

**Mid-Point Peer Review**

**Confidential Brief**

**Institution:** *Click or tap here to enter text.*

**Date:** Click or tap to enter a date.

Lead Evaluator: *Click or tap here to enter text.*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Section A: Responses to Recommendations*** |

1. Summary of the overall progress made on recommendations.
2. The peer evaluators found that the institution should continue responding to the following *recommendations*:
3. The peer evaluators found that the institution should also submit responses to the following *new recommendations:*

|  |
| --- |
| ***Section B: Student Achievement Indicators*** |

The peer evaluators found that the overall level concern for trends in student achievement indicators is:

No/minimal concern

Moderate concern

Serious concern

If the peer evaluators modify their level of concern based on contextual information provided by the institution, please provide a brief explanation:

After reviewing the institution’s student achievement data and accessing its student achievement webpage, did the peer evaluators have any concerns regarding the following?

The institution’s student achievement webpage being operational

Validity or accuracy of student achievement data

|  |
| --- |
| ***Section C: Viability and Capacity Indicators*** |

The peer evaluators found that the overall level concern for trends in viability and capacity indicators is:

No/minimal concern

Moderate concern

Serious concern

If the peer evaluators modify their level of concern based on contextual information provided by the institution, please provide a brief explanation:

|  |
| --- |
| ***Section D: Financial Health Indicators*** |

The peer evaluators found that the overall level concern for trends in financial health indicators is:

No/minimal concern

Moderate concern

Serious concern

If the peer evaluators modify their level of concern based on contextual information provided by the institution, please provide a brief explanation:

|  |
| --- |
| ***Section E: Review of the Institutional Response*** |

Review of the institutional response does not lead the peer evaluators to modify any of their conclusions.

Review of the institutional response leads the peer evaluators to modify their conclusions.

Please provide brief explanation:

|  |
| --- |
| ***Section F: Proposal to Inform Commission Action*** |

*Indicate the evaluators’ proposal to inform Commission action:*

The peer evaluators found the institution’s performance on key indicators to show no or minimal concerns related to the institution’s ability to continue to meet the Commission’s standards for accreditation, requirements of affiliation, policies and procedures, and federal compliance requirements. The peer evaluators have also reviewed the institution’s responses to recommendations and have confirmed that the institution is making appropriate progress in those areas. No further evidence is required at this time

The institution should provide further evidence relating to the following recommendations: (Indicate any recommendations given for any section of the MPPR Evaluator Report.)

policies, processes and programs to admit, retain and facilitate the success of **all** students. (Standard IV)

processes designed to enhance the successful achievement of students’ educational goals. (Standard IV)

improvement of key indicators of student success, including retention and graduation rates. (Standard IV)

published information regarding student achievement, including student outcome measures. (Standard IV, MSCHE Policy on Published Information)

adequate fiscal and human resources, including physical and technical infrastructure, to support operations. (Standard VI)

comprehensive planning for facilities, infrastructure and technology linked to the sustainability of the planning process. (Standard VI)

an annual independent audit confirming financial viability with evidence of follow-up on any cited concerns. (Standard VI)

demonstrated strategies to measure and assess the adequacy of institutional resources to support mission and goals. (Standard VI)

improved financial viability and sustainability. (Standard VI)

enrollment management planning linked to budget development. (Standard VI)

demonstrated capacity to support enrollment increases. (Standard VI)

strategies to address enrollment decline. (Standard VI)

sufficient resources to improve student achievement measures. (Standard VI)

The institution should provide responses to the recommendations in the **next self-study**.

The institution should provide **responses in conjunction with each Annual Institutional Update until its next self-study.**

The institution should provide responses in **a focused report and host a** **focused team visit**: