

## Guidelines for Completing the Confidential Recommendation Form

The Confidential Recommendation is a non-binding advisory to the Board of Commissioner. It is an important component of the peer-evaluation process that informs Commissioners of the judgments and opinions of the evaluators regarding accreditation actions and future oversight. **The contents of the Confidential Recommendation are not shared publicly or privately, in written or verbal form, with the institution or any of its constituents.** The following is provided to guide completion of the Confidential Recommendation Form.

### 1. Recommended Action

For most evaluations, only one category will apply. For others, such as institutions going to a different degree level, two actions may be marked. For example, if an institution accredited at the associate and baccalaureate degree levels and a candidate at the master's degree level, the evaluator might mark "reaffirmation of accreditation" at the associate and baccalaureate degree levels and "granting of accreditation" at the master's degree level.

### 2. Sanction, if appropriate

The evaluator may, based upon an evaluation of areas within the scope of the evaluation upon which the sanction is based, suggest imposition, continuation, or removal of a sanction. *Warning* is a public sanction that is not subject to appeal. *Probation* and *Show-Cause* are public sanctions that may be appealed by the institution. If the evaluator is changing the level of the sanction, then the old sanction would be removed and the new sanction would be imposed. For example, if elevating a sanction from *Warning* to *Probation*, the evaluator would remove *Warning* and impose *Probation*. If imposing a sanction, note the Eligibility Requirements or Standards that serve as the basis for the sanction.

### 3. Status of Current Areas of Non-Compliance (within the Scope of this Evaluation) Cited Previously:

Some areas within the scope of the evaluation may be areas where the institution is currently out-of-compliance with one or more Eligibility Requirements or Accreditation Standards. In those cases, the evaluator is asked, following an evaluation of those areas, for a determination as to whether those areas continue to be out-of-compliance or whether they are now in compliance with the cited Eligibility Requirements or Accreditation Standards.

### 4. Discernment of Recommendations Originating from Your Evaluation Report:

The evaluator is to provide a determination of compliance or non-compliance for each of the Recommendations resulting from the evaluation. As such, each Recommendation at the end of the peer-evaluation report must be accounted for in this section of the Confidential Recommendation.

### 5. Recommended Follow-Up

Evaluators identify suggested oversight for areas identified in the peer-evaluation report and Recommendations. Areas determined to be out-of-compliance with one or more Eligibility Requirements or Accreditation Standards must be evaluated not later than two (2) years from the season in which the determination was made. That timeline may be extended for areas within the scope of this evaluation determined previously to be out of compliance and determined by the evaluators to be still out-of-compliance. Evaluators may request that non-financial matters may be addressed as addenda to regularly scheduled evaluations. Evaluators may request ad hoc reports (with or without visits) if they determine that the seriousness or urgency of the matter requires another review before the next regularly scheduled evaluation.

Provide a rationale for each of the above on the back side of the Confidential Recommendation Form.