

# Preliminary Peer Review

Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation

Purpose

The purpose of the panel review is to determine whether the institution has the capacity and readiness to pursue membership with HLC, specifically to host a comprehensive evaluation visit for initial accreditation as part of an accelerated process. The panel review determines whether the institution has presented sufficient evidence such that it meets the Eligibility Requirements and Assumed Practices and appears likely to have met the Criteria for Accreditation providing evidence at the summary Criterion level. A final determination about whether the institution has indeed met these requirements, including meeting the Criteria for Accreditation at the Core Component level, will be made following the comprehensive evaluation visit for initial accreditation. However, the panel review is a helpful tool for HLC and the institution to obtain a preliminary analysis without a comprehensive evaluation.

Instructions

At the conclusion of the panel review, the panel will determine whether or not the institution has provided sufficient information to proceed with hosting a comprehensive evaluation for initial accreditation as part of the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation. The panel will provide the reasons for its determination as to each of the Criteria for Accreditation, as well as its overall findings regarding the institution’s compliance with the Assumed Practices and Eligibility Requirements.

The panel should submit the completed report and the Assumed Practices and Eligibility Requirements worksheets at [hlcommission.org/upload](https://www.hlcommission.org/upload). Select “Final Reports” from the list of submission options to ensure the materials are sent to the correct HLC staff member.

## Review Details

Institution:

Date of review: MM/DD/YYYY–MM/DD/YYYY

List the names, titles and affiliations of each reviewer.

## Eligibility Requirements

The panel must complete the Eligibility Requirements worksheet as part of its review. The worksheet should be submitted with this form. Provide the panel’s determination from the worksheet below.

Please note: If the institution does not meet every Eligibility Requirement, the institution cannot proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

Select one of the following statements:

[ ]  The panel has reviewed all Eligibility Requirements and has determined that the institution meets all the Eligibility Requirements.

[ ]  The panel has reviewed all Eligibility Requirements and has determined that the institution does not meet the Eligibility Requirement(s) listed below.

Eligibility Requirement(s) that are not met:

## Assumed Practices

The panel must complete the Assumed Practices worksheet as part of its review. The worksheet should be submitted with this form. Provide the panel’s determination from the worksheet below.

Please note: If the institution does not meet every Assumed Practice, the institution cannot proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

Select one of the following statements:

[ ]  The panel has reviewed all Assumed Practices and has determined that the institution meets all the Assumed Practices.

[ ]  The panel has reviewed all Assumed Practices and has determined that the institution does not meet the Assumed Practice(s) listed below.

Assumed Practice(s) that are not met:

## Criteria for Accreditation

HLC’s Assurance System is used in a unique way during the preliminary peer review stage of the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

At the preliminary peer review stage, institutions are asked to write and provide evidence at the Criteria **summary** level rather than writing to each Core Component, which will occur later in the process. Following that directive to institutions, peer reviewers are asked to review only the narrative and linked evidence that is provided by institutions in the summary portions of the Assurance System for each Criterion. It is possible that institutions may have begun drafting narrative at the Core Component level in those respective areas within the Assurance System. Peer reviewers are asked to disregard anything that the institution may have included in the Core Component sections, as those areas are incomplete at this stage and will be evaluated later in the process.

Similar to how the institution has prepared narrative for this stage, peer reviewers should write their analysis in the sections below corresponding to each of the five Criterion summaries.

For institutions continuing beyond the Preliminary Peer Review stage, HLC will unlock the institution’s Assurance System site so that they may complete the Core Component sections and update/revise their Criteria Summary sections in preparation for a comprehensive evaluation for initial accreditation.

1. **Criterion 1. Mission**

The institution’s mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution’s operations.

Conclusion:

[ ]  The institution has provided sufficient narrative and documentation regarding this Criterion for Accreditation to proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

[ ]  The institution has not provided sufficient narrative and documentation regarding this Criterion for Accreditation to proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

Rationale:

1. **Criterion 2. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct**

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Conclusion:

[ ]  The institution has provided sufficient narrative and documentation regarding this Criterion for Accreditation to proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

[ ]  The institution has not provided sufficient narrative and documentation regarding this Criterion for Accreditation to proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

Rationale:

1. **Criterion 3. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support**

The institution provides quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Conclusion:

[ ]  The institution has provided sufficient narrative and documentation regarding this Criterion for Accreditation to proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

[ ]  The institution has not provided sufficient narrative and documentation regarding this Criterion for Accreditation to proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

Rationale:

1. **Criterion 4. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement**

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Conclusion:

[ ]  The institution has provided sufficient narrative and documentation regarding this Criterion for Accreditation to proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

[ ]  The institution has not provided sufficient narrative and documentation regarding this Criterion for Accreditation to proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

Rationale:

1. **Criterion 5. Institutional Effectiveness, Resources and Planning**

The institution’s resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

Conclusion:

[ ]  The institution has provided sufficient narrative and documentation regarding this Criterion for Accreditation to proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

[ ]  The institution has not provided sufficient narrative and documentation regarding this Criterion for Accreditation to proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

Rationale:

## Conclusion and Analysis

**[ ]** The institution has provided sufficient narrative and documentation to proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

**[ ]** The institution has not provided sufficient narrative and documentation to proceed with the Accelerated Process for Initial Accreditation.

Rationale for conclusion:

Summary analysis of the evidence: