

Multi-campus Visit Reviewer Form

After conducting the electronic and on-site portions of the multi-campus visit, the assigned peer reviewer completes a separate Multi-campus Reviewer Form for each campus that was reviewed. The reviewer then emails completed forms to the rest of the comprehensive evaluation team members. The team discusses and integrates the findings into its final comprehensive evaluation report in the Assurance System, including any concerns or recommended follow-up.

After the visit, the team chair should submit all Multi-campus Reviewer Forms as PDFs at [hlcommission.org/upload](http://hlcommission.org/upload). Select “Final Reports” from the list of submission options to ensure the institution’s materials are delivered to the correct HLC staff member. (Note: The submission webpage can be accessed through the Assurance System by clicking the Submit Final Form button on the Forms tab.) The Multi-campus Report from the institution and the reviewer forms become part of the institution’s permanent file and are shared as appropriate with future evaluation teams.

## Instructions

A Multi-campus Reviewer Form should be no more than five pages. The form begins with a brief description of the campus and its operations to provide the context for the on-site team’s deliberations.

For each review category, provide 2–3 evidence statements that make clear the team’s findings in relationship to the Criteria and Core Components. Check one of the following for each category:

* The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the review category. (The reviewer may cite ways to improve.)
* The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the review category.

This form does not request a recommendation from the reviewer. Instead, the full evaluation team is expected to include a discussion of the evidence related to the multi-campus visit in its deliberations about the oversight, management, and educational quality of extended operations of the institution. The team will incorporate evidence on extended operations into the final team report. Further, the full team may determine that a pattern of concern exists across multiple categories of a single campus or more than one campus and may result in a recommendation for additional monitoring or sanction.

Multi-campus Visit Report

Name of Institution:

Name and Address of Branch Campus:

Date of Visit:

Reviewer:

## 1. Campus Overview

Provide a brief description of the scope and operations of the campus. Include information about consortial or contractual arrangements, if applicable.

## 2. History, Planning, and Oversight

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the effectiveness of the institution’s planning, governance and oversight processes at the campus and in relationship to the broader systems of the institution, particularly as they relate to enrollment, budgeting and resource allocation at the institution.

**Judgment of reviewer (check one):**

[ ]  The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.

[ ]  The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

**Evidentiary Statements:**

## 3. Facilities and Technology

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the institution’s facilities and technology at the campus and their suitability to the needs of the students, staff and faculty, as well as the educational offerings. Consider, in particular, classrooms and laboratories (size, maintenance, temperature, etc.); faculty and administrative offices (site, visibility, privacy for meetings, etc.); parking or access to public transit; bookstore or text purchasing services; security; access for people with disabilities; and other services or facilities (food or snack services, study and meeting areas, etc.).

**Judgment of reviewer (check one):**

[ ]  The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.

[ ]  The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

**Evidentiary Statements:**

## 4. Human Resources

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on appropriateness of faculty and staff qualifications, sufficiency of staff and faculty for the campus, and the processes for supporting and evaluating personnel at the campus. Consider the processes in place for selecting, training and orienting faculty at the location, as well as the credentials of faculty dedicated to the campus and other faculty.

**Judgment of reviewer (check one):**

[ ]  The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.

[ ]  The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

**Evidentiary Statements:**

## 5. Student and Faculty Resources and Support

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the student and faculty services and academic resources at the campus, as well as the processes to evaluate, improve and manage them. Consider, in particular, the level of student access (in person, by computer, by phone, etc.) to academic advising/placement, remedial/tutorial services, and library materials/services. Also, consider the level of access to admissions, registration/student records, financial aid, and job placement services, as well as attention to student concerns. Finally, consider the resources needed by faculty to provide the educational offerings.

**Judgment of reviewer (check one):**

[ ]  The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.

[ ]  The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

**Evidentiary Statements:**

## 6. Educational Programs and Instructional Oversight

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the institution’s capacity to oversee educational offerings and instruction at the campus. Identify whether the institution has adequate controls in place to ensure that information presented to students is ample and accurate. Consider consistency of curricular expectations and policies, availability of courses needed for program and graduation requirements, performance of instructional duties, availability of faculty to students, orientation of faculty/professional development, attention to student concerns.

**Judgment of reviewer (check one):**

[ ]  The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.

[ ]  The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

**Evidentiary Statements:**

## 7. Evaluation and Assessment

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the institution’s processes to evaluate and improve the educational offerings of the campus and to assess and improve student learning, persistence and completion sufficiently in order to maintain and improve academic quality at the campus. Consider, in particular, the setting of outcomes, the actual measurement of performance, and the analysis and use of data to maintain/improve quality. Identify how the processes at the branch campus are equivalent to those for assessment and evaluation on the main campus.

**Judgment of reviewer (check one):**

[ ]  The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.

[ ]  The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

**Evidentiary Statements:**

## 8. Continuous Improvement

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements that demonstrate that the institution encourages and ensures continuous quality improvement at the campus. Consider in particular the institution’s planning and evaluation processes that ensure regular review and improvement of the campus, as well as alignment of the branch campus with the mission and goals of the institution as a whole.

**Judgment of reviewer (check one):**

[ ]  The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.

[ ]  The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

**Evidentiary Statements:**