January 31, 2006

Dear ACCET and Other Colleagues:

This letter and the accompanying enclosures are presented as an update on the actions undertaken by the ACCET Accrediting Commission at the recently completed meeting. A summary of all final action, referenced by institution, a summary of statistics for all actions relative to the various classifications of review, and the policy/documentation revision reference herein, can be viewed and/or downloaded from the ACCET website (www.accet.org) along with this report under Commission Report and the Documents and Forms links. The following policy synopsis is offered for your reference, followed with some observations on current events and developments.

**Finalized Document Approvals**

- **Document 1 – Accreditation Plan Policies and Procedures, Eligibility Criteria #7**
  
  In the context of the Commission’s recent review of the Standards for Accreditation, the institutional eligibility criteria (#7) was determined to be an inaccurate and/or ambiguous reflection of ACCET’s longstanding policy to allow an application from a non-degree related, stand-alone department. The revision, which removes the prior limitation to IEPs and adds the requirement that the institution as a whole be accredited by a USDE recognized agency, was circulate in a call-for-comment sent out to the membership and other interested colleagues following the August 2005 Commission meeting. It was approved.

- **Document 2 – Standards for Accreditation**
  
  The ACCET standards, as previously reviewed, revised, proposed, and forwarded by the Commission to the ACCET membership following the August 2005 meeting, were unanimously approved at the Annual Conference in San Francisco on October 26, 2005.

- **Document 3. series (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.ESL, and 3.VESL)**
  
  These ASER preparation guidelines and templates have been revised consistent with the new (October 2005) Standards for Accreditation. Institutions preparing for initial accreditation or reaccreditation visits scheduled for the August 2006 review cycle, with an eASER due date of March 10, 2006, have the option of utilizing the “old” Document 2 (October 2000 version) and respective 3. series document(s) or the recently revised “new” Document 2 (October 2005 version) and respective 3. series document(s).
Comparable institutions scheduled for the December 2006 review cycle are required to prepare the eASER/BASER(s) utilizing the new standards. The fillable versions of these referenced documents are being posted on the ACCET website as this report is being prepared. Shortly thereafter the Document 3. OAD – Occupational Associate Degree template and Document 3.IDL – Interactive Distance Learning template will be finalized and similarly posted for review and download.

- **Document 12.1 – Annual Statistical Self-Evaluation**

  This annual report, applicable to vocational institutions, has been minimally revised with minor formatting and wording changes for appearance and clarity, and removal of the previous requirement to submit a catalog. The Catalog Checklist and Guidelines (Document 29) must still be submitted in hard copy along with the electronic submission of Document 28.1s – Completion and Placement Statistics for each program offered.

- **Document 25 – Policy Approval of New or Revised Curriculum**

  This document is applicable to all institutions offering a certificate/diploma, Occupational Associate Degree (OAD), or interactive distance learning (IDL). The revision to the document is found on page 1 of 5, with the addition of item 5, relative to requirements for the introduction of IDL courses/programs, which were inadvertently dropped from the previous Document 1 revision, under General Policies. These requirements have been in place since the inception of the IDL criteria promulgated in 1996, and represent a methodical approach to the development, implementation and feedback process to ensure a quality focus throughout the transitional learning curve.

  **Call-For-Comment**

- **Document 28 – Completion and Placement Policy**

  This standout favorite policy of our vocational institutions has withstood the test of time, and patience, by clearly demonstrating the value and effectiveness of the training offered. The proposed revisions, aside from minor format and wording changes, are focused on clarifying various employment categories relative to the term “remuneration,” for which empirical evidence suggests only a dozen or so people can explain the meaning. In a more serious vein, ACCET has been an early leader and advocate on “outcomes” since 1989 and the introduction of the various categorical definitions in 1997, was a credit to the pragmatic approach supported by the ACCET membership. Sound verification criteria remain at the core of this approach.

This completes the report of the December 2005 Commission meeting.

Best Regards,

**Roger J. Williams**

Roger J. Williams
Executive Director