**Follow-Up Review**

**TEMPLATE**

**Team Chair’s Confidential Brief**

*Effective Date: February 1, 2021*

**NAME OF INSTITUTION**

**Team Visit: *[start date-end date]***

# Section A: Team Members

Name of Team Chair: Click here to enter text.

Names of Team Members: Click here to enter text.

# Section B: Institutional Context

Provide a brief introduction to the institution, including a summary of the nature and conduct of the visit. Include the Commission action that directed this visit.

# Section C: Overview of Findings

1. **Requirements of Affiliation**

Indicate whether the team was able to affirm that the institution appears to meet all requirements of affiliation.

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

*If not, note the specific requirement(s) of affiliation not met and the requirements issued in the Team Report.*

*If the review of requirements of affiliation resulted in recommendation(s), please list each requirement of affiliation and the recommendations listed in the Team Report.*

1. **Standards for Accreditation**

Indicate whether the team was able to affirm that the institution appears to meet each standard for accreditation.

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

*If not, note the specific standards for accreditation not met and the requirements issued in the Team Report.*

*If the review of standards resulted in recommendation(s), please list each standard(s) and the recommendations listed in the Team Report*

1. **Applicable Federal Regulatory Requirements**

Indicate whether the team was able to affirm that the institution appears to be in compliance with applicable federal regulatory requirements.

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

*If not, note the specific area of the applicable federal regulatory requirements not met.*

1. **Third-Party Comments**

Indicate whether the team received and was able to evaluate any third-party comments.

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

Note the findings of that evaluation here.

*If the review of the third-party comments result in a team recommendation or requirement, the team must propose an action in accordance with the Commission’s* [*Accreditation Actions Policy and Procedures*](https://www.msche.org/policies-guidelines/?title-search=accreditation+actions&type=)*.*

# Section D: Proposal to Inform Commission Action

*The Team Chair should select* ***only one*** *of the following three options:*

[ ]  1. The team found that the institution appears to comply with all the Commission’s standards for accreditation, requirements of affiliation, policies and procedures, and applicable federal regulatory requirements. *The team recommends that the Commission acknowledge receipt of the follow-up report and further follow-up reporting is* ***not*** *necessary prior to the institution’s next accreditation activity. This option is not available if the institution is being reaffirmed following a non-compliance action*.

*The following are optional monitoring activities:*

[ ]  Stipulate that the institution address specific recommendations in the next self-study report.

[ ]  Request that the institution provide further evidence in conjunction with each Annual Institutional Update (AIU) until the next MPPR or self-study evaluation, whichever is first. The institution will provide a narrative response each year.

[ ]  2. The team found that the institution has achieved and can sustain compliance with all the Commission’s standards for accreditation, requirements of affiliation, and applicable federal regulatory requirements but the institution should address recommendations identified in Section C to demonstrate sustained, ongoing institutional compliance.

*Indicate one of the following:*

[ ]  Request a supplemental information report demonstrating sustainability of implemented corrective measures and further evidence of sustained, ongoing institutional compliance.

[ ]  A monitoring report is required for an affirming action that follows a non- compliance action. The monitoring report will be followed by a follow-up team visit for reaffirmation after probation or show cause actions. The monitoring report may or may not be followed by a follow-up team visit for reaffirmation after warning actions.

*(Briefly describe the rationale that enabled the team to draw this conclusion below):*

[ ]  3. The team found the institution out of compliance with one or more standards for accreditation, requirements of affiliation, policies or procedures, or applicable federal regulatory requirements, included *requirements* in the Team Report, and identified issues in Section C needing immediate attention in order for the institution to come into compliance.

[ ]  In addition to identifying *requirements* for one or more standards for accreditation, requirements of affiliation, policies and procedures, and applicable federal regulatory requirements, the team also identified *recommendations* for additional standards for accreditation, requirements of affiliation, policies and procedures, or applicable federal regulatory requirements that the institution should remain attentive to and address in the follow-up report.

*(Briefly describe the rationale that enabled the team to draw this conclusion below):*