**Self-Study Evaluation**

**TEMPLATE**

**Team Chair’s Confidential Brief**

*Effective Date: February 1, 2021*

**NAME OF INSTITUTION**

**Self-Study Evaluation 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. **Approach to Self-Study**

This section should also identify the institution’s approach to self-study and the institutional priorities selected for review in the self-study report.

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

1. **Self-Study Site Visits**

Provide a list of all locations visited by the Team Chair or a designated member of the team. Include the name and address of the site, date visited, type of location – branch campus or additional location, and the individual(s) who visited it.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Location Name and Address** | **Date of Visit** | **Type of Location** | **Individual Visiting** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

***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 which are 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(s) of the applicable federal regulatory requirements which are 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) here.*

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) here.*

1. **Third-Party Comments**

Indicate whether the Team received and was able to review any third-party comments.

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

*Note the findings of that review here.*

*If 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 reaffirm accreditation and follow-up reporting is* ***not*** *necessary prior to the institution’s next accreditation activity.*

*The following are optional monitoring activities under #1:*

[ ]  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 appears to comply with all the Commission’s standards for accreditation, requirements of affiliation, policies and procedures, and applicable federal regulatory requirements but the institution should address *recommendations* to demonstrate sustained, ongoing institutional compliance. *The team recommends that the Commission reaffirm accreditation and request a supplemental information report*.

*(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 and procedures, and 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. *The team recommends that the Commission take a non-compliance action and request a monitoring report and follow-up team visit.*

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