

# Non-financial Panel Report

Analysis and Recommendation

Panel members should review the institutional report and supplementary documents and provide their analysis and recommendation on whether the institution is at risk of not meeting the Criteria for Accreditation. If the panel decides that additional information is necessary to make a recommendation, the panel lead should contact HLC to obtain that information. See the [Financial and Non-financial Indicator Process](http://download.hlcommission.org/NFI-FIProcess_PRC.pdf) for additional details.  
  
**Submission Instructions**  
After ensuring that all parts of the form are complete, the panel lead should upload the Non-financial Panel Report to the panel page in [Canopy](https://canopy.hlcommission.org/).

Institution:

City:       State:

Date of panel review:      

Non-financial Panel members:

Previous HLC action regarding the institution’s report (if applicable):

Items addressed in the report:

**1. Significant Enrollment Changes—**Three-year increase or decrease of 80% or more in enrollment for small institutions or 40% or more for large institutions.

**2. Degrees Awarded—**Three-year increase or decrease of 75% or more in degrees awarded for small institutions and 65% or more for large institutions.

**3. Full-time Faculty Changes—**Three-year decrease of 75% or more for small institutions or 50% or more for large institutions in the headcount of full-time faculty (not full-time equivalent).

**4. Minimal Full-time Faculty—**The headcount of full-time faculty (not full-time equivalent) divided by the number of degree programs offered is less than one.

**5. Student to Teacher Ratio—**The number of undergraduate full-time equivalent students divided by the number of undergraduate full-time equivalent faculty is greater than or equal to 35.

## Panel Analysis

An institution should address all related Core Components and Assumed Practices for the triggered indicator condition(s). Consider the following questions in this analysis:

* Do any of the Core Components or Assumed Practices appear at risk of not being met? Please explain.
* Is it likely that the institution has already taken enough steps to keep it from flagging in the future?
* If the institution has not already taken enough steps to keep it from flagging in the future, does the institution seem to have a reasonable plan?

Provide evidence for your responses. This section should be approximately 2–3 pages in length.

## Panel Recommendations

The panel has reviewed and evaluated the institutional documents provided (report and supplementary documents) in making its recommendation.

**Accept Report.** The panel concludes that the institution has substantially met its commitment in its report on non-financial indicators.

Rationale:

**Accept Report With Qualifications.** Overall, the institution addressed the Core Components and Assumed Practices adequately. However, the panel has concerns on the following matters that the institution should consider in future planning.

Specific concerns:

**Accept Report With Monitoring.** The panel has concerns that the institution may be at risk of not meeting specific Core Components or Assumed Practices, explained below. The panel is recommending the following monitoring:

Interim Report—due no sooner than three months from the date of action\*

Focused Visit—to occur no sooner than six months from the date of action\*

*\*HLC staff may adjust this follow-up to be included in future monitoring or a visit already scheduled with the institution.*

Specific Core Components and Assumed Practices at risk of not being met, with explanation: