



DAVID QUIGLEY, Chair (2021)  
Boston College

GEORGE W. FETLER, Vice Chair (2019)  
Worcester, MA

HARRY E. DUMAY (2019)  
College of Our Lady of the Plains

JEFFREY R. GODLEY (2019)  
Grafton, CT

COLEEN C. PANTALONE (2019)  
Northeastern University

MANIKO SILVER (2019)  
Bennington College

KASSANDRA S. ARDINGER (2020)  
Trustee Member, Concord, NH

RUSSELL CAREY (2020)  
Brown University

FRANCESCO C. CIESAREO (2020)  
Assumption College

P. JAVIER CEVALLOS (2020)  
Framingham State University

RICK DANIELS (2020)  
Concord, MA

DONALD D. DEHAYES (2020)  
University of Rhode Island

PAM Y. EDDINGER (2020)  
Bunker Hill Community College

THOMAS S. EDWARDS (2020)  
Thomas College

KIMBERLY M. GOFF-CREWS (2020)  
Yale University

MARTIN J. HOWARD (2020)  
Boston University

SUSAN D. HUARD (2020)  
Manchester Community College (MA)

JEFFREY S. SOLOMON (2020)  
Worcester Polytechnic Institute

ELIZABETH BAKER (2021)  
Falmouth, ME

KATHLEEN DE RIGORIO (2021)  
Connecticut College

PETER L. IBB (2021)  
Trustee Member, Boston, MA

GREGORY W. JOWLER (2021)  
Southern New Hampshire University

DENNIS M. HANNO (2021)  
Wheaton College

LILY S. HSU (2021)  
Johnson & Wales University

ELLEN M. KENNEDY (2021)  
Berkshire Community College

ABDALLAH A. SHEIR (2021)  
Lebanese American University

JOHN M. SWENNEY (2021)  
Providence College

President of the Commission  
BARBARA E. BRITTINGHAM (2021)  
bbrittingham@neche.org

Sr. Vice President of the Commission  
PATRICIA M. O'BRIEN (2021)  
pobrien@neche.org

Vice President of the Commission  
CAROL L. ANDERSON  
canderson@neche.org

Vice President of the Commission  
LAURA M. GAMBINO  
lgambino@neche.org

Vice President of the Commission  
PAULA A. HARBECKE  
pharbecke@neche.org

April 10, 2019

Dr. Robert E. Johnson  
Chancellor  
University of Massachusetts Dartmouth  
285 Old Westport Road  
North Dartmouth, MA 02747-2300

Dear President Johnson:

I am pleased to inform you that at its meeting on March 1, 2019, the New England Commission of Higher Education considered the report submitted by University of Massachusetts Dartmouth regarding its plans to offer a dual degree doctoral program in Marine Sciences with Universidade de São Paulo Instituto Oceanográfico, Brazil and took the following action:

that the report be accepted and the dual degree doctoral program in Marine Sciences with Universidade de São Paulo Instituto Oceanográfico, Brazil (USP-IO) be encompassed within the institution's accreditation, with an effective date of March 1, 2019;

that the comprehensive evaluation scheduled for Spring 2020 be confirmed and include an assessment of the implementation of the dual degree doctoral program in Marine Sciences with USP-IO, Brazil;

that, in addition to the information included in all self-studies as well as the matters specified in our letter of April 2, 2015, the institution give an update on its continued success in offering the dual degree doctoral program in Marine Sciences with USP-IO, Brazil, with emphasis on the institution's success in:

- 1) achieving its enrollment and financial goals for the program;
- 2) developing and implementing assessment practices for the USP-IO program.

The Commission gives the following reasons for its action.

The report submitted by University of Massachusetts Dartmouth was accepted and the dual degree doctoral program in Marine Sciences with USP-IO, Brazil encompassed within the institution's accreditation because the Commission finds the activity to be substantially in compliance with the *Standards for Accreditation* and relevant Commission policies.

The Commission commends University of Massachusetts Dartmouth (UMassD) for developing a dual degree doctoral program in Marine Sciences with USP-IO. We agree that this program aligns with UMassD's mission, providing students an opportunity to "enrich their education" and "foster a global perspective." We are pleased to learn that the program was developed through a "joint committee of faculty and directors from both institutions" and that implementation is guided by a detailed memorandum of understanding. The Commission acknowledges that all courses in the program are taught in English, and the dissertation is written in English with the abstract in Portuguese. We understand that the institution expects the program "to be especially attractive to Portuguese-speaking U.S. students," and we note with favor that UMassD and USP-IO "seek to maintain an environment conducive to diversity and inclusion and accessibility."

The scheduling of a comprehensive evaluation in Spring 2020 is consistent with Commission policy requiring each accredited institution to undergo a comprehensive evaluation at least once every ten years. In keeping with Commission policy, an on-site evaluation to assess implementation of the dual degree doctoral program in Marine Sciences with Universidade de São Paulo Instituto Oceanográfico, Brazil will be added to the Spring 2020 comprehensive evaluation. A copy of the relevant procedural statement is enclosed for your information and use.

In addition to the information included in all self-studies and the matters specified in our letter of April 2, 2015, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth is asked, in the self-study prepared for the Spring 2020 evaluation, to provide an update on its continued success in offering the dual degree doctoral program with emphasis on two matters related to our standards on *Students, Planning and Evaluation, The Academic Program, and Educational Effectiveness*.

The Commission understands that the dual degree program "is designed for a balanced number of students" from each institution, but that initially more students will enroll from USP-IO. The program projects an enrollment of 3 students in Year 1 (1 from UMassD, 2 from USP-IO), increasing to six students in Year 4 (2 from UMassD, 4 from USP-IO). We note that "program costs will be covered through existing personnel and programmatic budgets;" in-kind costs are projected to be \$17,000 in Year 1, increasing to \$25,000 in Year 4. We look forward to being apprised, through the Spring 2020 comprehensive evaluation, of the institution's success in achieving its enrollment and financial goals for the dual degree program. We are guided here by our standards on *Students and Planning and Evaluation*:

Consistent with its mission, the institution sets and achieves realistic goals to enroll students who are broadly representative of the population the institution wishes to serve (*Students, Statement of the Standard*).

The institution has a demonstrable record of success in implementing the results of its planning (2.5).

We are pleased to learn that, at University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, an Academic Quality Assessment and Development Process (AQAD) was used to assess the Marine Sciences program in FY2018, resulting in an action plan with recommendations for improving the program. It was not evident from the report, however, what assessment practices are in development or being implemented at USP-IO for the dual degree program. The Spring 2020 comprehensive evaluation will provide UMD the opportunity to apprise the Commission about how it is collaborating with USP-IO to implement assessment practices for the dual degree program. Our standards on *The Academic Program and Educational Effectiveness* are relevant here:

The institution develops, approves, administers, and on a regular cycle reviews its academic programs under institutional policies that are implemented by designated bodies

with established channels of communication and control. Review of academic programs includes evidence of student success and program effectiveness and incorporates an external perspective. Faculty have a substantive voice in these matters (4.6).

The institution uses a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods and direct and indirect measures to understand the experiences and learning outcomes of its students, employing external perspectives including, as appropriate, benchmarks and peer comparisons (8.5).

The results of assessment and quantitative measures of student success are a demonstrable factor in the institution's efforts to improve the learning opportunities and results for students (8.8).

The Commission expressed appreciation for the report submitted by University of Massachusetts Dartmouth and hopes its preparation has contributed to institutional improvement. We appreciate your cooperation with the effort to provide public assurance of the quality of higher education in New England.

You are encouraged to share this letter with all of the institution's constituencies. It is Commission policy to inform the chairperson of the institution's governing board and the head of the system of action on its accreditation status. In a few days we will be sending a copy of this letter to Robert Manning and Martin Meehan. The institution is free to release information about the evaluation and the Commission's action to others, in accordance with the enclosed policy on Public Disclosure of Information about Affiliated Institutions.

If you have any questions about the Commission's action, please contact Barbara Brittingham, President of the Commission.

Sincerely,

  
David Qurgley

DQ/sjp

Enclosures

cc: Robert Manning  
Martin Meehan



---

## Procedures for the Substantive Change Evaluation Visit

---

Commission policy and federal guidelines stipulate that certain types of substantive change require a visit to assess implementation. These include, but are not limited to: moving to the higher degree, establishing a branch campus or additional instructional location, establishing an overseas location, moving to a new location, and undergoing a change in control. The substantive change evaluation provides a means of monitoring the institution's capacity to implement the change at an acceptable level of quality. When the Commission requires a substantive change evaluation, the institution prepares an update on its implementation of the change, and a small team visits the institution to validate the information provided in the update, evaluate the institution's success in implementing the substantive change, and report its findings and recommendations to the Commission. The Commission considers the institutional update, the team report and confidential recommendation, and the institution's response to the team report and takes action.

### Notification to the Institution

Several months before the visit, the Commission President sends a reminder to the institution about the upcoming evaluation and works with the chief executive officer on the selection of dates for the visit. Typically, visits to assess a move to the higher degree are two days in length, while visits to assess new U.S. locations may be accomplished in a single day. Depending on the circumstances, such visits may run from morning to night or from noon to noon, in cases where an off-campus location offers evening programming. Visits overseas are typically two days in length, excluding travel time.

The Commission staff selects a prospective team to conduct the evaluation and requests the chief executive officer's comments on the proposed team before appointing its members. The size of the team, typically one to three persons, reflects the complexity of the change, based on Commission experience. When the team is complete, the institution and team members are informed, and appropriate evaluator materials are sent to the team from the Commission office.

### Arrangements for the Team Visit

Upon receipt of the team list, the institution contacts the team chairperson/evaluator to discuss the schedule for the visit, accommodations (if needed), and other arrangements. The institution notifies each team member directly about accommodations and communicates with the team chairperson about all other matters related to the visit. The institution arranges to have all hotel accommodations and meals, if possible, billed directly to the institution. After the visit, the Commission bills the institution for the team members' out-of-pocket expenses, primarily travel costs. Reimbursement should be made directly and promptly to the team. In keeping with Association policy, the Commission office bills the institution for the substantive change evaluation fee.

### Materials

At least four weeks in advance of the evaluation visit, the institution sends to the visitor(s) a copy of its original substantive change proposal, together with an update regarding steps taken to implement the proposal and any other new information it believes useful. At the same time, the institution sends an electronic copy (single, searchable pdf file) and four (4) paper copies of these same materials to the offices of the Commission.

The update should reflect and assess the institution's experience in implementing the substantive change and should address any areas of emphasis identified by the Commission in its letter approving the institution's plans. Relevant enrollment and financial information should be included. The institution is also asked to include information about its plans for continued implementation of the substantive change under review as well as its plans, if any, for additional substantive changes. Attention should be given to the institution's capacity to implement these plans.

The update should include a cover page with the institution's name and location, the date, and a brief summary of the subject(s) of the report. The update should be single-spaced, printed on both sides of the paper, and neither stapled nor bound. Please do not use three-ring binders or elaborate printing options.

An institution scheduled for a **substantive change evaluation** is urged to contact Commission staff for assistance in developing its update and making preparations for the evaluation.

#### **Conduct of the Visit**

During the on-site evaluation, the visitor(s) meet with institutional representatives who can provide information about the implementation of the substantive change under review. Depending upon the circumstances, these include, but are not limited to: the chief executive officer, chief academic officer, off-campus location site coordinator, faculty, staff, students, and members of the governing board. Depending on the circumstances, visits to assess implementation of off-campus locations may not involve a visit to the institution's main campus. The visit may conclude with a meeting between the team chairperson/evaluator and the institution's chief executive officer to review the major findings of the evaluation.

For most substantive change evaluations, a preliminary visit by the team chairperson/evaluator is unnecessary. However, regular communication by phone should be initiated by the institution, and the chairperson/evaluator should feel free to contact the institution to discuss arrangements in detail or to request additional materials if team members see a need for them.

#### **Preparation of the Evaluation Report**

Within a month of the visit, the team/evaluator prepares a narrative report of no more than 5-6 pages that describes the institution's success in implementing the substantive change under review, with particular attention to any areas identified for emphasis by the Commission. The report should conclude with a list of identified strengths and concerns related to the institution's implementation of the substantive change.

The institution is provided an opportunity to review a draft of the evaluation report for factual accuracy and to write a substantive response to the team report.

#### **Team's Confidential Recommendation to the Commission**

In keeping with Commission procedures, the team/evaluator develops a confidential recommendation based upon its findings in evaluating the substantive change. The recommendation should contain the following elements:

1. The team's recommendation on whether the substantive change should be included in the institution's accreditation.
2. The team's recommendation on the timing and content of any follow-up reporting on the implementation of the substantive change. A recommendation for subsequent progress reports related to the substantive change is advisable if the team concludes that further monitoring of the specific situation is necessary.

3. The rationale for the recommendations. Reasons should be given in narrative form for both components of the recommendation.

Four (4) paper copies and an electronic copy (single, searchable pdf file) of the team's report and the team's recommendation should be submitted to the Commission office.

**Commission Action**

The team report and confidential recommendation, along with the institutional materials and response, are considered by the Commission at its earliest possible meeting. Typically, the institutional chief executive officer and team chairperson/evaluator are not requested to attend the meeting when the substantive change evaluation is reviewed. The institution and team member(s) are informed of the Commission's action shortly after the meeting.

*July 2009*

*Editorial Revisions March 2014 June 2015*



New England Commission of Higher Education  
3 Burlington Woods Drive, Suite 100, Burlington, MA 01803-4514  
Tel: 781-425-7785 | Fax: 781-425-1001 | [www.neche.org](http://www.neche.org)

---

## **Public Disclosure of Information About Affiliated Institutions**

The following policy governs the release of information regarding the status of affiliated colleges and universities by institutions and by the Commission.

### **1. Release of Information by Institutions Regarding Their Accreditation Following Commission Action**

At the conclusion of the evaluation process institutions are encouraged to make publicly available information about their accreditation status including the findings of team reports and any obligations or requirements established by Commission action, as well as any plans to address stated concerns. Because of the potential to be misleading, institutions are asked not to publish or otherwise disseminate excerpts from these materials.

While the Commission does not ordinarily release copies of self-studies, progress reports, evaluation reports, or other documents related to the accreditation of individual institutions, it believes it to be good practice for institutions to make these materials available, in their entirety, after notification of Commission action.

The Commission will release information on actions of show cause or deferral. If such information is also released by the institution in question or is otherwise made public, the Commission will respond to related inquiries and may issue a revised public statement.

If an institution releases or otherwise disseminates information which misrepresents or distorts its accreditation status, the institution will be notified and asked to take corrective action publicly correcting any misleading information it may have disseminated, including but not limited to the accreditation status of the institution, the contents of evaluation reports, and the Commission actions with respect to the institution. Should it fail to do so in an immediate and timely way, the Commission, acting through its President, will release a public statement in such form and content as it deems desirable providing correct information. This may include release of notification letters sent by the Commission to the institution, and/or a press release.



## 2. Published Statement on Accredited Status

The Commission asks that one of the following statements be used for disclosing on its website and in catalogues, brochures, advertisements, etc., that the institution is accredited.

An institution may wish to include within its website, catalogue or other material a statement which will give the consuming public a better idea of the meaning of regional accreditation. When that is the case, the Commission requests that the following statement be used in its entirety:

\_\_\_\_\_ College (University) is accredited by the New England Commission of Higher Education (formerly the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Inc.).

Accreditation of an institution of higher education by the Commission indicates that it meets or exceeds criteria for the assessment of institutional quality periodically applied through a peer review process. An accredited college or university is one which has available the necessary resources to achieve its stated purposes through appropriate educational programs, is substantially doing so, and gives reasonable evidence that it will continue to do so in the foreseeable future. Institutional integrity is also addressed through accreditation.

Accreditation by the Commission is not partial but applies to the institution as a whole. As such, it is not a guarantee of every course or program offered, or the competence of individual graduates. Rather, it provides reasonable assurance about the quality of opportunities available to students who attend the institution.

Inquiries regarding the accreditation status by the Commission should be directed to the administrative staff of the institution. Individuals may also contact:

**New England Commission of Higher Education**  
**3 Burlington Woods Drive, Suite 100, Burlington, MA 01803-4514**  
**(781) 425 7785**  
**E-Mail: [info@neche.org](mailto:info@neche.org)**



The shorter statement that an institution may choose for announcing its accredited status follows:

                     College (University) is accredited by the New England Commission of Higher Education (formerly the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Inc.).

Inquiries regarding the accreditation status by the Commission should be directed to the administrative staff of the institution. Individuals may also contact:

**New England Commission of Higher Education**  
**3 Burlington Woods Drive, Suite 100, Burlington, MA 01803-4514**  
**(781) 425 7785**  
**E-Mail: [info@neche.org](mailto:info@neche.org)**

Accreditation by the New England Commission of Higher Education has reference to the institution as a whole. Therefore, statements like “fully accredited” or “this program is accredited by the Commission” or “this degree is accredited by the Commission” are incorrect and should not be used.

### 3. **Published Statement on Candidate Status**

An institution granted Candidate for Accreditation (Candidacy) status must use the following statement whenever it makes reference to its affiliation with the New England Commission of Higher Education:

                     College (University) has been granted Candidate for Accreditation status by the New England Commission of Higher Education (formerly the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Inc.). Candidacy for Accreditation is a status of affiliation with the Commission which indicates that the institution has achieved initial recognition and is progressing toward accreditation.

Candidacy is not accreditation nor does it assure eventual accreditation.

Inquiries regarding the status of an institution affiliated with the Commission should be directed to the administrative staff of the college or university. Individuals may also contact:

**New England Commission of Higher Education**  
**3 Burlington Woods Drive, Suite 100, Burlington, MA 01803-4514**  
**(781) 425 7785**  
**E-Mail: [info@neche.org](mailto:info@neche.org)**

#### **4. Public Disclosure of Information about Affiliated Institutions by the Commission**

The Commission publishes the following information about member and candidate institutions on its website:

- Name of the institution
- The date of initial accreditation and/or when candidacy was granted
- Accreditation status (member or candidate)
- Address
- Phone and fax numbers
- CEO name and title
- Degree levels awarded
- Dates of initial accreditation (or candidacy), last review and next review
- Locations of off-campus instructional sites
- The basis for Commission action affecting candidacy or accreditation status
- The date and nature (comprehensive or focused) of the most recent on-site evaluation and subsequent Commission action on the institution's accredited status
- The date and nature (comprehensive or focused) of the next scheduled on-site evaluation
- Submission date and action taken on the most recent written report required by the Commission
- The date and nature of any show-cause for denial of candidacy or accreditation, probation, or withdrawal of candidacy or accreditation status
- The extent of, or limitations on, the status of affiliation
- In cases of adverse action (denial or withdrawal of candidacy or accreditation, placing an institution on probation), the Commission's reasons for that status and, in the case of probation, its plans to monitor the institution. The Commission, in consultation with the institution, will prepare a written statement incorporating the above information. The Commission reserves the right to make the final determination of the nature and content of the statement. The institution will also be offered the opportunity to make its official comment; if the institution does make

an official comment, the comment will be made available by the Commission

- For institutions whose candidacy or accreditation has been withdrawn, the date of, and reasons for, withdrawal.

The Commission recognizes that, to be fully understood, information about the accredited status of institutions must be placed within the context of the policies and procedures of the New England Commission of Higher Education. In responding to inquiries, the Commission will endeavor to do so.

The Commission may also publish on its website a public statement about an action taken regarding a member or candidate institution when further information about the action and the Commission's reasons for taking the action would be helpful to members of the public.

Adverse actions (placement of an institution on probation, denial of candidacy or accreditation, and withdrawal of candidacy or accreditation) are communicated when the decision becomes final (i.e., when the institution does not appeal or when the appeals process is completed and the decision is upheld). The Commission, at its discretion, may make the adverse action public before the decision is final or the appeal is completed. In so doing, the Commission will provide information about the appeal process.

## **5. Public Disclosure of Institutional Actions**

Within 30 days after the action on accreditation status is taken, the Commission will notify the Secretary of Education, New England state higher education officers, appropriate accrediting agencies, and the public. The Commission will also make public on its website the basis for these decisions. Such actions include:

A final decision to:

Grant candidacy or accreditation

Continue an institution in accreditation

Deny or withdraw the candidacy or accreditation of an institution

Place an institution on probation

Approve substantive change (e.g., moving to a higher degree level)

A decision by an accredited or candidate institution to voluntarily withdraw from affiliation with the Commission.

Per federal regulation, within 60 days of a final decision to take an adverse action (probation, denial of candidacy or accreditation, or withdrawal of candidacy or accreditation), the Commission will submit a copy of the final decision letter to the Secretary of Education. The Secretary will make the letter public.

*November 1998*

*September 2001*

*April 2010*

*September 2011*

*Editorial Changes, March 2014*

*April 2015*

*April 2017*

*Editorial Changes, September 2018*