meetings, staff meetings, board reports shared publicly by the President after each meeting, through emails and University committees.

In compliance with the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA), the Office of Student Financial Services adheres to the University’s Code of Conduct, which consists of 12 specific policies to ensure transparency involving lenders and conflict of interest. Student Financial Services qualified as a low-risk auditee in the external audit.

The University Bulletin documents academic integrity through the publication of academic policies for undergraduate and graduate students, including the process for students to resolve grade disputes. The Institution provides information required under the “Higher Education Opportunity Act" and "Student Right to Know Act” on a dedicated website. The Student Handbook fully discloses student rights, along with available services. It also contains the Right to Appeal/Grievance section, presenting appeal/grievance procedures for both academic and non-academic issues. At the time of the visit, AU was developing an integrated website where students could share campus feedback
including Care Reports, Incident Reports, appeals to an Ombudsmen, or simply share their thoughts; the purpose is to make it simple for students to express concerns.

The duties of the faculty are outlined in the working policy document, which includes qualifications and conditions of employment, policies governing the professional status and quality of faculty members, rank and tenure requirements, and academic policies. The newly created Faculty Senate, the result of the commitment to shared governance in the past five years, provides a forum for faculty to address concerns and make recommendations related to the areas of their primary authority.

The University operates with integrity with respect to all employees. As an institution owned and operated by the Seventh-day Adventist Church, the University’s employment practices reflect religious preferences, while at the same time acting in accordance with protections provided by the United States Constitution and by law. For example, the University complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act, providing equal opportunity to qualified individuals with disabilities in all employment practices. In compliance with the Affordable Care Act (ACA), all employees, including students, adjunct faculty, contract, and temporary workers who have worked 30 hours or more per week, are provided with Andrews University healthcare coverage.

The University operates with integrity in its auxiliary enterprises, including dining services, University housing and residence halls, the bookstore, and the AU dairy farm. These auxiliary enterprises of the University provide services needed to support campus life, and in the case of the dairy farm, to support an academic program. Policies and procedures are in place to ensure adherence to applicable laws and regulations as advanced in the assurance system.

Administration, faculty and staff agree as a condition of employment or admission to recognize and uphold the principles of the Seventh-day Adventists, and to abide by a shared code of conduct. Students of other faiths are attracted by the conservative nature of the Seventh-day Adventists, and also agree to respect the religious nature of the institution and its code of conduct.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
2.B - Core Component 2.B

The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The University's presentation of information about its programs, tuition and fees, affiliations, and accreditations was reviewed as part of the Federal Compliance Report and found to be in compliance with expected standards.

A meeting with students affirmed that published policies are accessible in the Bulletin and handbook, and that faculty and staff supplement these publications by helping students to interpret and apply policy. In the meeting, students did identify an opportunity for AU to clarify its communications and to streamline its processes related to transfer policies; students also indicated they had channels available to them to share this feedback.

Feedback in the HLC student survey reflected a general level of satisfaction with services and information, and in areas where opportunities were identified for improvement, these had to do with selected academic programs. A 2016 visit survey, a 2016 enrollment survey, and a 2016 registration survey, all internal to AU, show general student satisfaction with the information provided during these respective processes. For example in the enrollment survey, the average score for student responses related to items about the thoroughness and frequency of communication was 4 and higher, on scale of 1 to 5 with 5 as strongly agree.

It is clear when one enters campus that Andrews University is affiliated with the Seventh-day Adventists as announced through structures, signage, and bulletin boards.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
2.C - Core Component 2.C

The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

1. The governing board’s deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution’s internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Rating
Met

Evidence

1. The Board has as its priority preserving and enhancing Andrews University. As found in the updated 2016 Board Policy Manual, the Statement of Board goals/priorities provides that, "Trustees seek to govern a financially sound university that fulfills its mission." A review of minutes from multiple Board meetings reflect the following:

   - Approval an annual budget
   - Receipt of regular updates on the annual operations
   - Receipt of the annual report from the Audit Committee
   - Approval of all capital expenditures over $250,000
   - Review of Key Performance Indicators presented in the Provost's report
   - Receipt of reports for compliance and diversity

2. The Board considers the interests of the institution’s internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations as evidenced by the Board action in 2010 allowing Andrews to “take control” of Griggs University (a school of distance education) and as a part of this to ensure resources were available for the implementation of this action. Responding to the interests of internal constituents, the Board approved the construction of a new University Health & Wellness Center.

In its very structure the Board represents the relationship of Andrews University to the Seventh-day Adventist world church. The Board of Trustees of Andrews University is composed of approximately 40 members. Half of them are officials in the Seventh-day Adventist Church and serve ex officio, and the other half are lay members of the church, elected for a renewable five-year term during a meeting of the Corporation membership as outlined in the University Bylaws. The Board chair is a vice president of the Seventh-day Adventist world church organization and is formally installed in office by a vote of the newly constituted board following the membership meeting.

3. The Board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of external parties and acts
to ensure its autonomy. As stated in the AU Board Policies Manual (5.7.4), "The Board and the president reserve the right to accept (or, in some cases, to decline) any commitment offered to them." For example, the recent gift to the University of $1 million for development of online learning, as part of "taking control" of Griggs University, was a direct result of the interest of ex-officio Board members in this project; they, in turn, made the case on behalf of the University to the world church. Had the gift not been available, the University reported that they would have declined taking control of Griggs.

The 50% elected lay members also provide a balance to the influence of church officials, and the risk of their “undue influence” through, for example, financial contributions, is monitored by the University administration in line with the conflict of interest declarations.

4. As stated in the AU Board Policy Manual (2016), "As a general principle the Board governs and the University administration and staff, working through the president, administer the institution on behalf of the Board. For example, the Board established the mission of the University, but hires a president, administration, faculty and staff to carry it out." (4.1.4.1) This policy will allow the Board to refine its practices in relation to decisions about staff hiring at the institution, as minutes from two previous years show the Board approving multiple position hires as recommended by administration. Conventionally, boards affirm promotion and tenure decisions for faculty, it is less common for boards to approve faculty and staff hiring, even for key positions.

When meeting with the AU Board, the team heard very clearly that the Board perceives its role to be leading the institution through visioning and strategic planning, and to delegate the responsibility to manage the University to the President in the management of the University. The Board sees itself as supporting the President in line with Board policy 4.1.4.1 as stated above.

---

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

_No Interim Monitoring Recommended._
2.D - Core Component 2.D

The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Andrews University has a published policy on Academic Freedom, which can be summarized as freedom with responsibility: “Like all other freedoms, academic freedom is subject to limitations and requires certain responsibilities of those who enjoy it.” It is further stated that the institution espouses academic freedom because it serves “to foster disciplined and creative investigation in all phases of learning.” (Working Policy 2:159) This policy is further elaborated in statements related to the “Freedom to Engage in Research and Publication,” “Freedom in the Classroom,” and “Freedom as a Private Citizen.”

As stated and documented in the assurance argument, faculty are expected to subscribe to and work within the framework of the statement of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists on Freedom and Accountability and Academic Freedom in Seventh-day Adventist Institutions of Higher Education, as outlined in the policy on academic freedom. Evidence in the Assurance System included a forum on creationism hosted by Andrews University at which the evolutionary and creationist positions were advanced by leading scholars from within a Christian context.

The visiting team confirmed with faculty in an open meeting and in a meeting focused on Criterion Two that faculty perceive themselves as having academic freedom in their teaching and scholarly pursuits. One faculty member indicated that he had more freedom at Andrews University than he had at a major state university where his research results had challenged a major donor. As 99% of the faculty are Seventh-day Adventists, they speak from within the tradition, however, as indicated by a number of faculty, there are differing viewpoints within the faith tradition, thereby creating an intellectually challenging environment. An example was provided on the divergent viewpoints within the faith and by Andrews University concerning the ordination of women.

Also Andrews University seeks to prepare its students for service in the world as professionals, and as such, academic programs including education, physical therapy and social work have professional codes that require treating all individuals with dignity. These professional requirements were described as compatible with the vision of a Christian life for the institution.

The team notes the faith tradition and institution espouse a modest and conservative life for the student body, and there are rules for campus life that support such behavior. In an open session with students there was a suggestion that the institution reconsider its 10pm closing of the library in order to support those commuter students who need greater access to this study space. As Andrews University seeks to grow its enrollment to include other conservative Christian students to augment its enrollment of Adventist students, then they can anticipate needing to be more responsive to a wider
set of student needs. The team found the institution to be aware of these student needs. As another example of meeting student needs, student life has articulated a statement on sexuality that recognizes that some students perceive themselves as gay/lesbian/bisexual.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
2.E - Core Component 2.E

The institution’s policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students and staff.

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.
2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.
3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Rating

Met

Evidence

1. The Office of Research & Creative Scholarship (ORCS) at Andrews provides oversight and support services to ensure that research and scholarly practice provided by its faculty, staff, and students adhere to federal regulations. The team found evidence to support its conclusion that the institution supports responsible acquisition and application of knowledge. There is a federally registered Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human participants in research. The University operates a dairy farm as an instructional site as well as a working farm, thereby increasing the areas of regulation with which it must comply. In compliance with the federal regulations concerning the care and use of all vertebrate laboratory animals, Andrews University Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) oversees the University’s research activities involving the use of animals, and information is posted on the website of the Office of Research & Creative Scholarship.

2. Instruction in research ethics and the requirements for research are taught at the undergraduate, as well as graduate, levels through the active engagement of the IRB personnel across campus. The Office of Research & Creative Scholarship offers students a variety of resources and training opportunities on its website.

3. Andrews University has recently updated its integrity policy. Academic integrity is overseen by two councils—the Faculty Academic Integrity Council (FAIC) and the Student Academic Integrity Council (SAIC). These two councils are tasked with various responsibilities such as keeping records of violations, organizing Integrity Panels as needed to review certain cases of reported dishonesty, and making suggested changes regarding integrity policy to the university. A summary of the new policy and the Integrity Pledge are provided in the Student Handbook and on the Academic Integrity website. The updated policy will also appear in the next bulletin.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Evidence

In summary, the integrity of Andrews University is upheld by formal policies and procedures, by the commitment to shared governance, and by the centrality of education and the pursuit of truth to the faith tradition. Andrews University provided evidence that it operates with financial integrity through reference to internal policies and related procedures. Andrews University has a published policy on Academic Freedom, which can be summarized as freedom with responsibility. The Office of Research & Creative Scholarship (ORCS) at Andrews provides oversight and support services to ensure that research and scholarly practice provided by its faculty, staff, and students adhere to federal regulations.

The AU Board perceives its role to be leading the institution through visioning and strategic planning, and to delegate the responsibility to manage the University to the President in the management of the University. The Board sees itself as supporting the President in line with Board policy 4.1.4.1.

The team concurs with the institution's self-evaluation of the ways that it has strengthened its focus on integrity through the development of a Board Policies Manual, formalizing institutional compliance, and creation of a Faculty Senate.

The institution has also identified opportunities to further enhance its integrity including embedding FERPA, and Title IX training into institutional operational cycle.
3 - Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

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

3.A - Core Component 3.A

The institution’s degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
3. The institution’s program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Rating

Met

Evidence

1. Andrews University is a complex institutions that offers Associate, Bachelors, Masters, Doctorates, Specialist, and Certificate programs. The programs require semester hours appropriate for the degree offered with a minimum of 60 credits for the associate degree, 124 semester hours for the bachelors degree, a range of 32-108 credits for a masters degree with the MDiv at 108 semester credits and 64-100 credits for the doctoral degrees. All programs reflect a clear connection to the mission and goals of the university. The undergraduate programs are built upon a well appointed general education program and identified learning outcomes. The university is implementing a Unified Framework that maps learning outcomes to specialized, broad, and integrated knowledge, intellectual skills, applied and collaborative learning, and civil and global learning according to undergraduate and graduate expectations. Specialized programs including nursing, physical therapy, social work, etc. are appropriately accredited by their professional agencies. The organizational structure in academic affairs, including deans and program chairs is carefully designed to provide oversight to programs to assure knowledge, skill and attitude development in the program to fulfill the mission and vision of the University. All programs participate in a cycle of program review that includes evidence of student performance of expected outcomes. The process of program review, evidence of the process and results, feedback and program revisions is outlined accurately in the assurance argument and affirmed by the faculty.

2. A review of a sample of syllabi from all levels of program offerings indicated clearly articulated learning goals that are appropriately differentiated to the level of program. Meetings with program faculty, deans, and students confirm the information presented in the assurance argument that doctoral programs culminate in dissertation, masters programs require portfolio or thesis capstone projects, and
the honors baccalaureate program requires an undergraduate thesis.

3. Andrews University delivers programs in a variety of modalities, on campus face-to-face, blended, online, distant site, and correspondence. The team confirmed in discussion with faculty, students and administration, as well as with a review of course materials, that the learning goals are consistent regardless of delivery mode. Full time faculty develop syllabi and if an adjunct faculty develops curriculum, the full time faculty in the department approve the syllabi before it is accepted. Student, faculty and course evaluations are completed for all courses in all delivery modalities and program directors attest to the consistent outcomes. Dual credit courses are primarily taught on the AU campus by full time qualified AU faculty. These courses are evaluated in the same manner as all AU courses. Faculty teaching in online courses are provided assistance with appropriate instructional technology. Online courses are audited and reviewed several times during the term for quality in teaching and learning.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*

The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution’s mission.

Rating

Met

Evidence

1. In 2008-09 Andrews University began the process of revising their general education program. The team met with the faculty and administrative committees that have been charged with implementing and assessing the general education program. Two tracks, one for pre-professional programs and one for majors in the liberal arts, were approved at 42 and 56 minimum credits required respectively. Pre-professional programs require additional liberal arts courses that are required prerequisite to the major. The revised general education program was based on national standards and consistent with the University's mission and strategic plan. Coursework in religion, communication, physical science, social studies, history, fine arts, wellness and the philosophy of service provide the foundation for all degree programs.

2. The Andrews Core Experience (ACE) is clearly articulated and well communicated to faculty, students and advisors. Grounded in the AU mission to Seek Knowledge, Affirm Faith and Change the World, and reinforced with the 'pillars' of the Strategic Plan- quality, faith commitment, leadership, community and growth, the general education coursework and outcomes are also consistent with expectations of a college educated person.

3. Faculty and students as well as the Dean of Research, and program directors validate the information in the assurance argument that all degree programs include robust scholarship and research. Research grants are available for undergraduate and graduate projects often accomplished by faculty student teams. The team was provided with many examples of studies completed by student
and student/faculty teams. The general education curriculum includes required courses in communication and skills of inquiry that are further developed in the student's major program.

4. A strength of Andrews University is its commitment to diversity and the global Church. The student body at the main campus is 15-20% students from the international community and with more than 30 international sites, interaction with a wide diversity of students from more than 100 countries is common. The student body is 34% white, 27% black, 18% Asian and 17% Hispanic. Faculty from the main campus visit each off campus site on a regular rotation and many programs require distance education students to visit campus. Students and staff alike were enthusiastic about the diversity represented on campus, many noting that it was a primary reason for their high level of satisfaction with the school. Andrews University is committed to the Global Church, fulfilling the mission of the Seventh Day Adventist church to 'go into the world'. The faculty, administration, staff and student body reflects this embrace of diversity. The University is committed to the Seventh-day Adventist faith, and is committed to diversity of nationality, race, gender, economy and age.

5. Faculty and students are committed to scholarship, creative work and discovery of knowledge. The team was provided with many examples of publications, presentations and current studies by faculty and students as well as the clear expectation for scholarly activity for promotion and tenure. Meetings with faculty, deans and administration support the information in the assurance argument that more than 120 publications by faculty were accepted in peer-reviewed journals in 2015. The team was provided with materials and examples from music performance, art and other creative work of faculty and students.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.
2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.
3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.
4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.
5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.
6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

**Rating**

Met

**Evidence**

1. Andrews University has 233 full time faculty, qualified adjuncts and professional staff including academic advisors serving approximately 1500 undergraduate and students, a 9:1 student faculty ratio. Discussion with faculty, program directors and deans confirm that the faculty adhere to a 24 semester credit teaching load for undergraduate coursework and 16 semester credits in graduate programs. The workload policy was shared with the team and the faculty confirmed their participation in scholarship, advising, committee work, curriculum development and assessment as part of the expected role. The team met with members of many curriculum and assessment committees well represented by faculty including the general education (ACE) committee. All adjunct faculty must meet the same qualifications as a full time faculty and the appointment approved by the appropriate program director or dean.

2. More than 80% of all faculty have terminal degrees and faculty generally have one degree higher than the program in which they are assigned. In the rare situation that a faculty does not have an earned terminal degree while teaching in a graduate program, the university has established experiential requirements for appointment approval. Dual credit courses are generally taught by AU full time faculty or an approved adjunct with appropriate degree/credential. Adjunct faculty teaching online, site based and/or international sites are vetted and approved by full time faculty. Many of these courses are taught by full time faculty as a part of load or by qualified faculty in partnership institutions serving as adjunct at AU.
3. All instructors in every course, in all delivery modalities are evaluated by students at the end of each course. The evaluations are reviewed by their department chair, dean, and the Dean of Distance Education/Graduate Studies if appropriate. The dean and department chair complete an evaluation of each faculty each academic year. The benchmark for teaching effectiveness is 4/5 likert scale. Quality teaching is a valued component of the criteria for promotion and tenure.

4. Meetings with faculty, the Provost, and deans affirm that Andrews University supports faculty with resources for continuing professional development as well as in-house development opportunities. Faculty have the resources to travel to a national conference every other year and local conferences yearly. The Provost and deans indicated that they find development money to support scholarly presentations when it is a faculty/student project. Other faculty development opportunities include yearly fall workshops which include content in pedagogy, curriculum development, use of technology for teaching and learning. The Deans Council indicated that a faculty development portal was being developed for both full and part time faculty that will include syllabi templates, resources for teaching and learning and advising. As noted in 3.c.3. all faculty are evaluated at the conclusion of each course for teaching effectiveness including quality of content. The dean/department chair evaluates full and adjunct faculty for currency in their field, instructional expertise, scholarly contribution, and service. The team was very impressed with the faculty, their expertise, their commitment to mission and Andrews. They are highly credentialed, prolific in their field and excellent teachers who would be prized at many institutions. It is clear that they are at this institution because of their commitment to the church and mission.

5. Faculty are required to post and hold office hours. All faculty also serve as academic advisors to their students. Student satisfaction surveys indicate a high level of satisfaction with faculty advising and availability. The distance education students are served by full time advisors who often use video conferencing for communication.

6. The team met with faculty and staff who provide student services, both on campus and distance education. Andrews University international and global student services are provided by the Dean of Distance Education, an assistant dean, administrative assistants, and designated advisors. Library, counseling, financial aid, academic advising, and disabilities services are provided to on campus and distance education students by a cadre of highly skilled, well qualified staff who are supported in professional development opportunities. Tutoring is provided to on campus students through a 1 credit class. Distance education students are tutored by video conferencing, online tutorials and/or tutors identified at their location. Student surveys of these services indicate a high level of satisfaction with scores of 4/5 likert scale with the exception of financial aid counseling. This officer volunteered that her staff are working on improving customer service. Campus ministry is very active on campus and have developed an app that can be used by main campus and distance education students alike. It includes daily devotional prayers, Bible study, and information about activities and events.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution’s offerings).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Rating

Met

Evidence

1. Discussion with the Director of the Student Success Center, professional faculty advisors in each school, and the Student Transition Committee validated the information presented in the assurance argument that advising programs are available to meet student needs. All students are assigned an academic advisor in the their major field of study, Students who are deciding on a major are advised by the Success Center staff. Those who are at risk with lower admission ACTs or other high risk factors are advised by the Director of the Success Center. Accessibility services are also provided when the need for an accommodation is assessed. In addition to the Director, the Success Center includes 3 professional advisors who each have approximately 75 advisees, an administrative assistant and a tutor coordinator. Andrews supports an Office of International Student Services that includes advising and support services for more than 650 undergraduate and graduate students.

2. Enrollment management staff and the student success staff work together to provide seamless support to incoming students. Students are placed in remedial classes in math, reading and writing as needed, based on test scores. Andrews staff completed a study for student persistence and graduation based on admission criteria and found that students with ACT scores below 17 were not graduating within the expected 4-6 year timeframe. This resulted in a revision of admissions criteria and scrutiny of remedial support. All students on an academic program for improvement are advised through the advising center. Any student who requests a change of major is directed to the Success Center for career counseling.

3. Students with a declared major are given an advisor in their area of study. If the student is undecided or changes their major, Andrews University has a program, Explore, which assists students in discerning their major. Career counselors are also active within the student services arena for this assistance. Distance education students are also advised by an advisor in the distance education
program as well as by an academic advisor in their area of study. The University's LMS is LearningHub which is available for on campus, distance education, face-to-face, blended and online coursework. The Office of Information Technology Services provides support for the learning module system and other student and faculty needs. Students expressed some dissatisfaction to the team regarding transfer credits and advising for transfer students with some ambiguity about what coursework would be required for their program at Andrews. The advising staff noted that they are working on a more clear translation of accepted coursework for transfer students and intend to follow the accepted guidelines from the Michigan state system. The University is attentive to and provides individualized advising to students.

4. Andrews University facilities and infrastructure are well maintained and adequate for the programs offered. Discussion with the Cabinet affirmed that the facilities are able to support not only the current enrollment but also the growth outlined in the enrollment goals of the strategic plan. A campus tour provided an overview of laboratories, the library, music and performing arts studios, classroom and office space, and museums, all well maintained and appropriate for the academic programs served.

5. The University places a priority on scholarly activity and research by undergraduate and graduate students and faculty. The library serves an important function in the support of this activity. Discussion with the Dean of the Library and associate librarians confirmed their support of the academic program. Library guides are being developed for each program, available on line for distance education students regardless of location, to assist students with research. The library staff has developed a video to assist faculty in finding appropriate resources for their research. Andrew's IRB committee is well established with policy and guidelines to function efficiently.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

*No Interim Monitoring Recommended.*
3.E - Core Component 3.E

The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution’s mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.
2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students’ educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The team met with representatives from many branches of student services including campus ministry, counseling, and residence life and with a group of students as well. They supported the information in the Assurance Argument that Andrews University supports many co-curricular activities that are congruent with the mission. Campus ministry supports the community's faith life through chapel, vespers, and service projects. Opportunities to grow intellectually include short courses, "Choice" programs, and an honors program that sponsors many activities and guest speakers. Enhanced community engagement is obvious with more than 60% of the students involved in volunteer services including providing health services for under-served populations in the community.

The mission to 'engage globally and change the world' is evident in the internship and research global opportunities and global volunteer services. The University has many clubs and organizations that offer support and education for this culturally diverse population. A majority of the students in the seminary are working pastors from around the globe who contribute culturally as well as spiritually to the entire community.

Andrews also supports a small athletic program and is raising funds to build a wellness center. The concept to live wholly is evident in the emphasis on fitness, nutrition, healthy lifestyle and encouragement to live a balanced life. The new performing arts facility and fine arts programs support many recitals, concerts, and guest performances that are well attended.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.
3. S - Criterion 3 - Summary

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

Evidence

Review of the assurance argument and evidence provided including syllabi and examples of student work, conversations with faculty and students both on campus and in distance education programs affirm that Andrews University is providing high quality education in its offerings regardless of location or delivery modality. Program offerings include certificate, associate, bachelors, masters and doctoral degrees with appropriate levels of complexity, and assessed outcomes for the degree offered.

Andrews University has developed and offers a coherent general education program that supports its mission and program offerings. Students and faculty are engaged in scholarly inquiry in a broad range of educational programs with an exceptional strength in human and cultural diversity. With a 1:9 faculty to student ratio, and more than 80% of the faculty with terminal degrees, the university has the faculty and staff necessary to deliver its programs. The team was impressed with the university's commitment to qualified and dedicated administrative and support personnel.

Student success is supported by advising, tutoring classes, well maintained facilities, and information technology including an LMS and online library resources. The professional programs have agreements with over 200 clinical sites to serve the experiential components of the programs.

Academic programs offered at Andrews University including seminary, professional and undergraduate programs are consistent with the mission to "engage globally and change the world."
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

1. Andrews University (AU) responded to the 2009 HLC observation that “Andrews University [had] conducted program reviews at different times in its history, but the efforts were not consistent or continuous” by establishing the Program Development and Review Committee which is a subcommittee of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. The program review process is described in the Program Review Process Outline and Instructions, originally drafted in 2011 and revised in 2015. This document gives a comprehensive description of the history of program review at AU and describes the process of review around four criterion: 1) Mission, History, Impact, and Demand 2) Program Quality 3) Financial Analysis 4) Strategic Analysis. The Program Development and Review Committee consists of five representatives from the
Graduate Faculty (one of which is co-chair), nine representatives from the Undergraduate Faculty (one of which is co-chair), the School of Graduate Studies Dean (co-chair), the School of Graduate Studies Executive Secretary (secretary), the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, the Dean of Libraries, College of Arts & Sciences Dean, and School of Business Administration Dean. The committee publishes the schedule of review through the Institutional Effectiveness webpage. This review has resulted in departments making changes in curriculum or offerings. For example, the review for the MA Religion, which is offered on campus and internationally, noted a lack of specificity as to how the curriculum developed student skills, including that of research, and that the “curriculum at off-campus sites is not being tailored to specific student needs.” The Seminary responded by clarifying the curriculum and including the MA Religion in their strategic planning. As a result, the program now has an increased number of required core courses, including a research methods course early in the curriculum.

2. AU has policies and procedures published in the Bulletin for awarding credits for experiential and prior learning. The Bulletin contains policies pertaining to Advanced Placement (AP) credit, International Baccalaureate (IB) credits, College Level Examination Program (CLEP) and, because of the large number of international students, credits awarded through international high schools and institutions of higher education.

3. In a meeting with the students, there was some dissatisfaction with the timeliness and communication of granting of transfer credit. AU is aware of this dissatisfaction and is taking steps to make evaluation of transfer credit more automated and seamless including recently signing onto the Michigan Transfer Agreement. In addition, all transfer credit evaluation is centralized in the Registrar's Office which consults with individual departments or programs if questions arise.

4. The authority over establishment of course prerequisites begins with faculty, progresses through the program or department level and then processes through faculty governance to the Undergraduate or Graduate Councils. This process is described in detail in the Working Policy section 2:411. As described in the Bulletin, AU offers three types of dual credit courses: 1) college courses taught by regular or adjunct faculty at Andrews University 2) college courses taught by regular or adjunct faculty online 3) college courses taught by teachers approved to serve as Andrews University adjunct faculty at an approved high school or academy. The School of Distance Education and International Programs (SDEIP) maintains oversight of dual credit syllabi and adjunct instructors that teach dual credit. These instructors must meet the same criteria for faculty that are hired to teach the course in any modality.

5. As listed in its Bulletin, AU has a large number of specialty accreditations including Chemistry, Nursing, Business, and Psychology. In addition, AU maintains specialty accreditation in the Accrediting Association of Seventh Day Adventist Schools, Colleges, and Universities. Currently, programs seeking initial accreditation are Counseling Psychology, Master of Public Health, Doctor of Nursing Practice, and Special Education.

6. AU has demonstrated commitments to learning about the success of its graduates. AU conducts two surveys of its graduates: First Destination, administrated yearly, and an Alumni Survey administered every other year. The 2015 First Destination survey indicates that 66% of the 523 respondents were either employed or admitted and planning to attend graduate school after graduation. In addition, the school examines and reports licensure pass rates to its board each year. Highlights of the October 2016 report from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to the Board indicated that Nursing had a 95% pass rate in the period between April 2015 to March 2016, Speech Pathology had a 91% percent pass rate between September 2015 to August 2016,
and Clinical Mental Health Counseling had a 100% pass rate for 2015 to 2016.

**Interim Monitoring (if applicable)**

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

1. In 2009, the Higher Learning Commission Review Team indicated that Andrews University’s (AU) assessment culture was weak and proscribed a focused visit in 2013. To address these challenges, AU made several strategic decisions to increase its assessment culture. These included purchasing WEAVE, an assessment management software (2010), developing Assessment policies (2011) which are published on the Office of Institutional Effectiveness’s website, and an increase in Assessment staffing placed in various schools from 2012 through 2016. The 2013 Focused Visit Team’s report found that “Andrews University now has in place a structure to promote and support the assessment of student learning throughout the institution.” As illustrated in the Bulletin, AU has institutional goals and, through the use of WEAVE, each program of study has published Learning Outcomes that can be assessed by each program and given oversight by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Additionally, the University is moving towards a Unified Framework of Outcomes (UFOs) based on the Lumina Foundation’s Degree Qualifications Profile. The General Education Learning Outcomes were developed under the purview of the Director of General Education and Andrews Core Experience (ACE) Committee and passed by faculty governance in 2013. These Learning Outcomes are found in the AU Bulletin. The ACE Committee will assess the General Education curriculum based on the AACC Value rubrics beginning in spring 2017. Institutional Effectiveness monitors institutional and program learning outcomes and, while still maintaining use of WEAVE, AU is considering if WEAVE is the best tool for all programs to compile assessment of learning outcomes.

2. AU assesses achievement of curricular learning outcomes through a variety of measures including ETS proficiency exams for undergraduates at the end of their senior year, a senior survey administered each year, an Alumni Survey administered every other year, and NSSE. In addition, the various specialty accredited programs, such as Business, Nursing, and others, report assessment results to their various accrediting bodies. All licensure pass rates are reported to the Board annually. The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), with many unaccredited programs, has all assessment plans entered into WEAVE though there are varying comfort levels in using the program within CAS. CAS hosted its first assessment retreat in 2015 where each department presented program outcomes, major
assessments, assessment results, and areas for improvement. CAS continues this retreat and it has helped the school refine its assessment methods. In spring and fall of 2016, the ACE program is piloting an assessment incorporating the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) VALUE Rubrics. This pilot will continue in spring 2017 by significantly increasing the number of courses using the VALUE Rubrics. After meeting with the ACE Committee, they should be applauded for piloting the rubrics and seeking to make meaningful assessment of the general education curriculum; however, the committee, with support of the Provost, should move from the pilot to a widely accepted system of assessment for the student outcomes that produces actionable data over time. As indicated on the Division of Student Life webpage, co-curricular outcomes relate to personal well-being, academic skills and career readiness, faith development, cultural competence, service, and leadership. These outcomes are assessed through a variety of indirect measures. For example, the 2016 Office of Student Activities and Involvement results from 2015 illustrate students’ satisfaction or dissatisfaction with various activities, Campus Ministry uses an internally developed tool to measure faith development, and Student Life also administers a survey each semester to students to collect feedback on co-curricular programming and learning gains. In meeting with the ACE committee, the Assistant Vice President for Campus & Student Life and the Director of Personal and Career Development have been added to the ACE Committee within the last year in order better coordinate curricular and co-curricular outcomes.

3. Each year, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness sorts student comments from the Senior Survey into categories and distributes them as applicable to the provost, deans, department chairs, Student Life, Campus Ministries, and other offices. Departments do make changes based on these examples. For example, student comments as well as ratings from the Senior Survey, the dean of the School of Health Professions and the Department of Nursing brought in a consultant in 2015 for assistance with curriculum sequencing. Actions also occur on the department or program level based on assessment practices. The School of Business Administration realized that quantitative scores for Management majors were low in the ETS major field test and have developed action plans to address this issue. Faculty in the Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology program reviewed the ETS Proficiency Profile results and realized that their students were lower than the Andrews average in math, which is an important skill in clinical practice. Therefore, beginning fall 2016, undergraduates are advised to take college algebra in their junior year, as well as the required statistics course. As indicated in the 2015-16 report on Co-Curricular Involvement, Student Life plans to strengthen Tuesday Offering by including “short courses” to move from a “one and done” model to more sustained Student Life offerings.

4. Since the Higher Learning Commission’s 2013 focused visit, AU continues to make strides to embed a culture of assessment throughout all portions of the university. Found in section 2:440:2:5 of the Working Policy, the Assessment Process Map delineates clear lines of reporting for assessment at AU. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness maintains a website of assessment resources. The Department Checklist gives clear instructions to ensure uniform learning outcomes, based on disciplines, and across syllabi. As illustrated in the Annual Faculty Review, faculty must report on their individual assessment activities. Four of the schools hold annual assessment day workshops. Recently, led by the Dean and faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences, there is a proposal for a Unified Framework of Outcomes (UFO) based on the Lumina Foundation’s Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) that the Faculty Senate, in 2016, has appointed an ad hoc steering committee to finalize the document, communicate with faculty, and make policy recommendations. The UFO is scheduled to be first implemented officially in fall 2017, with framework outcomes identified in course syllabi and university-wide assessment of two of the outcomes developed.
Interim Monitoring (if applicable)
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**

1. Andrews University (AU) is a Seventh Day Adventist institution that serves primarily Seventh-Day students as a central part of its mission. As listed in the Bulletin, prospective students must have a minimum high school grade point average of 2.5 and ACT/SAT composite scores at or above the 50th percentile. Some freshmen, however, who do not meet these requirements but show the potential for success, may be accepted with special advising and assistance by the Student Success Center, as outlined in the Undergraduate Admissions Committee acceptance guidelines. Typically, average ACT/SAT scores of Andrews’ students are well above the 50th percentile. As defined in the October 2016 Board Presentation, AU has set Head Count goals of unduplicated undergraduates with a loss of 2.5% from the 1483 Head Count during fall 2016 to 1460 in fall in 2017, flat in 2018, and a slight gain to 1497 in fall 2019. Based on demographics of AU’s service region and the Seventh Day Adventist population that AU mainly recruits from, these goals are attainable. Growth in the School of Distance Education and International Partnerships’ online program from 219 in 2010/11 to 698 in 2015/16 of unduplicated headcount was indicated in the March 2017 Academic Services and Education Service Committee of the Board presentation. In meetings with Off-Campus Programs and the Provost and Academic Deans, there was anecdotal discussion of raising International and Graduate enrollment; however, it was difficult to ascertain exact goals related to this growth. The March 2017 Academic Programs and Education Service Committee of the Board presentation indicates that first- to second-year retention rates hovered between 78% to 80% between 2011 to 2014. In 2015, the first- to second-year retention rate jumped to 87%. A retention goal of 80% is stated in the Retention Slide of the Provost's Board Presentation. The four-year graduation rates for AU, as reported in
the 2015 Provost Report to the Board and the 2015 and 2015 IPEDS report, has ranged from 59% to 63% between 2011 to 2015.

2. AU’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness collects and shares IPEDS data on retention and completion with the provost and Deans’ Council who then disseminates the information to the wider campus community. AU’s Student Life collects and analyzes retention and persistence of students in student housing (approximately 60%) and annually collects data on reasons students leave Andrews. This information is then shared with the Board Academic Programs and Education Services Committee and to the entire Board through the Provost’s report. In meetings with various groups, multiple internal committees, such as ACE, Student Transitions, Enrollment Management, for example, analyze this information in order to make data-informed decisions concerning matters related to their area.

3. Various constituencies at AU use information on student retention, persistence, and completion to make improvements. For example, in meeting with the Director and Associate Director of International Student Services and Programs, they reported that international students’ graduation rates fell from 44% in 2012 to 33% in 2013. In reviewing exit surveys, some students expressed that they did not feel “at home” at AU. During the last eighteen months, the Director and the Associate Director have made a strategic effort to make students’ transition to the campus more welcoming by hosting events throughout the year to celebrate the international students’ cultures and to build a community of international learners. However, the greatest success that AU has demonstrated in using retention data to positively impact student experience rests with the Explore program. In spring 2014, the provost initiated conversations on how to better support undeclared students and help them find a career that would fit their interests and natural skills, as well as complete a degree based on a 3.8% yield rate of students who did not have a major. By summer, as indicated by a newly crafted position description, the director of personal and career exploration was created. This position was charged with three major responsibilities: career development, mentoring and advising, and implementation and management of exploration initiatives. As indicated by the six-year plan drafted by the director, Explore’s goals are to: 1) Ensure each student has a clear major choice and career plan early in their college experience 2) Improve graduation rates with an increased focus on timely graduation plans for each student 3) Implement University offerings that will help ensure that graduates are either employed in their career field (or are involved in pursuits relevant to the goals of their chosen major) or enroll in graduate studies within a reasonable amount of time after graduation. All seven of the undeclared students who received career guidance and mentoring in fall 2014 returned in fall 2015. The yield rate of accepted undeclared FTIAC’s rose from 3.8% in fall 2014 to 20.3% in fall 2015. The director then mentored those students through their first year, and a staff member in Student Success mentored several others who joined the program. At the end of August 2016, 39 of the 43 (90.6%) first-year students in the program returned in fall 2016, which is higher than AU’s overall 79% retention rate for the same period. As noted earlier, the University’s retention was 87% overall as of fall 2016 partly attributable to the success of the Explore program. These two examples illustrate AU’s commitment to using data to improve student retention, persistence, and completion.

4. AU’s strives to reliably and uniformly report information on student retention, persistence, and
completion of programs; however, because of the complexity of AU’s online, international, and other off-campus programs, the campus community struggles to report this information consistently. In conversations with the Assessment Committee, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, the Deans and Provosts, and the President, the team determined that AU recognizes this challenge and is working towards consistent reporting as illustrated by the Andrews Enrollment Report 2015-16. Continuing this important work will assist AU in aligning retention, persistence, and completion rates and goals with strategic and budgetary goals.

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

Andrews University (AU) responded to the 2009 HLC observation that “Andrews University [had] conducted program reviews at different times in its history, but the efforts were not consistent or continuous” by establishing the Program Development and Review Committee which is a subcommittee of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. AU has strengthened its assessment culture through strategic hiring, increasing resources dedicated solely to assessment to individual schools and departments, and faculty and staff "buying into" this culture. AU has demonstrated, through various initiatives, to use data to inform their strategies to serve their mission, improve academic programs and student services, and track student retention, persistence, and graduation. Because of its complexity, AU continues to evolve in its ability to consistently report data across all units, but is striving to improve in this area.
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 With Concerns

Evidence

1. Despite possessing a relatively small endowment of approximately $50 million, Andrews is given impressive support from the Seventh-day Adventist church. In fiscal year 2016, $11.5 million came from the World Church, the North American church and the four state union in which Andrews is located representing about 14% of the total budget. The Financial Statement for 2016 shows a three million dollar decrease in the value of the endowment going from $52 million in fiscal year 2015 to $49 million in 2016. Conversation with the Board of Trustees, half of whom are appointed to the Board by virtue of their office in the Seventh-day Adventist church, indicates that they anticipate continued support for the University at current levels. As such it seems incumbent on the University to maintain all revenue streams, since it is not assumed that the church will fund annual operating deficits.

In the assurance argument it is noted by AU that they have operated with three years of annual deficits:

“It should be noted that the end-of-year figures for the last three years indicate shortfalls in the operating budgets that reflect changing student numbers and demographics on one hand, and unexpected benefit costs on the other. The three-year plan approved by the Board of Trustees in
March 2016 indicates adjustments to revenue and expenditure to right-size the institution to the current mix of students and adjustments of benefit contributions to meet recent realities.”

Recent enrollment declines in the traditional age, on-campus first year student population have contributed to the opening of a $4.4 million deficit in fiscal year 2015-2016. These deficits, resulting in the need to make greater use of cash reserves, is a concern for Andrews, and is keenly understood by all campus constituencies. The last three Statements of Activities from the audited financials clearly present the concern related to aggregate net tuition revenue declines. The trajectory of net tuition revenue ($46.9m in FY14, $45.2m in FY15 and $43.9m in FY16), if not corrected, implies a continuing use of cash reserves.

The projected 2016-17 budget balance sheet projects a break-even budget excluding the dairy rather than a deficit, even though some decline in student enrollment is still anticipated. As such, it is through budget controls and new academic initiatives that the deficit is being addressed. For example, staff had been reduced by 28 as part of “right-sizing.”

A three-year plan for academic initiatives was provided by AU as evidence of opportunities for growth resulting from academic programs that will yield approximately $1.7 million for 2016-17, $2.4 million for 2017-18, and $2.2 million for 2018-19. Similarly the team learned of enrollment management strategies to increase marketing seeking to gain more market share from the surrounding communities of conservative Christians, and a reversal to declining enrollment through targeted increased growth. In the judgment of the team, there is a critical need for the three-year initiatives plan to be effective in generating new revenue through tuition and fees.

The institution enjoys relatively low debt which is reported as $19 million in the 2016 Financial Statement. It does this by seeking and successfully receiving outside funding for new construction. The team noted from the Financial Statement that in 2020 one $11 million bond will mature, and the institution indicated that their pattern has been to refinance when bonds become due.

Average tuition net revenue for those paying banded tuition is approximately $16,000, which represents a commitment on the part of the institution to keep tuition affordable. The University is in good standing with the Department of Education and has evidence of cash reserves allowing it to be categorized as low risk. The discount rate is around 40% for undergraduates and 21% for graduates. Given the commitment to maintaining access for all students, it does not appear that there is much margin for increasing revenue with the current student body. For example, AU is only proposing a modest 2.5% tuition increase.

The team found that the faculty and staff of AU put the welfare of the institution before, or on par with, their own welfare as seen by their acceptance of little to no raises in the recent deficit years. There was a general recognition that faculty and staff compensation was below that of other institutions, and that there was limited progress on the strategic goal of improving compensation. A commitment to working through the decline in revenue was expressed by faculty, administration, and the Board. For example, the team was provided with an Academic Program Prioritization and Strategic Planning document that outlines a process for the review of existing programs which could lead to new institutional efficiencies.

An extensive two hour campus tour revealed that the campus is well maintained and that the amount of deferred maintenance is obviously held in check by a very well qualified and supported staff. The tour also demonstrated that there have been many renovations in the last few years, all flowing from a $3 million capital budget prioritizing those moves. As noted in the Assurance Argument the capital budget has been impacted by shortfalls in tuition revenue leading to decreased amounts available for
funding capital projects. Still the institution seems to be making the needed investments in labs and facilities to support its growing professional programs. This is especially important as some of the professional programs are in candidacy with specialty accrediting bodies and require operating and capital investments to meet program standards and requirements.

2. Andrews University has no superordinate entities. However, it owns a farm, a retirement housing unit, a K12 school and the Center for Youth Evangelism. According to conversations with the CFO and an examination of audited financial statements, it is clear that small positive cash flows return to the University from the combined revenue and expenditure flows from these four entities.

3. The long run sustainability of the academic program is challenged by the very large number (173) of course, program and major offerings. A low student to faculty ratio does sustain this program diversity, along with a willingness of the faculty to take on heavy workload obligations. However, the level of physical infrastructure and human resources currently deployed are more typically seen at institutions with larger enrollments. This makes the imperative of returning enrollments to earlier levels even more pressing. If the institution is to maintain its commitment to its current level of staffing and physical infrastructure, it is imperative that enrollments grow significantly.

The team struggled during the visit, and with AU materials, to understand the figures for the current enrollment and the targets for future enrollment. Depending on the method of calculation, the enrollment was cited as between 3,000 students to 5,000 students. At the same time, the enrollment target was set at 5,000 students. While the challenges of counting on-campus, online, correspondence, and international site enrollment are recognized, nevertheless, the institution needs to provide a consistent set of enrollment, retention, and persistence figures on which it plans its revenue from tuition and fees, and which informs its annual operating budget.

4. All employees receive Title IX training and relevant employees receive FERPA training. All staff are expected to attend Advanced Connections, a customer service focused program. MS Office training is available through IT services. In the Staff open session, many indicated that supervisors support attendance at professional meetings, webinars, and other in-service workshops. More than one staff employee in their open session agreed that supervisors care about the professional development of their employees.

5. 165 cost centers are monitored monthly by the VP, Financial Services working closely with the Provost, Deans and other unit heads. The University uses a Program Margin Analysis tool supplied by BKD auditors to monitor credit cost, drilling down to the individual student credit. The University has also undertaken cost control measures for fiscal 2017, eliminating 28 positions over two years. It also projects a $1.5 million improvement in revenue for fiscal 2018 based on improved enrollment projections. These measures are projected by the VP to erase the $4.4 million deficit for fiscal year 2016, and generate a 2.5 million dollar surplus by 2018 excluding the dairy. Should this occur, the $4.8m annual depreciation amount can be fully funded.

The expected contribution to overhead costs by the Provost’s academic units has slipped from the goal of 40% to 35% last year. Cost control measures are currently being undertaken to reverse this decline. The CFI scores, consistently in the safe range in the last four years, nevertheless indicate that liquidity is a primary challenge for the budgeting operations of the University. Conversations with the chief financial officer confirm this.

Given these concerns related to current enrollment trends, experienced deficits, coupled with reporting challenges and the unknown outcomes of newly implemented efficiencies and initiatives, the team recommends interim monitoring related to 5A.
Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

The team is recommending two interim reports for 5A related to its enrollments trends, financial outcomes, and planned initiatives.

The first interim report for 5A related to enrollments trends, financial outcomes, and planned initiatives is due October 15, 2018.

In this report Andrews University must demonstrate a consistent set of measures for enrollment, persistence and retention. All three of these measures should be constructed for undergraduate and graduate schools. All administrative units must work from the same set of metrics. The institution should provide evidence that the metrics tie explicitly to planning, program resource allocation and budgeting, so that the Commission can review progress toward the goals of a break-even budget in 2016-17 and a surplus by 2017-18. The fiscal year 2017 Financial Statement should accompany the report.

In the second report due in three years, the institution is to continue reporting on tuition and revenue from enrollment, and also address the following areas as these relate to the financial sustainability of the institution:

- Results of the Academic Program Prioritization process
- Results of the initiatives described in the three-year plan
- Results of the increased and targeted marketing on enrollment
- Progress on anticipated program accreditations
- Alignment of financial goals with the 2017-22 Strategic Plan
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

1. In a one hour conversation with fifteen Board Trustees, it was clear that they understand the distinction between management functions of the president and her administrative staff, and Board fiduciary responsibilities. One member stated that their primary duty was to support the President, and this generated affirming comments from others in the meeting.

The board meeting materials are quite detailed, giving a responsible board member the opportunity to fully understand the functioning of the college. The new Trustee orientation, described briefly in the meeting, prepares new members for their roles. The process of choosing new members emphasizes diversity of viewpoint, experience and ability to contribute, both financially and in skill set.

2. Trustees, the University cabinet, department chairs and Directors, and students all have well articulated policies describing their engagement and governance. The faculty appear to have primary authority in the articulation of academic policies. this is evident in documents and was confirmed in the faculty open session. Board members recognize that the greatest challenge to the University is enrollment. Maintaining and investing in quality are imperatives, but difficult given demographic projections.

3. Faculty participants in criterion sessions indicate that in the last five years, shared governance for that group has improved significantly. The newly formed Faculty Senate gives greater voice and autonomy to faculty. However, the creation of the Faculty Senate has left staff, at least temporarily, with a less effective voice. Plans are currently being devised to recreate a body that will give staff a greater voice in governance decisions. Students in their open session were quite articulate in framing needed changes, but it was not obvious that students were aware of appropriate formal ways to participate in governance decisions.

In open session discussions with staff, it was not clear that all understood how raises are given and how employee evaluations are used to give these raises. Furthermore, faculty in their open session
indicate that in their perception salary compression has worsened. The team had no independent confirmation of this faculty perception; however, the team recognized that the institution has an opportunity to increase communication around compensation. Given a fixed pool for salaries and raises and the need to hire new faculty through more competitive salaries, this then leaves a smaller pool for addressing existing faculty salaries. If not for the serious commitment to the Andrews mission, these factors could negatively impact future employee retention.

**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

1. The Seventh-day Adventist mission is at the forefront of all of the university documents. The forthcoming strategic plan is centered around five clearly articulated goals. The $17 million Wellness Center, with $15.7 million already raised will showcase the Church's whole health focus. The successful integration of the Griggs University, an online education unit, was made possible with a $1 million gift from the Seventh-day Adventist world church. Andrews very generously reimburses faculty for doctoral level coursework, evidence of their commitment to building an excellent faculty. Finally, a successful initiative backed by a $200,000 commitment to create a Speech-Language Pathology program was highlighted in the Strategic Plan and recently executed.

2. Criterion 4 and 1.C.2 link mission and diversity initiatives to specific initiatives flowing from the planning process. To cite just a few examples, the Office of International Student Services and Programs gained additional budget and staffing after an examination of retention results. The Department of Engineering and Computer Science, seeking final ABET accreditation in 2 years, has gained more space and equipment as a result of their assessment process. Two departments were recently merged, Visual Art and Communication, to achieve better efficiencies as a result of the summer 2015 program evaluation.

3. The 2012-2017 Strategic Plan has been used by the President and Board to help build support for campus initiatives. Faculty and School meetings are the venue for informing faculty of these initiatives. The Office of Alumni Services engages and informs that group. The 2013 HLC focused visit team praised the Provost for initiating a planning process that engaged broadly campus constituencies.

4. The University plans for demographic shifts, especially the decline in the numbers coming from
Adventist academies. Andrews understands the importance of diversifying revenue streams by expanding online course offerings in both the undergraduate and graduate programs. In a 13 college Adventist consortium, they have also engaged Royall and Company to expand the applicant pool. The University must continue to rigorously analyze current program offerings to reallocate away from small and costly programs to those capable of attracting from new student pools. Simply adding programs to attract new students will further strain the existing faculty. However, if enrollments cannot meet projected increases and rise to levels associated with their current physical plant and human resources, Andrews may be faced with the decision to reduce faculty and scale back its impressive commitment to its infrastructure. Despite these concerns, Andrews avoids debt finance, with large capital projects beginning only when funds are in hand.

5. The open session and staff meetings confirm that campus offices charged with planning tasks are well aware of both the national demographic trends and of forces in the Seventh-day Adventist community which present enrollment challenges for Andrews. Refer to Criterion 5.A.5 for a few of their responses to these challenges. With respect to the challenges many campuses face in a globalizing world, Andrews is a national leader. Their extensive network of Seventh-day Adventist schools and churches, their already well developed international recruiting efforts and their missionary activities position them well to expect continued adaptability in a dynamic world.

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

1. The University administrative staff produces a series of Key Performance Indicators used by Board Trustees to guide its oversight work. Job placement information, graduation rate data and Educational Testing Services results are all used by departments and administrators to inform program evaluation. However two deficiencies in this area must be noted. First, reporting of both enrollments and retention is inconsistent and confusing. The review team spent some time working to understand how the various measures are cited and used by campus administrative units. A consistent metric must be developed to report enrollment and retention data and to inform goal setting as noted in 5A.

Second, the team did not see evidence of an integrated administrative review process to improve administrative performance that holds those units to the same level of scrutiny now faced by academic programs. It was shared with the team that administrative units use satisfaction surveys to gather information and they use metrics to track their performance, however these internal unit practices are not integrated into a systematic, formal review process. Insofar as the institution has an Office of Institutional Effectiveness, there seems to be the leadership and support in place for the development of an integrated administrative review process.

2. As noted above, the University had made adjustments to budgets, including the reduction of 28 positions over two years through retirements, not filling recently vacated positions and by releasing staff. The Institutional Operations Council, the University Strategy and Policy Committee and the Academic Operations Council all have been better aligned to reduce inefficiencies and to streamline reporting and analysis.

The University also reduced its financial risk profile by shifting from a defined benefit pension plan to a defined contribution plan in 2000. The VP for Financial Services also effectively uses a $10 million line of credit to manage cash flows during the year. Finally, a five year capital worksheet, while still a work in progress, will help clarify trade-offs and serve as a tool for effective planning.

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

Andrews University faces a challenge that many smaller private institutions do not face. Its impressive faculty, its 173 undergraduate and graduate programs, and its physical and technological infrastructure are built for a larger enrollment. There are vigorous efforts to return enrollment to levels seen less than a decade ago. At the same time, AU indicates that they are not seeking to return to the demographic mix of the past; rather, they are seeking to adjust enrollment goals to a different mix of students based on projections, for example, that show growth in graduate students and professional programs. In the team's view, it will be a challenge to meet goals used by the enrollment management team, especially given demographic challenges facing all colleges and universities, but intensified by the reduction in numbers coming from Seventh-day Adventist academies in the U.S. Midwest. At some point in the next decade, Andrews may need to reduce faculty, infrastructure and programs to align with realistic capacity tied to enrollment.

Two Interim Reports on 5A are recommended related to current enrollment trends, financial outcomes, and planned initiatives; the first report is due in 18 months and the second report is due in three years.

The team anticipates in the forthcoming strategic plan that Andrews University will incorporate its strategies for enrollment growth, student retention, and institutional efficiencies into its goals. The new strategic plan needs to reflect an understanding of the institution’s current capacity, even if strategies are in place, or further planned, to reverse the trends leading to the strain on financial resources.

While the institution is currently challenged with enrollment, Andrews has a history of showing resilience and adaptability in its past. Its deep roots in church mission, combined with the fierce loyalty of its students, alumni, Board, and faculty and staff, are hopeful signs that it possesses the strength to continue to thrive and fulfill its mission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.A</td>
<td>Core Component 1.A</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.B</td>
<td>Core Component 1.B</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.D</td>
<td>Core Component 1.D</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.S</td>
<td>Criterion 1 - Summary</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.B</td>
<td>Core Component 2.B</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.C</td>
<td>Core Component 2.C</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.D</td>
<td>Core Component 2.D</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.E</td>
<td>Core Component 2.E</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.S</td>
<td>Criterion 2 - Summary</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.A</td>
<td>Core Component 3.A</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.C</td>
<td>Core Component 3.C</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.D</td>
<td>Core Component 3.D</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.E</td>
<td>Core Component 3.E</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.S</td>
<td>Criterion 3 - Summary</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.S</td>
<td>Criterion 4 - Summary</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.A</td>
<td>Core Component 5.A</td>
<td>Met With Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.B</td>
<td>Core Component 5.B</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.C</td>
<td>Core Component 5.C</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.D</td>
<td>Core Component 5.D</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.S</td>
<td>Criterion 5 - Summary</td>
<td>Met With Concerns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review Summary

Interim Report(s) Required

Due Date
10/15/2018

Report Focus
An interim report for 5A related to enrollments trends, financial outcomes, and planned initiatives is due October 15, 2018.

In this report Andrews University must demonstrate a consistent set of measures for enrollment, persistence and retention. All three of these measures should be constructed for undergraduate and graduate schools. All administrative units must work from the same set of metrics. The institution should provide evidence that the metrics tie explicitly to planning, program resource allocation and budgeting, so that the Commission can review progress toward the goals of a break-even budget in 2016-17 and a surplus by 2017-18. The fiscal year 2017 Financial Statement should accompany the report.

Due Date
3/2/2020

Report Focus
A second Interim Report is due March 2, 2020. Here the institution is to continue reporting on tuition and revenue from enrollment, and also address the following areas as these relate to the financial sustainability of the institution:

- Results of the Academic Program Prioritization process
- Results of the initiatives described in the three-year plan
- Results of the increased and targeted marketing on enrollment
- Progress on anticipated program accreditations
- Alignment of financial goals with the 2017-22 Strategic Plan

The fiscal year 2018 and 2019 Financial Statements should accompany the report.

Conclusion

The team found Andrews University to meet four of the five Criteria for Accreditation; it is concern with Core Component 5A that results in Criterion 5 being rated as met with concern. While it is a single Core Component that is of concern, nevertheless, Core Component 5A is significant as it relates to the financial sustainability of the institution and interrelates with 5C in planning for the future.

With respect to Criterion 1, the institution's mission is clearly articulated, widely published, and well known by the campus community and Board of Trustees. The mission of Andrews University is foremost educational, and it occurs in the context of the Seventh-day Adventist faith tradition and world church. Diversity is highly valued by Andrews University and the institution is very diverse in its student population and with respect to faculty and staff.
In Criterion 2, the integrity of Andrews University is upheld by formal policies and procedures, by the commitment to shared governance, and by the centrality of education and the pursuit of truth to the faith tradition. The AU Board perceives its role to be leading the institution through visioning and strategic planning, and to delegate the responsibility for management of the University to the President. AU has strengthened its focus on integrity through the development of a Board Policies Manual, formalizing institutional compliance, and creation of a Faculty Senate.

For Criterion 3, evidence provided including syllabi and examples of student work, conversations with faculty and students both on campus and in distance education programs, affirms that Andrews University is providing high quality education in its offerings regardless of location or delivery modality. Andrews University has developed and offers a coherent general education program that supports its mission and program offerings. Students and faculty are engaged in scholarly inquiry in a broad range of educational programs with an exceptional strength in human and cultural diversity.

With respect to Criterion 4, AU has strengthened its assessment culture through strategic hiring, and increasing resources dedicated solely to assessment to individual schools and departments, leading the team to perceive that faculty and staff are "buying into" this culture. AU has demonstrated, through various initiatives, that it uses data to inform their strategies, to serve their mission, improve academic programs and student services, and track student retention, persistence, and graduation.

It is Criterion 5, Core Component 5A, that is of concern. The positive progress and promising trajectory of the institution needs to be supported by the financial resources and financial planning that allows it to assure its future. Three years of declining enrollments and reported deficits, even if combined with institutional efficiencies and plans for new initiatives, do not necessarily assure that declines will be reversed or that the institution has “right-sized” its faculty, staff and facilities to support its enrollment. Andrews University is faced with larger demographic trends, that coupled with its historic focus on recruiting Seventh-day Adventists, create a unique challenge for expanding recruitment and growing enrollment. While the team believes that the institution is aware, is planning and is implementing changes to grow its enrollment and diversify its student body, further evidence of the outcomes of these plans are needed. The three-year plan for new initiatives was initiated in 2016-17. Although this plan builds on prior planning from 2012-17 leading to the introduction of selected graduate programs in areas of market need, and the expansion of online education, continued evidence of the positive impact of the initiatives on enrollment and revenue is sought with the Interim Report.

The team recognizes that the institution met the previous concerns of visiting teams from 2009 and 2013, and AU is to be commended for so doing. The 2009 team expressed concern about the descriptive nature of the self-study report, governance structure, the lack of use of data, the lack of integration of additional locations, and the lack of approvals for distance education and the delivery of degrees abroad. These concerns were noted as "met" by the 2013 focused visit team, and their new concern, given the change of control with the acquisition of Griggs University, was with the integration of the new acquisition into the larger university. The current team found that Griggs University is fully integrated, and even more so, that the School for Distance Education & International Partnerships represents a maturation of processes leading to consistency in quality across delivery modalities and legal compliance.

In spite of these accomplishments, the team recommends that the institution remain with the Standard Pathway given the importance of Core Component 5A to the future sustainability of the institution.

**Overall Recommendations**

**Criteria For Accreditation**
Met With Concerns
**Sanctions Recommendation**
No Sanction

**Pathways Recommendation**
Limited to Standard
Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

The team reviews each item identified in the Federal Compliance Filing by Institutions (FCFI) 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 the appropriate parts of the Assurance Review or Comprehensive Quality Review.

This worksheet is to be completed by the peer review team or a Federal Compliance reviewer in relation to the federal requirements. The team should refer to the Federal Compliance Overview for information about applicable HLC policies and explanations of each requirement.

Peer reviewers are expected to supply a rationale for each section of the Federal Compliance Evaluation.

The worksheet becomes an appendix in the team report. If the team recommends monitoring on a Federal Compliance Requirement in the form of a report or focused visit, the recommendation should be included in the Federal Compliance monitoring sections below and added to the appropriate section of the Assurance Review or Comprehensive Quality Review.

Institution under review: Andrews University

Please indicate who completed this worksheet:

☐ Evaluation team
☒ Federal Compliance reviewer

To be completed by the Evaluation Team Chair if a Federal Compliance reviewer conducted this part of the evaluation:

Name: Neil Pagano, Federal Compliance Reviewer

Team Chair: Mary Moore

☒ I confirm that the Evaluation Team reviewed the findings provided in this worksheet.
Assignment of Credits, Program Length and Tuition  
(See FCFI Questions 1–3 and Appendix A)

1. Complete the Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution’s Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours. Submit the completed worksheet with this form.
   - Identify the institution’s principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level (see the institution’s Appendix A if necessary). 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 1 quarter hour = 0.67 semester hour.
   - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.
   - Review any differences in tuition reported for different programs and the rationale provided for such differences.

2. Check the response that reflects the evaluation team or Federal Compliance reviewer’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
   - ☑ The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
   - ☐ The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
   - ☐ The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
   - ☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Syllabi for both online and self-paced courses were randomly selected and reviewed and course content was substantive and credit awarded for these was appropriate. Online versions of face to face classes were identical in terms of learning outcomes, student work, and materials. The institution provided a detailed list of tuition adjustments and rationales for each of these.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Records of Student Complaints  
(See FCFI Questions 4–7 and Appendixes B and C)
1. Verify that the institution has documented a process for addressing student complaints and appears to by systematically processing such complaints, as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.

- Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints, its complaints policy and procedure, and the history of complaints received and resolved since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC.
- Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.
- 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 improvements in services or in teaching and learning.
- Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.
- 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.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
- The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

**Rationale:**

The institution publishes clear guidelines (“Right to Appeal/Grievance”) in the Student Handbook. These guidelines extend far beyond grade grievances, and this section explicitly addresses housing, work, and “other.” The institution also maintains an inventory of complaints and provided a summary of the nature of the complaints and their resolutions.

Additional monitoring, if any:

---

**Publication of Transfer Policies**
(See FCFI Questions 8–10 and Appendixes D–F)

1. Verify that the institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies should contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.
• Review the institution’s transfer policies.

• Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and for specific programs and how the institution publicly discloses information about those articulation agreements.

• Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its website) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.

• Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. The information the institution provides to students should explain 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 (1) accepts credits from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; (2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements; (3) both offers and accepts credits with the institution(s) in the articulation agreement; and (4) what specific credits articulate through the agreement (e.g., general education only; pre-professional nursing courses only; etc.). Note that the institution need not make public the entire articulation agreement, but it needs to make public to students relevant information about these agreements so that they can better plan their education.

• Verify that the institution has an appropriate process to align the disclosed transfer policies with the criteria and procedures used by the institution in making transfer decisions.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

☑ The institution meets HLC’s requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution has complete, full, and clear information about its transfer policies on its web site and its academic bulletin. The transfer web site section includes an interactive drop down box that identifies course equivalencies from a long list of colleges and universities. The webs site also lists the institutions with which it maintains articulation agreements. The articulation process is managed by the Registrar’s Office with significant input from the University’s Academic Council.

Additional monitoring, if any:
Practices for Verification of Student Identity
(See FCFI Questions 11–16 and Appendix G)

1. Confirm that the institution verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided through distance or correspondence education. Confirm that it appropriately discloses additional fees related to verification to students, and that the method of verification makes reasonable efforts to protect students’ privacy.

- 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.
- Check that any costs related to verification (e.g., fees associated with test proctoring) and charged directly to students are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance or correspondence courses.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
- The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution employs standard processes to verify student identity. User names and passwords are provided to students and they must also upload a photo to their records. Distance courses mandate at least one video conference to verify student identity. Also, exams are proctored and photos are used to ensure student identity. There are no additional costs associated with this process/policy.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Title IV Program Responsibilities
(See FCFI Questions 17–24 and Appendixes H–Q)

1. This requirement has several components the institution must address.

- The team should verify that the following requirements are met:
- **General Program Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC 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 has raised regarding the institution’s fulfillment of its responsibilities.

- **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution’s fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 5 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 HLC 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 has raised regarding the institution’s fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note that 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 the HLC staff.

- **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** The institution has provided HLC 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/Equity in Athletics.** The institution has provided HLC 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 2, Core Component 2.A if the team determines that the disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)

- **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Policies.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its 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 and online. Note that HLC does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance unless required to do so by state or federal regulations 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 programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC 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 Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Contractual Arrangements on HLC’s website for more information.)

- **Consortial Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC 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 Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Consortial Arrangements on HLC’s website for more information.)

- Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.
- Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution’s compliance or whether the institution’s auditor has raised any issues in the A-133 about the institution’s compliance, and also look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.
- If the 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 the corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.
- If issues have been raised concerning 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 Components 2.A and 2.B*).

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
- The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

**Rationale:**

A Department of Education Program Review conducted in April 2012 found minimal compliance issues. Loan default rates for the most recent years have been declining at a good pace (10.2 to 7.6 to 5.3). A-133s for the past three years found zero deficiencies or
weaknesses. SAP policies for both undergraduate and graduate students are clearly explained in the catalog/bulletin.

The Federal Compliance Reviewer noted that section18a reports on the three most recent composite ratios. The ratio reported for 2014 was 2.25090, yet the composite figure reported at studentaid.ed.gov for the fiscal year ending 4/30/14 was 2.4.

The team inquired about this discrepancy and was informed that Andrews University follows standard procedure for completing the U.S. Department of Education, Review of Non-Profit Financial Statements worksheet each year, using figures from its audited financial statements. The institution reported the same CFI figures provided in the Federal Compliance Filing as those reported in the US DOE worksheets, and as reflected in the HLC Institutional Update (though with rounding to the tenths). It is not clear why the discrepancy to the institution why the discrepancy exists. The team determined that this response was sufficient; in both cases the scores were satisfactory.

Additional monitoring, if any:

**Required Information for Students and the Public**
(See FCFI Questions 25–27 and Appendixes R and S)

1. Verify that the institution publishes accurate, timely and appropriate information on institutional programs, fees, policies and related required information. Verify that the institution provides this required information in the course catalog and student handbook and on its website.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

   - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
   - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
   - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
   - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

**Rationale:**

The Andrews University Bulletin provides comprehensive and timely information on degree programs, academic policies, Satisfactory Academic Progress, and degree requirements. The “Student Right to Know” section of the university’s web site is a comprehensive collection of public information, including Tuition and Fees, Financial Aid, Grants and Scholarships, Academic Services, and Accreditation. The new program approval process is comprehensive and institution-wide in scope, and it includes stakeholders such as the CFO, Marketing/Enrollment Management, and SFS.
Additional monitoring, if any:

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information
(See FCFI Questions 28–31 and Appendixes T and U)

1. Verify that 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 HLC and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.
   - Review the institution’s disclosure about its accreditation status with HLC to determine whether the information it provides is accurate, complete and appropriately formatted and contains HLC’s web address.
   - Review the institution’s 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.
   - Review the institution’s catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, website and information provided by the institution’s advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate, timely and appropriate information to current and prospective students about its programs, locations and policies.
   - Verify that the institution correctly displays the Mark of Affiliation on its website.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
   - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
   - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
   - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
   - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The University’s web site contains extensive information concerning its accrediting status with HLC, with the Adventist Accrediting Association, and accreditations with specialized accreditors. Random specialized accreditor web sites were spot checked to confirm AU’s affiliation. The University web site and bulletin provide extensive information for prospective students regarding all of its programs, including credits and course sequencing.

Additional monitoring, if any:
Review of Student Outcome Data
(See FCFI Questions 32–35 and Appendix V)

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether they are appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs the institution offers and the students it serves.
   - Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about planning, academic program review, assessment of student learning, consideration of institutional effectiveness and other topics.
   - Review the institution’s explanation of its use of information from the College Scorecard, including student retention and completion and the loan repayment rate.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
   - [ ] The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
   - [ ] The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
   - [ ] The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
   - [ ] The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:
The Office of Institutional Effectiveness posts a comprehensive series of documents, including data on job placement, licensure pass rates, retention and graduation, and Key Performance Indicators related to the institution’s Strategic Plan. It also posts assessment results from NSSE, and Alumni and Senior Surveys.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Student Outcome Data
(See FCFI Questions 36–38)

1. Verify that the institution makes student outcome data available and easily accessible to the public. Data may be provided at the institutional or departmental level or both, but the institution must disclose student outcome data that address the broad variety of its programs.
   - Verify that student outcome data are made available to the public on the institution’s website—for instance, linked to from the institution’s home page, included within the top
three levels of the website or easily found through a search of related terms on the website—and are clearly labeled as such.

- Determine whether the publication of these data accurately reflects the range of programs at the institution.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

☑ The institution meets HLC’s requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution has many documents available on its website, including the Assurance Argument for its upcoming March 2017 site visit from a visiting team of the Higher Learning Commission. The website for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness contains a comprehensive list of data on student outcomes, including but not limited to job and graduate school placements for undergraduates, retention rates, licensure pass rates, and six-year graduation rates. It also has links to summary reports on Alumni Surveys, NSSE results, ETS Proficiency Profile results, and others.

Additional monitoring, if any:

---

**Standing With State and Other Accrediting Agencies**
(See FCFI Questions 39–40 and Appendixes W and X)

1. Verify that the institution discloses accurately to the public and HLC its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditors and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.

   The team should consider any potential implications for accreditation by HLC of a sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or of loss of authorization in any state.

   **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 HLC status in light of this action.
- Review the list of relationships the institution has with all other accreditors and state governing or coordinating bodies, along with the evaluation reports, action letters and interim monitoring plans issued by each accrediting agency.

- Verify that the institution’s standing with state agencies and accrediting bodies is appropriately disclosed to students.

- Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution’s capacity to meet HLC’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 HLC staff liaison immediately.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC’s requirements.

- The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

- The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:
The institution is accredited by a host of specialized accreditors and submitted a summary of the status with each of these with their filing. Their relationship with these accrediting bodies is also posted on their web site. Andrew’s relationship with these bodies was spot checked and status was confirmed.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment
(FCFI Questions 41–43 and Appendix Y)

1. Verify that the institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third-party comments. The team should evaluate any comments received and complete any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments.

   **Note:** If the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comments 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.

- Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including copies of the institution’s notices, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.
• 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.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

☐ The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
☐ The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
☐ The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution solicited input from students, faculty, and staff via an online newsletter. Input from parents, alumni, donors, and church constituency was solicited via the alumni magazine.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Competency-Based Programs Including Direct Assessment Programs/Faculty-Student Engagement
(See FCFI Questions 44–47)

1. Verify that students and faculty in any direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution have regular and substantive interactions: the faculty and students communicate on some regular basis that is at least equivalent to contact in a traditional classroom, and that in the tasks mastered to assure competency, faculty and students interact about critical thinking, analytical skills, and written and oral communication abilities, as well as about core ideas, important theories, current knowledge, etc. (Also, confirm that the institution has explained the credit hour equivalencies for these programs in the credit hour sections of the Federal Compliance Filing.)

• Review the list of direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution.
• Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty in these programs regularly communicate and interact with students about the subject matter of the course.
• Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty and students in these programs interact about key skills and ideas in the students’ mastery of tasks to assure competency.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
The institution meets HLC’s requirements.

☐ The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

☐ The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

**Rationale:**

The institution provides a fairly rigorous structure to its competency-based graduate programs. Students and faculty work together as the students build their skills to achieve competency on multiple levels throughout the programs. These programs are not fully competency-based, as a significant portion of the programs include traditional coursework.

**Additional monitoring, if any:**

**Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team**

Provide a list of materials reviewed here:

- **Student Handbook:** [https://bulletin.andrews.edu/content.php?catoid=13&navoid=1915](https://bulletin.andrews.edu/content.php?catoid=13&navoid=1915)
- **Transfer policies from Andrew’s web site:** [https://www.andrews.edu/undergrad/apply/transfer/transferingcredits/](https://www.andrews.edu/undergrad/apply/transfer/transferingcredits/)
- **Description of Prior Learning Credit and Assessment:** [https://www.andrews.edu/services/sscenter/pla/](https://www.andrews.edu/services/sscenter/pla/)
- **Student Right to Know:** [https://www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/student-right-to-know/](https://www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/student-right-to-know/)
- **Tuition and Fees:** [https://www.andrews.edu/services/sfs/general_information/costs/](https://www.andrews.edu/services/sfs/general_information/costs/)
- **Specialized Accreditation:** [https://bulletin.andrews.edu/content.php?catoid=13&navoid=2026](https://bulletin.andrews.edu/content.php?catoid=13&navoid=2026)
- **New Curriculum Process:** [https://www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/approvals/](https://www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/approvals/)
- **New Program Process:** [https://www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/approvals/new-program-approval-process-revised-2016-05.pdf](https://www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/approvals/new-program-approval-process-revised-2016-05.pdf)
- Recruitment materials for the following programs: Architecture MA; Curriculum and Instruction MA, EdS, EdD, and PhD; School Counseling M; Educational Psychology MA, EdD, and PhD; Accounting BBA; Aviation;
- **Withdrawal calendar:** [https://www.andrews.edu/distance/students/gradplus/withdrawal.html](https://www.andrews.edu/distance/students/gradplus/withdrawal.html)
Affiliation with HLC on AU's web site:
https://www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/accreditation/

Transfer policies:
https://www.andrews.edu/undergrad/apply/transfer/transferringcredits/

Articulation agreements: https://www.andrews.edu/distance/about/compliance/articulation.html

Accreditation with Adventist Accrediting Association:
http://adventistaccreditingassociation.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=49&Itemid=65

Andrews University Accreditation status with ABET:
http://main.abet.org/aps/AccreditedProgramsDetails.aspx?OrganizationID=1044&ProgramIDs=

Andrews University Accreditation status with National Association for the Schools of Music:
https://nasm.arts-accredit.org/directory-lists/accredited-institutions/search/?id=I0369

Andrews University Accreditation statues with the Counsel for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs:
http://www.cacrep.org/directory/?state=&pt_id=&pc_logic=any&accr_status%5B%5D=A&accr_status%5B%5D=PA&accr_status%5B%5D=IP&keywords=Andrews+University&submitthis=

Program Information for Information Systems BBA:
https://bulletin.andrews.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=13&poid=7564&returnto=search

Program Information for Behavioral Sciences Student Development BS:
https://bulletin.andrews.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=13&poid=7292&returnto=2028
Program Information for Biology, Biological Science BS:
https://bulletin.andrews.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=13&poid=9319

Graduate Programs tuition and fees: https://www.andrews.edu/grad/finances/

Courses approved for high school registrants: https://www.andrews.edu/services/precollege/hs-orientation/hs-courses.html


Andrews University 2017 Assurance Argument:
Graduation Rate Report (August 2016):

Job Placement Report (October 2016):

Licensure Pass Rates (undated but through 2016 for a majority of programs):
https://www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/effectiveness/docs/licensure-pass-rate.pdf

Freshmen to Sophomore Retention Rates:

List of other reports on Institutional Effectiveness web site:
https://www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/assessment/highlights/

Key Performance Indicators Report from Institutional Effectiveness (2016):

Senior Survey (2016):

Andrews Focus Fall 2016 (alumni magazine) with Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment:
https://alumni.andrews.edu/focus/view/2016-4/

Andrews Agenda (Nov. 16, 2016) with Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment:
https://www.andrews.edu/agenda/42995

Information on the Leadership graduate degrees that include competency-based components:
https://www.andrews.edu/sed/leadership_dept/leadership/about/

List of Course Syllabi Reviewed (Spring 2017 Semester):
1. ENGL 115 950 (1426)
2. ENGL 215 950 (1698)
3. PSYC 101 950 (1468)
4. MATH 168 950 (1884)
5. ANTH 200 901 (2053)
6. COMM 104 902 (1232)
7. ENGL 115 902 (1235)
8. ENGL 215 902 (1236)
9. HIST 117 902 (1253)
10. PHYS 110 901 (1619)
11. FDNT 230 950 (1428)
12. FNCE 500 999 (694)
13. IDAS 613 999 (2085)
14. PBHL 540 999 (1460)
15. ACCT 121 902 (1212)
16. BSAD 210 902 (1225)
17. CHIS 505 075 (1823)
18. DSRE 503 064 (1841)
Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution’s Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours

Institution Under Review: Andrews University

Review the Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours, including all supplemental materials. Applicable sections and supplements are referenced in the corresponding sections and questions below.

Part 1. Institutional Calendar, Term Length and Type of Credit

Instructions
Review Section 1 of Appendix A. Verify that the institution has calendar and term lengths within the range of good practice in higher education.

Responses
A. Answer the Following Question

1. Are the institution’s calendar and term lengths, including non-standard terms, within the range of good practice in higher education? Do they contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments:
The vast majority of the institution’s offerings exist in traditional semester contexts.

B. Recommend HLC Follow-Up, If Appropriate

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution’s calendar and term length practices?

☐ Yes  ☒ No

Rationale:
Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

Part 2. Policy and Practices on Assignment of Credit Hours

Instructions
Review Sections 2–4 of the Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours, including supplemental materials as noted below. In assessing the appropriateness of the credit allocations provided by the institution the team should complete the following steps. The outcomes of the team’s review should be reflected in its responses below.

1. **Format of Courses and Number of Credits Awarded.** Review the Form for Reporting an Overview of Credit Hour Allocations and Instructional Time for Courses (Supplement A1 to the Worksheet for Institutions) completed by the institution, which provides an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats.

2. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution (see Supplements B1 and B2 to Worksheet for Institutions, as applicable).

   - 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 descriptions in the catalog should reflect courses that are appropriately rigorous and have 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 federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. HLC procedure also permits this approach.

3. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course (see Supplement B3 to Worksheet for Institutions). Pay particular attention to alternatively structured or other courses completed in a
short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor that have particularly high credit hour assignments.

4. **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.

- For the programs sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several courses, identify the contact hours for each course, and review expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.

- 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.

5. **Direct Assessment or Competency-Based Programs.** Review the information provided by the institution regarding any direct assessment or competency-based programs that it offers, with regard to the learning objectives, policies and procedures for credit allocation, and processes for review and improvement in these programs.

6. **Policy on Credit Hours and Total Credit Hour Generation.** With reference to the institutional policies on the assignment of credit provided in Supplement A2 to *Worksheet for Institutions*, 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 time frame 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 HLC 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?

• Do the number of credits taken by typical undergraduate and graduate students, as well as the number of students earning more than the typical number of credits, fall within the range of good practice in higher education?

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 provides evidence of implementation.

• If the team identifies an application problem and that problem is isolated to a few courses or a single department, division or learning format, the team should call for follow-up activities (a monitoring report or focused evaluation) to ensure that the problems are corrected within no more than one year.

• If the team identifies systematic noncompliance across the institution with regard to the award of credit, the team should notify the HLC staff immediately and work with staff members to design appropriate follow-up activities. HLC shall understand systematic noncompliance to mean that the institution lacks any policies to determine the award of academic credit or that there is an inappropriate award of institutional credit not in conformity with the policies established by the institution or with commonly accepted practices in higher education across multiple programs or divisions or affecting significant numbers of students.

Worksheet on Assignment of Credit Hours

A. Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team

Course/Syllabus Reviewed:

1. ENGL 115 950 (1426)
2. ENGL 215 950 (1698)
3. PSYC 101 950 (1468)
4. MATH 168 950 (1884)
5. ANTH 200 901 (2053)
6. COMM 104 902 (1232)
7. ENGL 115 902 (1235)
8. ENGL 215 902 (1236)
9. HIST 117 902 (1253)
10. PHYS 110 901 (1619)
11. FDNT 230 950 (1428)
12. FNCE 500 999 (694)
13. IDAS 613 999 (2085)
14. PBHL 540 999 (1460)
15. ACCT 121 902 (1212)
B. Answer the Following Questions

1. Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

   a. Does the institution’s policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution? (Note that for this question and the questions that follow an institution may have a single comprehensive policy or multiple policies.)

      □ Yes  □ No

      Comments:
      This is defined in the Bulletin/Catalog for both face-to face and non face-to-face learning experiences.

   b. Does that policy relate the amount of instructional or contact time provided and homework typically expected of a student to the credit hours awarded for the classes offered in the delivery formats offered by the institution? (Note that an institution's policy must go beyond simply stating that it awards credit solely based on assessment of student learning and should also reference instructional time.)

      □ Yes  □ No

      Comments:

   c. For institutions with non-traditional courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

      □ Yes  □ No

      Comments:
d. Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC 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.)

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments:

2. Application of Policies

a. Are the course descriptions and syllabi in the sample academic programs reviewed by the team appropriate and reflective of the institution’s policy on the award of credit? (Note that HLC 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.)

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments:

b. Are the learning outcomes in the sample reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution’s policy on the award of credit?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments:

c. If the institution offers any alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the course descriptions and syllabi for those courses appropriate and reflective of the institution’s policy on the award of academic credit?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments:

d. If the institution offers alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the learning outcomes reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution’s policy on the award of credit? Are the learning outcomes reasonable for students to fulfill in the time allocated, such that the allocation of credit is justified?

☐ Yes  ☐ No
Comments:

e. Is the institution’s actual assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution reflective of its policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments:

C. **Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate**

Review the responses provided in this worksheet. If the team has responded “no” to any of the questions above, the team will need to assign HLC follow-up to assure that the institution comes into compliance with expectations regarding the assignment of credit hours.

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution’s credit hour policies and practices?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Rationale:

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

D. **Systematic Noncompliance in One or More Educational Programs With HLC Policies Regarding the Credit Hour**

Did the team find systematic noncompliance in one or more education programs with HLC policies regarding the credit hour?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Identify the findings:

Rationale:

---

**Part 3. Clock Hours**
Instructions
Review Section 5 of Worksheet for Institutions, including Supplements A3–A6. Before completing the worksheet below, answer the following question:

Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs in clock hours or programs that must be reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs?

☐ Yes  ☒ No

If the answer is “Yes,” complete the “Worksheet on Clock Hours.”

Note: This worksheet is not intended for teams to evaluate whether an institution has assigned credit hours relative to contact hours in accordance with the Carnegie definition of the credit hour. This worksheet solely addresses those programs reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes.

Non-degree programs subject to clock hour requirements (for which an institution is required to measure student progress in clock hours for federal or state purposes or for graduates to apply for licensure) are not subject to the credit hour definitions per se but will need to provide conversions to semester or quarter hours for Title IV purposes. Clock hour programs might include teacher education, nursing or other programs in licensed fields.

Federal regulations require that these programs follow the federal formula listed below. If there are no deficiencies identified by the accrediting agency in the institution’s overall policy for awarding semester or quarter credit, the accrediting agency may provide permission for the institution to provide less instruction so long as the student’s work outside class in addition to direct instruction meets the applicable quantitative clock hour requirements noted below.

Federal Formula for Minimum Number of Clock Hours of Instruction (34 CFR §668.8):

1 semester or trimester hour must include at least 37.5 clock hours of instruction
1 quarter hour must include at least 25 clock hours of instruction

Note that the institution may have a lower rate if the institution’s requirement for student work outside of class combined with the actual clock hours of instruction equals the above formula provided that a semester/trimester hour includes at least 30 clock hours of actual instruction and a quarter hour includes at least 20 semester hours.

Worksheet on Clock Hours
A. Answer the Following Questions

1. Does the institution’s credit-to-clock-hour formula match the federal formula?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments:
2. If the credit-to-clock-hour conversion numbers are less than the federal formula, indicate what specific requirements there are, if any, for student work outside of class.

3. Did the team determine that the institution’s credit hour policies are reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that if the team answers “No” to this question, it should recommend follow-up monitoring in section C below.)

   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

   Comments:

4. Did the team determine in reviewing the assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution that it was reflective of the institution’s policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

   Comments:

B. Does the team approve variations, if any, from the federal formula in the institution’s credit-to-clock-hour conversion?

   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

C. Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

   Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution’s clock hour policies and practices?

   ☐ Yes  ☐ No

   Rationale:

   Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:
Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

INSTITUTION and STATE: Andrews University, MI

TYPE OF REVIEW: Standard Pathway Comprehensive Evaluation

DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW: Comprehensive Evaluation to include a Federal Compliance Reviewer.

DATES OF REVIEW: 3/13/2017 - 3/14/2017

☐ No Change in Institutional Status and Requirements

Accreditation Status
Nature of Institution
Control: Private NFP

Recommended Change: No Change

Degrees Awarded: Associates, Bachelors, Masters, Specialist, Doctors

Recommended Change: No Change

Reaffirmation of Accreditation:
Year of Last Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2009 - 2010
Year of Next Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2016 - 2017

Recommended Change: 2026-2027

Accreditation Stipulations

General:
Information regarding all new programs is to be provided to the Commission in the Annual Report.

Recommended Change: No Change

Additional Location:
The institution has been approved for the Notification Program, allowing the institution to open new additional locations within the United States and internationally.

Recommended Change: No Change
Distance and Correspondence Courses and Programs:
Approved for distance education courses and programs. Approved for correspondence education courses and programs.

**Recommended Change:** No change

**Direct Assessment:**
The institution is approved to offer four credit-based competency-based education programs as declared to HLC and offered prior to May 1, 2015. Any programs initiated after that date must receive HLC review and approval.

**Recommended Change:** No Change

**Accreditation Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Pathway</th>
<th>Standard Pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Change:</strong></td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Upcoming Events**

**Monitoring**

**Upcoming Events**
None

**Recommended Change:**
Interim Report Due 10/15/2018: (5.A) Enrollment Trends, Financial outcomes, and planning initiatives;
Interim Report Due 03/02/2020 (5.A.) Continued monitoring on enrollment, tuition revenues and financial sustainability.

**Institutional Data – No Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Programs</th>
<th>Recommended Change:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degrees</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Degrees</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Graduate</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Internal Procedure

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Master's Degrees</th>
<th>Specialist Degrees</th>
<th>Doctoral Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degrees</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Degrees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degrees</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extended Operations

Branch Campuses

None

Recommended Change: No Change

Additional Locations

Adventist University of Central Africa, Remera, Kigali, RWANDA, - Active
Burman University, 6730 University Dr, Lacombe, AB T4L 2E5, CANADA, - Active
Centro Universitario Adventista de Sagunto, Carretera de petres s/n, Apartado 52, 46500 Sagunto (Valencia), SPAIN, - Active
Centro Universitario Adventista de Sao Paulo, Estrada de Itapecerica 5859, Sao Paulo, BRAZIL, - Active
Chesapeake Conference, 6600 Martin Road, Columbia, MD, 21044-3928 - Active
Chile Adventist University, Casilla 7-D, Fundo, Las Mariposas, CHILE, - Active
Columbia Union Conference, 5427 Twin Knolls rd, Columbia, MD, 21045-3247 - Active
Concord Hotel, Hai Malakia, Juba, South Sudan, SUDAN, - Active
East Sahel Union Mission, 72, Rue Ahuitime, Lome, TOGO, - Active
Florida Conference of SDA, 351 S. State Road 434, Altamonte Springs, FL, 32714-3824 - Active
Forest Lake SDA Church, 515 Harley Lester Lane, Apopka, FL, 32703 - Active
Helderberg College, Helderberg College Rd, Somerset W., - Capetown, SOUTH AFRICA, - Active
Hong Kong Adventist College, 1111 Clearwater Bay - Sai Kung, Hong Kong, CHINA, - Active
Italian Adventist College, Villa Aurora, Via dek Pregolino 12, Florence, ITALY, - Active
Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, Loma Linda, CA, 92350 - Active
Mid-America Union, 8307 Pine Lake Rd, Lincoln, NE, 68516-4078 - Active
Middle East University, Ferdous St, Beirut, LEBANON, - Active
Newbold College, St Mark's Rd, Binfield, Bracknell, UNITED KINGDOM, - Active
North Pacific Union Conference, 5709 N. 20th Street, Ridgefield, WA, 98642-7724 - Active
Northern New England Conference, 479 Main Street, Westbrook, ME, 04092 - Active
Polish Senior College of Theology & Humanities, Ul. Jana Pawla II 39 , 05-807 Podkowa Lesna, POLAND, - Active
Romanian Adventist Seminary (SEM), Sos. Decebal 11-13, Cernica, Ilfov, ROMANIA, 077035 - Active
Samyook Language Sch (CAS), 287-1 Hwikyung-dong, Seoul, KOREA, REPUBLIC OF, - Active
Southeastern California Conference, 11330 Pierce Street, Riverside, CA, 92505-3303 - Active
Southwestern Adventist University, 100 West Hillcrest Street, Keene, TX, 76059-1922 - Active
Ukrainian Adventist Center of Higher Education, 14 Instytutska, 08292 Bucha, Kyiv Region, UKRAINE, - Active
**Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union College, 3800 South 48th Street, Lincoln, NE, 68506-4387</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Eastern Africa, P O Box 2500, Baraton, KENYA</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad Adventista Dominicana, Autopista Duarte Km 74 ½, Villa Sonador, Provincia Monseñor Nouel, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Caribbean, Maracas Royal Rd., Port-of-Spain, TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View University, Mile 19 Accra-Dodowa Road, Near Oyibi, GHANA</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City, International Education Institute, Ho Chi Minh City, VIET NAM</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla University, 204 S. College Avenue, College Place, WA, 99324-1139</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Adventist University, 7600 Flower Ave, Takoma Park, MD, 20912-7744</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaokski Theological Seminary (SEM), Rudneva St 43-A, Zaoksky - Tula Region, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 301000</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Change: No Change**

**Distance Delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.0301</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction, Doctor, EdD in Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>EdD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0301</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction, Doctor, PhD in Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0301</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction, Master, MA in Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0301</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction, Specialist, EdS in Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>EdS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0401</td>
<td>Educational Leadership and Administration, General, Certificate, Graduate Certificate in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0401</td>
<td>Educational Leadership and Administration, General, Doctor, EdD in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Doctor, EdD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0401</td>
<td>Educational Leadership and Administration, General, Doctor, PhD in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Doctor, PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0401</td>
<td>Educational Leadership and Administration, General, Master, MA in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Master, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0401</td>
<td>Educational Leadership and Administration, General, Specialist, EdS in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Specialist, EdS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0406</td>
<td>Higher Education/Higher Education Administration, Doctor, EdD Higher Education Administration</td>
<td>Doctor, EdD</td>
<td>Higher Education Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0406</td>
<td>Higher Education/Higher Education Administration, Doctor, PhD in Higher Education Administration</td>
<td>Doctor, PhD</td>
<td>Higher Education Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0406</td>
<td>Higher Education/Higher Education Administration, Master, MA in Higher Education Administration</td>
<td>Master, MA</td>
<td>Higher Education Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0406</td>
<td>Higher Education/Higher Education Administration, Specialist, EdS in Higher Education Administration</td>
<td>Specialist, EdS</td>
<td>Higher Education Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9999</td>
<td>Education, Other, Certificate, Graduate Certificate in Leadership</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9999</td>
<td>Education, Other, Doctor, EdD Leadership</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Doctor, EdD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9999</td>
<td>Education, Other, Doctor, PhD Leadership</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Doctor, PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9999</td>
<td>Education, Other, Doctor, Post-Doctoral Certificate in Leadership</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Doctor, Post-Doctoral Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9999</td>
<td>Education, Other, Master, MA Leadership</td>
<td>Other, Master, MA</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9999</td>
<td>Education, Other, Specialist, EdS Leadership</td>
<td>Other, Specialist, EdS</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.2308</td>
<td>Physical Therapy/Therapist, Doctor, Doctor of Science in Physical Therapy, Concentration in Orthopedic Manual Therapy</td>
<td>Doctor, Doctor of Science</td>
<td>Concentration in Orthopedic Manual Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.3817</td>
<td>Nursing Education, Certificate, Post-MS Nursing Education Certificate</td>
<td>Certificate, Post-MS Nursing Education</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.3818</td>
<td>Nursing Practice, Doctor, Doctor of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>Doctor, Doctor of Nursing Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.0201</td>
<td>Business Administration and Management, General, Associate, AS General Business</td>
<td>General, Associate, AS</td>
<td>General Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.0201</td>
<td>Business Administration and Management, General, Master, MBA in Business Administration</td>
<td>General, Master, MBA</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Change: No Change**

**Correspondence Education**
Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

24.0102 - General Studies, Associate, AA General Studies
24.0102 - General Studies, Associate, AS General Studies
24.0102 - General Studies, Bachelor, BA in General Studies
24.0102 - General Studies, Bachelor, BS in General Studies
38.0201 - Religion/Religious Studies, Associate, AA in Christian Discipleship
38.0201 - Religion/Religious Studies, Bachelor, BA in Religion

Recommended Change: No Change

Contractual Arrangements

None

Recommended Change: No Change

Consortial Arrangements

24.0102 - General Studies - Bachelor - Bachelor - 24.0102 General Studies (BA in General Studies) - Consortium of Adventist Colleges and Universities
24.0102 - General Studies - Bachelor - Bachelor - 24.0102 General Studies (BS in General Studies) - Consortium of Adventist Colleges and Universities
38.0201 - Religion/Religious Studies - Associate - Associate - 38.0201 Religion/Religious Studies (AA in Personal Ministries) - Consortium of Adventist Colleges and Universities
38.0201 - Religion/Religious Studies - Bachelor - Bachelor - 38.0201 Religion/Religious Studies (BA in Religion) - Consortium of Adventist Colleges and Universities

Recommended Change: No Change