**HOW TO USE THIS TEMPLATE (DELETE THIS PAGE PRIOR TO SUBMISSION):**

This template is designed to assist your team as it completes its Peer Review Team Report. The template is essentially an annotated outline of the Peer Review Team Report, with embedded guidance and instructions for each required section. The template also includes embedded formatting (e.g., headers, etc.) that will help build a table of contents for the final document.

Throughout the template, you will see highlighted text containing instruction and guidance:

* **Yellow highlighting** contains instructions and additional guidance related to the section.
* **Gray highlighting** indicates “insert text here” and provides a description of what to insert.

**Both types of highlighted text should be removed prior to completion of your team report.** Additional information about the team report can be found in Section 4 of the *Accreditation Handbook.*  Your ACCJC staff liaison is available to answer questions at any time.

**REPORT DUE DATE**:

Team reports are due no later than November 15 for focused site visits which occur in the fall, and no later than April 15 for focused site visits which occur in the spring.

**THINGS TO CHECK BEFORE SUBMISSION:**

* The team addressed each Standard in their narrative
* The required documentation was reviewed and verified in the team report
* The conclusions logically flow from the findings presented in the report
* Recommendations and/or commendations cite explicit Standards

**SUBMISSION PROCESS:**

Upon completion of the focused site visit, the team chair should send a draft of the team report to the ACCJC staff liaison and entire peer review team for their final feedback. Thereafter send a copy of the report to the institution’s CEO for errors of fact check. Upon completion of your review for corrections of errors of fact, the team chair should email a copy of the final draft report to the liaison noting that it is the completed draft submitted for the Commission’s review and decision.

**Peer Review Team Report**

[insert Institution Name

Institution Address

Institution City, State Zip Code]

**This Peer Review Team Report remains in draft form until the Commission takes action on the accredited status of the institution.**

The draft report submitted to the Commission represents the findings of the Peer Review Team that conducted Team ISER Review on <insert date> and a Focused Site Visit to < Institution Name> from <Date> to <Date>.

<Chair Name>

Team Chair
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# Peer Review Team Roster – Focused Site Visit
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# Purpose of Focused Site Visit and Summary Analysis

INSTITUTION: < Institution >

DATES OF VISIT: <Dates>

TEAM CHAIR: <Name>

**Purpose of the Focused Site Visit**

This Peer Review Team Report is based on the findings of the peer review team which conducted its evaluation and analysis over a two-semester comprehensive peer review process. In [month, year], the team conducted Team ISER Review (formative component) to identify where the Institution meets Standards and to identify Core Inquiries which specify areas of attention for the Focused Site Visit (summative component). The Core Inquiries are appended to this report. The team chair and vice chair held a pre-Focused Site Visit meeting with the institution CEO on <date> to discuss updates since the Team ISER Review and to plan for the Focused Site Visit.

A <enter number> member peer review team conducted a Focused Site Visit to < Institution Name> <Dates of Visit> for the purpose of completing its Peer Review Team Report and determination of whether the Institution continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and U.S. Department of Education regulations. During the Focused Site Visit, team members met with approximately <enter number> faculty, administrators, classified staff and students in formal meetings, group interviews and individual interviews. <If applicable> Team members met with <enter number> trustees from the Institution and observed a board meeting. The team held an open forum which was well attended and provided the Institution community and others to share their thoughts with members of the Focused Site Visit team. The team evaluated how well the Institution is achieving its stated purposes, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement. The team thanks the Institution staff for hosting the Focused Site Visit, coordinating meetings, providing additional documentation, and ensuring a smooth and collegial process.

**Summary Analysis**

Include a brief description on the institution’s history, geographic area, population served, and other unique attributes. Provide a summary analysis of the institution’s focus to accomplish its mission and achieve equitable student outcomes. Through the team’s analysis of the ISER and visit, share the team’s observations recognizing areas the institution can continue to grow and deepen its practices to reach its aspirational goals. Mention notable and effective practices the team observed through its Team ISER Review and during the Focused Site Visit. Suggested length is one page of narrative.

[Insert the summary analysis]

# Major Findings

**Commendations**

Commendation 1: The team commends the Institution for [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy]

If None, delete section.

**Recommendations for Compliance:**

Recommendation 1: In order to meet the Standard(s), the team recommends the Institution [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy in parenthesis after the statement]

If None, specify None.

**Recommendations to Improve Institutional Effectiveness:**

Recommendation 2: In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the Institution [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy in parenthesis after the statement]

If None, specify None.

**Required Documentation:**

The Institution submitted the required documentation per the Accreditation Standards.

If the Institution did not submit the required documentation, specify below as follows:

In order to meet the requirements for expected documentation under Standard [cite Standard], the team recommends the Institution submit [name the required documentation].

# Standard 1

**Mission and Institutional Effectiveness**

Suggested length for all of Standard 1 is no more than 3 pages.

General Observations:

In 1-3 paragraphs, provide a very brief overview of the conditions of the Institution pertaining to Standards in this section and allude to any concerns or areas of excellence. You will elaborate on the details in the pertinent findings of each specific Standard.

[Insert narrative]

Findings and Evidence:

For each specific Standard in this section, briefly summarize the evidence that you reviewed that demonstrates the Institution is aligned with the Standard. If the evidence illustrates an exemplary practice that is highly developed, describe it. If the Institution’s practices could be improved (to meet Standards or to improve quality), describe evidence of the shortcomings and area of improvement. If the Institution has self-identified plans for improvement, briefly describe progress on those plans as presented in the evidence. The narrative should cite the Standard discussed at the end of each paragraph (in parenthesis). The length of the response for each Standard will vary depending upon the complexity of the ideas contained within the Standard.

[Insert narrative response and cite Standard at end of each paragraph(s) in parenthesis.]

If the team is offering a recommendation or commendation, be sure the findings and evidence provides sufficient detail to support it and include the recommendation or commendation after your narrative in the specific Standard as follows:

Commendation 1: The team commends the Institution for [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy]

Recommendation 1: In order to meet the Standard(s), the team recommends the Institution [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy in parenthesis after the statement]

Recommendation 2: In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the Institution [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy in parenthesis after the statement]

Conclusions:

The Institution meets Standard 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5.

If the Institution does not meet a Standard, adjust the list above and add statement as follows:

The Institution does not meet Standard [list Standard(s) not met].

# Standard 2

**Student Success**

Suggested length for all of Standard 2 is no more than 6 pages.

General Observations:

In 1-3 paragraphs, provide a very brief overview of the conditions of the Institution pertaining to Standards in this section and allude to any concerns or areas of excellence. You will elaborate on the details in the pertinent findings of each specific Standard.

[Insert narrative]

Findings and Evidence:

For each specific Standard in this section, briefly summarize the evidence that you reviewed that demonstrates the Institution is aligned with the Standard. If the evidence illustrates an exemplary practice that is highly developed, describe it. If the Institution’s practices could be improved (to meet Standards or to improve quality), describe evidence of the shortcomings and area of improvement. If the Institution has self-identified plans for improvement, briefly describe progress on those plans as presented in the evidence. The narrative should cite the Standard discussed at the end of each paragraph (in parenthesis). The length of the response for each Standard will vary depending upon the complexity of the ideas contained within the Standard.

[Insert narrative response and cite Standard at end of each paragraph(s) in parenthesis.]

If the team is offering a recommendation or commendation, be sure the findings and evidence provides sufficient detail to support it and include the recommendation or commendation after your narrative in the specific Standard as follows:

Commendation 1: The team commends the Institution for [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy]

Recommendation 1: In order to meet the Standard(s), the team recommends the Institution [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy in parenthesis after the statement]

Recommendation 2: In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the Institution [insert language and cite standard(s) or policy in parenthesis after the statement]

Conclusions:

The Institution meet Standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9.

If the Institution does not meet a Standard, adjust the list above and add statement as follows:

The Institution does not meet Standard [list Standard(s) not met].

# Standard 3

**Infrastructure and Resources**

Suggested length for all of Standard 3 is no more than 6 pages.

General Observations:

In 1-3 paragraphs, provide a very brief overview of the conditions of the Institution pertaining to Standards in this section and allude to any concerns or areas of excellence. You will elaborate on the details in the pertinent findings of each specific Standard.

[Insert narrative]

Findings and Evidence:

For each specific Standard in this section, briefly summarize the evidence that you reviewed that demonstrates the Institution is aligned with the Standard. If the evidence illustrates an exemplary practice that is highly developed, describe it. If the Institution’s practices could be improved (to meet Standards or to improve quality), describe evidence of the shortcomings and area of improvement. If the Institution has self-identified plans for improvement, briefly describe progress on those plans as presented in the evidence. The narrative should cite the Standard discussed at the end of each paragraph (in parenthesis). The length of the response for each Standard will vary depending upon the complexity of the ideas contained within the Standard.

[Insert narrative response and cite Standard at end of each paragraph(s) in parenthesis.]

If the team is offering a recommendation or commendation, be sure the findings and evidence provides sufficient detail to support it and include the recommendation or commendation after your narrative in the specific Standard as follows:

Commendation 1: The team commends the Institution for [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy]

Recommendation 1: In order to meet the Standard(s), the team recommends the Institution [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy in parenthesis after the statement]

Recommendation 2: In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the Institution [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy in parenthesis after the statement]

Conclusions:

The Institution meet Standards 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9.

If the Institution does not meet a Standard, adjust the list above and add statement as follows:

The Institution does not meet Standard [list Standard(s) not met].

# Standard 4

**Governance and Decision-Making**

Suggested length for all of Standard 4 is no more than 4 pages.

General Observations:

In 1-3 paragraphs, provide a very brief overview of the conditions of the Institution pertaining to Standards in this section and allude to any concerns or areas of excellence. You will elaborate on the details in the pertinent findings of each specific Standard.

[Insert narrative]

Findings and Evidence:

For each specific Standard in this section, briefly summarize the evidence that you reviewed that demonstrates the Institution is aligned with the Standard. If the evidence illustrates an exemplary practice that is highly developed, describe it. If the Institution’s practices could be improved (to meet Standards or to improve quality), describe evidence of the shortcomings and area of improvement. If the Institution has self-identified plans for improvement, briefly describe progress on those plans as presented in the evidence. The narrative should cite the Standard discussed at the end of each paragraph (in parenthesis). The length of the response for each Standard will vary depending upon the complexity of the ideas contained within the Standard.

[Insert narrative response and cite Standard at end of each paragraph(s) in parenthesis.]

If the team is offering a recommendation or commendation, be sure the findings and evidence provides sufficient detail to support it and include the recommendation or commendation after your narrative in the specific Standard as follows:

Commendation 1: The team commends the Institution for [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy]

Recommendation 1: In order to meet the Standard(s), the team recommends the Institution [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy in parenthesis after the statement]

Recommendation 2: In order to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends the Institution [insert language and cite Standard(s) or policy in parenthesis after the statement]

Conclusions:

The Institution meet Standards 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6.

If the Institution does not meet a Standard, adjust the list above and add statement as follows:

The Institution does not meet Standard [list Standard(s) not met].

# Verification of Required Documentation

The evaluation items detailed in this Checklist are those which fall specifically under federal regulations and related Commission policies, beyond what is articulated in the Accreditation Standards. Some required documentation may have been used in response to ACCJC Standards that address the same or similar subject matter. For each required item listed, the team must verify its review of the required documentation, and indicated its conclusion by choosing one of the options below and note any comment or concerns where needed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Verified | The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements. |
| Verified, with Recommendations for improvement | The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but improvement is recommended. |
| Not met | The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements. |

**Standard 1: Mission and Institutional Effectiveness**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Required Item** | **Conclusions** |
| i Documentation of institution’s authority to operate as a post-secondary educational institution and award degrees (e.g., degree-granting approval statement, authorization to operate, articles of incorporation) (ER 1) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| ii. Procedures/practices for periodic review of mission/mission-related statements, including provisions for revision (if/when revisions are needed) that allow for participation of institutional stakeholders, as appropriate for the character and context of the institution | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| iii. Documentation of the governing board’s approval of the institutional mission (ER 6) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| iv. Procedures/practices for setting institutional goals, including provisions for the inclusion of input from relevant institutional stakeholders, as appropriate for the character and context of the institution | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| v. Documentation that the institution has established standards and goals for student achievement (i.e., institution-set standards), including but not limited to standards and goals for course success, degree and certificate attainment, transfer, job placement rates, and licensure examination pass rates, at the institutional and program levels (ER 2, ER 11) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |

**Standard 2: Student Success**

| **Required Item** | **Conclusions** |
| --- | --- |
| i. Documentation that the institution’s practices for awarding credit reflect generally accepted norms in higher education, including:   * Commonly accepted minimum program lengths for certificates, associate degrees, and baccalaureate degrees * Written policies for determining credit hours that are consistently applied to all courses, programs, and modalities * Adherence to the Department of Education’s standards for clock-to-credit hour conversions, if applicable (ER 10)   (See Commission [*Policy on Credit Hour, Clock Hour, and Academic Year*](https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Policy-on-Credit-Hour-Clock-Hour-and-Academic-Year.pdf)) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| ii. Documentation that the institution’s transfer of credit policies include the following:   * Any established criteria the institution uses regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution * Any types of institutions or sources from which the institution will not accept credits * A list of institutions with which the institution has established an articulation agreement * Written criteria used to evaluate and award credit for prior learning experience including, but not limited to, service in the armed forces, paid or unpaid employment, or other demonstrated competency or learning   See [*Policy on Transfer of Credit*](https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Policy-on-Transfer-of-Credit.pdf) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| iii. Documentation of the institution’s advertising and recruitment policies, demonstrating alignment with the [*Policy on Institutional Advertising and Student Recruitment*](https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Policy-on-Institutional-Advertising-and-Student-Recruitment.pdf)(ER 16) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| iv. Documentation of clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, including:   * Evidence that these policies/procedures are accessible to students in the catalog and online; * Evidence that that institution provides contact information for filing complaints with associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| v. Verification that the institution maintains files of formal student complaints received throughout the current accreditation cycle (i.e., since the last site visit), demonstrating:   * Accurate and consistent implementation of complaint policies and procedures * No issues indicative of noncompliance with Standards | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| vi. Verification that student records are stored permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| vii. Documentation of the institution’s policies and/or practices for the release of student records | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| viii. Documentation that the institution’s policies and procedures for program discontinuance provide enrolled students with opportunities for timely completion in the event of program elimination | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| ix. Official college catalog contains required elements  (ER 20) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| **FOR TITLE IV PARTICIPANTS:** | |
| x. Documentation of institution’s implementation of the required components of the Title IV Program, including:   * Findings from any audits and program/other review activities by the U.S. Department of Education (ED) * Evidence of timely corrective action taken in response to any Title IV audits or program reviews   See [*Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*](https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Policy-on-Institutional-Compliance-with-Title-IV.pdf) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| **FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH DISTANCE EDUCATION AND/OR CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION:** | |
| xi. Documentation of institution’s :   * Procedures for verifying that the student who registers in a course offered via distance education or correspondence education is the same person who participates in the course and receives academic credit * Policies and/or procedures for notifying students of any charges associated with verification of student identity (if applicable) * Policies regarding protection of student privacy   See [*Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education*](https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Policy-on-Distance-and-on-Correspondence-Education.pdf) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| **REQUIRED ONLY IF APPLICABLE** | |
| xii. Documentation demonstrating how the institution distinguishes its pre-collegiate curriculum from its college-level curriculum | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| xiii. Documentation of policies and/or procedures for awarding credit for prior learning and/or competency-based credit | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| xiv. Documentation of agreements with other external parties regarding the provision of student and/or learning support services | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| xv. Policies and/or other documentation related to institutional expectations of conformity with any specific worldviews or beliefs | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |

**Standard 3: Infrastructure and Resources**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Checklist Item** | **Conclusions** |
| i. Written policies and procedures for human resources, including hiring procedures | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| ii. Employee handbooks or similar documents that communicate expectations to employees | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| iii. Annual financial audit reports - 3 prior years (include auxiliary organizations, if applicable) (ER 5) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| iv. Practices for resource allocation and budget development (including budget allocation model for multi-college districts/systems) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| v. Policies guiding fiscal management (e.g., related to reserves, budget development) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| vi. Policies, procedures or agreements (e.g., AUAs) related to appropriate use of technology systems | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| **FOR TITLE IV PARTICIPANTS:** | |
| vii. Documentation that the institution’s student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by ED, or – if rates fall outside the acceptable range - documentation of corrective efforts underway to address the issue | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| **REQUIRED ONLY IF APPLICABLE** | |
| viii. Documentation of any agreements that fall under ACCJC’s policy on contractual relationships with non-accredited organizations | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| ix. Written code of professional ethics for all personnel including consequences for violations | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |

**Standard 4: Governance and Decision-Making**

| **Checklist Item** | **Documentation** |
| --- | --- |
| i. Governing board policies/procedures for selecting and regularly evaluating its chief executive officer | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| ii. Documentation or certification that the institution’s CEO does not serve as the chair of the governing board (ER 4) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| iii. Governing board policies/procedures/bylaws related to Board Ethics | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| iv. Governing board policies/procedures/bylaws related to conflict of interest | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |

**Other Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Checklist Item** | **Conclusions** |
| i. Documentation of the institution’s appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of the Focused Site Visit and – if applicable - cooperate with the review team in any necessary follow-up  See [*Policy on Rights, Responsibilities, and Good Practice in Relations with Member Institutions*](https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Policy-on-Rights-Responsibilities-and-Good-Practice-in-Relations-with-Member-Institutions.pdf)*,* Section D | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| ii. Documentation that the institution provides accurate information for the public concerning its accredited status with ACCJC on its institutional website, no more than one page (one click) away from the home page  See [*Policy on Representation of Accredited Status*](https://accjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Policy-on-Representation-of-Accredited-Status.pdf) | \_\_\_\_Verified  \_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement  \_\_\_\_Not met  **Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |

# Appendix: Core Inquiries

Append the Core Inquiries report submitted to the institution.