ATHEA

ASSOCIATION FOR TRANSNATIONAL
HIGHER EDUCATION ACCREDITATION

CANDIDACY

SELF-EVALUATION MANUAL

Version 2.0

December 2016

Table of Contents

PART I: INTRODUCTION

Mission, Vision, and Values of ATHEA

MISSION

The Association for Transnational Higher Education Accreditation (ATHEA) is a voluntary, non-governmental, membership association that is dedicated to quality assurance and improvement through accreditation via peer evaluation. Accreditation by ATHEA instils public confidence in the institutional mission, goals, performance, and resources through its rigorous accreditation standards and their enforcement of those standards. ATHEA standards for accreditation are based on the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ESG) required for recognition by the European Quality Assurance Register in Higher Education (EQAR).

VISION

The Association for Transnational Higher Education Accreditation (ATHEA) aspires to be the preeminent resource for institutions of higher education striving to achieve excellence in fulfilling their missions. ATHEA intends, through voluntary assessment and adherence to high standards for student learning outcomes and operational behaviour, to assure higher education's publics that its accredited institutions are fulfilling their stated purposes and addressing the publics' expectations.

CORE VALUES

The Association for Transnational Higher Education Accreditation (ATHEA) is guided by these Core Values:

➢ Voluntary membership

➢ Self-regulation and peer-review

➢ A continuous and seamless relationship with member institutions to promote continuous self-evaluation and institutional improvement

➢ Respect for the unique mission of each institution and evaluation within that context

➢ Student learning and effective teaching

➢ Transparency about the accreditation processes and the status held by each member institution

➢ Commitment to the principles of cooperation, flexibility, and openness

- ➢ Responsiveness to the needs of the higher education community and societal changes

- ➢ Consideration of societal and institutional needs through attention to and emphasis on both improvement and compliance

- ➢ Responsiveness to a diverse, dynamic, global higher education community that is continually evolving

Scope of Accreditation

The Scope of Accreditation is to provide educational, accrediting, quality assurance and other services to its member institutions, degree/diploma granting post-secondary educational institutions offering higher education and located inside or outside the European area, including, but not limited to, the countries who are signatories of the Bologna Protocols.

Statement of Accreditation Philosophy

Organizational Purpose

The ATHEA is a non-profit organisation to promote the following activities:

(a) To provide educational, accrediting, quality assurance, and other services to its member institutions, degree/diploma granting post-secondary educational institutions offering higher education and located inside or outside the European area, including, but not limited to, the countries who are signatories of the Bologna Protocols.

(b) To serve as an accrediting agency that is included on the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education. As such, the ATHEA will conduct voluntary, non-governmental peer review and make decisions concerning the accreditation or pre-accreditation status of member institutions.

(c) To promote quality assurance and improvement through voluntary accreditation via peer evaluation and instil public confidence in its institutional members' missions, goals, performance, and resources through its rigorous accreditation standards and their enforcement.

(d) To initiate and sustain such training and research activities as may be consistent with the general purposes of ATHEA.

ATHEA's Accreditation Beliefs

ATHEA believes that accreditation must be mission-based, strategic planning driven, outcomes and competency centred, and based upon peer-review. Accreditation signifies that an institution has a purpose appropriate to higher education and has resources, programmes, and services sufficient to accomplish and sustain that purpose. Accreditation indicates that an institution maintains clearly specified educational objectives that are consistent with its mission and appropriate to the degrees it offers, and that it is successful in achieving its stated objectives.

Self-regulation through accreditation embodies a philosophy that a free people can and ought to govern themselves through a representative, flexible, and responsive system. Accordingly, accreditation is best accomplished through a voluntary association of educational institutions. Accreditation enhances educational quality throughout the region by improving the effectiveness of institutions and ensuring that institutions meet standards established by the higher education community, and serves as a common denominator of shared values and practices among the diverse institutions.

Both a process and a product, accreditation relies on integrity, thoughtful and principled judgment, rigorous application of requirements, and a context of trust. It provides an assessment of an institution's effectiveness in the fulfilment of its mission, its compliance with the requirements of its accrediting association, and its continuing efforts to enhance the quality of student learning and its programmes and services. Based upon reasoned judgment, the process stimulates evaluation and improvement, while providing a means of continuing accountability to constituents and the public. An intended outcome of accreditation is that the process leads to continuous enhance and development of the institution, and serves as a mechanism of continuous improvement.

The product of accreditation is a public statement of an institution's continuing capacity to provide effective programmes and services based on agreed-upon requirements. The statement of an institution's accreditation status is also an affirmation of that institution's continuing commitment to the principles and philosophy of accreditation.

Accreditation supports the right of an institution to pursue its established educational mission; the right of faculty members to teach, investigate, and publish freely; and the

right of students to access opportunities for learning and for the open exchange of ideas. However, the exercise of these rights should not interfere with the overriding obligation of an institution to offer its students a sound education.

The ATHEA adheres to the following fundamental characteristics of accreditation:

- Participation in the accreditation process is voluntary and is an earned and renewable status.

- Member institutions develop, amend, and approve accreditation requirements through an open and transparent governance concept.

- The process of accreditation is representative, responsive, and appropriate to the types of institutions accredited.

- Accreditation is self-regulation.

- Accreditation requires institutional commitment and engagement.

- Accreditation is based upon a peer review process.

- Accreditation requires an institutional commitment to student learning and achievement.

- Accreditation acknowledges an institution's prerogative to articulate its mission within the recognized context of higher education and its responsibility to show that it is accomplishing its mission.

- Accreditation expects an institution to develop a balanced governing structure designed to promote institutional autonomy and flexibility of operation.

- Accreditation expects an institution to ensure that its programmes are complemented by support structures and resources that allow for the total growth and development of its students.

Transnational Higher Education Accreditation - THEA

THEA is the Transnational Higher Education Accreditation. ATHEA is the membership-based organisation. THEA is the actual accreditation. THEA is the principle service provided by ATHEA to its members. An institution joins ATHEA in order to be awarded THEA.

The processes, procedures, and specifics of THEA fall within the purview of the THEA Board of Commissioners, which organisationally is part of ATHEA with independence relative to matters of accreditation. The full name of the THEA Board of Commissioners is: *Transnational Higher Education Accreditation (THEA) Board of Commissioners for the Association for Transnational Higher Education Accreditation (ATHEA)*.

The THEA Board of Commissioners is organisationally subordinate to the ATHEA Board of Directors, but there is a degree of separation relative to Commission actions relative to accreditation. Such separation ensures unbiased accreditation actions. The shortened versions would be *the THEA Board of Commissioners* when referring to the organisational entity, and *THEA Commissioners* when referring to the persons on the Commission.

An Institutional Member is granted THEA Candidacy by the THEA Board of Commissioners and subsequently obtains THEA-Candidate. Thus, the ATHEA Institutional Member has obtained THEA-Candidate status.

A THEA-Candidate is awarded THEA by the THEA Board of Commissioners and subsequently becomes THEA-Accredited. Thus, the ATHEA Institutional Member has obtained THEA-Accredited Status

The terms *grants/granted* and *awards/awarded* are specific relative to candidacy and accreditation.

Based on the actions taken by the THEA Board of Commissioners, the institution has different accreditation statuses with related dues/fees requirements.

A few examples regarding the use of ATHEA and THEA are as follows:

- The THEA Board of Commissioners grants THEA Candidacy to XYZ University. Thus, XYZ University is an ATHEA Institutional Member and has been granted THEA-Candidacy. Or, XYZ University is a Candidate for THEA. A unique logo will be available to the candidate to designate the status.

- The THEA Board of Commissioners awards THEA to XYZ University. Thus, XYZ University is an ATHEA Institutional Member who has been awarded THEA, and is designated THEA-Accredited. Or, XYZ University has received THEA and has THEA-Accreditation. A unique logo will be available to the member who has obtained THEA to designate the achievement.

- An institution joins and is a member of ATHEA.

- Institutional members of ATHEA seek to obtain THEA.

- An Institutional Member is a candidate for THEA (THEA-Candidate).

- An Institutional Member that has been granted THEA-Candidacy is accredited by the THEA Board of Commissioners and has been awarded THEA (THEA-Accredited).

Requirements for Institutional Membership

Three levels of institutional membership are recognized by the ATHEA:

1. **Institutional Membership**. This is the entry into the ATHEA and the starting point for all institutional members who may seek accreditation. The institution must have legal authorization to operate as a tertiary educational institution, have students in an academic programme, be in existence for at least 1 year, and offer and teach their own institution's programmes. If, for example, an institution is teaching for another institution but has no academic programmes of their own, they could not be an Institutional Member. In the ATHEA Charter, the specific term stated is *Member*.

2. **Candidacy for Accreditation**. An Institutional Member who has completed all of the requirements for candidacy status as stated in the Accreditation Policy Manual will be considered a candidate for accreditation. The Institutional Member must have graduates of the programme and be in existence for at least 3 years. The specific term used to state a positive outcome for candidacy is THEA-Candidate. In the ATHEA Charter, the specific membership category is *Candidate Member*. The member therefore becomes an ATHEA Candidate Member, having been granted THEA-Candidate by the THEA Board of Commissioners.

3. **Accredited**. Once an ATHEA Candidate Member completes a self-evaluation, passes a site evaluation, and is accepted into accreditation status by the

THEA Board of Commissioners, the institution is awarded accreditation. The THEA-Candidate must have at least 2 cycles of graduates from their institution. The specific term for accredited is THEA-Accredited. In the ATHEA Charter, the specific membership category is *Accredited Member*. The Candidate Member therefore becomes an ATHEA Accredited Member, having been granted THEA-Accreditation by the THEA Board of Commissioners.

In order to become an Institutional Member of the ATHEA, an academic institution must:

1. Submit an application for Institutional Membership. Applications for the ATHEA institutional membership must be approved and signed by the institution's chief executive officer (i.e., president, chancellor, director general), affirming its commitment to abide by the accreditation policies and procedures of the ATHEA. The application form will be reviewed by the ATHEA staff and the applicant will be notified regarding acceptance.

2. Pay its membership dues to the ATHEA.

3. Provide evidence that the institution has the legal authority to operate as a tertiary educational institution. In cases where the documentation of the legal authority is written in a language other than English, the academic institution must submit a copy of the original non-English version and an English translation of the original documentation.

An Institutional Member is not allowed to claim or imply candidacy or accreditation by THEA-until candidacy or accreditation has been officially granted/awarded.

Privacy and Confidentiality of Accreditation Information

When an institution becomes a member of ATHEA, it agrees to the disclosure of its accreditation status, including disclosure of the extent to which its academic programs are in compliance with the THEA Standards and Expectations. The disclosure of this information assists external stakeholders, such as students, parents, employers, and the general public, in making appropriate educational decisions.

Much of the information provided to the ATHEA during the accreditation process is confidential, and the ATHEA makes every reasonable effort to protect that

confidentiality. Some of the information provided to ATHEA by the member institutions will need to be publically available as required by the ATHEA bylaws.

Only site evaluators, staff, and THEA Board of Commissioners may review confidential institutional information, and the THEA Board of Commissioners requires these individuals to abide by this confidentiality requirement. They must sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA).

The ATHEA and the THEA Board of Commissioners make every reasonable effort to avoid conflicts of interest. All members of the evaluation team must sign a declaration form prior to commencing activities to declare any potential conflict of interest. Site evaluators are excluded from involvement in the accreditation process for institutions in which they have had, or might foresee having, a professional or personal conflict of interest. Members of the ATHEA Board of Directors and THEA Board of Commissioners are required to recuse themselves from discussions, deliberations, or decisions about their own institutions where a conflict of interest might exist.

Site evaluators understand their ethical responsibilities pertaining to conduct before, during, and after accreditation site visits. Matters pertaining to an accreditation site visit are not discussed in public and are treated confidentially.

THEA Board of Commissioners policy requires that each site evaluation member maintain the confidentiality of all accreditation materials (e.g., self-study, site visit reports, etc.). While such materials can be disseminated throughout the institution, as appropriate, they should not be shared with outside parties without the approval of the THEA Board of Commissioners.

Becoming a THEA-Candidate

In order to become a THEA-Candidate, an institution must:

1. Be an institutional member of the ATHEA.

2. Submit an Application for Candidacy. Applications for Candidacy must be approved and signed by the institution's chief executive officer (i.e., president, chancellor, director general), affirming the institution's commitment to abide by the accreditation policies and procedures of the THEA Board of Commissioners.

3. Pay its application fee for candidacy status to ATHEA.

4. Agree to reimburse ATHEA for the travel expenses associated with the Candidacy Site Visit.

5. Receive the THEA Board of Commissioners THEA-Candidate recognition.

Accreditation by ATHEA is mission-based and outcomes-centric. Therefore, documentation submitted with the Candidacy Application should include the following key elements from the institution's strategic plan.
- Mission, Vision, and Values
- The Strategic Goals
- Organizational Structure
- Legal Authorization to Operate as a Tertiary Educational Institution

The following are the **10 Standards for Quality Assurance in Higher Education**, adopted by the ATHEA, which will be addressed in the candidacy application.

1. **Policy for Quality Assurance**. The institution has a policy for quality assurance that is available to the public and forms part of the institution's strategic management. Internal stakeholders develop, implement, and update the policy and strategy for quality assurance through appropriate structures and processes, and with the involvement of external stakeholders. This strategy should be included of the institution's strategic planning process.

2. **Design and Approval of Academic Programmes**. The institution has processes for the design and approval of their academic programmes. The academic programmes are designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme is clearly specified and communicated, and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area.

3. **Student-Centred Learning, Teaching, and Assessment.** The institution's academic programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process and the assessment of student learning reflects this approach.

4. **Student Admission, Progression, Recognition, and Certification.** The institution consistently applies pre-defined and published regulations and policies covering all phases of the student cycle including student admission, progression, recognition, and certification.

5. **Teaching Staff**. The institution assures themselves of the competence of their teachers, including appropriate qualification to teach the assigned work load. The institution applies fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the teaching staff. The institution performs research appropriate to the institution's mission.

6. **Learning Resources and Student Support**. The institution has appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities and provides adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support.

7. **Information Management.** The institution collects, analyses, and uses relevant information for the effective management of their academic

programmes and other institutional activities with appropriate policies and procedures to facilitate clear communication with all stakeholders.

8. **Public Information.** The institution publishes information about their activities, including academic programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date, and readily accessible.

9. **Ongoing Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programmes.** The institution monitors and periodically reviews their programmes to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them, and are responsive to the needs of students and society. Periodic reviews lead to continuous improvement of the academic programme. Actions planned or taken as a result of the periodic reviews are communicated to all those concerned, to include a comprehensive quality assurance plan.

10. **Cyclical External Quality Assurance.** The institution undergoes external quality assurance in accordance with the ATHEA Standards and Expectations on a cyclical basis.

Part II. CANDIDACY SELF-EVALUATION

As part of the THEA accreditation process it is necessary to produce a candidacy self-evaluation. The documents will be reviewed and validated by an external reviewer. This manual is to be used to prepare the application. The completion of an application for an institution is required to receive THEA candidacy status.

THEA recognizes, acknowledges, and respects the fact that institutions operate in differing educational, historical, cultural, and legal/regulatory environments. Consequently, each institution will have its own unique mission, goals and objectives, and organizational culture, all of which are reflected in the application.

The application is used to document the institution's eligibility for the THEA accreditation. The key to preparing a good application is to provide accurate, complete, and well thought-out responses to all of the accreditation standards. Inaccurate, incomplete, or improperly-formatted information may delay the accreditation process. Make sure that your responses are clear and address the relevant topics. At the same time, be succinct in the narrative statements that you provide. The quality of the content in the application is more important than the length of the document.

The application period must cover one full academic year; this should be the full academic year immediately preceding, and not including any portion of, the calendar year in which the site visit takes place. For example, if the site visit is scheduled for the calendar year of 2016, use the preceding academic year (2014-2015 academic year) as the application year. For consistency purposes, an academic year should consist of one twelve-month period.

A preliminary draft copy of the Candidacy Self-Study must be submitted to THEA offices at least 120 days prior to the site visit. THEA staff will review the application for completeness and accuracy. Any missing information and inaccuracies will be communicated in writing to the institution, which will then revise its application accordingly to ensure that it is complete, addresses all accreditation standards, and is in the appropriate format with accurate tables. No explicit site visit travel arrangements will be made and no site visits will be conducted until the THEA has received a complete and accurate application.

A complete and accurate Candidacy Self-Study must be submitted to the THEA at least 60 days before the scheduled site visit. The application and all supporting materials must be submitted electronically. Materials to be submitted: the completed

application, the institution's catalogue(s) or bulletin(s) for the application year, and any other supporting information.

The next section addresses the format of the application and is a template for your candidacy self-evaluation. It also provides a description of the information that you are to include.

Training is available for institutional members who want to start the candidacy process.

Part III. CANDIDACY SELF-EVALUATION - TEMPLATE

The application must consist of two volumes:

Volume 1 for your narrative responses to the candidacy standards and for the required tables.

Volume 2 for the appendices to accommodate bulky items such as course syllabi, strategic planning documents, outcomes assessment plan, faculty vitae, faculty handbook, etc.

The application and all supporting materials must be written in English.

Submit the documents in PDF format. It must be a searchable PDF format (No static image format).

Volume 1

Title Page

A) Institutional Background

B) Response to Candidacy Standards (Part III. of this documents)

Volume 2

Table of Contents

Appendices (Each appendix should have a separate cover page.)

The remaining part of this section is the template for the candidacy self-evaluation. The template is available as a MS-Word document.

TITLE PAGE

Name of the Institution	
Date founded	
Institution's web address	
Date of Submission	
Who Prepared this Document (list all members)	
Accreditation Liaison:	
Position	
Department	
Postal Address	
if different, Physical Address	
Email	
Phone	Office Mobile
Secondary Liaison:	
Position	
Department	
Email	
Phone	Office Mobile

A) INSTITUTIONAL BACKGROUND

The information in this section conveys a general profile of the institution, and provides essential background information. This information is needed so that the THEA Board of Commissioners can understand your academic institution. Please attach any supporting documentation or location of such document (website URL) with this report following the final appendix.

1. **Institution History**. In one or two paragraphs, provide a brief history of the institution. If the history is stated in the institution's catalogue, provide the page numbers for the relevant section.

2. **Institutional Type.** Please indicate the type of institution relative to ownership.

Institutional Type	
Private not-for-profit	
Private for-profit	
Public	
Other	

If "Other", please explain and describe:

3. **Instructional Levels and Modality.** Please indicate the instructional levels and their programme delivery modality.

Institutional Levels and Delivery Methods	Delivery Methods			
	Traditional	Online	Joint	Other
Undergraduate (First Cycle)				
2-year				
3-year				
4-year				
Masters (Second Cycle)				
Doctorate (Third Cycle)				
Post Doctorate				
Other (i.e., Certificate Executive Training)				

If you selected "Other" as a delivery modality, please explain what you mean.

4. **Institutional Partners**. Provide a list of institutional partners, if any, that offer programmes or joint programmes through or with the institution that is seeking candidacy (the applicant institution).

Institutional Partner	Who is the Degree Issuing Institution(s)?			
	Applicant Institution	Partner Institution	Joint	Other
Name of the Partner Institution				
Name of the Partner Institution				
Name of the Partner Institution				
Name of the Partner Institution				
Name of the Partner Institution				
Name of the Partner Institution				
Name of the Partner Institution				
Name of the Partner Institution				

If you list "Other" in terms of who is Issuing the degree, please explain.

5. **Strategic Plan**. First, briefly describe your institution's strategic plan in a few paragraphs. Next, provide a copy of the institution's strategic plan with this application; insert it in Volume 2 at the end of the appendices and label it as **Appendix K**.

B) RESPONSE TO THE CANDIDACY STANDARDS

Standard 1   Policy for Quality Assurance

The institution has a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of the institution's strategic management. Internal stakeholders develop and implement this policy and strategy through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders. This policy should be included in the institution's strategic planning process. All transnational activities of the institution including joint programmes, partnership arrangements, branch campuses, etc. should also be included within the strategy for quality assurance.

Expectation 1 *What is the institution's current policy relative to this Standard and its associated Quality Assurance?* In the narrative for this Standard state, describe, and discuss the institution's policy is part of the strategy for quality assurance across the institution. Address each of the areas in a comprehensive Quality Assurance Plan associated with this standard.

The following Quality Assurance Objectives are associated with this expectation.

The institution's quality assurance policy:

- Addresses the entire institution
- Is inclusive of all internal stakeholders
- Preserves academic integrity and freedom and is vigilant against academic fraud
- Guards against intolerance and discrimination
- Involves external stakeholders
- Includes transnational activities

Requirement #1 for Accreditation Standard 1 (Narrative response):

Provide a narrative response (1000-2000 words) of the institution's current policy and strategy for Quality Assurance for the entire institution. The response should include operational and academic strategies.

Please use the text box on the application form (example below) for your narrative response.

Areas to be covered:

1. What is the institution's understanding of Quality Assurance (QA) and explanation of your policy and strategy approach to QA.
2. The process used to develop the comprehensive QA plan; if still in the process what remains to be completed.
3. The date the plan was completed and first implemented.
4. The length of review cycle for the comprehensive plan.

Requirement #2 for Accreditation Standard 1 (Evidence of submission):

If a comprehensive quality assessment plan (outcomes assessment) is in place, please include it in the appendices including any:

    i.   Results of the implementation of the plan.

    ii.   Identified changes and improvements needed/made.

    iii.   Any realized outcomes (the effect of previous changes and improvements).

Provide documentation or other related evidence as Appendix A to this application that the institution has a strategy for quality assurance and the strategy addresses the entire institution.

Please note that this specific Quality Assurance Planning is considered critical for accreditation and must be a *Meets Standard* for the self-evaluation and peer-review visit. The *Meets Standard* for this requirement is that **the strategy is provided with evidence that the entire institution is included**.

If shortcomings relative to this specific *Quality Assurance Plan* are noted within the Candidacy Application, please plan to make the necessary improvements with the submission of the self-evaluation and peer-review visit for accreditation.

Standard 2   Design and Approval of Academic Programmes

The institution has processes for the design and approval of their academic programmes. The programmes are designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme is clearly specified and communicated, and referred to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area.

Expectation 2 *What is the institution's current strategy relative to this Standard and its associated Quality Objectives?* In the narrative for this Standard state, describe, and discuss the institution's plan for its academic programmes. Address each of the Quality Assurance Objectives associated with this standard.

The following Quality Assurance Objectives are associated with this expectation.

The process for the design and approval of the institution's academic programmes should include:

- Programme objectives and intended learning outcomes
- Involving faculty, students, and other key stakeholders such as employers in the design of the programmes
- Reflecting the four purposes of higher education of the Council of Europe (preparation for sustainable employment; preparation for life as active citizens in democratic societies; personal development; the development and maintenance, through teaching, learning and research, of a broad, advanced knowledge base.
- Facilitating smooth student progression
- Defining the expected student workload and other learning expectations (e.g. in ECTS)
- Applied experiential placement opportunities
- Formal institutional review

Requirement #1 for Accreditation Standard 2 (Narrative response):

For the Candidacy Application, provide a narrative response (1000-2000 words). State, describe, and discuss the institution's plan for its academic programmes. Please use the text box on the application form (example below) for your narrative response.

Areas to be covered:
1. Describe the process of development of programmatic objective and intended learning outcomes.
2. Describe how the results of the implemented quality assurance plan has been used to make improvements at the institutional, unit, and program levels.
3. If the plan has not been implemented, how do you expect to integrate the results of the plan into the institution?

Requirement #2 for Accreditation Standard 2 (Evidence of submission):

List all academic programmes offered by the institution at the time of this application. Include the data for each programme as indicated. For all data, use the current date for this application as the starting point to establish a frame of reference. List each degree level separately.

Programmes offered by the applicant institution List each degree level separately	Academic Programme Data				
	Levels of degree or diploma (e.g., undergraduate, masters, doctorate)	Number of students currently enrolled in the programme	Number of graduates in the past 12 months	Year the programme was first offered	Year of the last programme review

(Add lines as needed.)

Provide documentation or other related evidence in Appendix B to this application that the **institution's academic programmes have programme objectives and intended learning outcomes**. If the objectives and intended outcomes are in the completed quality assurance plan, provide the location in the plan.

Complete a table for each degree or diploma program offered. Copy additional tables as needed.

Programme:	
Programmatic Objectives	Intended Learning Outcomes

Programme:	
Programmatic Objectives	Intended Learning Outcomes

Please note that this specific Quality Assurance Objective is considered critical for accreditation and must be a *Meets Standard* for the self-evaluation and peer-review visit. The *Meets Standard* is that **all programmes have stated objectives and intended learning outcomes and associated rubrics**.

If shortcomings relative to this specific *Quality Assurance Plan* are noted within the Candidacy Application, please plan to make the necessary improvements with the submission of the self-evaluation and peer-review visit for accreditation.

Standard 3   Student-Centred Learning, Teaching, and Assessment

The institution's academic programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process and the assessment of student learning reflects this approach.

Expectation 3 *What is the institution's current strategy relative to this Standard and its associated Quality Objectives?* In the narrative for this Standard state, describe, and discuss the institution's plan for academic programme delivery. Address each of the Quality Assurance Objectives associated with this standard.

The following Quality Assurance Objectives are associated with this expectation.

The institution's student-centred learning and teaching:
- Recognizes and respects student diversity and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths
- Considers different delivery modalities where appropriate
- Uses a variety of pedagogical methods
- Evaluates and adjusts the modes of delivery and pedagogical methods
- Encourages a sense of autonomy in the learner
- Ensures adequate guidance and support from the teacher
- Promotes mutual respect within the learner-teacher relationship
- Has procedures for addressing student complaints

The institution's assessment strategy:
- Includes assessors familiar with existing testing and examination methods
- Is published
- Is focused on evaluating intended learning outcomes
- Employs multiple assessment methods
- Is consistent and fairly administered
- Includes a formal appeals procedure

Requirement #1 for Accreditation Standard 3 (narrative response):

For the Candidacy Application, provide a narrative response (1000-2000 words) addressing student-centred learning, teaching, and assessment. All the quality objectives listed under this expectation should be addressed. Please use the text box on the application form (example below) for your narrative response.

Areas to be covered:

1. Explain the institutions understanding of student-centred learning, teaching, and assessment.
2. Describe the process used to implement a student-centred learning environment.
3. Describe the roll of faculty and students in the process.
4. Describe the faculty and staff development around this student-centred learning, teaching, and assessment.

Requirement #2 for Accreditation Standard 3 (evidence of submission):

Provide documentation or other related evidence as Appendix C to this application that describes ***the institution's academic student policies and services.***

6. Include a copy of the institution's academic policies that deal with learning, teaching, and assessment. If they are included in other provided documentation, provide the location of the evidence. If this information is located on your website, please provide the web address.

7. A copy of the institution's student handbook. If this information is located on your website, please provide the web address.

Please note that this specific Quality Assurance Objective is considered critical for accreditation and must be a *Meets Standard* for the self-evaluation and peer-review visit. The *Meets Standard* is that ***the institution demonstrates through their academic student policies and services that they are in compliance with their quality assurance objectives.***

If shortcomings relative to this specific *Quality Assurance Objective* are noted within the Candidacy Application, please plan to make the necessary improvements with the submission of the self-evaluation and peer-review visit for accreditation.

Standard 4 Student Admission, Progression, Recognition, and Certification

The institution consistently applies pre-defined and published regulations and policies covering all phases of the student cycle including student admission, progression, recognition, and certification.

Expectation 4 *What is the institution's current strategy relative to this Standard and its associated Quality Objectives?* In the narrative for this Standard state, describe, and discuss the institution's plan for students. Address each of the Quality Assurance Objectives associated with this standard.

The following Quality Assurance Objectives are associated with this expectation.

The institution's student admission, progression, recognition, and certification processes:

- Are predefined and published regulations and policies that are applied consistently, fairly, and in a transparent manner
- Has policies to monitor the student cycle
- Provides for fair recognition in accordance with appropriate regulatory standards and national/regional requirements
- Recognize both formal and informal learning
- Validate the qualifications of transfer students
- Have policies and procedures that cover both academic and non-academic life
- Cooperate with other institutions, quality assurance agencies and the ENIC/NARIC centres

Requirement #1 for Accreditation Standard 4 (narrative response):

For the Candidacy Application, provide a narrative response (1000-2000 words) concerning the student academic programme cycle (Student Admission, Progression, Recognition, and Certification). Please use the text box on the application form (example below) for your narrative response.

Areas to be covered:

1. Describe the institution's admission, progression, recognition, and certification/graduation policy/process, and address all the quality assurance objectives listed under this expectation.
2. Is there a difference between admission for undergraduate students and graduate students?
3. Discuss, if any have occurred, student admission, progression, recognition, and certification/graduation that has not followed the policy/process.
4. If these policies/processes have not been documented, what is the timeline to get the policies/processes documented in a way that meets this expectation?
5. Describe how your programmes link to the European Qualification Framework (Dublin Descriptors) - First cycle, second cycle and third cycle
6. Describe how your degree programmes link to the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS).

Requirement #2 for Accreditation Standard 1.4 (evidence of submission):

Provide documentation or other related evidence as Appendix D to this application that the institution's student processes provide for fair recognition in accordance with appropriate regulatory standards and national/regional requirements.

    i.   Include a copy of the student admissions form.

    ii.   A copy of the student file template or list of what is included in a student file.

    iii.   A copy the expectation placed upon the student to progress through the programme.

    iv.   A copy of the process that determines that a student has completed the programme of study and how the completion certificate/diploma/degree is awarded.

    v.   Show that the institution's student processes are in accordance with appropriate regulatory standards and national/regional requirements

    vi.   A copy of typical diploma(s) awarded for the first, second and third cycle of higher education (Bachelor, Master, Doctoral level)

    vii.   A copy of typical Diploma Supplements for the first, second and third cycle of higher education (Bachelor, Master, Doctoral level)

Please note that this specific Quality Assurance Objective is considered critical for accreditation and must be a *Meets Standard* for the self-evaluation and peer-review visit. The *Meets Standard* is that **the student admission, progression, recognition, and certification processes provide for fair recognition in accordance with appropriate regulatory standards and national/regional requirements. A copy of standards and requirements are included, and the institution's compliance is provided.**

If shortcomings relative to this specific *Quality Assurance Objective* are noted within the Candidacy Application, please plan to make the necessary improvements with the submission of the self-evaluation and peer-review visit for accreditation.

Standard 5 Teaching Staff

The institution assures themselves of the competence of their teachers, including appropriate qualification to teach the assigned workload. The institution applies fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the teaching staff. The institution performs research appropriate to the institution's mission.

Expectation 5 *What is the institution's current strategy relative to this Standard and its associated Quality Objectives?* In the narrative for this Standard state, describe, and discuss the institution's plan for teachers. Address each of the Quality Assurance Objectives associated with this standard.

The following Quality Assurance Objectives are associated with this expectation.

The institution's teaching staff:
- Are recruited using clear, transparent, and fair processes
- Have employment agreements that recognizes the importance of teaching
- Are offered opportunities for professional development
- Are encouraged to pursue scholarly activity and research
- Are encouraged to use innovative teaching methods and apply new technologies
- Are qualified for the role they assume

Requirement #1 for Accreditation Standard 5 (narrative response):

For the Candidacy Application, provide a narrative response (1000-2000 words) for teaching staff expectation. Be sure to cover all six of the quality assurance objectives. Please use the text box on the application form (example below) for your narrative response.

Areas to be covered:
1. Describe the recruitment and retention process of your faculty.
2. Describe the recruitment and retention process for non-teaching academic personnel.
3. If a faculty manual is in the process of being developed, what is the time frame for its completion?
4. Describe the institution's scholarly expectation of it faculty.
5. Describe the faculty development process to include new teaching methods and new technology.

Requirement #2 for Accreditation Standard 5 (evidence of submission):

Provide documentation or other related evidence as Appendix E to this application that are covered in requirement #1 to include the following:

i.   Include a copy of the institution's employment document/contract used by teaching staff. If there is more than one employment document/contract used, include copies of all of the documents.

ii.   Complete the following table that demonstrates that teaching staff are qualified to teach in their assigned academic programmes.

Specifically, list at least one qualified faculty member (usually the programme manager, chair, or department head) for each of the programmes as identified under Standard 1.2 and list his/her specific qualifications relative to the programme.

Note that for the accreditation self-evaluation, you will also need to list at least one qualified faculty member for each academic discipline taught within each academic programme.

Academic Programme (should be the same list of programmes as provided under Standard 1.2)	Faculty Member Name	Programme Role or Position (e.g., Chair, Lead Faculty, Programme Head, etc.)	Qualifications			
			Highest Degree Earned	Field of Study	Qualification to Teach	Teaching Load*

*For teaching load chose and define a value that has meaning in the context of your organization (e.g. lecture hours per week, term or year)

iii.　Provide evidence of professional development provided to instructors/teachers.

iv.　Provide evidence that instructors/teachers are involved in scholarly activity in their field of teaching responsibility. When providing evidence, please use the **Boyer Model** for scholarly activity. For more information regarding the Boyer Model, please see one of the following references.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. J*ournal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1(1), 11-20.

Please note that this specific Quality Assurance Objective is considered critical for accreditation and must be a *Meets Standard* for the self-evaluation and peer-review visit. The *Meets Standard* is that **the qualified teaching staff are recruited using clear, transparent, and fair processes, and evidence is provided documenting the implementation of the process**.

If shortcomings relative to this specific *Quality Assurance Objective* are noted within the Candidacy Application, please plan to make the necessary improvements with the submission of the self-evaluation and peer-review visit for accreditation.

Standard 6 Learning Resources and Student Support

The institution has appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities and provides adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support.

Expectation 6 *What is the institution's current strategy relative to this Standard and its associated Quality Objectives?* In the narrative for this Standard state, describe, and discuss the institution's plan for learning resources and student support. Address each of the Quality Assurance Objectives associated with this standard.

The following Quality Assurance Objectives are associated with this expectation.

The institution's learning resources and student support services:

- Are wide ranging to adequately support diverse student learning
- Are appropriately funded and equipped
- Are fit for purpose
- Are readily available to all students
- Are staffed with qualified professionals

Requirement #1 for Accreditation Standard 6 (narrative response):

For the Candidacy Application, provide a narrative response (1000-2000 words) for Expectation 6. Please use the text box on the application form (example below) for your narrative response.

Areas to be covered:

1. Describe how the institution is funded.
2. If the institution was to close, describe how the present students would be cared for to enable them to complete their certificate/degrees.
3. Describe the financial oversite for the institution.
4. Discuss the learning resources available to the students and faculty, and the process to assess the current and future needs at the institution.
5. Describe how the students and faculty access these resources.

Requirement #2 for Accreditation Standard 6 (evidence of submission):

Provide documentation or other related evidence as Appendix F to this application that supports the narrative response to Requirement #1. To include:

i. Cost to student to attend your institution.

ii. Evidence that there are financial reserves to insure that present students will be able to complete their education at your institution.

iii. List of present learning resources.

Please note that this specific Quality Assurance Objective is considered critical for accreditation and must be a *Meets Standard* for the self-evaluation and peer-review visit. The *Meets Standard* is that **the learning resources and student support services are staffed with qualified staff, with evidence of staffing and their qualifications.**

If shortcomings relative to this specific *Quality Assurance Objective* are noted within the Candidacy Application, please plan to make the necessary improvements with the submission of the self-evaluation and peer-review visit for accreditation.

Standard 7   Information Management

The institution collects, analyses, and uses relevant information for the effective management of their academic programmes and other institutional activities with appropriate policies and procedures to facilitate clear communication with all stakeholders.

Expectation 7 *What is the institution's current strategy relative to this Standard and its associated Quality Objectives?* In the narrative for this Standard state, describe, and discuss the institution's plan for information management. Address each of the Quality Assurance Objectives associated with this standard.

The following Quality Assurance Objectives are associated with this expectation.

The institution's information management systems:

- Provides reliable data for informed decision-making (Key performance indicators)
- Supports the internal quality assurance system
- Tracks student progression, success and drop-out rates
- Tracks student satisfaction with their programmes
- Monitors the career paths of graduates
- Facilitates the delivery of instructional content using information management and associated technology
- Facilitate good two-way communication with all stakeholders of the institution

Requirement #1 for Accreditation Standard 7 (narrative response):

For the Candidacy Application, provide a narrative response (1000-2000 words) for Expectation 7. Please use the text box on the application form (example below) for your narrative response.

Areas to be covered:
1. Describe the institution's information management system/s.
2. Describe how you collect key-performance indicators.
3. Describe how the institution communicates with its graduates.
4. Describe how the institution collects data about the career paths of institutions.
5. Describe how students, graduates, faculty and the public at large can instigate communications with the institution.
6. Discuss the process/policy used to insure information management, and that associated technologies are reviewed on a periodic base.

Requirement #2 for Accreditation Standard 7 (evidence of submission):

Provide documentation or other related evidence as Appendix G to this application that the institution's information management plan and processes are supportive to the internal quality assurance system.

    i.   Provide a copy of the template used for student files.

    ii.   Provide a copy of the template used for faculty files.

    iii.   Provide a copy of your organizational chart, to include both academic and administrative structures.

    iv.   Provide copies of any policies related to the standard.

Please note that this specific Quality Assurance Objective is considered critical for accreditation and must be a *Meets Standard* for the self-evaluation and peer-review visit. The *Meets Standard* is that **the information management systems support the internal quality assurance system and the Policies and Procedure manual was provided and is comprehensive.**

If shortcomings relative to this specific *Quality Assurance Objective* are noted within the Candidacy Application, please plan to make the necessary improvements with the submission of the self-evaluation and peer-review visit for accreditation.

Standard 8   Public Information

The institution publishes information about their activities, including academic programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date, and readily accessible. The institution also publishes information regarding its ethical standards, community engagement, and social responsibilities.

Expectation 8 *What is the institution's current strategy relative to this Standard and its associated Quality Objectives?* In the narrative for this Standard state, describe, and discuss the institution's plan for managing publically available information. Address each of the Quality Assurance Objectives associated with this standard.

The following Quality Assurance Objectives are associated with this expectation.

The institution's public information management process:

- Makes available to the public relevant information regarding the institution's activities
- Provides the public with information concerning the institution's programmes, the intended learning outcomes, the qualifications awarded, and the teaching, learning, and assessment procedures used
- Provides the public with the pass rates and graduate employment information
- States the ethical code of conduct for the institution
- Identifies community engagement activities
- Describes its social responsibility activities

Requirement #1 for Accreditation Standard 8 (narrative response):

For the Candidacy Application, provide a narrative response (1000-2000 words) for Expectation 8. Please use the text box on the application form (example below) for your narrative response.

Areas to be covered:
1. Describe the process/policy the institution uses to publish information about their activities, including academic programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date, and readily accessible. The institution also publishes information regarding its ethical standards, and community engagement.
2. Describe the institution's understanding of its social responsibilities.

Requirement #2 for Accreditation Standard 8 (evidence of submission):

Provide documentation or other related evidence as Appendix H to this application that supports the narrative response to Requirement #1.

    i.   Provide the location on your web site where this information can be found.

    ii.   Provide the locations available to the public that address this standard.

Please note that this specific Quality Assurance Objective is considered critical for accreditation and must be a *Meets Standard* for the self-evaluation and peer-review visit. The *Meets Standard* is that **the public information management process makes available to the public relevant information regarding the institution's activities information, and appropriate web addresses and other publications were provided and are compliant.**

If shortcomings relative to this specific *Quality Assurance Objective* are noted within the Candidacy Application, please plan to make the necessary improvements with the submission of the self-evaluation and peer-review visit for accreditation.

Standard 9   Ongoing Monitoring and Periodic Review of Programmes

The institution monitors and periodically reviews their programmes to ensure that the programmes achieve the objectives set for them, and are responsive to the needs of students and society. Periodic reviews lead to continuous improvement of the academic programme. Actions planned or taken as a result of the periodic reviews are communicated to all those concerned. A periodic review is also completed on the comprehensive quality assurance plan.

Expectation 9 *What is the institution's current strategy relative to this Standard and its associated Quality Objectives?* In the narrative for this Standard state, describe, and discuss the institution's plan for on-going programme review. Address each of the Quality Assurance Objectives associated with this standard.

The following Quality Assurance Objectives are associated with this expectation.

The institution's ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes evaluate:

- Programme content to ensure the up-to-date status of the content
- Society's needs
- Student workload, progression, and completion
- The effectiveness of procedures for assessment of students
- Student expectations, needs, and satisfaction in relation to the programme
- The learning environment and support services, and their fitness for purpose

Requirement #1 for Accreditation Standard 9 (narrative response):

For the Candidacy Application, provide a narrative response (1000-2000 words) for Expectation 9. Please use the text box on the application form (example below) for your narrative response.

Areas to be covered:

1. Describe the periodic review process/policy for all programs. Include how you determine that the program objectives are completed.
2. Describe the continuous improvements process and how action plans are developed and implemented.
3. Describe how these programmatic reviews are integrated into the institution's comprehensive quality assurance plan.

Requirement #2 for Accreditation Standard 9 (evidence of submission):

Provide documentation or other related evidence as Appendix I to this application that supports the narrative response to Requirement #1.

Provide the institution's comprehensive quality assurance plan

Please note that this specific Quality Assurance Objective is considered critical for accreditation and must be a *Meets Standard* for the self-evaluation and peer-review visit. The *Meets Standard* is that **the on-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes evaluate the effectiveness of assessment. The continuous improvement plan is included with results that identified changes and improvements.**

If shortcomings relative to this specific *Quality Assurance Objective* are noted within the Candidacy Application, please plan to make the necessary improvements with the submission of the self-evaluation and peer-review visit for accreditation.

Standard 10 Cyclical External Quality Assurance

The institution undergoes external quality assurance in accordance with the ATHEA Standards and Expectations on a cyclical basis.

Expectation 10 *What is the institution's current strategy relative to this Standard and its associated Quality Objectives?* In the narrative for this Standard state, describe, and discuss the institution's plan for using external review and assistance. Address each of the Quality Assurance Objectives associated with this standard.

> **The following Quality Assurance Objectives are associated with this expectation.**
>
> The institution's cyclical external quality assurance:
> - Considers the legislative environment in which the institution operates and is focused accordingly
> - Integrates feedback from the review into the continuous improvement of the institution

Requirement #1 for Accreditation Standard 10 (narrative response):

For the Candidacy Application, provide a narrative response (1000-2000 words) for Expectation 1.10.a. Please use the text box on the application form (example below) for your narrative response.

Areas to be covered:

1. Describe the legislative environment in which the institution exists, if the institution is working in more than one environment, all the environments will need to be covered.
2. Describe the present external review process and discuss how that process grants the institution the authority to function as an educational institution.

Requirement #2 for Accreditation Standard 10 (evidence of submission):

Provide documentation or other related evidence as Appendix J to this application that supports the narrative response to Requirement #1.

  i.   Provide evidence that the institution has the authority to function as an educational institution.

  ii. If the institution operates in more than one jurisdiction, the appropriate documents should be provided.

Please note that this specific Quality Assurance Objective is considered critical for accreditation and must be a *Meets Standard* for the self-evaluation and peer-review visit. The *Meets Standard* is that **the cyclical external quality assurance considers the legislative environment in which the institution operates and is focused accordingly with evidence provided that the institution meets the legal environment in which it is located.**

If shortcomings relative to this specific *Quality Assurance Objective* are noted within the Candidacy Application, please plan to make the necessary improvements with the submission of the self-evaluation and peer-review visit for accreditation.

Volume 2

Table of Contents

Appendices (Each appendix should have a separate cover page.)

--- End of Template ---

Part IV. CANDIDACY ACTIONS BY THE THEA BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

When the Candidacy Application is complete, the THEA Board of Commissioners will review the Candidacy Application and the Candidacy Visit Report and will take one of the following actions on the institution's request for candidacy status:

      i. Candidacy Granted

      ii. Action on Candidacy Deferred

      iii. Candidacy Denied

Candidacy Granted

If, in the judgment of the THEA Board of Commissioners, the institution's Candidacy Application and the Candidacy Visit Report indicate that the institution is substantially ready to pursue THEA accreditation, then the institution will be granted THEA Candidacy status. The institution will be notified in writing of the THEA Board of Commissioners' response. The institution will remain an Institutional Member of ATHEA and granted THEA-Candidacy.

Once THEA-Candidacy has been granted, the institution will, in consultation with the THEA Board of Commissioners, determine a timeframe for attaining first-time accreditation.

The timeframe for attaining first-time accreditation normally will not exceed five years. Under extenuating circumstances, an extension of an institution's THEA-Candidate status may be approved by the THEA Board of Commissioners. In those cases in which an extension is granted, the institution will be required to undergo a mentoring visit in order to address the issues that led to the extension request.

Under no circumstance is there any guarantee that the institution will be accredited just because THEA-Candidate status has been granted. This determination is made by the THEA Board of Commissioners after a self-evaluation is prepared and a peer-evaluation visit is conducted.

A THEA-Candidate is not allowed to claim or imply accreditation by the THEA Board of Commissioners until accreditation has been awarded by the THEA Board of Commissioners.

Once an institution has been granted THEA-Candidacy, the institution may denote this status on its website, in its catalogue and official publications, and in its advertising; however, the following form of notice and specific language must be used:

[Institution's name] has been granted Candidacy for Accreditation by the THEA Board of Commissioners for the Association for Transnational Higher Education Accreditation (ATHEA). The [institution] has affirmed its commitment to excellence in higher education and is eligible to undergo an accreditation review. For more information regarding ATHEA and THEA, please visit www.ATHEA.org.

The institution is also allowed to use the THEA-Candidate Logo.

Action on Candidacy Deferred

If there are issues of concern pertaining to the institution's operations and/or its academic programmes, the THEA Board of Commissioners may defer action on candidacy status for a period not to exceed one year pending remedial action and/or receipt of additional information. The THEA Board of Commissioners will provide written reasons for the deferred action and will invite the institution to respond.

A deferred action is, in effect, a ruling of no action on THEA-Candidate status at that time, and therefore, the action cannot be appealed. If, within the period specified by the THEA Board of Commissioners, the institution takes appropriate remedial action, the institution may provide written notification to the THEA Board of Commissioners requesting reconsideration of the deferred action, and describing the corrective actions the institution has taken. The letter must provide evidence and documentation that the issues that led to the deferred action have been satisfactorily addressed.

Based on a review of the institution's request for reconsideration of the deferred action and the evidence and documentation provided, the THEA Board of Commissioners will then determine the action to be taken on the institution's request for THEA-Candidate status. The institution will be notified in writing of the action of the THEA Board of Commissioners on its request for reconsideration of deferral.

If the institution does not take the identified remedial action and/or does not request reconsideration of the deferred action within the specified period, then no further remedy is available to the institution for the period of one year. After one year, the institution may reapply to become a candidate for accreditation. The institution's membership in ATHEA will continue.

Candidacy Denied

If there are substantial deficiencies in the institution's operations and/or its academic programmes, and if, in the judgment of the THEA Board of Commissioners, the institution is not sufficiently prepared to pursue accreditation, then THEA-Candidate status may be denied. In the case of denial of THEA-Candidate status, the THEA Board of Commissioners will provide written reasons for the denial. The institution may request a reconsideration of the denial action and may present its case, including new evidence, in a fair and impartial hearing before the THEA Board of Commissioners at its next scheduled meeting. The procedures for this type of hearing are as follows:

1. The request for such a hearing must be made within fifteen days of the date of notification of the denial, must be in writing, and must be signed by the chief executive officer of the institution. The arguments and reasons in support of the request must be limited to the points enumerated in the THEA Board of Commissioners' written statement of denial.

2. The institution may present only evidence **not** already considered. The institution may send one or more representatives, including its legal counsel, to present its case. The THEA Board of Commissioners records and subsequently transcribes all proceedings of this type for its own use.

Based on the evidence presented at the hearing, the THEA Board of Commissioners may affirm, modify, or reverse its previous decision to deny THEA-Candidate status. If the previous action of denial is upheld, the denial becomes final.

If the institution does not exercise its right to request reconsideration of the denial action or if the previous action of denial is upheld by the THEA Board of Commissioners in a reconsideration hearing, then no further remedy is available to it for the period of one year. After one year, the institution may reapply to become a candidate for accreditation. The institution's membership in ATHEA will continue.

The institution must pay in advance any additional costs associated with scheduling meetings of the THEA Board of Commissioners to address requests for reconsideration of denial of candidacy.

Candidacy Timetable, Costs, and Application
Candidacy Timetable

The THEA Board of Commissioners works with each institution to establish a timetable for obtaining THEA-Candidate status that suits its particular needs. Typically, it takes an institution about, at a minimum, two to three months to prepare and compile the materials required for candidacy. Candidacy visits usually take two days. Depending on the complexity of the institution, more time may be necessary for the candidacy visit.

Costs of Candidacy

Institutional Members who wish to seek accreditation from the THEA Board of Commissioners must first become a Candidate for Accreditation (THEA-Candidate) and then if the candidate is approved for accreditation by the THEA Board of Commissioners, the member becomes accredited (THEA-Accredited) by the THEA Board of Commissioners and designated appropriately. Costs for candidacy evaluation are as follows:

1. Application to become a Candidate Cost: 5,000 € (paid with the submission of the member's *Candidacy Application (Submission of the Candidacy Self-Evaluation*)

2. The estimated cost of one person to make a two-day visit to the institution to validate the candidacy documents: 2,000 € (including a 700 € honorarium)

ATHEA will invoice the institution for all costs for the candidacy visit that are incurred by the THEA Board of Commissioners representative, and will pay the representative after an expense report has been filed with the ATHEA office. The institution will make **no direct payments** to the THEA Board of Commissioners representative. Reimbursements to ATHEA should be made by the institution within 30 days for all the invoiced costs of the candidacy visit.

Application for THEA-Candidate Status

Application for THEA-Candidate status is made by the chief executive officer of the institution (i.e., president, chancellor, director general) by submitting an application form to the THEA Board of Commissioners and enclosing the 5000 € application fee. An application for THEA-Candidate status can be downloaded from the ATHEA website.