



UNIVERSITY SENATE
OF THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

**Organization, Policies
and Guidelines
2017-2020**





UNIVERSITY SENATE

OF THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

Organization, Policies, and Guidelines

Approved January 2018

Disciplinary quotations are from The Book of Discipline of The United Methodist Church

© 2016 by The United Methodist Publishing House. Used by permission.

Cover photos provided by Otterbein University, Hamline University, Southwestern College, and Wesley College.

CONTENTS

Membership, 2017-2020 Quadrennium	6
Section I.	
<i>University Senate Authority and Responsibility from The Book of Discipline of The United Methodist Church</i>	9
Organization and Membership	9
Purposes and Objectives	10
Institutional Affiliation	11
Annual Reports of Approved Institutions	11
Consultative Services	12
Section II.	
University Senate History and Structure	12
Introduction and History	12
Membership, Length of Service, Duties	13
Officers, Commissions, and Committees of the Senate	14
Executive Committee of the University Senate	14
Responsibility	14
Composition	15
Role of Staff Members	15
Commissions of the Senate	15
Commission on Institutional Review	15
Commission on Theological Education	16
Committees of the Senate	17
Site Review Committees	17
Ad Hoc Committees and Task Forces	17
Technical Assistance and Consultative Services	18

Section III.

Policy and Procedure for Listing Institutions	18
Categories of Affiliation for Institutions	18
Categories of Affiliation for Schools, Colleges, and Universities	18
Categories of Affiliation for Schools of Theology and Theological Seminaries	19
Associate Institutions	20
Requests for Affiliation or Program Review	21
Request for Affiliation	21
Request for Program Review	21

Section IV.

Procedures and Guidelines for Review of Institutions	21
Introduction	21
Philosophy Governing Institutional Reviews	22
Scheduling of Institutional Reviews	22
The Review Committee	23
Purpose	23
Composition and Work	23
Visit of the Review Committee	25
Preparation for the Visit	25
The Campus Visit	27
The Schedule for the Visit	28
Afternoon of the day of arrival	28
Evening of the day of arrival	28
Second day, morning and afternoon	28
Second day, evening	29
Third day, morning	29

Report of the Review Committee	29
Recommendation of the Review Committee	30

Section V.

Evaluation Criteria	32
Introduction	32
Institutional Integrity	32
Program Quality	33
Sound Management and Financial Health	33
Church Relatedness	33

Section VI.

Policies and Procedures for University Senate Actions	36
Procedures for Processing Senate Actions	36
Procedure for Complaints about Institutional Policies/Procedures	38
Procedure for Reconsideration of a Senate Decision	38

Appendices

A. Working Rules of the Commission on Theological Education	40
General Guidelines	40
Academic Credit and Approval	41
Procedure for Review of Non-United Methodist Schools of Theology	41
Approved Undergraduate Institutions	44
B. Criteria for Evaluating United Methodist and Non-United Methodist Schools of Theology	45
Freedom of Academic Inquiry	46
Compatibility with the Social Principles of The United Methodist Church	47
Racial and Gender Inclusiveness of Faculty, Staff, and Student Body	47

Academic Quality	47
Other Considerations	48
C. Format for Institutional Review Reports – Title Page	49
Format for Body of Report	50
D. Institutional Fiscal and Relevant Data	52
E. Role of Staff	53
F. Special Visits	54
G. Conflict of Interest	55
Notes	56

Membership



UNIVERSITY SENATE

OF THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

2017-2020 Quadrennium

Senators

Bill T. Arnold, Professor, Asbury Theological Seminary

Thomas J. Bickerton, Bishop, New York Episcopal Area, United Methodist Church

Dennis Carroll, Provost, High Point University

Barton D. Darrell, President, Kentucky Wesleyan College

Mark Y. A. Davies, Wimberly Professor of Social and Ecological Ethics and Director of the World House Institute for Social and Ecological Responsibility, Oklahoma City University

Socorro Brito de Anda, President, Lydia Patterson Institute

Larry M. Goodpaster, Bishop-in-Residence, Candler School of Theology, Emory University

Sandra S. Harper, President, McMurry University

Robert C. Helmer, President, Baldwin Wallace University

Tijuana R. Hudson, Vice President Fiscal Affairs, Claflin University

Kimberly T. Ingram, Director of Ministerial Services, Western North Carolina Annual Conference

Rock Jones, President, Ohio Wesleyan University

David C. Joyce, President, Brevard College

Robert L. Keasler, Jr., Vice President for Finance and Administration, Shenandoah University

Walter M. Kimbrough, President, Dillard University

Kah-Jin Jeffrey Kuan, President, Claremont School of Theology

Mark D. La Branche, President, Martin Methodist College

Jan Love, Dean, Candler School of Theology, Emory University

Albert D. Mosley, Senior Vice President, Faith and Health Division, Methodist Le Bonheur Hospital

Djoman Nathanael Ohouo, President, Universite Methodiste de Cote d'Ivoire

Amy C. Novak, President, Dakota Wesleyan University

Lallene J. Rector, President, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary

Bridgette Young Ross, Dean of the Chapel and Spiritual Life, Emory University

Jay K. Simmons, President, Simpson College

Henry N. Tisdale, President, Claflin University

Javier Viera, Dean, Drew University Theological School

David F. Watson, Academic Dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs, United Theological Seminary

Ex Officio Members

Kim Cape, General Secretary, General Board of Higher Education and Ministry

Greg Bergquist, Associate General Secretary, Division of Ordained Ministry, General Board of Higher Education and Ministry

Mark Hanshaw, Associate General Secretary, Division of Higher Education, General Board of Higher Education and Ministry; Executive Secretary, University Senate

Glenn Kellum, Special Assistant, Office of the General Secretary, General Board of Global Ministries

Episcopal Advisor to the Senate

Kenneth H. Carter, Jr., Bishop, Florida Episcopal Area, United Methodist Church

Recognition and Appreciation

The University Senate and the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry express their gratitude and appreciation for the leadership provided by Dr. Gerald D. Lord in the revision and refinement of the *2013-2016 Organization, Policies, and Guidelines of the University Senate*.

Section I

UNIVERSITY SENATE AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY from *The Book of Discipline of The United Methodist Church*

¶ 1414. Organization and Membership

1. The **University Senate** is an elected body of professionals in higher education created by the General Conference to determine which schools, colleges, universities, and theological schools meet the criteria for listing as institutions affiliated with The United Methodist Church²⁷.

2. The Senate shall be composed of twenty-seven voting members who, at the time of election, are actively engaged in the work of education through employment in an educational institution and are fitted by training and experience for the technical work of evaluating educational institutions. Election is for the quadrennium, except in cases where conflict of interest arises as a result of change in employment. Nine of these members shall be elected quadrennially by the National Association of Schools and Colleges of The United Methodist Church—seven of whom shall be chief executive officers of United Methodist-related educational institutions, the other two holding other positions relevant to academic or financial affairs or Church relationships six by the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry—two of whom shall be chief executive officers of United Methodist-related higher educational institutions, the other two holding other positions relevant to academic or financial affairs, and two holding positions relevant to Church relationships; four by the General Conference—two of whom shall be chief executive officers of United Methodist-related educational institutions at the time of their election, the other two holding other positions relevant to academic or financial affairs or Church relationships; four by the Senate itself, without limitation other than the general provisions of this paragraph; and four shall be appointed by the Council of Bishops—two of whom shall be chief executive officers of United Methodist-related educational institutions, the other two holding other positions relevant to academic or financial affairs or Church relationships. Each of the five electing bodies shall elect at least one woman.

Members elected by the General Conference shall be nominated and elected by the following procedure: Twelve persons shall be nominated by the Council of Bishops, six of whom shall be chief executive officers of United Methodist-related educational institutions, the other six holding other positions relevant to academic or financial affairs or Church relationships. At the same daily session at which the above nominations are announced, additional nominations may be made from the floor but at no other time. From these nominations, the General Conference shall elect without discussion, by ballot and by plurality vote, the four persons to serve on the Senate, two from each of the two categories of nominees. Should a vacancy occur in the members elected by General Conference in the interim prior to the next General Conference, the Council of Bishops shall appoint a replacement taken from the remaining nominees. The election process shall be repeated at each succeeding General Conference. Care should be taken that women, racial and ethnic persons, and representatives from the United Methodist-related

Black colleges and graduate theological seminaries shall be members of the Senate. If a member (other than the four elected by the General Conference) retires from educational work, or for any other cause a vacancy occurs during the quadrennium, it shall be filled by the agency by which the retiring member was elected at its next meeting. The general secretary of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry and the associate general secretaries of the Divisions of Higher Education and Ordained Ministry of that board shall serve as ex officio members of the Senate, with voice but without vote. There shall be one staff representative on the Senate from the General Board of Global Ministries, with voice but without vote, named by the general secretary of the General Board of Global Ministries

3. The associate general secretary of the Division of Higher Education shall be the executive secretary of the Senate. The general secretary of the board shall convene it for organization at the beginning of each quadrennium. The Senate shall elect its own officers, including a president, a vice president, and a recording secretary, and it may appoint such committees and commissions and delegate to them such powers as are incident to its work. Thereafter, it shall meet semiannually at such time and place as it may determine. Special meetings may be called on the written request of five members or at the discretion of the president and the executive secretary.

4. After consultation with the officers of the Senate, the Division of Higher Education shall provide in its annual budget for the expense of the Senate as it may deem sufficient, except that expenses incurred by the Senate on behalf of any other board of the Church shall be borne by that board.

¶ 1415. Purposes and Objectives

1. To establish the criteria that must be met by schools, colleges, universities, and theological schools to achieve and retain listing as institutions affiliated with The United Methodist Church.
2. To support the development of institutions whose aims are to address and whose programs reflect significant educational, cultural, social, and human issues in a manner reflecting the values held in common by the institutions and the Church.
3. To provide an effective review process to ensure that schools, colleges, universities, and theological schools listed by the University Senate and qualifying for Church support have institutional integrity, well-structured programs, sound management, and clearly defined Church relationships²⁸.
4. To establish effective annual reporting procedures that will provide the Senate with the data necessary to complete its review of the institutional viability and program integrity of member institutions.
5. At the conclusion of each General Conference a complete set of the Daily Christian Advocate for that General Conference shall be sent to each theological school approved by the University Senate.

¶ 1416. Institutional Affiliation²⁹

1. Approval by the Senate is prerequisite to institutional claim of affiliation with The United Methodist Church.
2. Every effort shall be made by both the annual conferences and institutions to sustain and support each other, but identification of an institution with The United Methodist Church shall depend upon its approval by the Senate. The Senate shall provide adequate guidelines and counsel to assist institutions seeking initial or renewed affiliation.
3. Only institutions affiliated with The United Methodist Church through approval by the Senate shall be eligible for funding by annual conferences, General Conference, general boards, or other agencies of The United Methodist Church.
4. To qualify for affiliation with The United Methodist Church, institutions must maintain appropriate academic accreditation.
5. Assessment of Church relationships shall be a part of the process for those institutions seeking approval of the Senate for affiliation with the United Methodist Church. Inasmuch as declarations of Church relationships are expected to differ one from the other, and because of the diversity in heritage and other aspects of institutional life, declaration of Church relationship will necessarily be of institutional design.

¶ 1417. Annual Reports of Approved Institutions

1. Each year the Senate shall publish a list classifying United Methodist-affiliated institutions. These institutions shall publish a list classifying United Methodist-affiliated institutions. These institutions shall include secondary schools, colleges, universities, graduate theological seminaries, and special schools.
2. The Senate shall also prepare annually a list of approved schools, colleges, universities, and graduate theological seminaries for use by annual conference boards of ordained ministry in determining candidate educational eligibility for admission into full connection.
3. An institution that chooses to disaffiliate with The United Methodist Church for any reason shall: a) inform the University Senate as soon as possible after discussions begin concerning disaffiliation; b) inform all appropriate United Methodist judicatories; and c) seek technical and legal assistance from the Division of Higher Education regarding fiduciary issues.
4. The Senate shall publish annually, with its list of United Methodist-affiliated institutions, the names of institutions of other historic Methodist Churches that wish to participate in research projects, the insurance program, and technical services of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry. Such institutions shall be designated as “associate” institutions.

¶ 1418. Consultative Services

1. Support for approved institutions shall include, through the appropriate divisions of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, consulting teams with skills in comprehensive institutional design, management, governance, and program.
2. Support for approved institutions shall include an interpretation of and consultation on data in the annual institutional reports.
3. The Division of Higher Education shall report annually to the Senate on the level and types of institutional support rendered by related conferences and agencies and shall evaluate such support, including specific responses of conferences and agencies to recommend levels.

NOTES

²⁷See Judicial Council Decision 589.

²⁸See Judicial Council Decision 589.

²⁹See Judicial Council Decision 589.

Section II

UNIVERSITY SENATE HISTORY AND STRUCTURE

Introduction and History

The United Methodist Church has more colleges, universities, theological schools, and preparatory schools related to it than any other non-Roman Catholic denomination. The predecessor bodies of The United Methodist Church were anxious to serve the larger society by engaging in education. In this they were true to John Wesley's own concern for education and, more specifically, to the institution building commitments of early American Methodism. American Methodism has always sought to serve the general community, as well as its own members, through a series of complex institutions including colleges, schools, hospitals, orphanages, retirement homes, and publishing operations. The University Senate was established in 1892, one of the earliest accrediting bodies in the United States. Its mission was to be certain that the schools, colleges, and universities related to the church be worthy of bearing the name of The United Methodist Church, in one way or another. In recent years the task has become less one of accreditation, in large part because this work is done by regional accrediting bodies, and more one of review

of the way in which an institution is in fact related to The United Methodist Church.

The Book of Discipline of The United Methodist Church (par. 1415.3) charges the University Senate along with other responsibilities: “To provide an effective review process to ensure that schools, colleges, universities, and theological schools listed by the University Senate and qualifying for Church support have institutional integrity, well-structured programs, sound management, and clearly defined Church relationships.” The University Senate does its work through its commissions and committees that operate in accord with the policies and procedures established by the Senate. The organization, policies, and procedures are revised frequently to enable the Senate to do its work in the rapidly changing field of higher education. All revisions in organization and policy are described in this document and its appendices.

Membership, Length of Service, Duties

The University Senate is composed of twenty-seven elected members with vote and several *ex officio* members with voice but no vote. The members are elected through organizations and agencies related to The United Methodist Church and its educational institutions as defined in general and for each appointing body in the *Book of Discipline* of The United Methodist Church (see Section 1, page 1, paragraph 1414 of these Guidelines). Should a vacancy occur during an appointment period, the electing body shall elect a replacement except in the case of the General Conference appointments. The general secretary of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry and the associate general secretaries of the Division of Higher Education and Division of Ordained Ministry shall serve as *ex officio* members of the Senate and each of its commissions, committees, and task forces, with voice but without vote. In addition, the president of the Senate shall serve as an *ex officio* member of all commissions, committees, and task forces of the Senate, with voice but without vote. In order to facilitate communication and understanding within the church and with the Council of Bishops, the general secretary of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry may invite bishops to serve as advisors to the senate and especially to the Commission on Theological Education, with voice but without vote. The general secretary of the General Board of Global Ministries shall name one staff representative to serve on the Senate with voice but without vote.

Appointments shall be made for each quadrennium and persons so elected shall serve from January 1 of the new quadrennium through the end of the calendar year of that quadrennium. A person may serve only for two consecutive quadrennial appointments on the Senate by being appointed the second time through one of the appointing bodies, but then must wait one full quadrennium before being reappointed. Should a person be appointed to fill a vacancy on the Senate of two years or fewer, he/she shall be eligible for two full additional terms.

Senators are expected to attend two scheduled meetings each year. In addition, there may be special-purpose meetings called at the discretion of the president and executive secretary of the Senate. Senators are expected to attend the scheduled meetings and will be asked to resign from the Senate if they miss two consecutive meeting without a valid excuse. In addition, senators chair and serve on the University Senate Visiting Committees which

visit the campuses of the educational institutions on a rotating basis and committees which are created to visit campuses to address special needs and circumstances. These committees are formed well ahead of the visit by the staff of the Division of Higher Education or the Division of Ordained Ministry. Senators will be assigned to other committees and task forces as necessary to fulfill the responsibilities assigned to the Senate.

Officers, Commissions, and Committees of the Senate

Officers:

President — elected by the Senate

Vice President — elected by the Senate

Recording Secretary — elected by the Senate

Executive Secretary — associate general secretary of the Division of Higher Education, who is responsible for the administrative and operational work of the University Senate (2016 Book of Discipline, par. 1414.3)

In order to maintain continuity, a nominating committee named by the president of the University Senate and staffed by the associate general secretary of the Division of Higher Education shall offer at the last official meeting in a given quadrennium a slate of officers for the next quadrennium. At that meeting, the slate offered can be modified from the floor and passed by a simple majority of those senators in attendance. Officers thus elected shall assume office beginning January 1 of the new quadrennium.

Executive Committee of the University Senate

Responsibility. The Executive Committee shall have responsibility for the following:

1. To provide oversight of (a) policy formation, (b) budgeting, (c) membership (when additions or replacements to the Senate are necessary), (d) release of information to the public, (e) legal matters.
2. To consider applications for listing as a United Methodist-related institution.
3. To take action for the Senate in cases of emergency between its meetings in all matters except the listing, not approved for listing, and approval of institutions and other matters reserved only for the Senate in *The Book of Discipline*.

Composition. The Executive Committee shall consist of the president, the vice president, and the secretary of the Senate, the associate general secretary of the Division of Higher Education (executive secretary of the Senate), the associate general secretary of the Division of Ordained Ministry, and the chairs of the commissions. The general secretary of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry is an *ex officio* member with voice but without vote.

Implementation. The Committee shall meet as often as necessary to facilitate the work of the Senate.

Role of Staff Members

GBHEM staff members have voice but no vote and play an important role in supporting the work of the University Senate. See Appendix E, Role of Staff.

Commissions of the Senate

The Senate makes final decisions as a whole, but it does so taking into account the recommendations of its review committees which review institutional situations in detail and report to the Senate. Only the Senate can make final decisions regarding institutional status, and only the president and/or the executive secretary can speak for the Senate or communicate University Senate actions. Members and chairs of the Commission on Institutional Review and of the Commission on Theological Education, all senators, are appointed by the Senate president and affirmed by the Executive Committee of the Senate. The composition of these commissions may vary from one Senate meeting to another with the goal of ensuring objectivity and fairness as well as continuity and consistency in decision-making. Some experts in particular fields may be asked for consultation with these commissions if necessary with the permission of the Senate President.

Each United Methodist-related institution is to be reviewed following the regional accreditation visit and more frequently if the Senate deems it to be warranted. The Senate may request reports from its institutions during these periods, and if these reports indicate issues that should be monitored, the Senate will take appropriate action in conversation with the particular institution's chief executive officer such as a site review committee visit or additional monitoring reports. Institutional representatives may be invited for interviews with either the Commission on Institutional Review or with the Commission on Theological Education as described later in this document. The CEO of an institution is obligated to report to the Executive Secretary of the University Senate all action letters regarding institutional status with regional accrediting agencies and any other activity of the institution such as financial duress that can possibly affect the survival of the institution. Failure to do so could possibly result in immediate action by the Senate.

Commission on Institutional Review

In general, the Commission on Institutional Review reviews all institutions except for theological education institutions, but it is possible, since theological education, while distinctive, is included in higher education, the Commission on Institutional Review might review theological institutions in certain cases—university-related

divinity schools, for example. After completing its review of each institution, the Commission on Institutional Review will report to the Senate with a summary of the salient points, a recommended action, and a rationale for that recommendation. Composition of the committee may include theological educators for the sake of inclusivity of ideas and consistent interpretation of the Senate standards that apply to all institutions.

Composition. Members of the commission shall include all senators, except those serving on the Commission on Theological Education. The chair of the commission shall be a senator and be appointed by the president of the University Senate.

Implementation. Members of this commission shall serve on visiting committees to review educational institutions as assigned. Though these committees may include non-senators, they are usually chaired by senators. Each United Methodist-related institution is to be reviewed consistent with the cycle of the particular institution's regional accreditation visit. Normally, the Senate visit will occur as soon as possible after the reaffirmation decision of the regional accrediting agency.

Specifics regarding implementation of the work of the Commission on Institutional Review are contained in Section IV of this document, entitled "Procedures and Guidelines for Review of Institutions."

Commission on Theological Education

While the Commission on Theological Education specializes in theological education institutions, it may, in certain cases, review other kinds of institutions for the sake of inclusivity of ideas and consistent application of Senate standards that apply to all institutions. Likewise, composition of the commission may include higher education professionals who are not in theological education.

The general secretary of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, after consultation with the associate general secretaries, the Senate president, and the chair of the Commission on Theological Education, may appoint additional church representatives to serve as advisors for specific issues to the Commission such as district superintendents, chairs of boards of ordained ministry, and/or annual conference ministerial services staff members. The intent of this provision is to have specific expertise available on call when needed by the Commission for specific institutional cases. While these advisors will not regularly attend Senate meetings, they might in specific exceptional cases be invited to attend a specific meeting for ad hoc reasons. On such occasions, they will have voice but no vote. The invitation will be issued by the Senate president if she/he approves a request from the chair of the Commission.

The commission reviews seminaries related to The United Methodist Church and each non-United Methodist seminary listed as approved for the education of United Methodist clergy. The commission shall review all United Methodist seminaries consistent with the cycle of the particular institution's regional or Association of Theological

Schools (ATS) accreditation. The Commission will report to the Senate with a summary of salient points, a recommended action, and a rationale for its recommendation. The commission will review each non-United Methodist seminary each quadrennium and report its recommendations to the Senate. The Division of Ordained Ministry associate general secretary will staff these review processes.

Being listed as a non-United Methodist seminary approved for the education of United Methodist clergy is a privilege, not a right. Criteria and procedures for review for listing a non-United Methodist seminary are included in Appendices A and B. The commission will invite institutions to be considered to be on the list, review institutions already on the list, establish the materials to be submitted, and delineate deadlines. In its review of these institutions, the commission will also consult with the resident bishops in the area, assess the needs of the church in the area, including geographic proximity of other approved seminaries, evaluate all the materials submitted, and make a recommendation with a rationale to the Senate. The review process may include campus visits as appropriate. The Senate makes the final decision on recommendations from the commission all United Methodist and non-United Methodist seminaries.

Committees of the Senate

Site Review Committees

Site Review Committees appointed by the Senate president or designee visit institutions both for post-regional accreditation reviews and for reporting on extraordinary circumstances at institutions. These committees may have non-senators as members, but the chairs of these committees will be senators unless an extraordinary circumstance prevents it. These visits are conducted in accordance with the protocols described later in this document. The reports of these committees are then reviewed either by the Commission on Institutional Review or by the Commission on Theological Education (or both, in some cases) and then by the Senate itself, upon receiving the recommendation of these committees, where the final action is taken. Timing of site visits is consistent with the review cycle of the particular regional accreditation association so that the reports of that agency may be taken into account by the Site Review Committee.

Ad Hoc Committees and Task Forces

As necessary, ad hoc committees and task forces shall be formed at the discretion of the University Senate. Members of the Commission on Institutional Review and the Commission on Theological Education shall be appointed by the president of the Senate to as many committees as necessary to achieve the following purposes:

1. To visit the campus of a United Methodist-related educational institution to address special problems or needs of the institution.
2. To hear and discuss the reports from the visiting committee to schools, colleges, and universities and make

appropriate recommendations to the full Senate concerning the listing of United Methodist-related institutions.

3. To clarify and update the criteria and maintain the guidelines established by the General Conference of The United Methodist Church for participation in the Black College Fund.
4. To address any special needs or concerns of any category of United Methodist-related institutions.
5. To review periodically the criteria for evaluation of institutions for listing as United Methodist.

Technical Assistance and Consultative Services

The University Senate, in concert with the Division of Higher Education, shall provide institutions with technical assistance and consultative services whenever practical. A special committee in some cases may be enlisted to provide to an institution in-depth study and/or technical assistance. Decisions about committee structure and appropriate review mechanisms for individual institutions shall reside with the University Senate and/or the associate general secretary of the Division of Higher Education or the associate general secretary of the Division of Ordained Ministry (for schools of theology).

Section III

POLICY AND PROCEDURE FOR LISTING INSTITUTIONS

Categories of Affiliation for Institutions

The University Senate is charged by The Book of Discipline of The United Methodist Church “to provide an effective review process to ensure that schools, colleges, universities, and theological schools listed by the University Senate and qualifying for Church support have institutional integrity, well-structured programs, sound management, and clearly defined Church relationships.” (§ 1415.3) The following paragraphs outline the policies and procedures for listing institutions and the different categories of affiliation.

To make informed decisions regarding an institution’s appropriate category of affiliation, the University Senate relies on the cooperation of institutions throughout the review process, both in conducting on-campus visits and paper reviews. Institutions are expected to coordinate closely with the University Senate in planning for reviews and providing all necessary information in a timely and thorough manner. Should an institution refuse to participate in the review process required for approval for listing as a United Methodist-related institution, the University Senate will take all necessary action to elicit cooperation. If an institution refuses to permit the Senate to conduct an effective review, the University Senate will recommend that the institution no longer be approved for listing as a United Methodist-related school, college, university, or theological school.

Categories of Affiliation for Schools, Colleges, and Universities

All schools, colleges, and universities related to The United Methodist Church must be approved by the University Senate for listing as affiliated institutions. Each institution is reviewed by the Senate with respect to continued listing following the regional accreditation visit or more often under special circumstances. Accreditation by a regional accrediting body is required for Senate listing. Accordingly the institution is generally reviewed by the Senate soon after the accreditation is received or reaffirmed for the institution. In the review process, institutions are evaluated according to criteria set forth in the *Discipline* and established by the University Senate.

The Senate has established categories used to define the affiliation status for each institution. These categories are:

1. Approved for Listing
 - a. Without qualification (public information)
 - b. With monitoring (not public information)
 - c. With alert (not public information)
2. Approved for Listing with Public Warning (public information)
3. Not approved for listing (public information)

These categories are not to be construed as sequential. While the vast majority of schools, colleges, and universities fall into the first category, it is necessary on occasion to place an institution on public warning or to remove it from affiliation.

Actions to approve an institution for listing with monitoring or listing with alert are qualified listings. These listings are private between the University Senate and the institution and call attention to perceived problems or potential problems that the institution must address in order to be removed from monitoring or alert. The listing with monitoring indicates a situation in which the University Senate determines that continued oversight by the staff of the Division of Higher Education is warranted. It is based on the existence of problems which, while not presently threatening the health of the institution, could threaten the institution's health in the future if not adequately addressed.

In communicating such conditional listing to the institution, the Senate shall specify the reasons for it.

The University Senate and its commissions conduct discussions and make decisions regarding affiliation status in executive session.

Categories of Affiliation for Schools of Theology and Theological Seminaries

All theological institutions listed for undertaking the education of the clergy of The United Methodist Church must be approved by the University Senate. Each institution is reviewed by the Senate with respect to continued listing following the regional or ATS accreditation visit or more often under special circumstances. Accreditation by a regional accrediting body and the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) is required for Senate listing. Two types of theological institutions are used for this undertaking:

Type I: Listed theological institutions affiliated with The United Methodist Church

Type II: Approved non-United Methodist theological institutions

Type I theological institutions are affiliated with The United Methodist Church and are reviewed at least once every 10 years by the University Senate with respect to continued listing as an affiliated institution. Each affiliated theological institution is listed in the same category as all other institutions. An affiliated theological institution may be removed from affiliation or may choose to withdraw from affiliation.

Affiliated theological institutions are evaluated according to criteria set forth in *The Book of Discipline*, quality factors established by the Division of Ordained Ministry of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, and the criteria of the University Senate.

Type II theological institutions are not affiliated with The United Methodist Church. By mutual consent, they are reviewed at least once every quadrennium by the University Senate for the purpose of being listed as an approved institution. Only those theological institutions that are not related to The United Methodist Church, but are approved for the education of United Methodist clergy, are listed for this purpose. Non-United Methodist theological institutions not approved for the education of United Methodist clergy are not listed. Affiliated United Methodist theological institutions may be listed with public warning. Approved non-United Methodist theological institutions are listed as approved without further distinction.

An approved Type II institution may be removed from the approved list by the University Senate, or may choose to withdraw from being listed. While most unlisted theological institutions remain unlisted by their own choice, it is necessary on occasion for the University Senate to remove from the approved list an institution previously listed.

Approved non-United Methodist theological institutions are evaluated according to criteria set forth by the University Senate. These criteria are designed to ensure that those seeking to qualify for ordination in The United Methodist Church are well prepared to serve the denomination and its distinctive traditions. (See Appendix B, “Criteria for Evaluating United Methodist and Non-United Methodist Schools of Theology.”)

Associate Institutions

Associate institutions are colleges or universities related to the African Methodist Episcopal, Christian Methodist Episcopal, or the African Methodist Episcopal Zion denominations, which may request status as associate institutions for possible inclusion in Educational and Institutional Insurance Administrators (EIIA), research projects, and/or technical services of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry. As associate members, these institutions must agree to provide annually the data needed for evaluation and be subject to review based on the established criteria of the *Discipline* and the University Senate.

Requests for Affiliation or Program Review

Request for Affiliation

Institutions seeking approval for listing as United Methodist-related may apply to the Executive Committee of the University Senate for consideration. The request should include the most recent report of the regional accrediting agency and the institutional response, along with the annual audits and management letters for the past three years. The institution also should include a statement explaining its relationship to The United Methodist Church and the evidence the purported relationship exists in fact. If further consideration of the institution is warranted, the Executive Committee shall request the review and recommendation of the appropriate commission.

Request for Program Review

The University Senate is the church agency responsible for determining if an institutional program meets the guidelines established by any church agency for certification. Requests for clarification or a decision on a particular program should be forwarded to the president of the University Senate or the associate general secretary of the Division of Higher Education. The University Senate will be the final authority for determining whether an institutional program meets the guidelines established by any church agency for certification.

Disaffiliation and Removal from Listing

Affiliation of a school, college, university, or theological school with The United Methodist Church may be terminated voluntarily by the institution itself or by formal action by the University Senate not to approve an institution for listing. It is important to note that per The Book of Discipline, “[o]nly institutions affiliated with The United Methodist Church through approval by the senate shall be eligible for funding by annual conferences, General Conference, general boards, or other agencies of The United Methodist Church.” (§ 1416.3)

If an approved institution seeks to voluntarily end its affiliation with The United Methodist Church, the institution must inform the University Senate in writing of its decision. The institution “shall: a) inform the University Senate as soon as possible after discussions begin concerning disaffiliation; b) inform all appropriate United Methodist judicatories; and c) seek technical and legal assistance from the Division of Higher Education regarding fiduciary issues.” (Book of Discipline, ¶1417.3)

Should an institution be removed from listing based on the recommendation and decision of the University Senate, the Senate shall follow the procedures outlined on pages 31-32 of the University Senate Guidelines (“Recommendation of the Review Committee”) and in Section VI, “Policies and Procedures for University Senate Actions.”

Section IV

PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF INSTITUTIONS

Introduction

The peer reviews of schools, colleges, universities, and theological schools related to The United Methodist Church have two essential purposes. First, they fulfill the mandate of *The Book of Discipline* that the University Senate “provide an effective review process” of all institutions, including the institutions providing theological education related to The United Methodist Church (¶1415.3). Second, peer reviews are necessary to ensure that the institutions meet the four criteria for United Methodist affiliation as specified in the *Discipline*: institutional integrity, well-structured programs, sound management, and clearly defined church relationships. Another purpose of institutional reviews is to assist these institutions in clarifying their mission and in evaluating their quality and effectiveness. Peer reviews can be significant instruments for reflection, insight, and institutional change.

In all reviews by the University Senate for the purpose of formal listing as a United Methodist-related institution, prior institutional membership and accreditation by a regional accrediting agency is required. The review committees shall focus on issues related to the criteria established by the *Discipline* and the University Senate for evaluating United Methodist-related institutions.

Philosophy Governing Institutional Reviews

This revision of the *Guidelines* of the University Senate attempts to make the Senate a more effective resource for strengthening the connection between The United Methodist Church and its institutions, and for supporting the development of their distinctive missions. By shifting its focus from in-depth inquiries about programs and financial health to a more intentional analysis of the other two areas of review (institutional integrity and church-relatedness), the Senate’s work becomes more distinctive and quite different from that of the regional accrediting bodies. This shift also should carry out the intent of the revised *Guidelines* to move away from a posture of accreditation process and practices, and more toward relational support and consultation. The Senate should and does attempt to assist and support United Methodist-related institutions, providing (along with the Division of Higher Education) resources that can help institutions and lead to improvement and to a stronger relationship with The United Methodist Church.

Scheduling of Institutional Reviews

Reviews of schools, colleges, and universities related to The United Methodist Church are by visits of University Senate review committees to the institutions, arranged through the executive secretary of the University Senate. A review committee organized by the University Senate shall make a visit to each institution related to The United Methodist Church closely following the visit and resulting decision of the regional accrediting body to which the institution is associated. The president/CEO is contacted to schedule the visit with the institution following its reaffirmation of accreditation by its regional accrediting agency.

Because of the nature of the church relationship and the *Discipline* mandate that the University Senate “provide an effective review process,” the executive secretary of the Senate may also establish a special University Senate review committee to visit a campus should the circumstances at the institution merit such a review. The decision to establish a special review committee shall be made by consultation between the executive secretary of the Senate and the President of the Senate. In the case of a special review, the executive secretary shall contact the president/CEO to inform him/her of the reasons for the special review. The special review committee may be composed of a smaller or larger number of members than the regular review committee and can be charged to review a general or a specific area of the institution. The special review committee shall be chaired by a senator. The Associate General Secretary of the Division of Higher Education or the Associate General Secretary of the Division of Ordained Ministry may also be a member of the review committee. This special visit may differ in scope, in specific purpose, in the arrangement of time, and in the interviews requested. However, the review committee shall be guided in the reporting of their findings by policies and procedures outlined in Section VI: Policies and Procedures for University Senate Actions, including making a recommendation to the Senate concerning listing. See Appendix F, Special Visits.

The Review Committee

As discussed above, the Senate’s review is distinctive from that of regional accreditation. The visit will focus primarily on those matters in which the church is interested. The review committee will make many judgments, especially relating to programs and finances, whenever possible, based on the findings of the regional accreditors. In preparing for review committee visits, institutions should focus on the “marks of church relationship” contained in the Guidelines, Section V, Church Relatedness of Schools, Colleges, and Universities. Review committees should use those marks as a means of adding emphasis to that area in interviews and in its report.

Purpose

The purposes of the review committee are as follows:

1. Serves as the arm of the University Senate in making assessments, judgments, and recommendations. The reported findings of fact and recommendations of the review committee form the basis for action by the University Senate with regard to the relationship of an institution to The United Methodist Church. The chair of the review

committee should consult with the executive secretary as to administrative and operational procedures.

2. Ascertains the level of performance of an institution with regard to compliance with the mandates of *The Book of Discipline of The United Methodist Church* and the criteria of the University Senate in the areas of sound management and financial health, program quality, church relatedness, and institutional integrity.
3. Keep its work confidential and report its findings and recommendations only to the institution and to the University Senate.

Composition and Work

Procedures for the institutional review process are designed to permit maximum flexibility. Ordinarily, the committee visiting the institution shall be chaired by a member of the University Senate. Each review committee chair, in consultation with the executive secretary as needed, is responsible for the coordination of the review process. The review committee shall include members with competence and expertise in financial health and administrative effectiveness, program quality, church relatedness, and institutional integrity. The membership of the review committee should reflect gender and racial inclusiveness whenever feasible. The names of the committee members are made known to the chief executive officer of the institution to be visited. Prior to a final assignment, adjustments may be considered in consultation with the executive secretary.

On-site visits by the University Senate are expected to produce objective and comprehensive assessments of institutions. It is important, therefore, that members of the review committee exercise the demeanor concomitant with the highest professional standards. To assure this expectation, the following suggestions and instructions are offered as guidelines.

1. Persons with a conflict of interest will not normally be assigned to a review committee for the institution(s) in question, but in all cases full disclosure is required. It is the responsibility of each person assigned to a visiting committee to inform the Division of Higher Education or the Division of Ordained Ministry of such a conflict. See Appendix G, Conflict of Interest.
2. Review committee members shall be sensitive to strengths and weaknesses and shall not overlook either.
3. Review committee members may discover programs or personnel suitable for their own institutions. The committee member must not take advantage of an on-site visit to recruit staff or spend time during the visit to probe ideas for the member's own institution.
4. Review committee members shall not offer their individual expertise to the institution, either for remuneration or otherwise, or suggest a desire to be related to the institution following the visit and report.

5. Review committee members shall refrain from comparisons with other institutions.
6. Findings of the review committee may be shared in confidence with the president before leaving the campus.
7. The Senate review committee as a whole may serve as a consulting body and offer specific suggestions for improvement to the institution through discussions with the president. Such suggestions must address specific issues and may guide future monitoring of the institution by the Senate.
8. Expenses of the review, including travel and hospitality, are to be borne by the institution. Every attempt should be made to keep costs at a minimum. Consulting fees or similar charges shall not be a part of the review committee visit. The review committee members shall submit an expense voucher to the executive secretary of the University Senate.
9. For institutions undergoing a visit to both the school of theology and the general university, the following procedures shall apply in addition to the regular procedures:
 - a. There shall be one site review committee with membership determined by the executive secretary of the University Senate in consultation with the associate general secretary of the Division of Ordained Ministry.
 - b. Reviews shall be conducted of both the school of theology and the university as a whole.
 - c. The final reports of the two reviews shall be merged, with specific attention being given to the place of the school of theology in the mission of the university.
 - d. The dean of the school of theology should be included in the exit interview.

Visit of the Review Committee

Preparation for the Visit

Prior to the visit, the review committee shall review the following materials forwarded from the chief executive officer of the institution to be visited not less than six (6) weeks before the scheduled visit:

- (a) Completed “Institutional Profile for a Committee Visit” (form provided by GBHEM prior to the visit);
- (b) The most recent catalog and selected admissions materials;
- (c) The most recent institutional self-study;
- (d) The report of the visiting committee of the regional accrediting agency;

- (e) The institutional response to the visiting committee's report;
- (f) The action letter of the regional accrediting agency and any subsequent reports required;
- (g) The financial audits and management letters from the two most recent years (See also Appendix D);
- (h) Copies of the institutional affirmative action plan and/or other relevant policies, plans, and practices;
- (i) The Completed "Evaluation Criteria Checklist" (See Section V, checklist provided by GBHEM prior to the visit); and
- (j) A written report regarding ways the institution demonstrates its church relatedness. (See also Section V, Church Relatedness)

With the agreement of the chair of the review committee, the institution may provide the requested materials in appropriate electronic form.

The review committee also shall review the charter and corporate by-laws and the reports of previous conversations conducted by the University Senate and other United Methodist judicatories. The executive secretary shall provide the review committee pertinent information and materials.

The review committee shall review the materials sent by the institution early enough to have time to seek additional information that may be needed from the institution, its accrediting association, and listing in college guides. The chair shall assign responsibilities to various members of the committee and maintain contact with them before the visit.

The schedule for the review committee is the responsibility of the chair of the committee. A tentative schedule shall be sent to the chief executive officer prior to the scheduled visit in time to allow for the scheduling of interviews by the institution.

The prearranged schedule shall allow for the possibility of last-minute changes and needed additions after the committee arrives on campus. The schedule shall provide time to walk around the campus and solicit responses spontaneously as a way to learn more about the ethos of the institution.

Selected on-site interviews shall be arranged with the chief executive officer of the institution and a cross section of the institution's constituencies, including representatives of The United Methodist Church, in an attempt to assess the institution's mission and the effectiveness of its achievements. Interviews conducted by member(s) of the review committee with representatives of the institution's constituencies shall not include the participation of members of the administration unless specifically requested by the review committee. A member of the staff of the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry is usually a member of the committee.

The Evaluation Criteria for Institutional Integrity, Program Quality, and Sound Management and Financial Health contained in Section V of the *Guidelines* will be provided to the members of the review committee and to the institution before the visit in checklist form. The institution should provide its answers to the checklist questions using the documents submitted to the regional accreditation agency, and the agency's response to those documents. For example, in response to a checklist item such as "Conflict of Interest Policies," the institution is encouraged to 'cut-and-paste' from both sets of documents its response to a similar "Conflict of Interest" query by the regional accreditor and any response the accreditor might have offered about the adequacy of those policies. A similar 'cut-and-paste' process would apply to all other aspects of the Evaluation Criteria.

If a component of the Evaluation Criteria cannot be addressed by referring to the aforementioned accreditation documents, the institution should provide that information as brief narrative responses to the individual checklist questions. In addition, the form "Institutional Profile for a Committee Visit" provides an opportunity to provide more current information than would be contained in the accreditation documents. Examples might include revised enrollment data, diversity of campus constituencies, and any recent information impacting public perception of the institution.

With these areas of review handled efficiently in advance of the visit, the Review Committee and the institution generally would have little need to discuss "accreditation issues" during the campus visit. This would allow the Senate to conduct "an effective review" within the spirit of the *Discipline* and the *Guidelines*. The goal is to be more focused and direct with the documentation provided in advance, allowing the Review Committee and the institution to use their time together primarily on matters of church-relatedness.

The Campus Visit

Review committees should rely on the reports prepared for and the findings of the regional accrediting bodies whenever possible, essentially applying the Note under the Program Quality section of the Evaluation Criteria to any area – program quality, financial health, sound management, or others. Thus, if an institution has no conditions or unusual circumstances related to its accreditation, the campus visit could be modified or shortened from the three day (or parts of three days) standard. Of course, issues could have arisen in the time following accreditation that require further inquiry during the campus visit, especially financial ones, and the Review Committee always should be mindful of the need to conduct all appropriate interviews while on site.

In general, however, the campus visit should focus more intentionally on the elements of the *Guidelines* relating to institutional integrity and church relatedness, including how this issue affects the programs, management and finances of the institution. Instead of a committee member talking with the Vice President for Enrollment Services about enrollment in general, the focus should be on what scholarships are available for United Methodist students, how church relatedness impacts enrollment strategies, and how effective these strategies are. Discussions with the Vice President for Advancement could (for example) revolve around plans to increase support for those scholarships,

to build an endowment to support the Chaplain and his or her work, or to leverage the support of United Methodist donors for the institution's programs. The Chief Financial Officer should be well versed in how the church supports the institution and how much funding the institution in turn allocates to its religious life programming. Designing a visit around discussions like this should enable the Review Committee to verify and affirm its preliminary conclusions based on the regional accreditation review while gaining real insight into how the institution's relationship with the United Methodist Church guides its work and mission.

Changes like this might necessitate other adjustments in the site visit, including the possibility of modifying the suggested schedule template sent in advance. Matters of cost to the institution should be relevant. Every member of the review committee should participate in the review of Church Relatedness.

As a practical matter, each member of the team should have primary responsibility for one or two areas, both for purposes of advance review and for drafting the committee's report. While on campus, however, one or perhaps two focused meetings in the areas of Finance and Program Quality should be sufficient. While those meetings are in session, the Church Relatedness team member could talk to the Chaplain or the Chair of the Religion Department. Unless the pre-visit review indicates some concern, individual meetings with other administrators would be minimized, allowing all members of the team to be involved in the review of Church Relatedness, including meetings with trustees, staff, and faculty. The goal is not to shorten the visit but to use the time wisely. If a compressed schedule allows for a full and thorough conversation, however, and for a determination that the initial perceptions of the committee were accurate, then completing the visit at the end of the second day could be possible.

The main point here is that all members of the review committee should be involved in the review of the institution's relationship with The United Methodist Church. They have much to offer, and they frequently learn from and are inspired by their experiences on campus. Indeed, conversations between visiting committee members and institutional personnel during visits often include advice and assistance whether or not the advice winds up in the formal written report of the committee.

The Schedule for the Visit

The chair of the review committee should contact the chief executive officer of the institution to arrange the details of the visit, logistical support, interview appointments, overall schedule, etc. Review committee visits typically take parts of three days but this is entirely flexible, depending on the areas of inquiry, the institution's level of preparedness, and the quality and thoroughness of the materials submitted in advance. The chair of the visiting committee will determine the schedule in consultation with the institutional CEO, taking into account these and other factors. Various alternatives might be developed, depending on the situation; thus, the following outline is only a suggestion and is subject to appropriate adjustments:

Afternoon of the day of arrival. Orientation meeting of the review committee with the representative of the Division

of Higher Education and/or the Division of Ordained Ministry as appropriate, briefing of the committee, confirmation of the individual areas of exploration, and review of the assignments and preliminary findings of individual members of the review committee. At the first meeting of the committee, the chair shall outline procedures for on-site activity, including the schedule of interviews, documents to be perused, and expectations of each of the members regarding his/her individual assignments, assessments, and findings.

Evening of the day of arrival. It is recommended to have a dinner and/or meeting of the review committee with the chief executive officer and representatives of the institution whom the chief executive officer invites. This is an appropriate setting for introductions, to answer questions about the review process, to review the schedule for interviews, and to discuss the general conditions related to the institution's health and vitality.

Second day, morning and afternoon. Interviews should be scheduled with students, faculty, administrative personnel staff, trustees, alumni, church officials, including, where possible, pastor(s), district superintendent, the chair of the annual conference Board of Higher Education and Campus Ministry, and the bishop. In all cases, a conversation shall be held between the resident bishop and at least one member of the committee, either on campus or by phone while the committee is on campus. When this is not possible during the on-site visit, the conversation may be arranged for another time prior to the visit. Committee members shall conduct interviews with faculty, administration, students, etc., expeditiously, that is, in a short period of time and with predetermined questions. Committee members shall confer for brief periods during the day in order to confirm data, verify impressions, avoid duplication, and determine progress and further steps to be taken. The chair of the committee shall consult regularly and keep the president informed during the visit. Committee members shall put in writing, periodically, impressions and names as close to the time of the events as possible, so as to assure accuracy.

Second day, evening. A private dinner should be arranged for committee members only.

This dinner meeting of the committee is to discuss findings, determine areas of further exploration, and determine final findings and recommendations.

Third day, morning. Exit interview. This conference shall relay to the chief executive officer clearly the findings of the review committee. Candor and clarity help eliminate subsequent surprises. Committee members, however, shall not make recommendations, offer their personal expertise, or anticipate the action of the University Senate. The exit sessions with the chief executive officer and his/her invitees are designed to share the basic findings of the members of the committee and are not intended to be a final report or statement of the University Senate. In this session, committee members should avoid the impression that they are reporting actions of the University Senate.

Report of the Review Committee

1. The report shall reflect the findings of members of the review committee with regard to institutional integrity,

well-structured programs, sound management, and clearly defined church relationships. Minimal documentation shall substantiate conclusions. The review committee may recommend areas where the institution is in need of specific assistance and services. These findings shall be conveyed to the University Senate and, where appropriate, directly to the Division of Higher Education for implementation.

2. Assessments shall be made by each member and given to the chair. Preparation of the final report to the University Senate is the responsibility of the chair.

3. The chair shall secure a consensus of the committee regarding the recommendation for affiliation to be made to the University Senate.

4. The initial report shall be restricted to findings of fact and shall be circulated to members of the committee and then to the institution's chief executive officer (with the committee's recommendation) for correction of factual errors only as soon as possible and usually no later than four (4) weeks following the visit. A report is normally five (5) to seven (7) pages in length (See Appendix C, "Format for Institutional Review Reports.") This report may be shared with appropriate persons from the reviewed institution at the discretion of the chief executive officer with the understanding that the report will be presented to the appropriate Senate commission and then to the Senate for a final decision.

5. In addition to the findings of fact as stipulated above, the report of the visiting committee should also recognize the institution if it demonstrates its relationship with The United Methodist Church in particularly creative, compelling, or inspiring ways. Others can benefit from learning about these exemplary practices. It is important to applaud the good work of our institutions, and the Senate will find ways to celebrate these successes publically. Similarly, the report should also find tactful ways to address sensitive issues that arise during a Senate review but might not fall neatly with the purview of the *Guidelines*. These issues might be very real to the institution and might be very significant to its ethos, its relationship to the church, or, indeed, to its very survival. In these cases, the report should include the visiting committee's suggestions concerning how the Senate can help the institution.

6. The final report of the committee shall be forwarded to the executive secretary of the University Senate (with the committee's recommendation). The report shall be presented for appropriate action at the next regular meeting of the University Senate. At that meeting, the report of the review committee shall be considered by the appropriate commission of the Senate and shall be reviewed for consistency with other reviews. Each commission has the discretion to modify the recommendation of a review committee and the responsibility to report to the Senate its final recommendation.

7. In cases in which it appears public sanction is possible, the institution will be sent a copy of the committee's report and representatives from the institution will be invited to appear before the commission as outlined in Section

VI of these *Guidelines*.

8. The Senate shall make the final decision concerning any institution.
9. Following Senate action, the chief executive officer, chair of the Board of Trustees of the institution, and the resident bishop of the episcopal area of the institution shall each receive written notice of the decision of the University Senate and a final copy of the review committee's report.

Recommendation of the Review Committee

The University Senate and its commissions act only in concert when they are in session. A recommendation concerning institutional affiliation expresses the opinions of individual senators who are not authorized to act for the Senate independently. Their opinions and recommendations may be rejected or amended by either the commission or the Senate.

A review committee must include a specific recommendation to the Senate with respect to continued approval for listing by the University Senate of the institution as United Methodist-related. If there are additional reports and/or other conditions which would pertain to the institution prior to the next scheduled visit, the committee should specify these. The review committee's recommendation for affiliation shall be included as a part of the report to the institution. However, it is to be conveyed to the institution that the committee's recommendation is addressed to the Senate and that after review by a Commission of the Senate and the full Senate the recommendation could be modified.

The categories used to define the affiliation status for each institution reviewed are set forth in Section III of the *Guidelines*. In general, an institution should be Approved for Listing Without Qualification if (a) the institution has been found to be in compliance by its regional accrediting body; (b) the Review Committee determines that no significant concerns have arisen since the action by the accrediting body; and (c) the Senate finds, on recommendation of the Review Committee, that the institution has demonstrated a meaningful relationship to The United Methodist Church. If any conditions have been imposed on the institution by its accrediting body, the Senate typically will incorporate those conditions in its own decision, through either the monitoring, alert, or public warning process (depending on the severity of the conditions). When the accrediting body finds compliance, the Senate will usually conclude its monitoring.

Similarly, if new developments have occurred after the time of regional accreditation, the Senate will address those recent concerns through monitoring, alert, public warning, or even removal from the list of approved institutions. The Senate typically will be cautious in imposing conditions when there has been no corresponding action by an accrediting body. Requiring an institution to send representatives to Senate meetings for interviews (or imposing other conditions that create additional financial burdens on an institution) should be reserved for instances where

threats to the institution's health and viability are apparent. The Senate will continue to contact an institution in an attempt to help. Likewise, GBHEM staff members who provide administrative support to the Senate may also render assistance to institutions.

Under normal circumstances, the process for listing an institution on public warning is outlined below. However, under certain circumstances (e.g. sufficient financial or enrollment concerns), the Senate may place an institution on public warning without an interview and prior to a campus site visit, with the institution invited for an interview to the first Senate meeting following the visit.

If the review committee's recommendation for affiliation is to be approval for listing with public warning or not approved for listing, the executive secretary of the Senate shall notify the institution of the gravity of the circumstances, delineating the issues precipitating the action. If there is adequate time between the submission of the review committee's report and the next scheduled Senate meeting, the institution shall be given the opportunity to respond to the appropriate commission in writing and the chief executive officer, the chair of the board of trustees, and the resident bishop of the episcopal area, or their designees, shall be invited for personal appearances and discussions before the appropriate commission prior to the presentation of the commission's recommendation to the full Senate. If there is not adequate time for a written response or to schedule personal appearances before the commission or if the commission makes a decision at the time of its meeting to recommend approval with listing with public warning or not approved for listing which was not recommended by the review committee, the commission shall not submit its recommendation to the Senate at that meeting. Under these circumstances, the institution shall be given the opportunity to respond to the appropriate commission in writing, and the chief executive officer, the chair of the board of trustees, and the resident bishop of the episcopal area, or their designees, shall be invited for personal appearances and discussions before the appropriate commission prior to the presentation of the commission's recommendation to the full Senate. Any written response from the chief executive officer and/or the chair of the board of trustees and/or the resident bishop shall become a part of the commission's report to the Senate. The appropriate commission shall recommend to the Senate one of the following: approval, approval for listing with monitoring, approval for listing with alert (not public), approval for listing with public warning (public), or not approved for listing (public).

Section V

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Introduction

Review committees of the University Senate shall focus their questions upon issues related to the criteria

established by the University Senate for evaluating United Methodist institutions, according to the mandates of *The Book of Discipline*. Accreditation by a regional accrediting body is a requirement for listing by the University Senate, and the most recent accreditation agency report and the institutional response shall be carefully reviewed to identify special issues and concerns. The review committee shall evaluate the status of the institutional responses and the changes made to strengthen operations or programs. The following questions may be used in guiding these institutional assessments and may be supplemented with additional inquiries by the committee. These questions are intended to identify the salient areas of inquiry.

Two documents, “Format for Institutional Review Reports” and “The University Senate Institutional Fiscal and Relevant Data,” are appended. (See Appendix C and Appendix D.)

Institutional Integrity

1. Are there any issues reflecting adversely upon the integrity of the institution, its constituent bodies, personnel, or programs? If so, what are these issues?
2. In the course of the review, did any problems surface that suggest conflicts of interest by representatives or officials of the institution? Do the members of the Board of Trustees sign a “Conflict of Interest” statement each year?
3. Are there any practices or conditions which, in the opinion of the review committee, threaten the integrity of the institution? Are there circumstances or practices which, if left unattended, may eventually undermine the integrity of the institution?
4. Has any official of the institution violated the standards of professional propriety?
5. How do the institution’s policies and practices reflect nondiscriminatory treatment of all individuals, and what documents or position statements indicate support of inclusiveness?
6. What are the official institutional policies and procedures to ensure academic freedom?
7. What are the official institutional policies and procedures to promote: (a) an inclusive campus in terms of ethnic and gender representation among students, faculty, staff, administrators, and trustees; (b) a campus free of harassment (sexual, racial, religious, or other); and (c) a campus free of substance abuse?

Program Quality

Note: As a general rule, the regional accrediting agencies examine the area of academic program quality. Since the visiting committee will have the full institutional report and response(s) as reading materials prior to the University

Senate visit, this area will not usually receive the same emphasis as some other areas of review. The committee members may ask for clarifications or further information on any areas of the academic program. As a general rule, the University Senate will request that any follow-up reports requested by the regional accrediting agency also be sent to the executive secretary of the University Senate. Such reports could place the institution on monitoring.

1. Are there deficiencies in program quality which the regional accrediting agency cites? If yes, are there follow-up reports required and when are they due?
2. Does the institution have in place realistic enrollment goals and has it achieved those goals over the past five years?
3. What is the profile within the faculty, administration, trustees, and students with respect to racial, ethnic, and gender inclusiveness?
4. What is the structure of faculty governance and is it adequate?
5. Are student support services, provided to support the academic program, adequate for the students being served?
6. What special features of the academic program at this institution deserve recognition?

Sound Management and Financial Health

1. Is the board of trustees properly constituted, clearly identified, and fully conversant with (a) the mission of the institution, (b) the current overall condition of the college, (c) its specific responsibilities as trustee/owners, (d) the legal relationship of the college to the church, and (e) its relationship to the president and the administration?
2. Is there a clear and fair policy and process for regularly evaluating the chief executive officer and for appointing and terminating the chief executive officer? Is there evidence that these are followed in practice?
3. Is the president of the institution providing adequate overall management of the institution; and is the president comfortable in his/her relationships to (a) the board of trustees and (b) the administrative staff, faculty, and other constituencies?
4. Is the institution regionally accredited, and are there any conditions, qualifications or unusual circumstances related to this accreditation in the areas of sound management and financial health? If so, what are they and what is required of the institution by the accrediting body?
5. Is there an annual audit of the financial affairs of the institution? Is it conducted by qualified and disinterested

parties? Is it accompanied by an unqualified opinion of the auditors? If there are concerns mentioned in the management letter(s) have they been resolved?

6. Have the articles of incorporation (or charter) and bylaws of the institution been reviewed recently; and, if so, when? Specifically, is there a statement concerning the disposition of institutional assets in the articles of incorporation or bylaws?

7. What is the financial condition of the institution with respect to the following specified items: (a) surplus or deficit in the current operating fund (unrestricted), (b) size of endowment and extent of inter-fund borrowing from endowment or other funds, (c) debt service, and (d) salaries for faculty and all other employees?

8. What is the condition of the physical plant, with specific reference to (a) state of maintenance (any deferred maintenance), (b) adequacy with respect to the number of students being served, and (c) plans for additional facilities?

9. Does the institution have an active and well planned development program with respect specifically to annual fund solicitation (including alumni solicitation), endowment, and other capital fund growth?

10. Does the institution have in place an effective planning process?

11. Does the institution have a master plan for physical plant development and maintenance?

12. What is the current enrollment of the institution; what is the enrollment trend for the past 5 to 10 years; and what are the enrollment projections for the future?

For more instructions, refer to Appendix D, “The University Senate Institutional Fiscal and Relevant Data.”

Church Relatedness

The University Senate, established in 1892, was one of the earliest accrediting bodies in the United States. Its mission was to be certain that the schools, colleges, and universities related to the church were worthy of bearing the name of the church, in one way or another. In recent years the task has become less one of accreditation, in large part because this work is done by regional accrediting bodies, and more one of review of the way in which an institution is in fact related to The United Methodist Church. Such relationships differ, and this is inevitable. History, geography, finances, governance structure, and current realities differ for each school. Nevertheless, there are some “marks of church relationship” which should be manifested if an institution is to be related meaningfully to The United Methodist Church. Among these are the following:

- A church related institution identifies itself as such in printed materials, official listings, and other statements of self-description.
- A church related institution respects, honors, and provides the teaching of religion and, specifically, appropriate scholarly theological teaching in the Christian tradition within the curriculum. In the case of professional institutions and programs, the curriculum includes opportunity for faculty and student reflection on the ethical dimensions of professional practice.
- A church related institution respects and honors religious practice and, specifically, worship and service for students and faculty that choose to participate in the Christian tradition within the total life of the school.
- A church related institution willingly allows faculty and students to explore the place of religious belief and practice and, specifically, the intellectual dimensions of Christian faith in all academic disciplines and co-curricular activities.
- A church related institution encourages the exploration of the place of religious belief and practice in the larger society and advocates appropriate recognition of the contributions of religion to public life.
- A church related institution recognizes the Social Principles of The United Methodist Church and seeks to create a community of scholarship and learning which facilitates social justice.
- A church related institution includes in its faculty, administrative officers, and board of trustees persons who understand and respect the relationship with The United Methodist Church.

In addition to an institutional response to the above-mentioned “marks of church relationship,” the following questions will be used in guiding the assessment of church relatedness and may be supplemented with additional inquiries by the committee:

1. Does the institution identify itself as United Methodist-related in its charter, by-laws, catalog, Web sites, admissions materials, and other published documents? If not, why not?
2. What is the evidence that the purported church relationship exists? How is church relatedness reflected in the life of the institution (curriculum, student life, and research)?
3. What are the perceptions of the bishop, the chair of the annual conference Board of Higher Education and Campus Ministry, and other appropriate officials of the church toward the college?

4. What is the extent of the religious life program and how is it staffed?
5. How is church relatedness reflected in the processes of governance?
6. Are persons who understand and respect the relationship with The United Methodist Church included on the faculty, administrative staff, and the board of trustees?

Section VI

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR UNIVERSITY SENATE ACTIONS

Procedures for Processing Senate Actions

Under normal circumstances, the process for listing an institution on public warning is outlined below. However, under certain circumstances (e.g. sufficient financial or enrollment concerns), the Senate may place an institution on public warning without an interview and prior to a campus site visit, with the institution invited for an interview to the first Senate meeting following the visit.

Provided sufficient time exists for the review committee to prepare the report, the appropriate commission, at the next meeting after the site visit, shall take action on the report presented by the chair of the review committee (or a member of the committee designated by the chair). If the review committee's recommendation to the commission is to be approval for listing with public warning or not approved for listing, the executive secretary of the Senate shall notify the institution of the gravity of the circumstances, delineating the issues precipitating the action. If there is adequate time between the submission of the review committee's report and the next scheduled Senate meeting, the institution shall be given the opportunity to respond to the commission in writing and the chief executive officer, the chair of the board of trustees, and the resident bishop of the episcopal area, or their designees, shall be invited for personal appearances and discussions before the appropriate commission prior to the presentation of the commission's recommendation to the full Senate. If there is not adequate time for a written response or to schedule personal appearances before the commission or if the commission makes a decision at the time of its meeting to recommend approval with listing with public warning or not approved for listing which was not recommended by the review committee, the commission shall not submit its recommendation to the full Senate at that meeting. Under these circumstances, the institution shall be given the opportunity to respond to the appropriate commission in writing, and the chief executive officer, the chair of the board of trustees, and the resident bishop of the episcopal area, or their designees shall be invited for personal appearances and discussions before the appropriate commission prior to the presentation of the commission's recommendation to the Senate. Any written response from the chief executive officer and/or the chair of the board of trustees and/or the resident bishop shall become a part of

the commission's report to the Senate. The appropriate commission shall recommend to the Senate one of the following: approval, approval for listing with monitoring, approval for listing with alert (not public), approval for listing with public warning, or not approved for listing (public).

During any review of institutional reports by commissions or the University Senate, any representatives of the institution under review shall absent themselves while the report is presented, discussed, and acted upon, unless they have been invited to be present. In such a case, they shall make a statement and answer questions and then be asked to leave during the discussion and vote. It is the policy of the University Senate and its commissions to conduct discussions and to make decisions regarding affiliation status in executive session.

The University Senate reserves the right to direct any document of the review committee to the chair of the board of trustees, the resident bishop, and to other members of the board of trustees to whom the findings and recommendations are deemed by the University Senate to be appropriate. In addition, the University Senate may request that the president of the University Senate, or one designated by the president, present the findings of the review committee directly to the board of trustees.

The University Senate shall announce decisions to list affiliated or approved institutions to the press. Only the president or executive secretary of the University Senate is authorized to speak for the Senate or communicate University Senate actions.

Only the University Senate shall announce decisions to approve for listing, approve for listing with public warning, or not approved for listing to the press. However, public announcements by the University Senate may be delayed following Senate action to provide ample opportunity for the institutions to inform their immediate constituents prior to public release. "Public release" is defined as publication in an official publication of The United Methodist Church. However, media outlets can and often do pick up items from these sources.

Procedure for Complaints about Institutional Policies/Procedures

The Book of Discipline mandates that the University Senate "provide an effective review process" of all institutions related to The United Methodist Church (§1415.3). Complaints related to individual institutions shall be directed first to the president of the institution. If not resolved, complaints or documented concerns may then be directed to the associate general secretary of the Division of Higher Education in the case of schools, colleges, and universities or the associate general secretary of the Division of Ordained Ministry in the case of seminaries for referral to the appropriate judicatory.

If an individual or group, including church agencies, has a legitimate, documented concern or complaint regarding educational institutions in general, the complaint and documentation shall be forwarded to the executive secretary of the University Senate.

A final appeal may be directed to the University Senate. Only the University Senate has the official authority to approve or to disapprove an educational institution's relationship to the church at all levels.

Procedure for Reconsideration of a Senate Decision

At the beginning of each quadrennium, the president of the University Senate shall appoint a committee to hear requests for reconsideration of a decision made by the Senate. The Reconsideration Committee shall be chaired by the secretary of the Senate and shall include four other members of the Senate representing each of the commissions.

If the University Senate reaches a negative decision, and the institution believes the decision was based on erroneous information or the misapplication of the Senate's policies, procedures, and guidelines for review of institutions related to The United Methodist Church, the institution will have ninety (90) days from receipt of the Senate decision in which to submit a formal, written request for reconsideration to the executive secretary of the University Senate. This request should contain a clear statement of the reasons for the request for reconsideration and appropriate supporting documents.

The request for reconsideration will be reviewed by the Reconsideration Committee prior to the next Senate meeting. If the request is judged to be without merit, the Reconsideration Committee shall deny the request, inform the institution through the executive secretary of the Senate, and submit a report to the full Senate defining the reasons for the denial of the request. There is no further appeal for a denial to hear a request for reconsideration by the Reconsideration Committee.

If the request for reconsideration is judged to have merit, the request for reconsideration shall be heard by the Reconsideration Committee, ordinarily at the time and site of the next regular meeting of the Senate. At the time of this hearing by the Reconsideration Committee, the institution may have its case presented by no more than three representatives—the chief executive officer, the chair of the board of trustees, and/or another person who shall be a member of a constituency related to the institution. Legal counsel shall not be permitted in any of the proceedings.

Upon completion of the hearing, the Reconsideration Committee shall present its recommendation to the University Senate, which shall act on the recommendation. The institution will be notified of the decision of the Senate by the executive secretary of the Senate. The Senate's action shall be final.

APPENDIX A

WORKING RULES OF THE COMMISSION ON THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

The University Senate is charged to “prepare annually a list of approved schools, colleges, universities, and graduate theological seminaries for use by annual conference boards of ordained ministry in determining candidate educational eligibility for admission into full connection.” (*The Book of Discipline* 2016, ¶1417.2)

In addition to the review of United Methodist-related schools of theology, the Commission on Theological Education implements the University Senate policy regarding the identification, invitation, and review of non-United Methodist schools of theology listed to educate candidates for ordained ministry. Specific criteria for evaluating United Methodist and non-United Methodist schools of theology are found in Appendix B.

General Guidelines

1. The policies and procedures of the Commission on Theological Education shall be communicated routinely to the Boards of Ordained Ministry throughout the denomination. These boards are in turn responsible for informing the students under their care of these policies and procedures.
2. Three categories shall be employed by the commission to describe the status of United Methodist and non-United Methodist schools of theology approved to educate clergy in The United Methodist Church:
 - a. Approved for Listing for the preparation of candidates for ordination in The United Methodist Church
 - (1) Without qualification (public information)
 - (2) With monitoring (not public information)
 - (3) With alert (not public information)
 - b. Approved for Listing with Public Warning (public information)
 - c. Not Approved for Listing (public information)
3. Schools of theology being invited for consideration will be expected to provide a plan for the development of opportunities for United Methodist students to grow in their own tradition (see Appendix B). Realizing that it will require time for this plan to be implemented, the commission will review the school at the end of the first quadrennium based on their implementation of the plan.
4. Since the task of the commission is to review the whole system of theological education to fulfill the mission of

the church, there is no appeal process during the identification and invitation stage.

Academic Credit and Approval

1. Academic credit earned at schools approved by the University Senate for the preparation of candidates for ordination in The United Methodist Church is recommended without prejudice to the annual conference Boards of Ordained Ministry (who bear final responsibility for determining the ministerial status of these students), provided the work yielding the academic credit is completed during an academic year in which the school was approved by the University Senate.
2. Academic credit which has been earned at schools not approved by the University Senate is not recommended to annual conference Boards of Ordained Ministry.
3. Academic credit earned at schools with conditional approval by the University Senate is recommended without prejudice to the annual conference Boards of Ordained Ministry, provided the work leading to the credit was completed during an academic year in which the school enjoyed conditional approval.
4. If a school is removed from the list of schools approved by the University Senate, a student enrolled in and attending such a school shall be permitted to continue his or her studies moving toward graduation from said school, but shall be encouraged to enroll at an approved school in pursuit of a theological degree. This provision is intended to protect only those students who enter an approved school and continue attending the school when it subsequently loses approved status during the time of uninterrupted attendance, normally not to exceed five years.
5. Academic credit earned at schools prior to the date of approval is not recommended by the University Senate to annual conference Boards of Ordained Ministry. Approval or conditional approval of a school is not retroactive, except when the University Senate takes action in response to the appeal of a school of theology or an annual conference Board of Ordained Ministry. The action must specify the academic years during which academic credit earned at the school is approved.
6. All schools approved by the commission for the preparation of candidates for ordination are to maintain close ties and to conduct continuing conversations with the bishops, conferences, and agencies of The United Methodist Church in their geographic areas.

Procedure for Review of Non-United Methodist Schools of Theology

1. The commission, through the Division of Ordained Ministry, shall provide the school with the necessary forms and timeline for review. All non-United Methodist schools of theology listed as approved for the preparation of candidates for ordination in The United Methodist Church shall be reviewed on a quadrennial basis. The commission shall initiate this review on behalf of the University Senate by notifying the school and sending the necessary forms and

information. A school removed from the approved list may request reconsideration as outlined in Section VI, “Procedure for Reconsideration of a Senate Decision.”

2. The Board of Ordained Ministry and the presiding bishop of the episcopal area in which a school is located shall be invited to submit a letter commenting on the school relative to the commission's criteria. The invitation is to be made at the time the commission initially notifies the school to be reviewed.

3. The review of the school shall be based primarily on materials submitted by the institution. The commission shall also take into consideration information provided by the bishop and the Board of Ordained Ministry.

4. In rare instances, the commission will send a visiting team or invite the school to send a representative to meet with the commission. The team shall be appointed by the chairperson of the commission and shall include at least one team member who is directly involved in theological education. The visit or meeting with a representative of the school shall be designed to address the specific nature of the commission's concerns.

5. Materials presented to the commission by the school shall not be shared with other schools or with the public. The information provided and deliberations regarding this information will be held in confidence by the commission and the University Senate.

6. The school shall be notified immediately concerning the University Senate's decision. Bishops and Boards of Ordained Ministry shall be notified within thirty (30) days after the final action of the University Senate has been conveyed to the school.

7. Certification of approved extension centers requires independent recommendation of the commission. The commission recommends approval for extension centers for Master of Divinity degree work when those centers are consistent with the broader institutional mission and offer educational resources and communal settings of comparable quality to the main campus. Educational resources must include:

- a. courses, 75 percent of which are taught by the school's regular faculty;
- b. adequate and accessible library resources;
- c. classes that have at least 75 percent M.Div. degree candidates; schools with fewer than 75 percent M.Div. degree candidates in these courses must demonstrate that the intent of instruction is consistent with the goal of preparation for ordained ministry;
- d. physical facilities conducive to learning and community building;
- e. a community of students and faculty large enough and consistent enough to provide community building,

dialogue, and interaction that helps in the deepening and integration of the learning process. The community should also provide opportunities for common worship and spiritual formation. The center must provide a United Methodist ethos to assist in forming United Methodist students in their tradition. The center must also meet the standards of inclusiveness of gender and ethnicity and stress the Social Principles required of all the approved seminaries.

Students may complete no more than 50 percent of their M.Div. program at an approved extension center. All extension center courses shall be clearly noted on the student's transcript. The same admissions requirements and procedures operating on the main campus, or alternatives demonstrably commensurate, shall be used.

8. The only distance education courses allowed to count toward a degree for a candidate seeking ordination in The United Methodist Church shall be offered by one of the 13 official United Methodist schools of theology and Asbury Theological Seminary. All United Methodist schools of theology and Asbury Theological Seminary are allowed to offer two-thirds of the Master of Divinity degree as distance education (as defined by ATS Standard ES.4), with one-third of the degree required to be campus-based (as defined by ATS Standard ES.2).

The following definitions and standards for on-line, hybrid, and blended courses are set by the Association of Theological Schools (ATS), which is the accrediting agency for seminaries and schools of theology, and the policies of the University Senate are the same as the ATS policies regarding on-line, hybrid, and blended courses. Of course, *The Book of Discipline* 2016 states that “the requirements set forth herein are minimum requirements only” (§1369.3), and Boards of Ordained Ministry may set more restrictive requirements, if desired.

The policies of the Association of Theological Schools state the following:

The credits awarded for a hybrid or blended distance education course will count toward residency for those degrees that require residential instruction only if the majority of instructor-directed learning occurs in situations where both faculty and students are in person on the school's main campus or at an extension approved for the school to offer the full degree. (ES.4.2.19)

The above policy clarifies the definition of “hybrid or blended” courses as distinct from “on-line” courses. If more than 50% of class time is in a setting where faculty and students are in person on the school's main campus or approved extension site, these courses, which may have some on-line components, are defined as “hybrid or blended.” Thus, “on-line” courses are ones where less than 50% of course time is in a setting where faculty and students are together in person on the school's main campus or approved extension site.

Another relevant ATS policy states the following:

Because MDiv education expects regular and substantive student-faculty interaction to achieve the stipulated learning outcomes, this interaction requires that at least one year of full-time academic study or its equivalent shall

be completed at the main campus of the school awarding the degree or at an extension site of the institution that has been approved for MDiv degree-granting status. An exception may be granted if a school can demonstrate how its educational design and delivery system accomplishes the learning outcomes associated with residential theological study. (A.3.1.3)

The above policy means that at least 1/3 of an MDiv degree shall be completed on campus and 2/3 may be completed “on-line.” With the definitions stated above, an “on campus” course may be “hybrid or blended” (more than 50% of course time with faculty and students together on the main campus or approved extension site), and an “on-line” course would have less than 50% time with faculty and students together on the main campus or approved extension site.

To further clarify, the above referenced passages from the ATS Standards are quoted below:

Distance education is a mode of education in which a course is offered without students and instructors being in the same location. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous and employs the use of technology. Distance education courses may consist of exclusively online or other technologically assisted instruction or a blend of intensive classroom and online instruction. In all cases, distance education courses shall ensure regular and substantive interaction of faculty and students. (ES.4.1)

Campus-based education involves classroom-based learning and a range of opportunities for student-faculty interaction among students. While it may take different forms and reflect different educational qualities, campus-based education is a model of theological education that typically includes the presence of faculty, students, administrative-support services, and library and information resources in a common location. It provides in-person classroom teaching and learning and opportunities for corporate worship, informal interaction, and other activities that support or enhance students’ educational experiences. (ES.2)

Annual Conference Boards of Ordained Ministry and schools of theology will have to work together to verify that students are complying with these policies within their MDiv degree programs for ordination in The United Methodist Church.

9. A school of theology has a maximum of four years to secure the unqualified approval of the University Senate.

Approved Undergraduate Institutions

A bachelor’s degree or its equivalent from any regionally accredited college or university will meet The Book of Discipline’s undergraduate requirement for the preparation and education of candidates for ordained ministry.

APPENDIX B

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING UNITED METHODIST AND NON-UNITED METHODIST SCHOOLS OF THEOLOGY

The Commission on Theological Education implements the University Senate policy regarding the identification, invitation, and review of United Methodist and non-United Methodist schools of theology desiring to educate and train candidates for ordained ministry. Non-United Methodist schools are reviewed and approved by the Senate to provide additional opportunities for training United Methodist clergy in order to fulfill the mission of The United Methodist Church. Effective January 2011, few, if any, additional schools of theology will be invited to join the list of non-United Methodist schools approved for the education of those seeking ordination in The United Methodist Church.

In reviewing individual schools, due consideration will be given to the availability of theological education through United Methodist schools of theology and other approved schools in the region in order to provide for the appropriate preparation of United Methodist students for fulfilling the mission of The United Methodist Church. Preference for approval of non-United Methodist schools will be given to schools of other denominations having ecumenical agreements with The United Methodist Church.

The review of seminaries and schools of theology will employ the following criteria:

- Compatibility with the document “A Wesleyan Vision for Theological Education and Leadership Formation for the 21st Century”
- Freedom of Academic Inquiry
- Opportunity for Growth in the United Methodist Tradition
- Compatibility with The Social Principles of The United Methodist Church
- Racial and Gender Inclusiveness of Faculty, Staff and Student Body
- Academic Quality

Compatibility with the Document “A Wesleyan Vision for Theological Education and Leadership Formation for the 21st Century”

The commission, in its responsibility for the provision of theological education by the General Church, is guided by the document “A Wesleyan Vision for Theological Education and Leadership Formation for the 21st Century.” Approved schools of theology should be able to respond appropriately to the challenges, opportunities and agenda

items expressed in this document. Schools should:

1. Be able to provide formation for sustained, faithful and effective pastoral excellence;
2. Prepare leaders who are people of grace and who are challenged to live as faithful disciples;
3. Provide resources for the teaching ministry of the church both in theological discourse and in the work of catechesis for the larger church;
4. Provide continuing resources for lifelong learning for laity and clergy;
5. Demonstrate a commitment to and presence with the poor;
6. Show an ability to celebrate and honor the multiethnic, intercultural, and interfaith manifestations of a Wesleyan ethos.

Freedom of Academic Inquiry

An uninhibited opportunity to address openly and seriously theological issues being addressed in United Methodist and non-United Methodist schools of theology requires that freedom of academic inquiry be guaranteed for faculty and students. A non-United Methodist school has the right to require allegiance to principles and doctrinal or confessional affirmations which are integral or indispensable parts of its institutional life. However, the school must demonstrate that such requirements neither inhibit nor abrogate free inquiry for faculty and students and are compatible with United Methodist traditions.

Opportunity for Growth in the United Methodist Tradition

Opportunity for growth in the United Methodist tradition requires:

1. Exposure to contemporary expressions of that tradition. The United Methodist Church is theologically diverse. There is an expectation that United Methodist seminarians will be exposed to a variety of theological positions current within Methodism.
2. Effective annual instruction in the history, doctrine, and polity of The United Methodist Church, and in evangelism. The Division of Ordained Ministry provides schools with guidance for constructing courses appropriate to this goal. Such study is a minimal requirement in order to insure that the seminarians will increase in their knowledge of the church in which they will serve.
3. Careful study of the life and thought of those contributing to that tradition. It is expected that the ecumenical experience gained by United Methodist seminarians through their study in a non-United Methodist school shall be supplemented by significant opportunities to study in depth the works of Methodist theologians.

4. Active participation in the life of The United Methodist Church. Seminarians must incorporate field learning in a United Methodist congregation into their study programs. They must also have the opportunity to participate regularly in the worship life of The United Methodist Church. Regular services of worship with United Methodist hymnody and liturgy should be available in the seminary chapel program.
5. Encounters with ministerial leadership consistent with the United Methodist tradition. Seminarians preparing for leadership in the church need opportunities to know mentors who demonstrate the commitments of The United Methodist Church, its connectional nature, its distinctive piety, its Social Principles, and its methods and materials for Christian education.
6. A community of inquiry and formation. The commission shall assess a school's ability to provide United Methodist students with an opportunity for growth in the United Methodist tradition. This shall include discussion and mutual inquiry into United Methodist history and theology. To nurture such a tradition, there must be a critical mass of persons who claim the tradition and an environment in which such an ethos can flourish. Schools and approved extension centers must demonstrate that adequate faculty guidance, financial support, and library resources are available for United Methodist students. Schools participating in a cluster or consortium must demonstrate their intentional effort to meet the needs of United Methodist students for exposure to and nurture in the United Methodist tradition. Reliance upon other schools within the consortium to provide for the United Methodist students is not sufficient for approval by the commission.

Compatibility with the Social Principles of The United Methodist Church

The United Methodist Church seeks to be responsive to the needs of people, the demands of justice, the challenges of love, and the obligations of power and influence. These responsibilities are set forth in its historic Social Principles.

Racial and Gender Inclusiveness of Faculty, Staff, and Student Body

The United Methodist Church is committed to affirmative actions and initiatives promoting justice and equality among all people regardless of race, gender, or national origin. It is committed to an ecumenical and inclusive community of faith which seeks and welcomes without reservation persons of every race, both male and female. This inclusiveness should be reflected in its faculty, administration and student body.

Academic Quality

As part of its responsibility, the Commission on Theological Education considers the accreditation status and the overall academic quality of schools seeking University Senate approval to educate United Methodist ministers. In so doing, the commission evaluates:

1. Quality of the faculty, including the number of faculty with terminal degrees;

2. Scholarly activity, including publications, of faculty;
3. Curriculum and academic resources;
4. Evidence of exposure to a variety of theological positions represented within United Methodism;
5. Academic quality of the entering student class.

Other Considerations

1. All official transcripts of University Senate approved schools shall identify the courses that are taken as distance education (as defined by ATS Standard ES.4).
2. Every academic year, all schools shall offer courses in United Methodist history, doctrine, and polity certified by the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry (as provided in *The Book of Discipline 2016*, ¶1421.3b). To fulfill this requirement, a school may choose one of two options. The first option is that a school may employ on a long-term contract at least one full-time UMC faculty member (a) whose specialization and Ph.D. or Th.D. degree are in UMC history, doctrine, or a related field (e.g., systematic theology, church history, or historical theology) and (b) who teaches courses in these fields. The second option is that a school may partner with a United Methodist school of theology to offer the required courses in history, doctrine, and polity. This partnership is understood to be a working relationship between the administration and faculty of the two schools of theology expressed in a Memorandum of Understanding.

APPENDIX C

FORMAT FOR INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW REPORTS - TITLE PAGE

REPORT OF THE REVIEW OF NAME OF INSTITUTION

City, State

Month, Date, Year

for the University Senate

of

The United Methodist Church

REVIEW COMMITTEE

Name of Chair, Position

Name, Position

Name, Position

APPENDIX C (Con't)

FORMAT FOR BODY OF REPORT

NAME OF INSTITUTION

City, State

Institutional Integrity

ISSUES TO BE REVIEWED (Refer to Section V, Assessment Criteria):

Program Structure and Quality

ISSUES TO BE REVIEWED (Refer to Section V, Assessment Criteria):

Sound Management

Financial Health and Administrative Effectiveness

ISSUES TO BE REVIEWED (Refer to Section V, Assessment Criteria):

Church Relatedness

ISSUES TO BE REVIEWED (Refer to Section V, Assessment Criteria):

Visiting Committee Recommendation to the Senate (with specifics):

This statement should be included in the report following the recommendation:

The visiting committee reports only to the University Senate. Therefore, this recommendation is to be presented to the University Senate through one of its Commissions. This process may modify the visiting committee's recommendation.

The work of review committees is confidential. Their findings of fact, however, are shared with institutional representatives as a part of the exit inter-view and should clearly specify any problems or concerns discovered during the visit. The recommendations of the review committee are addressed only to the University Senate but should be included in the written report of findings shared with the institution following the visit.

The entire report is normally 5 to 7 pages in length.

APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONAL FISCAL AND RELEVANT DATA

Institutions recognized by the University Senate as affiliated with The United Methodist Church must submit to the Executive Secretary of the Senate by December 1 each year the financial data listed below taken directly from their most recent financial audit. A copy of the audit and management letter may be requested from the institution for supporting documentation.

- Unrestricted net assets (operations results)**
- Unrestricted net assets less plant**
- Temporarily restricted net assets**
- Permanently restricted net assets**
- Total net assets**
- Net tuition revenue**
- Total liabilities**
- Cash flow from operations**
- Fulltime Equivalent Enrollment as defined by and reported to the United States Office of Education**

APPENDIX E

ROLE OF STAFF

GBHEM staff members provide administrative support to the University Senate. The General Secretary and the Associate General Secretaries in the Division of Higher Education and the Division of Ordained Ministry are *ex officio* members of the Senate with voice but not vote. The Associate General Secretary in the Division of Higher Education serves as the Executive Secretary of the Senate. Other staff members also support the work of the Senate. They might also, at the discretion of the Executive Secretary, accompany or serve as members of visiting committees.

Staff members play an active role in preserving the integrity of the process, in interpreting the Guidelines and their application in particular situations, and in promoting consistency in visiting committee and Senate actions and decisions. They are expected to advise and inform the Senate and its committees on matters relative to institutions or to Senate processes either at their own initiative or at the request of Senate members. Particularly germane are historical information on similarly situated institutions and procedural and substantive advice on how the policies and Guidelines have been interpreted and/or could be applied to an institution's case, including possible action and follow-up.

Such advice and information do not supplant the peer review process; rather, they provide additional insight in reaching informed judgments. In all cases, Senators, committee members, and staff members must take care that staff opinions do not overly influence decisions which must remain in the exclusive purview of Senators.

APPENDIX F

SPECIAL VISITS

Included among the purposes and objectives assigned to the University Senate by the *Book of Discipline* are:

- To support the development of United Methodist-related educational institutions (§ 1415.2), and
- To provide an effective review process for schools listed by the University Senate (§ 1415.3).

One of the ways in which the University Senate may accomplish these tasks is by designating a Special Visit to an institution. The former function may be accomplished through the use of a Special Consultation Visit. The latter may be accomplished through a Special Review Visit. Neither of these types of visits will replace the University Senate's regular (normally decennial) review of the institution.

Special Consultation Visit

The Senate, in concert with the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, shall provide institutions with technical assistance and consultative services whenever practical. (Guidelines, p.9, *Book of Discipline*, § 1418.1).

A Special Consultation Visit may be requested by the chief executive officer of the institution. The GBHEM will assess whether or not the visit can and should be conducted and will work with the institution to establish the purpose and purview of the visit. Such a visit will normally be chaired by a senator. At the conclusion of a Special Consultation Visit, the visiting committee's report will be provided to the institution and to the Senate for review. Normally, the cost of the visit will be processed in the same manner as regular institutional reviews.

Special Review Visit

The executive secretary or the president of the University Senate may authorize a Special Review Visit when reports from the institution, media, or other sources indicate potential issues in institutional integrity, educational programs, management, finance, or church relatedness, or if the University Senate needs information that cannot be sufficiently obtained through an off-site review in order "to provide an effective review process."

Such a visit will normally be chaired by a senator. At the conclusion of a Special Review visit, the visiting committee's report will be provided to the institution and to the Senate, which may take appropriate action based on the report of the visiting committee. Normally, the cost of the visit will be processed in the same manner as regular institutional reviews.

APPENDIX G

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

It is recognized that United Methodist related higher education and theological education are small worlds in which many institutional personnel know each other and, in fact, might be close colleagues or former colleagues. The University Senate does its work in the context of collegiality. For that reason, observing commonly accepted conflict of interest rules might be very difficult in some cases. Nevertheless, Senators and staff members should be conscious of the possibility of conflict of interest and act with propriety.

The Senate relies on the personal integrity of its members and staff members to be sensitive to these issues, to make individual judgments in order to avoid even potential appearances of conflict of interest, and to recuse themselves from participation on visiting committees or in Senate discussions or votes when this could be the case. Employees of institutions being discussed or voted upon should leave the room during the discussion and vote.

Some basic considerations and guidelines might be helpful when making these decisions. A Senator or staff member should make full disclosure and consider leaving the room during the discussion and vote when he or she:

1. Has a degree from the institution at issue.
2. Is currently or has been within the last ten years a compensated consultant, an employee or appointee (e.g., a board member) of the institution, or recently has been a candidate for employment at the institution.
3. Has a close personal or familial relationship with persons at the institution or a strong bias regarding the institution.
4. Is a member of an association or professional activity that an impartial person might reasonably conclude would compromise the capacity to deal objectively with issues concerning the institution. An obvious exception might be AUMTS, in which case the Senator would need to make a conscientious judgment regarding his or her objectivity, and the principle of full disclosure would apply.
5. Has any other relationship which would serve as an impediment to rendering an impartial, objective professional judgment regarding the institution.

These situations might normally but not necessarily lead to recusals, depending on the circumstances. The key principle is full disclosure and transparency so that the body can make an informed judgment when appropriate and so that these relationships can be officially recorded.

NOTES