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Background
The ACCJC and its member institutions shall provide information about the results of
institutional accreditation reviews to students, the public, employers, government agencies
and other accrediting bodies. Students and others rely on accreditation status as an indicator
of educational quality, and there is growing public interest in accreditation processes and the
outcomes of accreditation reviews for individual institutions.

The purpose of this policy is to strengthen the ability of institutions and the Commission to
fulfill their respective obligations to provide transparency in accreditation in a manner that
will enhance public confidence in the educational quality of accredited institutions and
protect the integrity of the accreditation process. The policy goals are:

1. to make meaningful information about institutional quality available to students and
prospective students, the public, employers and government agencies;

2. to provide institutions with guidelines for communicating information about their
accredited status and their response to the ACCJC’s actions and recommendations; and

3. to protect the integrity and validity of the accreditation review process by maintaining
appropriate levels of confidentiality about aspects of the accreditation process.

Policy
Both the Commission and the institution have responsibilities to provide information about
institutional quality and the accreditation process to the public. Public confidence in higher
education is enhanced by disclosure of information about the outcomes of accreditation
reviews. Institutional reports prepared for the accreditation process, External Evaluation
Reports of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and the Commission’s action
letter stating the outcome of an accreditation review and the institution’s resulting
accreditation status, shall be made available to campus constituencies, students, and the
public after the Commission takes action on the institution’s accreditation.

However, confidentiality is also critically important during the accreditation process. The
accreditation process must occur within a context of trust and confidentiality if it is to result
in an accurate appraisal of institutional quality. The efficacy of the accreditation process
requires that institutions provide accurate information, candid institutional self evaluation,
and evidence of compliance with Accreditation Standards and Eligibility Requirements. It also
requires that the external evaluation teams and the Commission provide carefully prepared,
accurate, rigorous, and candid analysis of institutional quality and recommendations for
improvement of quality.
The Commission's Responsibilities for Public Disclosure

I. Public Disclosure of Information about Accreditation Policies and Processes

Institutions applying for candidacy or initial accreditation and accredited institutions undergoing periodic evaluation are reviewed by the ACCJC under defined and published policies and procedures that conform to the recognition requirements of the U.S. Department of Education.

In accordance with the requirements of the Higher Education Act (34 C.F.R. § 602.27(c).), the ACCJC discloses in its Accreditation Reference Handbook, the Eligibility, Candidacy and Initial Accreditation Manual, and other appropriate publications on institutional evaluation, each type of candidacy granted by the Commission, the procedures for applying for eligibility, candidacy, or initial accreditation, and the criteria and procedures used by the Commission in determining whether to grant, reaffirm, deny, terminate accreditation or take any other action related to the accredited status of institutions. All commission policy documents and procedural manuals as well as related publications are available on the ACCJC website.

The ACCJC maintains a website which informs members and the public about the Commission and its practices (www.accjc.org). The ACCJC discloses through its website the names, academic and professional qualifications, and relevant employment and organizational affiliations of the Commissioners and the ACCJC's principal staff.

The Commission publishes a newsletter at least twice annually to provide timely information about accreditation. The newsletter includes a review of major accreditation issues in the region, a list of Commission actions, the list of institutions scheduled for educational quality and institutional effectiveness review, and updates of Commission policies. The newsletter is distributed to all member institutions, other accreditors, and appropriate higher education and government associations and agencies. The newsletter is available to the public on the ACCJC website. A list of upcoming comprehensive evaluation visits is also available to the public upon request.

The Commission publishes handbooks, manuals, and other materials which describe the Commission and its processes; these are available to all member institutions and to the public on the ACCJC website.

The Commission and Commission staff make presentations before organizations within higher education, government, and the public at large. The Commission and its staff participate in regional and national forums on subjects related to quality assurance and institutional improvement.

The Commission regularly renew its commitment to the principles expressed in its policies through a process of review by the Commission Policy Committee. When new issues in the field of higher education or changes in the U.S. Department of Education emerge, policies may be created, revised or eliminated. First reading Commission policies are sent to the field for review and comment, followed by submission to the Commission for second reading and adoption. The Commission announces all new policies and policy revisions after adoption.
II. Public Disclosure of Information about Institutions Accredited by the ACCJC

The ACCJC maintains on its website a Directory of Member Institutions currently accredited, in candidacy status, or formerly accredited by the ACCJC. The Directory includes the name of the institution, its legal address and the addresses of major additional campus sites, the name of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), the form of control, each type of accreditation or pre-accreditation (candidacy) status held by the institution, the date of initial accreditation by the ACCJC, and the date when the Commission will next review or consider the accreditation or candidacy of each institution. Public disclosure of accreditation information about an institution on the Commission is limited to matters addressed in the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies.

The Commission also posts a Public Disclosure Notice to the Directory of Member Institutions for every institution that is on Probation or Show Cause status, and a link to the Institution’s response, if any, to a Public Disclosure Notice. The Public Disclosure Notice describes the reasons the institution has been judged to be deficient (see discussion of Public Disclosure Notice below).

The Directory of Member Institutions also lists the names of institutions that were formerly accredited by the ACCJC and withdrew from accreditation or were subject to termination or denial of accreditation or candidacy, and the date on which the Commission took adverse action on such institutions. Under the provisions of the U.S. Department of Education Secretary’s Procedures and Criteria for the Recognition of Accrediting Agencies (34 C.F.R. § 602.2.), only denial or termination of accreditation or candidacy are defined as adverse actions by the Commission.

A Statement of Accredited Status is made available to each member institution and any member of the public upon request. The Statement includes information about the nature of the institution and the degrees and certificates it awards to students, its accredited status, the most recent Commission action on the accredited status of the institution, a definition of the meaning of the accredited status, a description of any follow-up reports or visits that may be required, and the institution’s next comprehensive evaluation date.

If an institution conducts its affairs so that it becomes a matter of public concern, misrepresents a Commission action, or uses the public forum to take issue with an action of the Commission relating to that institution, the Commission President may announce to the public, including the press, the action taken and the basis for that action, making public any pertinent information available to the Commission.

III. Public Disclosure of Information about Commission Actions on the Accredited Status of Institutions (34 C.F.R. § 602.26(a),(b),(c),(d).)

The Commission discloses information to the public about all actions it takes on the accredited status of institutions. Actions of the Commission regarding the accredited status of institutions are defined in the “Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions.” The Commission publishes the status of each institution on its entry in the Directory of Accredited Institutions and publishes a list of all institutional actions taken at each meeting of the Commission on the ACCJC website, in the Commission newsletter and in an announcement sent to interested parties, the U.S. Secretary of Education, appropriate state licensing or authorizing agencies and accrediting bodies within 30 days of the Commission’s meeting as required by the Higher Education Act.
II. Disclosure of the Results of an Accreditation Review
The CEO of the institution is responsible for informing the campus community of the accreditation action taken by the Commission and the reasons for the action. If the institution is in a multi-college system, the CEO is responsible for providing copies of college and External Evaluation Reports, and the Commission action letter, to the system CEO and members of the governing board. If the accreditation action includes a sanction of Warning, Probation or Show Cause, or if the institution’s accreditation has been terminated, the institution is obligated to provide that information to all current and prospective students and staff and governing board members within five days of the CEO’s receipt of the Commission’s action letter informing the institution of its accreditation status.

The Commission requires each accredited institution to make public the Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, the External Evaluation Report, and the Commission action letter by placing the documents on the institution’s website as well as other locations accessible to students and the public.

III. Information about the Institution’s Accreditors, Including the ACCJC and any other Specialized or Programmatic Accrediting Bodies, and State, Tribal or other Authorizing Bodies
The institution must post to its website and include in its catalog clear and accurate information about the agencies that have accredited it. Under federal regulations, an institution must make readily available to enrolled and prospective students the names of associations, agencies or governmental bodies that accredit, approve or license the institution and its programs and the procedures by which documents describing an institution’s accreditation, tribal approval or licensing will be made available to students and prospective students. 34 C.F.R. § 668.43.

IV. Information about Contact Information for Filing Complaints with the ACCJC and with the Institution’s State Approval or Licensing Agency
The institution must make readily available to enrolled and prospective students the contact information for filing complaints against the institution with the agencies that accredit and that provide state licensing or approval, or tribal approval, to the institution. Enrolled and prospective students are to be referred to the Complaint Process and Complaint Policy on the ACCJC’s website at www.accjc.org. 34 C.F.R. § 668.43.

V. Information about Evaluation Visits to the Institution
The Commission requires that the CEO notify the campus community of the date and purpose of each educational quality and institutional effectiveness review and any Follow-Up Reports or team visits requested by the Commission. Key elements in that notification to the campus community shall include the following:

- Notice of the opportunity for submission of third-party comments by the public and the process for doing so;
- Information regarding where and how the Accreditation Standards may be accessed;
- Information regarding the implementation of the institutional self-evaluation
process, the development of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, and a call for widespread participation; and

- Information regarding the evaluation visit, evaluation team composition, dates of the visit, and team schedule and activities. Institutions are expected to publicize times and locations during the visit when, during educational quality and institutional effectiveness reviews, evaluation team members have scheduled open meetings to discuss with any member of the campus community any issue related to the institution’s accreditation.

VI. Information about Institutional Effectiveness in achieving mission

The accreditation process requires institutions to gather and analyze information about achievement of mission. Institutions shall regularly disclose to students, prospective students and the public accurate and useful information about the institution’s educational effectiveness, including student achievement and student learning.

The Commission’s Responsibility for Confidentiality

I. The Commission does not ordinarily make Institutional Self Evaluation Reports, the External Evaluation Reports or the Commission action letters public. Should the institution fail to make the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the External Evaluation Report, or Commission action letter available to the public as per the institution’s responsibilities for public disclosure contained in this policy, or if it misrepresents the contents of the reports, the Commission will release the reports to the public and provide accurate statements about the institution’s quality and accreditation status.

II. The Commission does not generally disclose information about an institution’s potential accredited status before a Commission action is taken. Information about actions under review or appeal (denial of candidacy or initial accreditation, or termination of accreditation) will not be disclosed until a final decision is rendered, unless required by federal regulation. Review and appeal procedures are found in the Commission’s “Policy on Review of Commission Actions,” the Bylaws of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, and the “Appeals and Hearing Procedures.” and in the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Constitution.

III. The institutional file in the Commission office is part of the private relationship with the institution and is therefore not available to the public. Correspondence and verbal communication with the institution or its members can remain confidential at the discretion of the ACCJC Commission President. The Commission will consider institutional requests for confidentiality in communications with the Commission in the context of this policy.

IV. The Commission does not generally release contact information of its evaluators to the public.

V. Upon request, the Commission will disclose the number of complaints received about the institution since the last educational quality and institutional effectiveness review, the general nature of those complaints, and their resolution or status. In accordance with its “Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions”, the Commission will only include in that disclosure formal, signed complaints that are within the Commission’s jurisdiction and which have been referred to the institution. Multiple
complaints about a single issue will be assessed to determine how those complaints should be recorded. The Commission informs the institution when such an inquiry is received.

VI. In order to assure the accuracy and appropriateness of institutional information which is made public, the Commission expects evaluation team members to keep confidential all institutional information read or heard before, during, and after the evaluation visit. Except in the context of Commission work, evaluation team members are expected to refrain from discussing information obtained in the course of service as an evaluation team member. Sources of information that should remain confidential include the current Institutional Self Evaluation Report; previous External Evaluation Reports; interviews and written communication with campus personnel, students, governing board members, and community members; evidentiary documents, and evaluation team discussions.

Member Institution’s Responsibilities for Confidentiality

I. The institutional CEO is sent a draft of each External Evaluation Report for purposes of correcting errors of fact. The CEO is expected to keep the draft Report confidential.

II. The institution is expected to refrain from releasing personal contact information about evaluation team members to the public.

---

1 Also refer to the Statement on the Process for Preserving Confidentiality of Documents Related to Institutional Evaluations.
Policy on Commission Good Practice in Relations with Member Institutions

Policy
The Commission makes the commitment to follow good practices in its relations with the institutions it accredits.

Policy Elements
The Commission will fulfill its commitment by adhering to the following practices:

1. Make an initial visit to, or evaluation of, an institution only on the written request of the chief executive officer of the institution.

2. Revisit an institution only on request by the chief executive officer, or if a visit is initiated by the Commission, after due notice to the institution.

3. Permit withdrawal of a request for initial candidacy or initial accreditation at any time (even after evaluation) prior to final action by the Commission.

4. Appraise institutions in the light of their own stated purposes so long as these are within the general frame of reference of higher education and consistent with the standards of the Commission.

5. Use the institution’s Self-Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, the External Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness, and relevant qualitative and quantitative information in institutional evaluation.

6. Interpret standards for accreditation in ways that are relevant to the character of the particular institution, respecting institutional integrity and diversity.

7. Encourage sound educational innovation and assist and stimulate continuous improvement in the educational effectiveness of the institution.

8. Publish at least twice annually in the Commission newsletter the names of institutions scheduled for comprehensive evaluation.

9. Accept relevant third-party comment on the institutions scheduled for evaluation. Such comment must be submitted in writing, signed, accompanied by return address and telephone number, and received no later than five weeks before the scheduled
Commission consideration. The Commission will notify the institution when a third-party report is received by sending a copy of the report to the institution.¹

10. Establish reporting systems for annual, midterm, and self-evaluation reports which inform the Commission regarding student loan default rates and the standing of the institution with respect to appropriate state agencies, institutional or specialized accrediting agencies, and the institution’s compliance with Title IV.

11. Consider information regarding adverse actions against a member institution by another accrediting agency or state agency and provide an explanation consistent with Accreditation Standards why the action by another authority does not result in an adverse action.

12. Limit Practice monitoring and oversight required by federal statute and regulations to issues expressly in the manner required by that mandate.

13. Include on evaluation teams representation from other institutions of similar purpose and academic program to the extent feasible. Include educators, academics, administrators and members of the public on evaluation teams.

14. Provide institutions an opportunity to object, for cause, to individual members assigned to the team designated to visit the institution, with special concern for possible conflict of interest.

15. Arrange consultation for meetings during the comprehensive evaluation visit with administration, staff, students, and trustees, and include a publicized opportunity for an open meeting during the visit.

16. Address the standards set by the institution and institutional performance with regard to student achievement in reviews of institutional effectiveness. Advise team chairs that the team report should make clear those standards with which the institution does not comply and those areas needing improvement.

17. Advise team chairs that the team report should make clear those standards with which the institution does not comply and those areas needing improvement.

18. Provide to the institution a detailed written report on its review assessing the institution’s or program’s compliance with the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards and Commission policies, noting areas in which the institution must take steps to meet the Standards, and areas for improvement of institutional effectiveness and educational quality, and the institution’s performance with respect to student achievement and student learning.

19. Emphasize the value and importance of institutional self-evaluation study and respect the confidentiality of the institutional Self Evaluation Report and the External Evaluation Report until after the Commission has acted on them. The Commission has the responsibility to require that team members keep confidential all institutional

¹Also refer to the Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions.
information examined or heard before, during, and after the team visit and after the Commission acts.²

20. Encourage discussion and use on campus of major team recommendations.

21. Provide institutions due process³ concerning accrediting decisions made by the Commission: Institutions are provided an opportunity to respond in writing to draft External Evaluation Reports in order to correct errors of fact; to respond in writing (no less than 15 days in advance of the Commission meeting) to final External Evaluation Reports on issues of substance and to any Accreditation Standard deficiencies noted in the report; and to appear before the Commission when reports are considered.
   a. The Commission will notify the institution in writing, through an action letter, as soon as reasonably possible after Commission decisions are made and will include in its action letter the reasons for actions taken.
   b. If the Commission’s action lists any deficiency, which was not noted in the External Evaluation Report, before making any decision that includes a sanction, denying or terminating accreditation, or candidacy, the Commission, through its President, will afford the institution additional time to respond in writing to the perceived deficiency before finalizing its action at the next Commission meeting. The institution may address any asserted procedural errors as well.
   c. The institution may request a review by the Commission on certain sanctions of adverse actions, as described in the Accreditation Reference Handbook, Policy on Review of Commission Actions, and may request a further appeal hearing, as described in the WASC Constitution, Bylaws of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, and Appeal and Hearings Procedures, if the nature of the action warrants an appeal.

22. Provide an opportunity for institutional representatives and the general public to attend those portions of Commission meetings devoted to policy matters and others of a non-confidential nature.

23. Refrain from Will not conditioning candidacy or accreditation upon payment of fees which are not approved by the Commission for annual dues, for purposes other than annual fees and evaluation costs, or other assessments.

² Also refer to the Statement on the Process for Preserving Confidentiality of Documents Related to Institutional Evaluations.
³ Complies with 34 C.F.R. § 602.18, § 602.23, § 602.25.
Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems


Background
Almost half of the member institutions are part of larger systems, either by being part of a multi-college district/system or by being owned by a larger corporate entity. Institutions must work closely with the district/system to ensure that Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies are met and quality is sustained. The district/system’s role is to facilitate and support the successful implementation of the institutional mission and institutional effectiveness. This necessitates dialogue between the institutions and district/system and among the institutions within the district/system.

The Commission evaluates based on the Standards regardless of organizational structure. In single-college districts/systems all functions are carried out by the same entity. For multi-college districts/systems, key functions that relate to the Standards may be distributed among the institutions and the district/system in various patterns. In order for the Commission to evaluate institutions in single-college and multi-college organizations fairly, institutions must inform the Commission about their functional organization and involve district/system and college personnel responsible for the functions in accreditation activities.

The integrity of the district/system programs and services falls within the scope of the institution’s accreditation. The district/system auxiliary programs and services are subject to review if the program or service is executed in the name of the district/system or institution, or if the district/system administers or the board authorizes the program or service. The delineation and distribution of responsibilities among the district/system and the institution must be articulated clearly.

Policy
The Commission assures the equitable evaluation of all institutions regardless of organizational structures and clarifies the Commission’s expectations regarding the conduct and outcomes of educational quality and institutional effectiveness reviews comprehensive institutional evaluations and other reviews in multi-college districts/systems.

Policy Elements
1. While the Commission accredits individual institutions, the district/system holds a fundamental role and responsibility in the analysis and evaluation of district/system structures and how these structures assist the institutions to achieve and adhere to all the Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies and gain and sustain accredited status.

2. Institutions have the responsibility to describe and delineate clearly the particular way functions are distributed in their unique multi-college organization. The distribution of these functions is to be evaluated. There must be evidence of ongoing communication between the institution and the district/system regarding the distribution of these
functions. The Commission will use this evidence to identify the locus of responsibility for the institution’s ability to meet Eligibility Requirements, Accreditation Standards, and Commission policies.

3. When serious inadequacies in a district/system function are verified, such deficiencies could jeopardize the accreditation of one, some, or all of the district/system institutions. Both the district/system and the impacted institution(s) in question are responsible for correcting these identified deficiencies.

4. The Commission reserves the right to initiate direct interaction with district/system officers regarding the ability of institutions to demonstrate that they meet or exceed the Accreditation Standards. When district/system officers are contacted regarding an institution, the institution(s) will receive the same communication.

5. A district/system may make a special request to evaluate the effectiveness of its central functions in conjunction with scheduled educational quality and institutional effectiveness reviews (formerly comprehensive reviews). This activity is limited to issues related to the ability of institutions to demonstrate that they meet or exceed the Accreditation Standards. The outcome of this activity does not result in any “accredited” status for the district/system.

Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems

A. Institutional Self Evaluation
1. As part of the institutional self evaluation process (formerly self study process) and in consultation with the district/system, the institution must specify through an organizational “map,” which is a description of the delineation of district/system and college functions, whether the institution or district level holds the primary responsibility for all or parts of a specific function.

Moreover, the Commission recognizes that institutions in a multi-college system may have lateral relationships with other institutions in the district/system which should be included in the map. For example, police services may be a district/system service for all institutions in a multi-college district/system, yet located at one institution in the district/system.

2. Responsible Individuals responsible for key functions of at the institution or in the district/system, must be actively involved with the institution in developing the Self Evaluation Report of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness. The level of involvement will be based upon who has responsibility for the institutional function(s) addressed in the Standards. As a result, Close cooperation between and among the institutions and the district/system office is expected as a part of the preparation of the Institutional Self Evaluation Report.

3. In the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, institutions are expected to include a discussion of how the identified district/system functions and decisions affect the institutions’ ability to meet the Accreditation Standards. For example, the governing board’s role in adopting the institutional mission statement is addressed in the Standard dealing with mission; the district/system office responsibility for personnel is
discussed in the Standard appropriate to faculty and staff; the district/system financial allocation system should be included in the Standard in which financial resources are addressed. The organizational map will provide guidance for this discussion. The effectiveness of the map's delineation of functions includes analysis, evaluation, and subsequent planning for organizational improvement.

4. The district/system chief executive officer and governing board are expected to be involved in the process of developing the Institutional Self Evaluation Report. The governing board must review the final Institutional Self Evaluation Report and certify its involvement in the institutional self evaluation process.

B. Evaluation Team Composition
Just as for institutions in single-college districts, evaluation team composition for institutions in multi-college districts/systems is shaped by the institution being accredited. Evaluation teams visiting institutions in multi-college districts/systems will have the range of expertise appropriate for the institution and also individuals with multi-college district/system perspectives.

C. District/System Evaluation Team Visit Organization
The Commission organizes site visits to institutions in multi-college districts/systems simultaneously or in clusters of institutions.

Prior to simultaneous site visits taking place in the institutions of a district/system, the Commission President will name a coordinating chair. This coordinating chair, in consultation with institutional evaluation team chairs, will form a small district/system evaluation team which may be drawn from all of the evaluation teams visiting the institutions. It will consist of all of the evaluation team chairs and such members of the respective evaluation teams as are needed to address the district/system issues identified in the Institutional Self Evaluation reports and by the evaluation teams.

The purposes of the coordinating chair and district/system evaluation team are to:

- evaluate the evidence provided in the Institutional Self Evaluation Report to confirm that the functions provided by the district/system enable the institutions to meet the Standards;
- identify issues pertaining to the Standards that are related to district/system functions;
- ensure commonality and comparability of evaluation team recommendations across External Evaluation Reports (formerly Team Reports) when accreditation issues have district/system implications, and
- support the work of the teams evaluating each institution.

This evaluation team will meet with the district/system administration before the site visit to discuss prior district recommendations and will review evidence to evaluate adherence to the Standards.

The coordinating chair may have a separate evaluation team assistant available to him/her solely for the purpose of supporting the district/system evaluation team and for performing organizational tasks related to this part of the evaluation visits. Evaluation team chairs on the special district/system evaluation team will receive the Institutional
Self Evaluation Reports, the previous External Evaluation Reports, and Commission action letters from every institution involved and will make the materials available to institutional evaluation team members on the district/system evaluation team.

D. **Reports by the Institutional Evaluation Teams and the District/System Evaluation Team**

The district/system evaluation team will develop conclusions about any major issues pertaining to the district/system. Recognizing that some district/system observations may pertain to all institutions, and others only to particular institutions, the institutional evaluation team chair, working in conjunction with the coordinating chair and the members of the district/system evaluation team, will incorporate appropriate conclusions within the Standards in the individual institutional External Evaluation Reports of Educational Quality and Institutional Effectiveness. When the district/system evaluation team determines that a recommendation, that pertains to the district/system as a whole is in order, that same recommendation will appear in each of the Institutional Institutions’ External Evaluation Reports.

At the end of each site visit, the evaluation team chair meets with the college chief executive officer to discuss major findings. The evaluation team chair will then make a presentation of the evaluation process and findings at a meeting open to the entire college community. The coordinating chair shall meet separately with the district/system chief executive officer and with the college chief executive officer and present district/system findings. This discussion is limited to the district/system functions identified in the organizational map and the issues related to them which are identified in the Institutional Self Evaluation Reports and the findings of the institutional evaluation teams.

Although the district/system policies may affect the accredited status of the institution(s), the district/system evaluation team will not make recommendations on the accredited status of the institutions. Confidential recommendations, submitted to the Commission, on the accredited status of the institutions will come from each of the institutional evaluation teams.

E. **Commission Actions and Public Disclosure**

The Commission will receive the following items from each institution in preparation for Commission action: the Institutional Self Evaluation Report, the Institutional External Evaluation Report, the catalog, and other pertinent documents. The Commission, using its reader system, will consider each institution separately in relation to the district/system and take the appropriate action for each institution.

The Commission will discuss the district/system and develop a consensus on any matters to be communicated to the district/system Chief Executive Officer. In its action letters to the institutions, the Commission will comment on important district/system matters that significantly enhance or impinge on institutional quality.

In a case where one or more accreditation concerns, relating to the district/system are identified, the Commission may request a written response from the district/system itself and may also specify a site visit, by Commission representatives, to evaluate any such response.
The Commission will make clear that significant inadequacies in district/system functions can jeopardize the accreditation of one, some, or all of the district/system institutions. When correspondence is sent to the district/system Chief Executive Officer, copies will be sent to the appropriate institution(s).

Should the Commission decide that a district/system response and site visit are in order, the district/system evaluation team will normally include the coordinating chair, a member of the Commission, and additional persons with special expertise, as needed. The purpose of the site visit is to evaluate the response from the district/system. This response could be the basis for subsequent Commission action, relative to the accredited status of one or more of the institutions, in the district/system.

F. Follow-up Activities
The district/system Chief Executive Officer is required to share the External Evaluation Report and Commission action letter of any site visit related to district/system functions with the governing board and appropriate staff at the district/system and at the institutions.

The Commission may issue special communications to college Chief Executive Officers on particular leadership issues. When the institution involved is a member of a district/system, the district/system Chief Executive Officer will be copied on this correspondence.

G. Cost
The costs associated with the additional activities of a district/system site visit may be billed directly to the district/system involved on an actual cost basis.