Proposed Changes to the Commission Procedures

The ATS Board of Commissioners recommends the following changes to the Commission Procedures, to be voted upon by the Commission membership at its June 2014 Biennial Meeting in Pittsburgh. Deletions are noted with strike-through text; additions are underlined. Changes have explanatory footnotes.

ATS Commission Policies and Procedures¹

Procedures Related to Accreditation and Membership of the Commission on Accrediting of the Association of Theological Schools

* In light of the new architecture of the Educational and Degree Program Standards approved by the membership at the 2012 Biennial Meeting, users should keep in mind that references in the COA Procedures to Degree Program Standards should be understood to include both the Educational Standard and the individual Degree Program Standards. COA Procedures will be revised to reflect the changes at the appropriate time.²

Introduction

This document contains policies and procedures adopted by the entire Commission membership, as described in the Commission Bylaws, Section 2.3. Like the standards, they are considered incumbent upon all member schools, as noted in ATS Commission Standard 2, section 2.1, “Schools accredited by the Board of Commissioners shall carry out their educational programs and institutional activities according to the standards and procedures established by the Commission and its Board of Commissioners...” (emphasis added).³

[NOTE: No changes proposed in section I. Membership, so not copied here.]

II. Candidate for Accredited Status

A. Candidate for Accredited Status is conferred on those members of ATS that, after review on the basis of the Commission’s standards and procedures, have been formally authorized by vote of the Board of Commissioners to begin the self-study process. Candidate for Accredited Status is granted for a period of two years. By special action of the Board of Commissioners, candidacy may be extended for one year at a time, but in no case may candidacy extend beyond a total of five years.

¹ The current title “Procedures . . .” does not capture completely the nature of this document, which contains both “procedures” (e.g., sections V and VI) and “policies” (e.g., sections III.E and X). The term Policies is also more consistent with the title other accrediting agencies use in describing expectations (beyond the standards) for all member schools. This new title (“ATS Commission Policies and Procedures”) may help clarify that the Commission membership has two foundational and normative documents: (1) the Commission Standards and (2) the Commission Policies and Procedures.

² This footnote in the 2012 Procedures is no longer needed.

³ The addition of an introduction could further clarify the nature and expectations of this document, in keeping with the other Commission-approved document (the standards) that has an introductory statement.
B. Criteria for Candidate for Accredited Status

1. The applying institution shall be able to demonstrate that either it is, or by the conclusion of the self-study process will be, operating according to the Commission’s General Institutional and individual Educational and Degree Program Standards and that it has the institutional capacity to evaluate its institutional and educational effectiveness.4

2. The applying institution shall demonstrate that it has the resources and capacity to complete a self-study process and report satisfactorily within the normal two-year period.

C. Attaining Candidate for Accredited Status by Associate Members of ATS

1. The chief administrative officer of an Associate Member school desiring candidacy status should notify the Commission staff in writing that the school intends to petition the Board of Commissioners for Candidate for Accredited Status.

2. The applicant school shall undertake an internal study of its readiness for Candidate for Accredited Status. The Board of Commissioners will provide guidance for this internal study.

3. Upon the school’s completion of its internal study, a Commission staff member will review the study, conduct a staff visit to the school, and prepare a report regarding the school’s compliance with capacity to meet the General Institutional and Educational and Degree Program Standards.5

[NOTE: No changes proposed in section II.C.4 or in sections II.D or II.E, so not copied here.]

III. Accredited membership

A. Accredited members are institutions in the United States and Canada that are Associate Members of ATS that, after review on the basis of the accrediting standards of the Commission, are granted accreditation by the Board of Commissioners and become Full Members of ATS.

B. Criteria for accredited membership

1. Accredited institutions shall demonstrate that they operate according to the Commission’s General Institutional Standards.

2. All graduate degree programs offered by accredited members of the Commission shall meet the Educational and Degree Program Standards and be approved by the Board of Commissioners.

4 This change reflects the revised name of the standards adopted by the membership in 2012. This change occurs several times in this document without further note.

5 Since candidacy status no longer qualifies an institution to participate in US federal financial aid, the focus can now be on helping schools strengthen their capacity to meet the standards, rather than on compliance.
3. All extension education offerings that provide graduate credit toward approved degrees shall be approved by the Board of Commissioners.

4. Accredited members must have a defined accreditable entity that offers postbaccalaureate theological degree programs, not baccalaureate degree programs.6

C. Attaining accredited membership

1. Candidates for Accredited Status shall engage in the self-study process, following the guidance provided in the Commission’s Handbook of Accreditation. On-site staff consultation is available to schools in the self-study process. The General Institutional and appropriate Educational and Degree Program Standards must be addressed in the self-study report.

2. The Board of Commissioners will examine the self-study report and determine whether it provides a sufficient basis for an on-site evaluation committee visit. If the Board of Commissioners approves the self-study report and authorizes an initial accreditation visit, an evaluation committee will be appointed. If the Board of Commissioners finds the self-study report inadequate, an evaluation committee visit will not be authorized, but staff will be instructed to work with the institution to make the changes necessary to permit future consideration.

3. The evaluation committee will conduct a two- to three-day visit to the campus and prepare a written report evaluating the institution in the light of the Commission’s standards, following the procedures for evaluation committees published in the Commission’s Handbook of Accreditation.

4. Based on the committee report and its recommendations, the Board of Commissioners may act in one of two ways:
   a. accredit the institution and approve its degree programs for a period of no longer than seven years; or
   b. deny accreditation to the institution. In this event, specific reasons will be stated in writing to the school. A school denied initial accreditation has these four options: (1) appeal the decision, following the guidelines in section XI below, (2) petition for an extension of candidacy, if the time limit has not expired; (3) request continuation of associate membership status, with the understanding that the school will seek candidacy

---

6 This addition clarifies that the ATS Commission on Accrediting accredits only graduate theological institutions, not undergraduate institutions. Institutions with both graduate and undergraduate programs must have a defined graduate entity (e.g., school, department, etc.) that offers only graduate theological programs.
status again within two years; or (4) voluntarily withdraw from the Commission and the Association.  

5. It is possible for schools that offer graduate, professional theological degrees and that are demonstrably engaged in educating professional leadership for communities of the Christian and Jewish faiths but that are not individually eligible for accredited membership to qualify for accreditation by virtue of resources available through membership in a cluster or by contractual arrangement with another accredited institution. Accreditation requires assessment of the strength of the individual institution, the availability and actual use of resources claimed, and adequacy of the cluster of which the school is a part. Listings in publications, both of the Commission and of the school, shall state explicitly that such an institution is “accredited by The Commission on Accrediting of the Association of Theological Schools by virtue of affiliation with ________.”

D. Maintaining accredited membership

1. The institution shall maintain standards defined by the Commission and abide by the procedures of ATS and the Commission.

2. The institution shall complete the Commission’s Annual Report Forms.

3. The institution shall pay annual dues as prescribed by ATS and the Commission.

4. The institution shall, at intervals specified by the Board of Commissioners, complete a process of comprehensive institutional self-study and prepare for regular scheduled visits of evaluation committees.

E. Policy regarding teach-out plans

1. A member school must submit a teach-out plan to the Board of Commissioners for the Board’s approval upon the occurrence of any of the following events:

   a. if the Board of Commissioners withdraws, terminates, or suspends the accreditation of the institution;

   e. if the institution notifies the Board of Commissioners that it intends to cease operations of terminate a degree program entirely or close a location that provides one hundred percent of at least one program.

---

7 This addition clarifies the options that a school has if denied initial accreditation, cf. VII.G.
8 The number “1” is deleted, since there is no “2.” The list below is also reordered and relabeled with numbers, rather than letters.
9 Terminating a degree alone is not considered a substantive change requiring a petition and a teach-out plan—just notification (as section V.D below makes clear); closing a site offering a complete degree is considered a substantive change with a required teach-out plan.
a. if the US Department of Education notifies the Board of Commissioners of an action against the institution to limit, suspend, or terminate an institution’s participation in any Title IV program or initiates an emergency action against the institution; or

b. if a state licensing or authorizing agency notifies the Board of Commissioners that an institution’s license or legal authorization to provide an educational program has been or will be revoked;¹⁰

IV. Withdrawal from membership

A school may, on its own initiative and by written notice to the Board of Commissioners, withdraw from membership and accredited status.

V. Procedures related to degree program approval

A. New degree programs shall not be announced without prior approval by the Board of Commissioners.

B. A school considering the introduction of a new degree program shall notify Commission staff and seek consultative guidance. It shall then submit a petition for consideration by the Board of Commissioners. The petition shall follow the guidelines established by the Board of Commissioners, including (1) an evaluation of the appropriateness of the proposed degree in the light of the institution’s mission and purpose; (2) a detailed description of the design of the proposed degree (program features, compliance with the standards, resources available, relation to other degrees, etc.); (3) the institution’s assessment of the new degree’s impact on the programs already offered; and (4) an analysis of the financial support for the new degree and its impact on the institutional budget.

C. If the proposed degree program is at the master’s level, approval by the Board of Commissioners may be granted on the basis of the written petition. If the proposed degree is at the doctoral level, approval will be considered only after a focused evaluation visit has been conducted. The Board may excuse a school from this requirement if the institution already offers an approved doctoral program in the same degree category.

D. When a member school determines to terminate an approved degree program, it shall notify in advance the Board of Commissioners and indicate how the school proposes to make adequate provision for current students pursuing the degree program to complete their studies and earn the degree or an equivalent degree. If the termination of the degree program also entails the closing of an entire site approved to offer that complete degree, then the school shall petition for permission to close that site and submit a teach-out plan.¹¹

¹⁰ This condition is one specified by the USDE for US-based schools.
¹¹ See note on III.E.2 above.
VI. Procedures for approval of programs involving extension education (multiple locations or extension sites) and distance education

A. Institutions shall seek appropriate Board of Commissioners’ action for all programs involving multiple locations (extension sites) and distance education. The procedures for review and approval of such programs vary with the type of program. The Board of Commissioners has developed guidelines that outline in detail the review and approval process for different types of extension sites and for distance education programs.

B. Branch campuses. A branch campus is geographically apart and independent of the main campus of the institution as evidenced by permanence in nature, offering courses in educational programs leading to degrees, having its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization, and having its own budgetary and hiring authority. The establishment of a branch campus requires consultation and a written petition to the Board of Commissioners identifying the educational programs to be offered and the financial, operational, management, and physical resources necessary to meet Commission standards. A site evaluation is required prior to final action on the institution’s petition by the Board of Commissioners within six months of the beginning of the branch campus.

C. Complete degree sites. The offering of a full degree program at a site away from the institution’s primary location requires consultation, a written petition to and approval by the Board of Commissioners, and a site evaluation prior to final action on the institution’s petition by the Board of Commissioners within six months of the site beginning to offer as much as 50 percent of the course work necessary for a full degree.

D. Ongoing course offering sites. The establishment of a program at a site away from the institution’s primary location where a school intends to offer a variety of courses over time requires the submission of a written petition to the Board of Commissioners and action on the petition prior to the first offering of courses. Sites where courses are offered on an ongoing basis may be visited and evaluated as part of the Board of Commissioners’ review cycle. If as much as half of the course work required for any approved degree may be completed at the site away from the school’s primary location, a site evaluation shall be conducted within six months of the site beginning to offer as much as 50 percent of the course work necessary for a degree. Pursuant to Board policy, a school may be excused from an initial site visit.

G. Distance education

1. When as many as six of the courses offered in any approved degree may be taken through distance education, it will be considered a comprehensive distance education program, and

---

12 Slight change in title of this section.
13 This change conforms to current practice and reflects the policy in the Board Policy Manual (section III.A.1.d).
14 This change conforms to current practice and reflects the policy in the Board Policy Manual (section III.A.1.d).
15 This change conforms to current practice and reflects the policy in the Board Policy Manual (section III.A.1.d).
the institution must petition the Board of Commissioners for approval, according to
guidelines adopted by the Board of Commissioners.¹⁶

2. The school shall undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the program's distance education
offerings, either as part of its institutional self-study or at another time by request of the
Board of Commissioners.¹⁷

3. When the design or amount of distance education courses offered in an approved distance
program is significantly altered, the school is responsible for reporting the change to the
Board of Commissioners.¹⁸

4. In its consideration of approval of distance learning programs, the Board of Commissioners
may require a site evaluation.¹⁹

5. Schools conducting distance education must have a process by which the institution
establishes by use of secure login and pass code, proctored examinations, or other means that
are effective in verifying student identity and protecting student privacy, that the student
who registers in a distance education course or program is the same student who participates
in and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit. In addition, the
school must notify students of any projected additional student charges associated with the
verification of student identity at the time of registration or enrollment.²⁰

VII. Enforcement of standards for accredited members

A. Through comprehensive evaluation visits

1. Comprehensive evaluations occur prior to the expiration of a grant of accreditation.
Normally, a comprehensive evaluation committee visit will occur within six months of the
expiration of a grant of accreditation. The grant of initial accreditation is limited to no more
than seven years and reaffirmation to no more than ten years. The Board of Commissioners
may grant accreditation for shorter periods of time, with reasons given for the action in each
case. Because accreditation is an ongoing relationship between the Board of Commissioners
and the school, the Board of Commissioners may authorize a comprehensive evaluation at
any time when regular monitoring activities indicate significant problems at multiple levels
of a school or an institution initiates multiple substantive changes. The preparation of a self-

---

¹⁶ Approval for comprehensive distance education constitutes approval of a delivery system, not approval of a program,
which schools often confuse with a degree program.
¹⁷ See note for VI.G.1 above.
¹⁸ Current practice means that a school granted approval for comprehensive distance education can offer as many courses as
it wishes without further approval, provided all applicable standards are still met. So schools with comprehensive distance
education approval do not have to report any change in “amount” to the Board, other than as normally requested on the
Annual Report Forms. As for altering “the design,” it would be difficult to define what that means, so that is also deleted.
¹⁹ See note for VI.G.1 above.
²⁰ See note for VI.G.1 above.
study is not required when the Board of Commissioners authorizes such a special
comprehensive evaluation visit, though the institution must still provide evidence that it is
operating in conformity to the accreditation standards.\(^{21}\)

2. Institutions shall engage in an institutional self-study in preparation for each comprehensive
evaluation. The self-study shall follow the guidance provided in the *Handbook of Accreditation*.

3. The self-study report shall be submitted, at least sixty days before the scheduled visit, to the
Commission staff who, in consultation with the chairperson of the evaluation committee, will
determine whether the document is an adequate basis for conducting the visit or whether the
visit should be postponed. If the visit is postponed by Commission staff for more than one
semester, the institution shall have the right of appeal at the next scheduled meeting of the Board
of Commissioners.

4. In preparation for an evaluation visit, a school shall advertise to its constituencies at least 60
days prior to the visit that it is receiving an evaluation committee and invite comment in
writing to the school and/or to the Commission concerning the institution’s qualifications for
accreditation. These comments will be available to the evaluation committee. The evaluation
committee may also include an open hearing scheduled during the course of the visit.\(^{22}\)

5. The Board of Commissioners will publish the names of schools receiving a comprehensive
evaluation visit in a given year and request comment from other Commission member
institutions.

B. Through focused evaluation visits

1. Focused evaluation visits may be authorized by the Board of Commissioners as a response to
any of the following:

   a. a school’s invitation to the Board of Commissioners;

   b. a school’s decision to offer a new degree program, as noted in section V of these
      procedures;

   c. a school’s decision to offer 50 percent or more of the courses for an approved degree at a
      new location;

   d. a change in ownership or substantive change in the pattern of control of the institution;

   e. the receipt of other information that leads the Board of Commissioners to conclude that a
      focused evaluation visit is advisable;

---

\(^{21}\) This addition was made to the Board Policy Manual (II.C.12 and Appendix 4) in 2013 to address USDE concerns during the last re-recognition process.

\(^{22}\) The 60-day prior notice meets USDE expectations. The second revision clarifies who collects the comments.
f. an indication that the quality of a school’s programs may have been adversely affected by changes in circumstances; or

g. in the context of investigating a formal complaint against the institution when deemed appropriate.

2. The Board of Commissioners will require a focused visit whenever it deems that a report will not adequately address the Board’s need for additional information of a substantive nature or not adequately address the school’s ability to improve significantly in a particular area. When a focused visit is required, the Board of Commissioners may still require the school to submit a written report, identifying the key issue(s) to be addressed, and direct that the school’s report be provided to the focused evaluation committee at least 30 days in advance of the visit. In addition, Commission staff will supply the school and the committee a prospectus, describing the key issue(s), the nature of the visit, and any other documents the committee might need.

2.3. In preparation for focused evaluation visits, the Board of Commissioners may require reports from the school as are appropriate to the situation, authorize staff or other evaluators as appropriate, and provide instruction for the school and the evaluators regarding the committee’s report to the Board of Commissioners. The expectations for a focused evaluation will be described to the school in the context of a written prospectus prepared for the visit.

C. Through monitoring approval of substantive changes

1. Substantive changes that require petitioning for Board approval include the following:

   a. change in an institution’s fundamental mission, legal status, ownership, name, location, or governing control of an institution;

   b. change in location(s) at which an institution conducts its educational programs offers at least 50 percent of an educational program (see VI above);

   c. introduction of a program of six or more distance learning courses (see VI above);

   d. the offering of a new degree program (see V above); or major changes in the total hours required for an approved degree; the termination of an approved degree program; or...

---

23 This addition clarifies when the Board might require a focused visit, as opposed to a written report.
24 The current narrative is reformatted into this numbered list, with a few stylistic changes. “Substantive” changes that require Board approval and “significant, but not substantive changes” that require only staff approval are now also distinguished.
25 Simply reducing the total hours for an approved degree program no longer automatically constitutes a substantive change; see section 3.c below.
e. a change in type of educational units (e.g., a change from clock hours to credit hours); in addition, a substantive change includes 26

f. a new contract or major changes in existing contracts for educational or administrative services that would affect the school’s conformity to the accreditation standards (including, for Title IV participants, any contract for educational offerings with an entity not eligible to participate in Title IV programs); 27

g. the acquisition of any other institution or any program or location of another institution; and

h. the addition of a permanent location at a site at which the institution is conducting a teach-out for students of another institution that has ceased operating before all students have completed their program of study. Substantive changes do not include exceptions that an institution may choose to make for an individual student. 28

2. It is the responsibility of an accredited school to petition the Board of Commissioners for approval of these changes prior to implementing them.

3. In addition to substantive changes that require petitioning the Board for approval, certain other significant, but nonsubstantive changes require either a petition or notification to Commission staff.
   a. Changes requiring a petition to and approval by Commission staff include (1) change in degree nomenclature, and (2) opening of an extension site that offers less than 50 percent of a degree program (i.e., one not requiring a site visit).
   b. Changes that require notification to and acknowledgement by Commission staff include (1) the termination of a degree program at a location (main campus or extension site) that will continue in operation (i.e., one not requiring a teach-out plan or agreement), and (2) the closing of an extension site that offers less than 100 percent of a degree program (i.e., one not requiring a teach-out plan or agreement).
   c. In addition, schools considering a major revision to an approved degree program that could affect its continued adherence to Commission standards should consult with Commission staff to determine if the revision constitutes a change significant enough to require formal approval. 29

---

26 The parenthetical note clarifies what is meant.
27 Requirement of the USDE for Title IV participants
28 This last deleted statement is moved to a separate section, VII.C.4, below.
29 Further guidelines on what constitutes a major revision are provided in Appendix 3, section 3.e, in the Board Policy Manual.
4. Substantive changes do not include exceptions that an institution may choose to make for an individual student.\(^{30}\)

D. Through the use of reports

1. The Board of Commissioners may require a report if it judges that an accredited institution should supply additional information or needs to improve in an area or areas. In its action to require such a report, the Board will identify the standards where it needs information or judges that the institution requires improvement, and it will set the submission date or dates according to its judgment of the time reasonably necessary to provide the information or to make the improvement.

2. The circumstances meriting reports are not instances of noncompliance, and insufficient improvement does not signal noncompliance.

3. The Board of Commissioners will normally require a special midterm quality improvement report halfway through any period of accreditation that is six years or longer in length, noting in the action letter granting that accreditation any special areas to be addressed. The primary purpose of this special progress report is for member schools to document quality improvements and describe key changes and challenges since the last comprehensive visit, particularly any that impact institutional vitality (as described in the General Institutional Standards) and educational quality (as described in the Educational and Degree Program Standards). Guidelines for the preparation of this special report are provided by the Board of Commissioners. The use of this special progress report should reduce the number of other reports described in VII.D.1 above.\(^{31}\)

E. Through the use of published notations

1. On the basis of reports received either from an evaluation committee or from a member institution, the Board of Commissioners shall impose a notation or notations when it judges that an institution insufficiently meets one or more sections of an accrediting standards or that principles contained in the standards are not being adequately translated into practice. The Board views a notation as a notice or warning that a school partially meets a Commission

---

\(^{30}\) This statement moved from the end of VII.C.1.

\(^{31}\) This new report is intended to reduce the increasing number of smaller reports that the Board has required more frequently in recent years, though the Board may still require some periodic reports, especially for issues that need addressing sooner than midterm. Proposed guidelines mentioned above for this midterm report may be found in Appendix 10 of the Board Policy Manual.
standard, but it does not fully meet the standard until appropriate action is taken in a timely manner.\textsuperscript{32}

2. A notation is a public characterization of membership status. The Membership List includes any notations imposed by the Board of Commissioners as part of the institution’s formal accredited status.

3. Within two years following the imposition of a notation, the institution shall provide evidence to the Board of Commissioners will consider evidence as to why the notation should be removed. The school must submit that evidence at least two months prior to the meeting in which the Board of Commissioners will act, as specified in the Board’s action letter that imposes the notation. If the institution does not provide the requisite evidence, the Board of Commissioners shall take an adverse action. In certain cases and for demonstrated good cause, the Board of Commissioners may extend by one year the period of imposition of a notation.\textsuperscript{33}

\textbf{H. Adverse accrediting actions}

Adverse accrediting actions by the Board of Commissioners are defined as denial of accreditation or withdrawal of accreditation.

\textbf{I. Letter of Concern and Show Cause Order}\textsuperscript{34}

1. The Board of Commissioners may issue a nonpublic Letter of Concern prior to imposing a public notation if it determines that an institution, though still meeting the standards, has not responded appropriately to concerns it has raised or if it sees issues arising that need the institution’s immediate and serious attention. The Letter of Concern will specify the exact nature of the concern(s) or issue(s), including instructions regarding any interactions expected with the Board (e.g., any report(s) to be submitted or any visit(s) to be scheduled, as well as a timetable for any such interactions).

2. The Board of Commissioners may issue a Show Cause Order prior to imposing probation or prior to withdrawing accreditation, though it is under no obligation to do so. A Show Cause Order provides an opportunity for an institution to demonstrate to the Board beforehand why probation should not be imposed or why accreditation should not be withdrawn. A

\textsuperscript{32} This change is to clarify the nature and intent of notations. The Board of Commissioners has also approved a revised and abbreviated set of notations, published on the ATS website, that take effect June 1, 2014. Any notation imposed prior to that date will remain in effect until removed by Board action.

\textsuperscript{33} This change reflects the reality that the two-year time limit required by the USDE applies to the Board’s action to remove the notation, not the school’s submission of evidence to remove the notation.

\textsuperscript{34} These two new Board actions are intended to provide schools an opportunity to address concerns before the Board considers imposing (1) a notation or (2) probation or withdrawal of accreditation.
Show Cause Order is normally reserved for situations of a very serious nature that come unexpectedly to the Board’s attention and indicate that the school may not be meeting one or more standards. The Show Cause Order will specify the time frame in which the institution must respond (not to exceed six months), the reason(s) for the Board’s action, and any required action(s), such as site visits or written reports. The Show Cause Order may be public or private, at the Board’s discretion.

**Only two proposed changes after this point in the Procedures, as noted below.**

IX. Evaluation committees

E. In cooperative evaluation visits with another accrediting agency, if a school is given permission by Commission staff to host a joint evaluation visit with another accrediting agency (see Procedures XIII.D), the composition of the committee will be negotiated by Commission staff with that agency to ensure that all committee members are mutually acceptable.\(^{35}\)

XIII. Dual accreditation

D. Schools accredited by the Commission on Accrediting and other recognized accrediting agencies in the United States and Canada may request a joint comprehensive evaluation visit conducted by both agencies. The Commission on Accrediting will conduct joint visits if the other agency agrees, and if the joint evaluation procedures do not compromise the independence and consistency of the Board of Commissioners’ accreditation decisions. Member schools that are dually accredited and desire to host a joint or coordinated visit should consult with Commission staff at least a year prior to the visit.\(^{36}\)

The change in title to *ATS Commission Policies and Procedures* would also require a corresponding change in the Commission Bylaws, Section 2.3 and Section 3.13, as shown below.

**Commission Bylaws, Section 2.3 Powers of the Membership: Standards and Procedures**

In addition to any powers conferred on members of a nonprofit corporation under the relevant provisions of the NPCL, the Members of the Commission shall (i) adopt the dues structure for Members, (ii) elect the Commissioners, and (iii) adopt, maintain, modify, and revoke the Commission’s Standards of Accreditation and the *Commission Policies and Procedures for Accreditation and Membership* (“Standards and Procedures”). Modifications to the Standards and Procedures, either of these two documents (hereafter “Standards and Procedures”) shall require the approval of two-thirds (2/3) of the Members present at a duly organized meeting of the Members at which a quorum is present.

**Commission Bylaws, Section 3.13 Rules and Regulations**

The Board of Commissioners may adopt rules and regulations not inconsistent with these Bylaws or the Standards of Accreditation and Procedures for Accreditation and Membership adopted from time to time.

---

\(^{35}\) See XIII.D.

\(^{36}\) This proposed change reflects current Commission practice in light of the increasing practice of other agencies not to conduct joint or coordinated visits. Further guidelines on this change are proposed for various sections of the *Handbook of Accreditation* that discuss joint visits, especially Section One, p. 6.
by the Members for the administration and conduct of the affairs of the Commission and may alter, amend, or repeal any such rules or regulations adopted by it. Such rules and regulations may be amended by majority vote of the Board of Commissioners present and entitled to vote at a meeting of the Commission where a quorum is present.