



**Higher Learning Commission**  
A commission of the North Central Association

230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7-500 | Chicago, IL 60604-1411  
312-263-0456 | 800-621-7440 | Fax: 312-263-7462 | [ncahlc.org](http://ncahlc.org)

May 22, 2014

Dr. Cristobal Valdez  
President  
Edison State Community College  
1973 Edison Dr.  
Piqua, OH 45356

Dear President Valdez:

Attached is the report of the team that conducted Edison State Community College's Quality Checkup site visit. In addition to communicating the team's evaluation of your institution's compliance with the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation and the Commission's Federal Compliance Program, the report captures the team's assessment of your institution's use of the feedback from its last Systems Appraisal and its overall commitment to continuous improvement.

A copy of the report will be read and analyzed by the AQIP Panel that reviews institutions for Reaffirmation of Accreditation at the time your institution's review is scheduled.

Please acknowledge receipt of this report within the next two weeks, and provide any comments you wish to make about it. Your response will become a part of the institution's permanent record.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Green  
AQIP Accreditation Services

# QUALITY CHECKUP REPORT

# Edison State Community College

Piqua, Ohio  
April 1 – 4, 2014

**The Higher Learning Commission**  
A Commission of the North Central Association

## QUALITY CHECKUP TEAM MEMBERS:

**Dr. Linda Lujan**  
President  
Chandler-Gilbert Community College

**Dr. Dwight Smith**  
Vice President of Academic Affairs  
County College of Morris

## **Background on Quality Checkups conducted by the Academic Quality Improvement**

### **Program**

The Higher Learning Commission's Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) conducts Quality Checkup site visits to each institution during the fifth or sixth year in every seven-year cycle of AQIP participation. These visits are conducted by trained AQIP Reviewers to determine whether the institution continues to meet The Higher Learning Commission's *Criteria for Accreditation*, and whether it is using quality management principles and building a culture of continuous improvement as participation in the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) requires. The goals of an AQIP Quality Checkup are to:

1. Affirm the accuracy of the organization's Systems Portfolio and verify information included in the portfolio that the last Systems Appraisal has identified as needing clarification or verification (System Portfolio Clarification and Verification), including review of distance delivery and distributed education if the institution is so engaged.
2. Review with organizational leaders actions taken to capitalize on the strategic issues and opportunities for improvement identified by the last Systems Appraisal (Systems Appraisal Follow Up);
3. Alert the organization to areas that need its attention prior to Reaffirmation of Accreditation, and reassure it concerning areas that have been covered adequately (Accreditation Issues Follow Up);
4. Verify federal compliance issues such as default rates, complaints, USDE interactions and program reviews, etc. (Federal Compliance Review); and
5. Assure continuing organizational quality improvement commitment through presentations, meetings, or sessions that clarify AQIP and Commission accreditation work (Organizational Quality Commitment).

The AQIP peer reviewers trained for this role prepare for the visit by reviewing relevant organizational and AQIP file materials, particularly the organization's last *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* and the Commission's internal *Organizational Profile*, which summarizes information reported by the institution in its *Annual Institutional Data Update*. The Quality Summary Report provided to AQIP by the institution is also shared with the evaluators. Copies of the Quality Checkup Report are provided to the institution's CEO and AQIP liaison. The Commission retains a copy in the institution's permanent file, and will be part of the materials reviewed by the AQIP Review Panel during Reaffirmation of Accreditation.

---

**Clarification and verification of contents of the institution's Systems Portfolio**

***In the team's judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution's approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with the Commission's standards and AQIP's expectations.***

Clarifications to particular items were provided to the team and are noted in the AQIP consideration section below. The team met with a variety of stakeholders including the College President, the President's Cabinet (8), the Leadership Team (19), the Dean's Council (10), the elected representative to the President's Council (3), members of the Edison Board of Trustees (4), community members (2), the Director of Institutional Research, the Director of Administrative Computing, the Registrar, the Financial Aid Director, the CQI Steering Committee (9), representatives from Action Project teams (7), representatives from CQI process teams (16), a student representative (other invited students did not attend due to weather), faculty representatives (8), Curriculum Committee members (8), and Assessment Committee members (5). Additionally, the Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness provided information, support, and clarification throughout the visit and sat in on all meetings, including those in which she was a member of the group being interviewed. As evidenced in meetings with each group, the college community is knowledgeable about quality improvement, uses the vocabulary and concepts proficiently, and understands the relationship of AQIP and CQI to operational and strategic processes. It was evident to the visiting team that development and writing of the Systems Portfolio was a distributed activity allowing large numbers of stakeholders to engage in demonstrating the ways Edison has used AQIP principles and categories in its work. The Quality Checkup provided Edison opportunity to demonstrate competencies in continuous quality improvement that were not as clearly evident in the Systems Portfolio. The visiting team had an opportunity to consult with the Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness on strategies for improving the format and mechanics of a portfolio for future submissions.

**Review of the organization's quality assurance oversight of its distance education activities.**

***In the team's judgment, the institution has presented satisfactory evidence that its distance education activities are acceptable and do comply with the Commission's standards and expectations.***

Course syllabi for distance education courses document appropriate instruction and student work for the assigned credit hours. Edison provides good distance education access and support for faculty and students. The use of Quality Matters as a curriculum standard and faculty professional development strategy for distance education is an actionable and commendable mechanism for continuous quality

improvement in its delivery of distance education. As noted by one faculty member, Quality Matters, appears to have also influenced improvement in other delivery modalities as well. Distance Education courses are monitored by the academic dean and assessed by the appropriate department chair. The institution uses both a curriculum development and program review process that consider the curriculum, modalities, and learning outcomes as well as program demand. Systems to support students include an online introduction designed to support students, a prerequisite course “Introduction to Online Learning”, as well as online library resources.

**Review of the organization’s quality assurance and oversight of distributed education (multiple campuses)**

*In the team’s judgment, the institution has presented satisfactory evidence that its operation of a branch campus is acceptable and complies with Commission’s standards and expectations.*

*The “Multi-Campus Visit: Peer Review Report” for the Darke County Campus documents Edison State Community College meeting the Commission’s standards and expectations.*

**Review of specific accreditation issues identified by the institution’s last Systems Appraisal**

*In the team’s judgment, the institution provided satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution’s approaches to the AQIP process were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations. There were no accreditation issues identified in the Edison State Community College Systems Portfolio.*

**Screening of Criteria for Accreditation and Core Components**

The following section identifies any areas in the judgment of the Quality Checkup Team where the institution either has not provided sufficient evidence that it currently meets the Commission’s *Criteria for Accreditation* (and the core components therein) or that it may face difficulty in meeting the *Criteria* and core components in the future. Identification of any such deficiencies as part of the Quality Checkup affords the institution the opportunity to remedy the problem prior to Reaffirmation of Accreditation. Items judged to be “Adequate but could be improved” or “Unclear or incomplete” during the Checkup Visit screening will not require Commission follow-up in the form of written reports or focused visits. However, Commission follow-up will occur if the issues remain apparent at the point of reaffirmation of accreditation.

Criterion 1: Evidence found in the Systems Portfolio	Core Component				
	1A	1B	1C	1D	
Strong, clear, and well-presented.				X	
Adequate but could be improved.	X	X	X		
Unclear or incomplete.					
Criterion 2: Evidence found in the Systems Portfolio	Core Component				
	2A	2B	2C	2D	2E
Strong, clear, and well-presented.	X	X	X	X	X
Adequate but could be improved.					
Unclear or incomplete.					
Criterion 3: Evidence found in the Systems Portfolio	Core Component				
	3A	3B	3C	3D	3E
Strong, clear, and well-presented.		X		X	
Adequate but could be improved.	X		X		X
Unclear or incomplete.					
Criterion 4: Evidence found in the Systems Portfolio	Core Component				
	4A	4B	4C		
Strong, clear, and well-presented.		X			
Adequate but could be improved.	X		X		
Unclear or incomplete.					
Criterion 5: Evidence found in the Systems Portfolio	Core Component				
	5A	5B	5C	5D	
Strong, clear, and well-presented.	X	X	X	X	
Adequate but could be improved.					
Unclear or incomplete.					

***In the team’s judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution’s approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP’s expectations.*** In the Quality Checkup Visit team’s opinion, Edison State Community College fully met the criteria for accreditation. Edison demonstrated commitment to the accreditation criteria, core components, and subcomponents through evidence presented in its Systems Portfolio which was clarified and verified during its Quality Checkup Visit. As discussed with reviewers during the visit, Edison has better understanding of improved methods for presenting evidence in its next portfolio. For example, the visiting team members described ways to present evidence for clarity and completeness while staying within the word-count limits of a Systems Portfolio. Using graphs, charts, and diagrams were suggested as methods. Examples of flow charts and graphs from Baldrige recipients such as Richland Community College and University of Wisconsin-Stout were shared with Edison administrators as one approach to doing so.

**Review of the institution's approach to capitalizing on recommendations identified by its last Systems Appraisal in the Strategic Issues Analysis.**

*In the team's judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution's approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP's expectations.*

Interviews with faculty, staff, and administrators provided evidence that college constituents are broadly engaged in systematic quality improvement initiatives through AQIP and CQIN. Edison's response to the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report via its 2014 Quality Program Summary provided clarification and explication of processes and standards as well as a narrative related to its approach and plans for capitalizing on recommendations from the Systems Appraisal team. The Quality Checkup team is satisfied Edison demonstrates commitment and capacity for addressing those issues and opportunities. The institution's new strategic plan is aligned with AQIP categories and identifies key performance indicators for each goal to determine quality improvements. Additionally, the visiting team heard a positive, proactive excitement about working the new strategic plan from many of the groups interviewed, including faculty members. Additionally, during reviews and interviews, the visiting team determined items originally identified as Strategic Issues, such as transcribing of credit and clarification of several figures had been sufficiently addressed in the Quality Program Summary written in response to the Systems Appraisal Feedback and further clarified during the visit.

**Review of organizational commitment to continuing systematic quality improvement**

*In the team's judgment, the institution presented satisfactory evidence that it met this goal of the Quality Checkup. The institution's approach to the issue, documentation, and performance were acceptable and comply with Commission and AQIP's expectations.*

Edison State Community College demonstrated it is maturing into an institution that understands and effectively uses continuous quality improvement in virtually all it does. Interviews with faculty, staff, and administrators provided evidence that constituents are broadly engaged in systematic quality improvement initiatives through AQIP and CQIN. Consistently, the visiting team heard college employees using vocabulary and citing examples that demonstrated Edison's culture of continuous quality improvement is real.

**Other AQIP Considerations or Concerns**

During the Quality Checkup visit evidence was provided that corrects comments made in the Systems

Appraisal Feedback in the following areas:

- Under the Strategic Challenges section
  - Deletion of the second sentence in the second bullet (Institution is committed to continuous quality improvement)
  - Deletion of the second sentence in the third bullet (Data presented in Figures 3.7 and 3.17 were clarified)
  - Deletion of the fourth bullet (Evidence for process of evaluation and transcribing of transfer credits provided)
- Under the Accreditation Issues section
  - 3P1 first sentence of third paragraph is revised and fourth sentence is deleted (Evidence is provided and Figures 3.7 and 3.17 were clarified)

Additionally, the team noted the following considerations:

The visiting team echoed the Systems Appraisal team's observation that the five-year Strategic Master Plan is an opportunity for Edison to capitalize on its experiences with AQIP and CQI. Attention should be paid to monitoring progress and using the plan to advance the college.

The visiting team had opportunity to provide advice in the category of Other Distinctive Objectives and is confident the college has a clearer understanding of how to identify and document its objectives, processes, results, and improvements in this category.

The visiting team discussed with Edison the "mechanics" and format for more clearly presenting its work in a Systems Portfolio and is confident the college has a clearer understanding of documenting its progression, successes, and learning along its AQIP journey. As one of the founding AQIP institutions, Edison has made good progress in embedding continuous quality improvement into its culture and processes with good results and should be able to better describe its journey in the next systems portfolio.

As discussed in various groups during the visit, Edison has an opportunity to reflect on and discuss what it has learned along its journey and to use that learning to inform the next cycle of process improvements in a variety of areas.

The Dean of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness is highly competent and has been engaged in AQIP and CQI at Edison since 2000. Her knowledge and understanding is vast and she has done a good job of engaging others. Edison should ensure this knowledge is shared and distributed and works toward helping other employees achieve similar mastery in order to ensure AQIP continuity into the future.

## Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

Effective for visits beginning January 1, 2013

### Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

The team reviews each item identified in the Federal Compliance Guide and documents its findings in the appropriate spaces below. Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution's ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in appropriate sections of the Assurance Section of the Team Report or highlighted as such in the appropriate AQIP Quality Checkup Report.

This worksheet outlines the information the team should review in relation to the federal requirements and provides spaces for the team's conclusions in relation to each requirement. The team should refer to the Federal Compliance Guide for Institutions and Evaluation Teams in completing this worksheet. The Guide identifies applicable Commission policies and an explanation of each requirement. **The worksheet becomes an appendix to the team's report.**

---

### Assignment of Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

*Information is provided on the institution's website*

*<http://www.edisonohio.edu/uploads/FederalCompliance/APPENDIX-A.pdf>. Program length meets state of Ohio requirements.*

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

---

### Institutional Records of Student Complaints

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

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

5. Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.
6. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
  - ( X ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
  - ( ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends follow-up.
  - ( ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends follow-up.
  - ( ) The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The Federal Compliance Document on the institution's website contains links to the policy for student complaints. As indicated in the third link, the institution has used the CQP Process to improve the Student Complaint Policy and Procedure.

***Communicating the Policy and Procedure***

Students can find the grievance procedure on the Edison Current Students webpage and in the Student Handbook pp. 51-52. The Student Complaint Policy and Procedure was revised by a CQI Process Team.

Additional monitoring, if any: NONE

---

## **Publication of Transfer Policies**

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

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

Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions and any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. Note whether the institution appropriately lists its articulation agreements with other institutions on its website or elsewhere. The information the institution provides should include any program-specific articulation agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution under Commission

review: 1) accepts credit from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; 2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements that it accepts; or 3) both offers and accepts credits with the other institution(s).

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

Comments: The institution's transfer policies and articulation agreements are included on its webpage <http://www.edisonohio.edu/index.php?page=consumer-information>.

Additional monitoring, if any: NONE

---

## Practices for Verification of Student Identity

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

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

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

Comments: Evidence of student verification was provided at <http://www.edisonohio.edu/uploads/FederalCompliance/APPENDIX-D.pdf>.

Additional monitoring, if any: NONE

---

## Title IV Program Responsibilities

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

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

- **General Program Requirements.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area.*
- **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion Five if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)*

**Default Rates.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its three year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note for 2012 and thereafter institutions and teams should be using the three-year default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact Commission staff.*

- **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.*
- **Student Right to Know.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and*

*practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion One if the team determines that disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)*

- ***Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance.*** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook. Note that the Commission does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.*
  - ***Contractual Relationships.*** *The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require Commission approval and has not received Commission approval the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Contractual Change Application on the Commission's web site for more information.)*
  - ***Consortial Relationships.*** *The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require Commission approval and has not received Commission approval the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Consortial Change Application on the Commission's web site for more information.)*
1. Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.
  2. Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution's compliance or whether the institution's auditor in the A-133 has raised any issues about the institution's compliance as well as look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.
  3. If an institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the federal compliance portion of the team report and whether the institution appears to be moving forward with corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.
  4. If issues have been raised with the institution's compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution's ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity (*Core Component 2.A and 2.B*).

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

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

Comments: The information pertaining to Title IV Program Responsibilities is found on the institution's website <http://www.edisonohio.edu/index.php?page=consumer-information>.

Additional monitoring, if any: NONE

---

## Required Information for Students and the Public

1. Verify that the institution publishes fair, accurate, and complete information on the following topics: the calendar, grading, admissions, academic program requirements, tuition and fees, and refund policies.
2. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
  - ( X ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
  - ( ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends follow-up.
  - ( ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends follow-up.
  - ( ) The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The information is provided to students and the public through Edison State Community College's website and catalog at <http://www.edisonohio.edu/index.php?page=consumer-information>.

Additional monitoring, if any: NONE

---

## Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information

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

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

Comments: Information pertaining to the institution's accreditation status with the Higher Learning Commission and other specialized accrediting organizations is accessible and located at the institution's website <http://www.edisonohio.edu/index.php?page=accreditation>.

Additional monitoring, if any: NONE

---

## Review of Student Outcome Data

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether it is appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs it offers and the students it serves.
2. Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about academic programs and requirements and to determine its effectiveness in achieving its educational objectives.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
  - (X) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
  - ( ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends follow-up.
  - ( ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends follow-up.
  - ( ) The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: Student outcome data is maintained in the institution's data repository that is accessible to faculty and administrators. Student outcome data is available under F at <http://www.edisonohio.edu/index.php?page=consumer-information>. Edison appears to use this information effectively in its decision-making processes.

Additional monitoring, if any: NONE

---

## Standing with State and Other Accrediting Agencies

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

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

1. Review the information, particularly any information that indicates the institution is under sanction or show-cause or has had its status with any agency suspended, revoked, or terminated, as well as the reasons for such actions.
2. Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution's capacity to meet the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the Commission staff liaison immediately.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
  - ( X ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
  - ( ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends follow-up.
  - ( ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends follow-up.
  - ( ) The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: Information about the institution's status with the state and other accrediting agencies is found at the institution's website <http://www.edisonohio.edu/index.php?page=accreditation>. Edison is in good standing with the state of Ohio and other accreditation agencies and is seeking authorization in other states for delivery of distance education.

Additional monitoring, if any: NONE

---

## Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment

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

1. Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including sample announcements, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.

2. Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow-up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
  - (X ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
  - ( ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends follow-up.
  - ( ) The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends follow-up.
  - ( ) The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: Public notification to comment is on page 27 of the document found at the <http://www.edisonohio.edu/uploads/FederalCompliance/FederalCompliance2014.pdf>. The team was notified by the Higher Learning Commission that no comments were received from the public.

Additional monitoring, if any: NONE

---

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

The following institutional materials were reviewed by the team.

<http://www.edisonohio.edu/index.php?page=accreditation> (and all sub-links from this page)  
<http://www.edisonohio.edu/index.php?page=consumer-information> (and all sub-links from this page)  
<http://catalog.edisonohio.edu/content.php?catoid=17&navoid=1167>  
<http://catalog.edisonohio.edu/content.php?catoid=17&navoid=1166>  
<http://catalog.edisonohio.edu/index.php?catoid=17>  
<http://www.edisonohio.edu/index.php?page=safety-and-security>  
<http://www.edisonohio.edu/index.php?page=dashboard>

Syllabi of the following courses:

ACC 121S, ANT 121S, ART 124S, BIO 121S, BUS 221S, CIT 214S, COM 121S, ENG 121S, HRM 110S, HST 121S, HUM 121S, MED 126S, MGT 126S, MKT 218S, MLT 250S, MTH 125S, NUR 265S, OSA 151S, PLS 121S, PSY 121S, SSV 211S, SSV 212S

The following programs:

Accounting A.A.B., Fine Arts A.A., Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, Business Management Certificate, .Net Programming Fast Track, Economics A.S., Renewable Energy Certificate, English A.A., Industrial Management, Operations Technology Option A.A.S., Mathematics A.S., Allied Health-Medical Assisting A.T.S., Nursing, Registered Nursing Option A.A.S., Medical Coder Certificate, Paralegal Studies Post-Baccalaureate Certificate, Philosophy A.A., Physical Therapist Assistant A.A.S., Social Services A.A.S.

## Appendix

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

## Part 1: Program Length and Tuition

---

### Instructions

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

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

---

### Worksheet on Program Length and Tuition

#### A. Answer the Following Questions

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

Yes       No

Comments: The institution's degree program requirements are appropriate for a community college and where appropriate meet the requirements of specialized accrediting organizations. The program length meets state of Ohio requirements.

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

Yes       No

Comments: The institution's tuition costs are aligned with those of other community colleges within Ohio. These tuition costs provide support for the academic programs and services of the institution.

## B. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

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

Yes

No

Rationale: The institution's program length and tuition practices are aligned with those of other community colleges.

Identify the type of Commission monitoring required and the due date: NONE

## Part 2: Assignment of Credit Hours

---

### Instructions

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

1. Review the Worksheet completed by the institution, which provides information about an institution's academic calendar and an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats, and the institution's policy and procedures for awarding credit hours. Note that such policies may be at the institution or department level and may be differentiated by such distinctions as undergraduate or graduate, by delivery format, etc.
2. Identify the institution's principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level. The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:
  - Associate's degrees = 60 hours
  - Bachelor's degrees = 120 hours
  - Master's or other degrees beyond the Bachelor's = at least 30 hours beyond the Bachelor's degree
  - Note that one quarter hour = .67 semester hour
  - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.

3. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution.
  - At semester-based institutions courses will be typically be from two to four credit hours (or approximately five quarter hours) and extend approximately 14-16 weeks (or approximately 10 weeks for a quarter). The description in the catalog should indicate a course that is appropriately rigorous and has collegiate expectations for objectives and workload. Identify courses/disciplines that seem to depart markedly from these expectations.
  - Institutions may have courses that are in compressed format, self-paced, or otherwise alternatively structured. Credit assignments should be reasonable. (For example, as a full-time load for a traditional semester is typically 15 credits, it might be expected that the norm for a full-time load in a five-week term is 5 credits; therefore, a single five-week course awarding 10 credits would be subject to inquiry and justification.)
  - Teams should be sure to scan across disciplines, delivery mode, and types of academic activities.
  - Federal regulations allow for an institution to have two credit-hour awards: one award for Title IV purposes and following the above federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. Commission procedure also permits this approach.
4. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course. Pay particular attention to alternatively-structured or other courses with particularly high credit hours for a course completed in a short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor.
5. **Sampling.** Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution and the range of programs it offers.
  - At a minimum, teams should anticipate sampling at least a few programs at each degree level.
  - For institutions with several different academic calendars or terms or with a wide range of academic programs, the team should expand the sample size appropriately to ensure that it is paying careful attention to alternative format and compressed and accelerated courses.
  - Where the institution offers the same course in more than one format, the team is advised to sample across the various formats to test for consistency.
  - For the programs the team sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several of the courses in the program, identify the contact hours for each course, and expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.
  - The team should pay particular attention to alternatively-structured and other courses that have high credit hours and less frequently scheduled interaction between the students and the instructor.

- Provide information on the samples in the appropriate space on the worksheet.
6. Consider the following questions:
- Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution?
  - Does that policy address the amount of instructional or contact time assigned and homework typically expected of a student with regard to credit hours earned?
  - For institutions with courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy also equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the timeframe allotted for the course?
  - Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that the Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)
  - If so, is the institution's assignment of credit to courses reflective of its policy on the award of credit?
7. If the answers to the above questions lead the team to conclude that there may be a problem with the credit hours awarded the team should recommend the following:
- If the problem involves a poor or insufficiently-detailed institutional policy, the team should call for a revised policy as soon as possible by requiring a monitoring report within no more than one year that demonstrates the institution has a revised policy and evidence of implementation.
  - If the team identifies an application problem and that problem is isolated to a few courses or single department or division or learning format, the team should call for follow-up activities (monitoring report or focused evaluation) to ensure that the problems are corrected within no more than one year.
  - If the team identifies systematic non-compliance across the institution with regard to the award of credit, the team should notify Commission staff immediately and work with staff to design appropriate follow-up activities. The Commission 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** (see #5 of instructions in completing this section)

The syllabi of the following courses were reviewed.

ACC 121S, ANT 121S, ART 124S, BIO 121S, BUS 221S, CIT 214S, COM 121S, ENG 121S, HRM 110S, HST 121S, HUM 121S, MED 126S, MGT 126S, MKT 218S, MLT 250S, MTH 125S, NUR 265S, OSA 151S, PLS 121S, PSY 121S, SSV 211S, SSV 212S

The following programs were reviewed.

Accounting A.A.B., Fine Arts A.A., Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, Business Management Certificate, .Net Programming Fast Track, Economics A.S., Renewable Energy Certificate, English A.A., Industrial Management, Operations Technology Option A.A.S., Mathematics A.S., Allied Health-Medical Assisting A.T.S., Nursing, Registered Nursing Option A.A.S., Medical Coder Certificate, Paralegal Studies Post-Baccalaureate Certificate, Philosophy A.A., Physical Therapist Assistant A.A.S., Social Services A.A.S.

## B. Answer the Following Questions

### 1) Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

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: Per the College Catalog, "In general, one credit represents one hour of classroom instruction or two hours of laboratory or clinical instruction."

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: The credit policy in the catalog addresses instructional time, but not homework. Course syllabi provide evidence of requirements for homework assignments.

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 timeframe and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

Yes  No

Comments: Not applicable

Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that the Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

Yes  No

Comments: The policy is reasonable within the federal definition guidelines.

## 2) Application of Policies

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 the Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

Yes  No

Comments: Course descriptions and syllabi meet the institution's policy on the award of credit. Course meetings and homework assignments are detailed in the course syllabus. Student and faculty interviews confirm that the institutional policy is in effect.

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: The learning outcomes in the syllabi are appropriate for the courses and programs.

If the institution offers any alternative delivery or compressed format courses or programs, were 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: Not applicable.

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 reasonably capable of being fulfilled by students in the time allocated to justify the allocation of credit?

Yes  No

Comments: Not applicable.

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: The institution assigns credit according to its policy, which is reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practices. Class time is scheduled accordingly.

### C. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

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

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

Yes  No

Rationale:

Identify the type of Commission monitoring required and the due date: NONE

### D. Identify and Explain Any Findings of Systematic Non-Compliance in One or More Educational Programs with Commission Policies Regarding the Credit Hour



