**Substantive Change Review Report**

*Effective September 1, 2022*

**Instructions:**

* *Peer Evaluators must review the* [***Substantive Change Policy***](https://www.msche.org/policies-guidelines/?title-search=substantive+change&type=)[*and* ***Substantive Change Procedures***](https://www.msche.org/policies-guidelines/?title-search=substantive+change&type=) *before completing this form.*
* *Peer evaluators must read the Substantive Change Request Form and attachments submitted by the institution.*
* *Peer evaluators must work together to conduct a thorough and careful review. This report summarizes the findings of the peer evaluators.*
* *Peer evaluators must hold all information provided in the submission as confidential.*
* ***Send questions, concerns, or requests for additional information from the institution to Substantive Change staff,*** **substantivechange@msche.org** ***at least three weeks before the committee meeting.***
* *The report is due at least two weeks before the committee meeting.*
* *The first substantive change reader is responsible for uploading the completed review form to the Volunteer Portal—Chrome browser recommended. The review report must be submitted in* ***PDF*** *format.*

**Institution: Click or tap here to enter text.**

**Date: Click or tap to enter a date.**

**Evaluators Information**

**First Substantive Change Reader**: **Click or tap here to enter text.**

**Second Substantive Change Reader**: **Click or tap here to enter text.**

*By typing my name above, I affirm that I have reviewed the form and all attachments submitted by the institution. I understand that confidentiality must be maintained relating to this submission and proposal for action until the Commission action is communicated to the institution.*

**Requests for Additional Information**

If you requested additional information, please list or describe the additional information you received.

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

**Section A: Identify the Nature of the Substantive Change**

*Please check the type of substantive change.*

[ ]  1. Substantial Change in Mission or Objectives

2. Change in Legal Status, Form of Control, or Ownership (see *Complex Substantive Change Review Report*)

[ ]  3. Significant Departure from Existing Educational Programs

[ ]  4. Alternative Delivery Method

[ ] 5. Direct Assessment Programs

[ ]  6. Higher Credential Level

[ ]  7. Change in Measures of Student Progress

[ ]  8. Substantial Increase in the Number of Clock or Credit Hours Awarded

[ ]  9. Written Arrangements

 [ ]  Domestic (25-50%)

 [ ]  International

[ ] 10. Additional Location

 [ ]  Establishment/Relocation/Reclassification to Additional Location

 [ ]  Acquisition of any Additional Location or another institution

 [ ]  Closure of Additional Location with teach-out

[ ] 11. Branch Campus

 [ ]  New/Relocation/Reclassification to Branch Campus

 [ ]  Closure of Branch Campus with teach-out

[ ] 12. Relocation or Reclassification of Main Campus

[ ] 13. Planned Institutional Closure

[ ]  14. Experimental Sites Initiatives (ESI)

**Section B: Review of the Substantive Change Request**

**Answer questions that apply to the type of change requested. If the question does not apply, enter “NA”.**

1. **Introduction to Substantive Change**:Provide a brief overview (500 words or less) of the Substantive Change Request that will help you explain the change to the Committee.

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Mission and Goals Alignment**: Describe how the change is consistent with and reflective of the institution’s stated mission.

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Need for Proposed Substantive Change**: Describe how the institution documented and explained the need for the change.

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Program Description**: Did the institution provide an adequate description of the proposed program?

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Communication**: Describe how the institution will ensure that information about the proposed substantive change will be honestly and truthfully conveyed in public relations announcements, advertisements, and in all materials and communications.

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Timeline**: Describe how there are sufficient resources and planning to meet the projected timeline.

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Faculty and/or Staffing Needs**: Describe how the institution will provide faculty, staff, and administration with appropriate credentials and experience to support the substantive change.

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Organizational Structure**: Describe the sufficiency of oversight and capacity to administer and support the substantive change.

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Student Population**: Describe the student population and the possible impact of the proposed substantive change.

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Student Services Support of the Student Experience**: Describe the institution’s student support services that will be impacted by the substantive change and how the institution will maintain adequate student support services.

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Educational Effectiveness and Assessment Processes:** Describe how the institution plan to assess the effectiveness of any proposed educational programs.

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Enrollment Projections/Planning and Financial Analysis**: Describe how the institution sufficiently captured the financial impact of the substantive change and how the financial analysis align with enrollment projections.

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Organizational Capacity**: Describe how the institution demonstrated that it can sustain the capacity to ensure overall stability and quality including adequate and efficient institutional resources, such as adequate facilities, equipment, and technology, as well as how this change is considered in the institution’s facilities master plan?

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Institutional Improvement and Planning**: Describe how the institution will evaluate and assess the substantive change?

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. **Title IV Certification**.

Review the institution’s current Eligibility and Certification Approval Report (ECAR).

* 1. Verify if the institution intends to apply for title IV for the change. [ ]  No [ ]  Yes
	2. Is it necessary to request an updated ECAR in the Commission’s action? [ ]  No [ ]  Yes
	3. Document if there is anything in the ECAR that is not included within the scope of accreditation.

 Click or tap here to enter text.

**Section C: Specific Substantive Change Type Questions**

Complete the section relevant to the specific type of substantive change.

**Alternative Delivery Method:**

Summarize how the institution sufficiently addresses the following:

1. proposed approach to the new delivery method and platforms: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
2. capacity to implement the new delivery method: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
3. Adequate regular and substantive interaction: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
4. methodology used to determine credit hour equivalencies is sound: Click or tap here to enter text.
5. technical support and communications are sufficient: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
6. faculty training and support are sufficient: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
7. procedures for verification of student identity are effective: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
8. Effective procedures in place to ensure student privacy: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
9. effective procedures in place to notify students of any additional charges associated with verification of student identity: **Click or tap here to enter text.**

**Direct Assessment:**

Summarize how the institution sufficiently addresses the following:

1. methodology used to determine credit hour equivalencies is reasonable and meets higher education standards and expectations: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
2. approach to student learning assessment meets expectations: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
3. direct assessments will be regularly assessed and analyzed: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
4. program is appropriately rigorous and reflective of higher education expectations: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
5. general approach to CBE is sound and will be managed to ensure appropriate progression of students: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
6. faculty are appropriately qualified, and training is sufficient: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
7. meets federal requirements for regular and substantive student interaction: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
8. institutional learning outcomes are aligned and consistent with Commission standards: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
9. adequate description of any third-party provider, if applicable: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
10. the institution maintains adequate oversight of the program: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
11. student advisement and services will be effective: **Click or tap here to enter text.**

**Change in Measures of Student Progress:**

Summarize how the institution sufficiently addresses one of the following:

1. methodology used to determine credit hour equivalencies is reasonable and meets higher education standards and expectations: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
2. process used to verify length of academic period is effective and demonstrates compliance with clock or credit hour requirements**: Click or tap here to enter text.**

**Written Arrangements – Domestic/International****:**

Summarize how the institution sufficiently addresses the following:

1. accurate calculation of the percentage of the program offered by the third-party provider: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
2. accurate assignment of instructors to the institution or the third party: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
3. adequate description of the role of the third-party provider: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
4. suitable and reasonable terms and conditions of the contract: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
5. the institution maintains adequate oversight of the program: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
6. the institution is meeting the required disclosures: **Click or tap here to enter text.**
7. adequate description and compliance with international requirements, if applicable: **Click or tap here to enter text.**

**Additional Location/Branch Campus/Main Campus:**

Summarize how the institution sufficiently addresses the following:

1. adequate information and description of the location: Click or tap here to enter text.
2. complete description of educational programs offered: Click or tap here to enter text.
3. adequate facilities and resources: Click or tap here to enter text.
4. the institution maintains adequate oversight of the program: Click or tap here to enter text.
5. adequate description of international requirements, if applicable: Click or tap here to enter text.
6. sufficient teach-out plan and agreement form, if applicable: Click or tap here to enter text.
7. **Additional Locations Only** –capacity to maintain educational quality at the additional location even when experiencing rapid growth in the number of additional locations (more than 5 in the fiscal year July 1 – June 30. Click or tap here to enter text.

**Section D: Institutional Standing with other Accrediting Agencies**

1. Did the institution indicate monitoring with any other agencies (accrediting, federal, state, etc.)?

[ ]  No [ ]  Yes

1. If yes, note the monitoring and indicate how it influenced, if at all, the action being recommended.

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

**Section E: Required Approvals for the Substantive Change**

*The Commission will only approve the substantive change if documentation of all required approvals is submitted and reviewed. The institution must provide, at a minimum, written documentation of all required institutional approvals or available written documentation of approvals in progress. If an approval is in progress, the institution must provide documentation of its submission to the entity or agency and must provide updates on its status. The institution must provide written documentation (correspondence with the entity or agency, statute/law/regulation, etc.) if no approval is required.*

1. Was written documentation for all required approvals provided?

[ ]  No [ ]  Yes

* 1. Document which required approvals were received (sufficient documentation was provided).

Click or tap here to enter text.

* 1. Document any missing or inadequate approvals.

Click or tap here to enter text.

1. If applicable, report on the status of any required governmental requirements.

Click or tap here to enter text.

1. If applicable, indicate if the institution provided the necessary approval from the United States Department of Education to change primary accreditor.

Click or tap here to enter text.

1. Report on the status of other required approvals.

Click or tap here to enter text.

**Section F: Third Party Comments**

Describe the process used by peer evaluators to review third-party comments received by the Commission related to this change.

*If the third-party comments result in any concerns that may adversely affect the institution’s compliance with the Commission’s standards for accreditation, requirements of affiliation, policies and procedures, and applicable federal regulatory requirements or the institution’s capacity to implement the substantive change, peer evaluators should select “Yes” to question #3 in Section H and describe those concerns.*

***NOTE: This report should not include a summary of the third-party comments.***

**Section G: Checklist and Certifications**

1. Was the checklist and certification completed?

[ ]  No

[ ]  Yes

**Section H: Proposal for Action**

1. The proposed substantive change request should be included within the institution’s scope of accreditation because the change does not appear to adversely affect the institution’s compliance with the Commission’s standards for accreditation, requirements of affiliation, policies and procedures, and applicable federal regulatory requirements and the institution appears to have sufficient capacity to implement the change.

[ ]  No

[ ]  Yes

1. Provide a brief justification for the proposal for action:

(be prepared to present to the Committee)

**Click or tap here to enter text.**

1. The institution should provide a follow-up report on the implementation of the substantive change.

[ ]  No

[ ]  Yes