

**Template for the PRR Reviewers' Confidential Brief**  
(from pages 17 and 18 of the MSCHE *Handbook for Periodic Review Reports*, 12<sup>th</sup> Edition, 2011)

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**PRR Reviewers' Brief to the Commission on Higher Education**

Institution Evaluated:

Date of Brief:

First Reviewer:

Second Reviewer:

**I. Summary of Reviewers' Report**

The reviewers should briefly summarize for the Committee on Periodic Review Reports and the Commission their report, incorporating key findings from the finance associate's report, which they received after submitting their own report. They should keep in mind that the members of the PRR Committee will read the executive summary of the PRR, the reviewers' report, and the finance associate's report.

**II. Summary of Reviewers' Recommendations and Requirements**

The reviewers should repeat any recommendations or requirements that they identified in their report. If there are numerous recommendations, they may be summarized here.

**III. Reviewers' Recommendation for Commission Action**

The recommended action should follow the Commission's policy on range of actions, and its wording should follow the Commission's policy on standardized language.

If the reviewers' report includes **commendations** of the institution for (1) progress to date and/or (2) the quality of the PRR process and/or (3) the quality of the PRR, the reviewers should recommend that the Commission commend the institution in one or more of those ways.

If their report contained only **suggestions** or **recommendations**, the reviewers should recommend that the Commission reaffirm the institution's accreditation.

If the reviewers determine that an issue is sufficiently urgent to require that the institution address it prior to the next decennial evaluation (in five years), they may recommend the Commission request a progress report or monitoring report, or direct a visit to the institution. This is consistent with reaffirmation of accreditation.

A **progress report** is appropriate if the Commission needs to be assured that the institution is carrying out activities that were planned or were being implemented at the time the PRR was prepared. The due date for the report may be no later than 24 months from the date of the Commission action, and it normally is October 1, November 1, or April 1.

A **monitoring report** is appropriate if the Commission is concerned about continued institutional compliance with one or more accreditation standards. The due date for the report may be no later than 24 months from the date of the Commission action, and it normally is October 1, November 1, or April 1.

If the reviewers determine that an institution does not comply with one or more accreditation standards, they must issue **requirement(s)** and they must recommend that the Commission take an action other than the reaffirmation of accreditation. These actions include warning, probation, or show cause, in conjunction with a **monitoring report** and a **small team follow-up visit**.