

Summary of Actions a Team May Take or Recommend to the Commission

| Is the institution in compliance with the standards? | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| If the team's <i>confidential</i> answer is: ↓ | Then the team shares the following with the institution in the team report: | | And the team shares the following <i>confidentially</i> with the Commission and <i>only</i> in the Chair's confidential Brief: | |
| | The team <i>must</i> provide this to the institution: | And the team <i>may</i> , at its <i>option</i> , provide this to the institution: | The team <i>must</i> recommend that the Commission take this action: | And the team <i>may</i> , at its <i>option</i> , recommend that the Commission take this action: |
| Yes → | | 1. Discuss significant accomplishments/progress or exemplary/innovative practices; 2. Offer suggestion(s) for institutional improvement and/or make recommendations | To reaffirm accreditation | To commend the institution for progress to date and/or the quality of its self-study process and/or the quality of the self-study |
| Yes, the team is confident of the institution's continuing compliance, but the team wants the institution to focus its attention on improvements in certain areas over the next few years. → | Make Recommendation(s) | 1. Discuss significant accomplishments, significant progress, or exemplary/innovative practices; 2. Offer suggestion(s) for institutional improvement | To reaffirm accreditation and request that the Periodic Review Report, due June 1 [Year], address [specific issues that need attention or emphasis]. | To commend the institution for progress to date and/or the quality of its self-study process and/or the quality of the self-study |
| Yes, but assurance is needed that the institution is carrying out activities planned or being implemented. → | Make Recommendation(s) | 1. Discuss significant accomplishments, significant progress, or exemplary/innovative practices; 2. Offer suggestion(s) for institutional improvement | To reaffirm accreditation and to request a progress report, due by [date*], documenting... | 1. To request that the Periodic Review Report, due June 1 [Year], address [specific issues that need attention or emphasis]. 2. To commend the institution for progress to date and/or the quality of its self-study process and/or the quality of the self-study |
| Yes, but the team has concerns about continued institutional compliance with one or more standards. → | Make Recommendation(s) | 1. Discuss significant accomplishments, significant progress, or exemplary/innovative practices; 2. Offer suggestion(s) for institutional improvement | To reaffirm accreditation and to request a monitoring report(s), due by [date*], documenting... | 1. To request that the Periodic Review Report, due June 1 [Year], address [specific issues that need attention or emphasis]. 2. A visit may/will follow submission of the monitoring report. (Note: This is optional, used if verification of institutional status and progress requires on-site review.) 3. To commend the institution for progress to date and/or the quality of its self-study process and/or the quality of the self-study |
| No, the institution is not in compliance with one or more standards. → | Make Requirement(s) | 1. Discuss significant accomplishments, significant progress, or exemplary/innovative practices; 2. Offer suggestion(s) for institutional improvement 3. Make Recommendation(s) | To warn the institution that its accreditation may be in jeopardy and to request a monitoring report(s), due by [date*], documenting... A visit will follow submission of the monitoring report | To direct a prompt staff visit to discuss Commission expectations. |
| The team does not have sufficient information to determine if the institution is in compliance. → | Identify Areas of Insufficient Information | 1. Discuss significant accomplishments, significant progress, or exemplary/innovative practices; 2. Offer suggestion(s) for institutional improvement 3. Make Recommendation(s) | To postpone a decision on accreditation, and to request a supplemental information report, due by [date*], documenting... | 1. A visit may/will follow submission of the supplemental information report. (Note: This is optional, used if verification of institutional status and progress requires on-site review.) 2. To direct a prompt staff visit to discuss Commission expectations. |

* Dates for progress reports and monitoring reports must be 6-24 months after the Commission's action (6-12 months for two-year institutions), and dates for supplemental information reports must be 1-12 months after the Commission's action. Dates are normally April 1, October 1, or November 1, if no visit follows submission of the report, and March 1, September 1, or October 1 if a visit follows.

Note: Potential Commission actions also include probation, show cause, and removal of accreditation. Because these actions do not ordinarily stem from an evaluation team visit, they are not included in this chart. See the Commission's policy statement, "Range of Commission Actions," for information on these actions.