

Eligibility Requirements Worksheet

Institutions are required to demonstrate that they meet the Eligibility Requirements at various points in the process of seeking accreditation with HLC. Institutions may also, in accordance with HLC policy, sometimes be required to write specifically to the Eligibility Requirements once accredited.

This worksheet generally will be used when an institution provides the Compliance With Eligibility Requirements Form as a component of another review. The team should use the narrative in the form and supporting evidence to evaluate the institution’s compliance with the Eligibility Requirements. The institution may also use information provided in the Institutional Data Form as supporting evidence, if applicable. *(Note: Peer reviewers should use the "Eligibility Review Report" for institutions that are providing an Eligibility Filing as part of the Eligibility Process.)*

*Instructions*
If an Eligibility Requirement is rated as “not met,” indicate the specific reason the Eligibility Requirement is not met. If applicable, reference any Eligibility Requirement that is not met in the appropriate area of the main team report (i.e., the related Assumed Practice, Federal Compliance requirement, or Core Component[s]).

**Submitting the Worksheet**
Submit the final worksheet to HLC at [hlcommission.org/upload](https://www.hlcommission.org/upload). Select “Final Reports” from the list of submission options to ensure the worksheet is sent to the correct HLC staff member. If applicable, the team chair should send the draft of this worksheet to the institution’s HLC staff liaison at the same time the draft report is submitted for liaison review. (Note: The submission webpage can be accessed through the Assurance System by clicking the Submit Final Form button on the Forms tab.)

## Evaluation Details

Institution:       City, State:

Date of on-site visit (if applicable): MM/DD–DD/YYYY

Type of visit:

[ ]  Preliminary peer review (accelerated process for initial accreditation

[ ]  Comprehensive evaluation for candidacy

[ ]  Biennial evaluation

[ ]  Comprehensive evaluation for initial accreditation

[ ]  Show-Cause visit

[ ]  Other

Please specify:

List names, titles and affiliations of each peer reviewer and indicate the team chair if applicable.

## Eligibility Requirements

1. **Jurisdiction of HLC**The institution falls within HLC’s jurisdiction as defined in HLC’s Bylaws (Article III). HLC extends accreditation and candidacy for accreditation to higher education institutions that (1) are 1) incorporated in or operating under federal authority within, the United States, and (2) have substantial presence, as defined in HLC policy, within the United States.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Legal Status**The institution is appropriately authorized in each of the states, sovereign nations, or jurisdictions in which it operates to award degrees, offer educational programs, or conduct activities as an institution of higher education. At least one of these must be in HLC’s jurisdiction.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Governing Board**The institution has an independent governing board that possesses and exercises the necessary legal power to establish and review the basic policies that govern the institution.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Stability**
The institution demonstrates a history of stable operations and consistent control during the two years preceding the submission of the Eligibility Filing or the application for initial accreditation through the accelerated process.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Mission Statement**The institution has a statement of mission approved by its governing board and appropriate for a degree-granting institution of higher education. The mission defines the nature and purpose of the higher learning provided by the institution and the students for whom it is intended.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Educational Programs**The institution has educational programs that are appropriate for an institution of higher education. HLC may decline to evaluate an institution for status with HLC if the institution’s mission or educational programs fall outside areas in which HLC has demonstrated expertise or lacks appropriate standards for meaningful review.

In appropriate proportion, the institution’s programs are degree-granting and involve coursework provided by the institution, establishing the institution’s commitment to degree-granting higher education.

The institution has clearly articulated learning goals for its academic programs and has strategies for assessment in place.

The institution:

* maintains a minimum requirement for general education for all of its undergraduate programs whether through a traditional practice of distributed curricula (15 semester credits for AAS degrees, 24 for AS or AA degrees, and 30 for bachelor’s degrees) or through integrated, embedded, interdisciplinary, or other accepted models that demonstrate a minimum requirement equivalent to the distributed model. Any exceptions are explained and justified.
* has a program of general education that is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts common knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess. The institution clearly and publicly articulates the purposes, content and intended learning outcomes of its general education program.
* conforms to commonly accepted minimum program length: 60 semester credits for associate’s degrees, 120 semester credits for bachelor’s degrees, and 30 semester credits beyond the bachelor’s for master’s degrees. Any exception to these minima must be explained and justified.
* meets the federal requirements for credit ascription described in HLC’s Federal Compliance Program.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Information to the Public**
The institution makes public its statements of mission, vision, and values; full descriptions of its program requirements; its requirements for admission both to the institution and to particular programs or majors; its policies on acceptance of transfer credit, including how credit is applied to degree requirements; clear and accurate information on all student costs, including tuition, fees, training and incidentals, and its policy on refunds; its policies regarding good standing, probation, and dismissal; all residency requirements; and grievance and complaint procedures.

The institution portrays clearly and accurately to the public its accreditation status with institutional, specialized, and professional accreditation agencies as well as with the Higher Learning Commission, including a clear distinction between candidate or accredited status and an intention to seek status.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Financial Capacity**
The institution has the financial base to support its operations and sustain them in the future. It demonstrates a record of responsible fiscal management, including appropriate debt levels.

The institution:

* has a prepared budget for the current year and the capacity to compare it with budgets and actual results of previous years; and
* undergoes external financial audit by a certified public accountant or a public audit agency. For private institutions the audit is annual; for public institutions it is at least every two years. (Institutions under federal control are exempted provided that they have other reliable information to document the institution’s fiscal resources and management.)

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Administration**
The institution has a Chief Executive Officer appointed by its governing board.

The institution has governance and administrative structures that enable it to carry out its operations.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Faculty and Other Academic Personnel**
The institution employs faculty and other academic personnel appropriately qualified and sufficient in number to support its academic programs.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Learning Resources**
The institution owns or has secured access to the learning resources and support services necessary to support the learning expected of its students (research laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, etc.).

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Student Support Services**
The institution makes available to its students support services appropriate for its mission, such as advising, academic records, financial aid, and placement.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Planning**
The institution demonstrates that it engages in planning with regard to its current and future business and academic operations.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Policies and Procedures**
The institution has appropriate policies and procedures for its students, administrators, faculty, and staff.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Current Activity**
The institution has students enrolled in its degree programs. (To be granted initial accreditation, an institution must have graduated students from at least one degree program.)

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Integrity of Business and Academic Operations**
The institution has no record of inappropriate, unethical, and untruthful dealings with its students, with the business community, or with agencies of government. The institution complies with all legal requirements (in addition to authorization of academic programs) wherever it does business.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Consistency of Description Among Agencies**
The institution describes itself consistently to all accrediting and governmental agencies with regard to its mission, programs, governance, and finances.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Accreditation Record**
Within the five years preceding the initiation of the process of seeking accreditation with HLC, the institution has not (a) been subject to a sanction or Show-Cause Order with another recognized accreditor; (b) has not been subject to an adverse action with another recognized accreditor; or (c) has not voluntarily resigned its status with another recognized accreditor while subject to (a) or (b).

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

1. **Good Faith and Planning to Achieve Accreditation**
The board has authorized the institution to seek membership with HLC and indicated its intention, if a member of HLC, to accept the Obligations of Membership.

The institution has a realistic plan for achieving accreditation with HLC within the period of time set by HLC policy.

* If the institution offers programs that require accreditation from a recognized accreditor in order for its students to be certified or sit for licensing examinations, it either has the appropriate accreditation or discloses publicly and clearly the consequences of the lack thereof. The institution always makes clear to students the distinction between the various types of accreditation and the relationship between licensure and these various types of accreditation.
* If the institution is predominantly or solely a single-purpose institution in fields that require licensure for practice, it demonstrates that it is also accredited by or is actively in the process of applying to a recognized accreditor for each field, if such a recognized accreditor exists.

Rating:

[ ]  Met

[ ]  Not met

Rationale:

## Determination

Select one of the following statements:

[ ]  The team or panel has reviewed all Eligibility Requirements and determined that the institution meets all the Eligibility Requirements.

[ ]  The team or panel has reviewed all Eligibility Requirements and has determined that the institution does not meet the Eligibility Requirement(s) listed below.

Eligibility Requirement(s) that are not met: