

# Change Visit Report

Substantive Change Recommendation Form

After the team reaches consensus, the team chair completes this form to summarize and document the team’s view. Notes and evidence should be essential and concise. Complete a separate form for each change request included in the visit.

**Draft report:** Submit the draft report to the institution’s HLC staff liaison. Once the staff liaison confirms the report is complete and acceptable, send the report to the institutional representative who submitted the substantive change application for corrections of errors of fact.

**Final report:** Submit the completed report to HLC at [hlcommission.org/upload](https://www.hlcommission.org/upload). Selection “Final Reports” from the list of submission options to ensure the report is sent to the correct HLC staff member. (Note: For Change Visits embedded into comprehensive evaluations, the submission webpage can be accessed through the Assurance System by clicking the Submit Final Form button on the Forms tab.)

Institution:       City, State:       Visit date: MM/DD–DD/YYYY

Change requested:

**Peer Review Team:** (List names, titles and affiliations of each peer reviewer.)

Was this Change Visit embedded into a previously scheduled visit to the institution?

[ ]  No

[ ]  Yes

If yes, provide the type of visit:

## Part A: Analysis

### Substantive Change Application: Part 1

1. Classification of Change(s)—Purpose of Visit

[ ]  Complete

[ ]  Incomplete

Notes or additions if marked incomplete:

1. Special Conditions—Institutional Context

[ ]  Complete

[ ]  Incomplete

Notes or additions if marked incomplete:

1. Required Approvals

[ ]  Complete

[ ]  Incomplete

Notes or additions if marked incomplete:

### Substantive Change Application: Part 2

1. **Essential Elements**. The categories below relate to the evidence expected across subsections of Part 2 of the change application.

4a. Planning and design of the proposed change, including preparation for and fit of the proposed change to the institution

[ ]  Acceptable

[ ]  Not acceptable

Evidence:

4b. Capacity for the proposed change, including resources and commitment of the institution. Provide an evaluation of the sufficiency, qualifications and experience of the faculty teaching the discipline and at the level of the proposed change.

[ ]  Acceptable

[ ]  Not Acceptable

Evidence:

4c. Services and support for the proposed change

[ ]  Acceptable

[ ]  Not acceptable

Evidence:

4d. Evaluation, assessment and improvement processes for the proposed change

[ ]  Acceptable

[ ]  Not acceptable

Evidence:

4e. Quality and integrity of the proposed change, including potential positive or negative effects

[ ]  Acceptable

[ ]  Not acceptable

Evidence:

Complete the relevant additional section for applications that involve any of the following:

• [Contractual arrangement](#_Contractual_Arrangements)

• [Competency-based education program](#_Competency-Based_Education_Programs)

If neither of those topics apply, go to [Part B: Recommendation and Rationale](#_Part_B:_Recommendation).

### Contractual Arrangements

Complete the questions below only for applications regarding contractual arrangements.

5a. Modality. Check all that apply:

[ ]  On-ground delivery [ ]  Distance education [ ]  Correspondence education

[ ]  Off-campus delivery [ ]  Other:

[ ]  Complete

[ ]  Incomplete

Notes or additions if marked incomplete:

5b. Key Services Provided by Partner

[ ]  Complete

[ ]  Incomplete

Notes or additions if marked incomplete:

5c. Level of Programming and Enrollment Affected

[ ]  Complete

[ ]  Incomplete

Notes or additions if marked incomplete:

5d. Overall Proportion of Affected Programs Provided by Partner

[ ]  Complete

[ ]  Incomplete

Notes or additions if marked incomplete:

### Competency-Based Education Programs

Only complete the following questions for applications regarding competency-based education (CBE) programs.

6a. The degree or certificate program is consistent with college-level work and rigor, establishing academic outcomes and competency statements comparable to similar programs offered by the institution:

[ ]  Acceptable

[ ]  Not acceptable

Evidence:

6b. The institution has submitted with its application a current credit hour worksheet OR has on file a recent (within the past three years) credit hour worksheet, which it has used to determine credit-hour equivalency for any program involving direct assessment:

[ ]  Complete

[ ]  Incomplete

Notes or additions if marked incomplete:

6c. The institution has determined that “sufficient educational activity” takes place in the CBE program and is consistent with the federal definition of the credit hour or is applied to the credit-hour equivalency used by the program (i.e., educational activity that reasonably approximates not less than one hour of classroom instruction and two hours of out-of-class work each week during a typical academic semester):

[ ]  Complete

[ ]  Incomplete

Notes or additions if marked incomplete:

6d. The program includes policies and procedures for meeting the federal requirement that “regular and substantive” interaction takes place between students and instructors:

[ ]  Acceptable

[ ]  Not acceptable

[ ]  Not applicable; note that if this program is a correspondence program, the institution is also required to complete a separate Distance Delivery substantive change application.

Evidence:

6e. The institution has made a reasonable determination of what is expected of enrolled students regarding the normal time to complete the CBE program (typically expressed as “satisfactory academic progress”) and uses that determination to report student progress:

[ ]  Acceptable

[ ]  Not acceptable

Evidence:

## Part B: Recommendation and Rationale

Recommendation:

[ ]  Approve request

[ ]  Approve modified request

[ ]  Deny request

**Rationale for the team’s recommendation to approve:** If the recommendation is a modification of the institution’s request, make clear how the team modified the original request.

**Rationale for the team’s recommendation to deny:** If recommending denial of the request, explain what was inadequate.

**Stipulations or limitations on future accreditation relationships:** If recommending a change in the institution's level for review of future changes (locations, programs, delivery, etc.), state both the old and new level and provide a brief rationale for the recommended change. Check the Institutional Status and Requirement (ISR) report for the current wording.

**Monitoring:** In limited circumstances, the team may call for a follow-up interim report. (Note that some types of substantive changes have built-in follow-up reviews; for example, the Campus Evaluation Visit.) If the team concurs that monitoring is necessary, indicate the topic, timeline and expectations for that monitoring.

**Interactions With Institutional Constituencies and Materials Reviewed:** List the titles and positions, but not names, of individuals with whom the team interacted during the review and the principal documents, materials and web pages reviewed. (Note: If the team received an updated version of the institution’s change application, submit it to HLC with the final team report. Do not submit any other materials that the team reviewed.)