

Guide for Completing the Confidential Recommendation

This guide is intended to assist evaluators in completing the Confidential Recommendation to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. If, after reading these guidelines, you have questions or special circumstances, please contact the Commission office at 425-558-4224.

General Instructions

- List your overarching Commendations and Recommendations (resp., if any) at the end of your report.
- For tracking purposes, please number each Commendation and Recommendation (resp., if any).
- Commissioners make determinations of non-compliance, so refrain from making statements in the body and Recommendations of the report regarding compliance or non-compliance with accreditation criteria.

1. Recommended Action (Check only one using the following as a guide.)

- Options for Comprehensive, Regular, Focused, and Special evaluations for accredited institutions: 1) reaffirm accreditation; 2) defer action until a future date (see #5); and 3) terminate accreditation. **Note:** if the comprehensive evaluation includes a new degree level(s), the options are: 1) reaffirm, defer action, or terminate accreditation at the existing degree level(s) and grant, defer action, or deny accreditation at the new degree level(s).
- Options for Initial Accreditation comprehensive evaluations: 1) grant initial accreditation; 2) defer action until a future date (see #5); and 3) deny initial accreditation.
- Options for Initial Candidacy comprehensive evaluations: 1) grant initial candidacy; 2) defer action until a future date (see #5); and 3) deny initial candidacy.
- Options for Interim Candidacy, Focused and Special evaluations for candidate institutions: 1) continue candidacy; 2) defer action until a future date (see #5); and 3) withdraw candidacy.

2. Recommended Sanction (Check all that apply.)

- Options for new sanctions: 1) Warning (private); 2) Probation (public); and 3) Show Cause (public).
- Options for existing sanctions: 1) continue the sanction; and 2) remove the sanction.
Note: if moving the institution from one sanction to another, be sure to indicate that one sanction is removed and another sanction is issued.

3. Status of Areas Relevant to this Visit Previously Identified as Areas of Non-compliance.

If your visit included a review of Recommendations previously identified as areas of non-compliance, please account for all such Recommendations by indicating whether they are now substantially in compliance with accreditation criteria or whether they remain out of compliance with accreditation criteria.

4. Discernment of Recommendations Originating from Your Evaluation Report.

Indicate whether Recommendations originating from your report are areas of non-compliance with accreditation criteria or whether they are substantially in compliance with accreditation criteria, but where improvement is needed. Please account for all Recommendations.

5. Recommended Oversight (Complete for all that apply.)

The institution will address all Recommendations from your report at its next comprehensive or regular interim evaluation. At your discretion you may recommend earlier oversight related to one or more of your Recommendations. You may recommend all Recommendations be addressed at one time by either a Progress or Focused Interim report and visit or you may recommend a Progress report on some Recommendations at one point in time and a Focused Interim report and visit on other Recommendations at another point in time. **Note: Recommendations identified in #4 as areas of non-compliance must be the subject of a Progress report or Focused Interim report and visit not later than 18 months from the time of your visit.**

(continued overleaf)

Rationale

While you may feel your rationale is self evident, it is helpful to provide Commissioners with short summary statements that specifically address the topics below.

1. Please provide a succinct rationale for the action recommended overleaf. In essence, why did you come to the conclusion that it is appropriate given your findings?
2. Please provide a succinct rationale regarding Sanctions identified overleaf. Why do you believe the issuance, continuance, and/or removal of a sanction is appropriate based on your findings?
3. Please provide a succinct rationale for your determinations of the current status of areas relevant to this visit previously identified as areas of non-compliance. Based on the accreditation criteria, why do you conclude that one or more of the Recommendations cited previously are areas in which the institution is now substantially in compliance with accreditation criteria? Based on the accreditation criteria, why do you conclude that one or more of the Recommendations cited previously as area(s) of non-compliance are areas in which the institution is now substantially in compliance with accreditation criteria? Based on the accreditation criteria, why do you conclude that one or more of the Recommendations cited previously as area(s) of non-compliance are areas that continue to be out of compliance with accreditation criteria?
4. All Recommendations must cite relevant accreditation criteria as the basis of findings. Please provide a succinct rationale for your discernment of areas of non-compliance and areas for improvement cited in Recommendations originating from your evaluation report. Be sure to account for all Recommendations. Based on the accreditation criteria, what lead you to conclude that one or more of your Recommendations were areas of non-compliance? Based on the accreditation criteria, why do you conclude that one or more of your Recommendations were areas substantially in compliance, but where improvement is needed?
5. Please provide a succinct rationale for the recommended oversight listed overleaf. Why do you recommend a Progress report and/or Focused Interim report and visit at the times specified to address the identified Recommendations?

(continued overleaf)