**Applicant Assessment Team Visit**

**TEMPLATE**

**Team Chair’s Confidential Brief**

*Effective Date: January 1, 2021*

**NAME OF INSTITUTION**

**Applicant Assessment 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

1. **Institutional Overview**

Provide a brief overview of the institution, including information that can help the Commission understand its role within the context of higher education, such as the institution’s history and mission, and distinctive aspects about the institution’s program offerings.

1. **Recognition of Accomplishments, Progress, or Exemplary Practices**

Where appropriate, also include recognition of accomplishments, progress, or exemplary or innovative practices from Section D of the Team Report.

1. **Site Visits**

Provide a list of all locations including the name and address of the site, date visited, type of location (branch campus (BC), additional location (AL), other instructional site (OIS), and the individual(s) who visited it. Insert rows as necessary.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Location Name and Address** | **Date of Visit** | **Type of Location**  **(BC) (AL) (OIS)** | **Individual Visiting** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

*\*In conjunction with an applicant assessment team visit, all locations must be visited by the Team Chair or a designated member of the team to establish them within the institution’s scope of accreditation.*

# 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 which are not met and the requirements issued in the Team Report.*

*If the review of requirements 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 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. **Review of Student Achievement and Verification of Institutional Data**

Indicate whether the team was able to confirm that the institution’s approach to realizing its student achievement goals is effective, consonant with higher education expectations, and consistent with the institution’s mission.

Yes  No

*If not, note the concern(s).*

Indicate whether the team was able to confirm that data and other information provided by the institution are reasonably valid and conform to higher education expectations.

Yes  No

*If not, note the concern(s).*

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 two 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 grant Candidate for Accreditation status and invite the institution to initiate the self-study evaluation.*

*The following is optional under #1*:

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

2. 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 and included *requirements* in the Team Report. *The team recommends that the Commission deny Candidate for Accreditation status.*

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