

**HLC Fact of the Week:**  
**“HLC’s Rubric for Evaluating Criteria for Accreditation”**  
(April 7, 2017)

As noted in previous “HLC Facts”, there are five HLC [Criteria for Accreditation](#) and each of those criteria includes several [Core Components](#). The Assurance Argument we write and the evidence we provide are intended to show how we meet each criterion and each core component. When HLC’s peer review team visits Lindenwood next November, the team will evaluate the criteria and core components and, in each case, make one of three [judgments](#):

1. Met
2. Met with concerns
3. Not met

For a given criterion, if all of its core components are met, the criterion is considered met and the team recommendation will be “no monitoring.” This, of course, is the outcome every institution is seeking to achieve.

If, instead, one or more core components are met with concerns, the criterion is considered to be met with concerns and the team recommendation will be some type of monitoring (interim report or focused visit) or placing the institution on notice (sanction).

If one or more core components are not met, the criterion is considered not met and the team’s recommendation will be probation (sanction) or withdrawal of accreditation.

For more information regarding interim monitoring, focused visits, and sanctions, check out these sections of the HLC website: [monitoring](#) and [sanctions](#).

To learn more about accreditation and Lindenwood’s comprehensive evaluation and site visit scheduled for November 6-7, 2017, and to see the countdown clock to the visit, go to the HLC page on the Lindenwood website here: <http://www.lindenwood.edu/about/higher-learning-commission/>.

Questions? Contact David Wilson, Associate VP for Institutional Effectiveness, at [DWilson@lindenwood.edu](mailto:DWilson@lindenwood.edu) or x4737.