

Template for the PRR Reviewers' Report
(from pages 12 and 13 of the MSCHE *Handbook for Periodic Review Reports*, 12th Edition, 2011)

Throughout the report and in summary at its conclusion, the reviewers should provide suggestions, recommendations, and requirements, as appropriate.

Suggestions express collegial advice for institutional consideration and may be included, based on accreditation standards, the reviewers' professional experiences, or the Commission's non-binding suggestions in its various published guidelines which have been developed with peer input. Suggestions should be integrated at appropriate points within the preceding text of the report.

Recommendations, distinct from suggestions, are reserved for aspects of an institution where, in the reviewers' judgment, improvement is advised in order to continue to meet the Requirements of Affiliation or accreditation standards in [*Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*](#). These recommendations should be based on the reviewers' explicit findings of fact and should reference the appropriate requirement or standard.

Requirements indicate that the institution does not comply with one or more Requirements of Affiliation or accreditation standards in [*Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*](#). The reviewers should state specifically in what ways the institution fails to meet a requirement or standard and, when appropriate, the reviewers should specify particular steps that should be taken in order to meet those requirements or standards.

Suggestions and **recommendations** are consistent with reaffirmation of accreditation. A **requirement** necessitates the Commission placing the institution on warning, probation, or show cause. See Figure 4 of the Handbook, "Summary of Actions PRR Reviewers May Take or Recommend to the Commission." Also, see the section on "Submitting the Reviewers' Report and the Confidential Brief."

Note that the recommendation regarding accreditation action that the reviewers will make to the Commission, including any requests for specific follow-up activities, should **not** be included in this report or otherwise communicated to the institution. Instead, it should be submitted to the Commission in the reviewers' Confidential Brief.

The reviewers' report usually follows the order of the PRR being reviewed:

I. Introduction

The reviewers should provide general comments on the adequacy and usefulness of the Periodic Review Report, including commendations to the institution for the quality of the PRR process and/or the report, and/or for progress to date.

II. Responses to Recommendations from the Previous Decennial Evaluation

The reviewers should evaluate the adequacy and appropriateness of the institution's responses to any recommendations made in its own self-study and in the visiting team's report from the previous decennial evaluation, which have not been addressed in previous progress reports or monitoring reports to the Commission. An institution need not accept all of the team's recommendations, but the PRR should reflect careful consideration of the recommendations and should provide a rationale for not accepting a team recommendation. Suggestions made by the team but not explicitly labeled as recommendations need not be addressed in the PRR.

III. Major Challenges and/or Opportunities

The reviewers should evaluate the analysis in the PRR of the institution's major challenges and/or opportunities, and comment on any impact those challenges and opportunities may have on the institution's continuing compliance with the Commission's Requirements of Affiliation and accreditation standards.

IV. Enrollment and Finance Trends and Projections

The reviewers should evaluate the information provided in the PRR about the institution's enrollment and finance trends and projections, and comment on any issues related to the institution's continuing compliance with the Commission's Requirements of Affiliation and accreditation standards.

V. Assessment Processes and Plans

Using Standard 7 on Institutional Assessment, Standard 14 on the Assessment of Student Learning, and the fundamental elements related to assessment in the other standards, and consulting the document, *Assessing Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness*, which is in the appendix of the [Handbook for Periodic Review Reports](#), the reviewers should evaluate the current status of the institution's outcomes assessment processes. They should pay particular attention to the institution's assessment of its achievement of its goals at various levels, and to the use of the results of those assessments to improve programs and services and to inform planning and resource allocation.

VI. Linked Institutional Planning and Budgeting Processes

Using Standard 2 on Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal, and other references in the standards to planning, the reviewers should evaluate the linkages between the institution's planning and budgeting processes.

VII. Conclusion

The reviewers should provide a summary of areas of institutional progress or areas of concerns, with particular attention to those with strong relation to the Requirements of Affiliation and accreditation standards. Any recommendations and requirements identified throughout the report may be repeated here.

The recommendation for accreditation action that the reviewers will make to the Commission should **not** be included in the summary of recommendations and requirements.