

Naropa University

HLC ID 1955

STANDARD PATHWAY: Mid-Cycle Review

Visit Date: 3/11/2019

Mr. Charles Lief
President

Gigi Fansler
HLC Liaison

Katie Clauson
Review Team Chair

Robert Norwood
Federal Compliance Reviewer

Lisa Furman
Team Member

Michael Lorenz
Team Member

Nataka Moore
Team Member

Dennis Pedrick
Team Member

Context and Nature of Review

Visit Date

3/11/2019

Mid-Cycle Reviews include:

- The Year 4 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Biennial Review for Applying institutions

Reaffirmation Reviews include:

- The Year 10 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Review for Initial Candidacy for Applying institutions
- The Review for Initial Accreditation for Applying institutions
- The Year 4 Review for Standard Pathway institutions that are in their first accreditation cycle after attaining initial accreditation

Scope of Review

- Mid-Cycle Review
- Federal Compliance
- On-site Visit

- Federal Compliance 2018

Institutional Context

Founded in 1974, Naropa University (NU) remains committed to being “an academic institution arising from the Buddhist heritage and integrating Western scholarly and artistic disciplines with the rich contemplative tradition of Buddhism and other spiritual traditions having a meditative or mystical body of teachings and practice”. Naropa claims to be the national leader in the field of mindfulness and contemplative pedagogy.

The Higher Learning Commission has accredited Naropa since 1986. Located on three campuses (the Arapahoe, the Paramita, and the Nalanda) in Boulder, Colorado, Naropa enrolled 409 undergraduate and 534 graduate students in fall of 2018 in eleven undergraduate majors and fourteen graduate programs, including relatively new online programs that include a residential component.

The March 2018 visit is a Year 4 Comprehensive Evaluation, including a focus on program review and assessment and the effectiveness of NU's planning to address declining enrollment and the development of potential areas of enrollment growth (specifically Core Components 4A, 4B, and 5C).

Shortly before the visit, NU's Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs resigned and her post-resignation time at NU was minimal. The President reported that, given the time of year (December) and the desire by both the senior administrative leadership and the faculty senate (Cauldron) to review academic leadership, they elected not to immediately seek a new Provost. The Team met with an interim academic affairs leadership team consisting of the two Associate Provosts, the Dean of the undergraduate school, the Dean of the School of Arts and Education, and

three elected faculty members (two members of the Cauldron Faculty Senate and one who was elected by the ranked faculty at large).

Interactions with Constituencies

President

Vice President for Operations

Special Advisor to the President

Director of Development

2 Associate Provosts who are temporarily filling the position of Provost

Senior Advisor for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Initiatives

Executive Director for Mission Integration and Student Services

Core Faculty Member who is the elected faculty representative to the President's cabinet

5 Core Faculty Members who are designated assessment leaders

2 Core Faculty Members who are designated IRB leaders

20 Faculty Members who attended an open session

Controller

Academic Affairs Budget Manager

Project Manager for Curriculum, Catalog, and Assessment

Project Manager for Accreditation and Compliance

Dean of Naropa College

Registrar

Director for Online Education

Director of Institutional Research

Coordinator of Student and Campus Life

Coordinator for Residence Life and Student Housing

Director of Contemplative Practices

GSCP (Clinical Placement) Advisor

Director of Community Counseling Center

Associate Director of Conflict Resolution and Inclusive Community

Associate Director of Equity/Title IX

Director of Sustainability

Accessibility Resources Coordinator

Administrator of Staff and International Student and Scholar Services

Crisis and Substance Abuse Counselor

Veteran Success Coordinator

Director, Community Learning and Career Development

Career Development Counselor

Retention Specialist for Student Engagement

Assistant Director of Community-Based Learning

6 members of the Board of Trustees

Senior Director of Marketing and Admissions

Director of Admissions and Recruitment

Data and Operations Manager

Marketing Project Manager

Open Session attended by staff, faculty, students and Board of Trustees members

Institutional Review Board Leaders

10 undergraduate students who attended an open forum students

14 graduate students who attended an open forum for students

Additional Documents

There are no additional documents reviewed.

1 - Mission

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

1.A - Core Component 1.A

The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

Team interviews with various Naropa University (NU) groups and Team review of NU records consistently affirmed the understanding and commitment of all constituencies to the NU mission. The five goals of the NU Strategic Plan, "Create 2022", adopted by the BOT in 2017, speak to various aspects of the mission of educating, "the whole person, cultivating academic excellence and contemplative insight in order to infuse knowledge with wisdom." NU's five strategic goals and supporting academic, enrollment, development and retention plans directly address ways to advance NU's leadership in the field of contemplative and socially transformative educational practices.

Evidence that the mission and strategic plan guide operations includes:

- Team interviews with members of the Board of Trustees (BOT) provided an understanding of how the BOT's commitment to contemplative education is a key consideration in strategic decisions, not only with regard to academic programming but also in decisions related to, for example, student life, facilities space, and community outreach.
- Interviews with the President, Vice President of Operations, and Comptroller indicated that resource allocation decisions are made based on enrollment and fit with the mission and how the five priorities of the strategic plan guide the multiyear budgeting process.
- Interviews with multiple staff groups affirmed that they have been able to participate in decision-making related to their functional areas and that decisions are made in collaboration with administration and related to the mission.
- NU has established a Center for the Advancement of Contemplative Education to serve as an international hub for research, collaboration, contemplative teaching, and collaboration in the field of Contemplative Education.

As evidenced by the 7th Amended and Restated Bylaws of Naropa University (NU Bylaws), Naropa University's (NU) mission statement was developed by the Board of Trustees and reaffirmed in 2014 and 2019.

NU's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its mission:

- In Team interviews with graduate and undergraduate students, many affirmed that they selected NU because of the unique mission and they testified to how well it is reflected in the curriculum.
- After meeting with Team members, one undergraduate student wrote to thank the Team and reiterated her commitment to contemplative education: "... A contemplative education in my experience is one that works to integrate the academic source material into a student's life and personal journey....this type of integrative, supported education fosters critical thinking, problem solving, and passion, both for our education, and the betterment of the world around us."
- An example of NU's alignment of the core curriculum with the mission is the required Contemplative Learning seminar and Body/Mind requirements as established in the 2018-19 NU Degree Course Catalog (Catalog). Faculty members shared how the seminar is designed to establish a working knowledge of contemplative inquiry.
- Team meetings with graduate and undergraduate students provided examples of how the contemplative process is an underlying, consistent learning objective in their coursework.
- The Office of Community-Based Learning and Career Development staff provided seminar curricula and handouts to demonstrate that their job search and interview skills seminars and workshops reflect the contemplative process.
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) scores from 2010 – 2017 reflect the students' understanding of the mission. Average senior responses are consistently stronger than their peers to the following items:
 - “The faculty and staff here are respectful of people of different religions.”
 - “The students here are respectful of people of different religions.”
 - “The faculty and staff here are respectful of people of different races and cultures.”
 - “The students here are respectful of people of different races and cultures.”
 - “People of different sexual orientations are accepted socially here.”
 - “The environment here encourages students to develop an appreciation of diversity.”
 - “As a result of my experience here, I am more aware of social justice (fairness and equality) issues in the world.”

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.B - Core Component 1.B

The mission is articulated publicly.

1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University (NU) clearly articulates its mission through public documents, including its Mission Statement, Vision Statement, and current strategic plan (Create 2020).

- The mission statement is prominently displayed throughout the campus, publicly distributed documents, and on the website;
- Both the mission and values statements are located on the university's website, in the faculty, staff, and student handbooks, and in the NU Degree Course Catalog 2018-19, and in multiple student and staff recruiting materials; and
- The mission explains the extent of NU's emphasis on the overarching theme of contemplative education, including "the sense of purpose that accompanies compassionate service to the world, and the openness and equanimity that arise from authentic insight and self-understanding."

The charge of the BOT's Student Journey and Enrollment Management Committee, according to the NU Bylaws and Team discussions with Board of Trustees (BOT) members, confirms that the BOT reviews academic programs through program-based assessments and comprehensive program reviews, in order to make decisions about the composition of the academic portfolio of programs offered by NU. For example, the BOT has approved the sunsetting of programs as a result of the faculty's program review and recommendation.

The BOT's Orientation Manual, Faculty Orientation Syllabus, and Staff Orientation Powerpoint each include descriptions of the NU mission and cultural traditions.

The mission claim that, "Drawing on the vital insights of the world's wisdom traditions, the university is simultaneously Buddhist-inspired, ecumenical, and nonsectarian," makes it clear that it intends to serve a broad constituent base, as does the value statement that, "We are Buddhist-inspired, ecumenical, and nonsectarian welcoming faculty, staff, and students of all faiths as well as

those who don't ascribe to any religion."

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.C - Core Component 1.C

The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University (NU) publicly describes itself as an "ecumenical and nonsectarian" institution that welcomes "faculty, staff, and students of all faiths as well as those who don't ascribe to any religion," thereby declaring a commitment to inclusiveness and the value of a diverse society.

- The mission statement proclaims that, "Naropa values ethnic and cultural differences for their essential role in education. It embraces the richness of human diversity with the aim of fostering a more just and equitable society and an expanded awareness of our common humanity."
- NU's values statement adds, "...we fiercely embrace diversity and inclusivity. Through admissions, hiring, and our curriculum we strive to foster an environment of "belonging with differences," working consciously to include persons of different races, ethnicities, gender identities, sexual orientations, veteran status, perspectives, socioeconomic backgrounds, ages, disabilities, national origins, and, of course, religions."
- NU's strategic plan includes educating "students to meet the world's needs with a relevant and socially transformative curriculum". Strategies include integrating the Office of Student Affairs and the Office for Inclusive Communities.
- The website includes a page that articulates NU's Community Commitment to Diversity .

NU's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves. Evidence includes:

- Objective 3-C of NU's strategic plan states that "We will build a culture of diversity and inclusivity that explicitly recognizes, appreciates, and respects all employee identities."
- Syllabus guidelines for courses require instructors to identify how each course addresses diversity, and faculty report that departments discuss this in program meetings.
- Co-curricular programs and invited speakers throughout the academic year lend diverse perspectives and cultural experiences. Examples of trainings and programming were provided by the Office for Inclusive Community and included diversity events and training sessions.
- NU's Gender Equity, Sexual Misconduct, and Relationship Violence Policy and Procedures identify processes to explicitly address diversity and equity.
- 2010 – 2017 NSSE results (provided in the Team response to Core Component 1A) demonstrates that NU student responses rank significantly higher than those of students at

- comparison institutions, including mission-engaged institutions, on diversity issues.
- BOT members spoke to NU's responsibility in promoting diversity in the Boulder area and in lessening the effects of "white privilege" across the metropolitan area.
 - The President's response to a confrontation between the city policy and a NU student of color, published in a local newspaper, included quotes that clearly articulated support for the student's civil rights.
 - In various interviews, administration, faculty, and staff spoke to the Team about their own respect for individual differences and efforts to help students feel welcome. For example, the President and several faculty members recently participated in a civil rights march.

In an interview with students, several reported on opportunities for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or queer (LGBTQ) students. One student reported that in a recent survey, more than 50% of NU students identified themselves as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or queer (LGBTQ) and this statistic was confirmed with the Director of Institutional Research. The Office's website includes a handout entitled, "How to find an LGBTQ College" and the students mentioned several NU student organizations and activities that are focused on gender identity.

NU's Common Data Set indicates that 24% of NU students identify themselves as an ethnic minority. Although students who spoke to the Team were positive in their assessment of the Naropa living and learning environments and described their experiences as welcoming and accepting, they mentioned that they know other students who may not feel the same level of belongingness. The Pre-visit HLC student Opinion Survey received 96 responses; three comments related to concerns about the need for more racial diversity among the students and staff. NU may want to work across the institution to more strategically identify and address the challenges of preparing students for an increasingly global world.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.D - Core Component 1.D

The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University's (NU) mission directly addresses the dual purpose of serving students and communities by modelling service and teaching students to serve their local and global communities: "NU students explore the inner resources needed to engage courageously with a complex and challenging world, to help transform that world through skill and compassion, and to attain deeper levels of happiness and meaning in their lives."

The focus of many of NU's academic programs center on improving the public good. The Contemplative Art Therapy, Contemplative Psychology, Elementary Education, and Environmental Studies undergraduate majors require extensive interactions with the public in the greater Boulder area. In addition, their graduate programs, including clinical mental health counseling and ecopsychology degree programs, emphasize the welfare of the people they serve.

As evidenced by a review of NU's most recent external audit and projected budgets, their largest allocations are to instruction and instruction-related expenses. No allocations are made to investors and no parent organization exists.

NU is active in encouraging sustainability. The Create 2020 Strategic Plan has identified strategic initiatives to move the community towards specific goals, such as, but not limited to, zero waste, climate neutrality, and 100% renewable energy. NU is a member of AASHE, the Carbon Commitment Climate Leadership initiative, the Colorado Carbon Neutral Fund, and a signatory member of the American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment.

As seen on the university calendar, NU sponsors multiple diversity-related lectures each month, for example, the Bayard and John Cobb Peace Lecture, Frederick P. Lenz Lecture, Chögyam Trungpa Lecture Series, Francisco Varela Series, Allen Ginsberg Lecture, and Leslie Scalapino Lecture.

The faculty, staff, and students report that they are engaged in the community. As seen in the internship and practicum site directory rosters, many NU degrees require students to interact with the community members as part of their educational experience. A list of Partnership and Consulting Arrangements includes about 250 internship and practicum host organizations in the greater Boulder area as well as 16 out-of-state, nature-based sites. In a large-group open interview with the Team, members of the community spoke to the value of some of these relationships.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.S - Criterion 1 - Summary

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

Evidence

Naropa University's (NU) mission is clear and articulated publicly in multiple, easily-accessible formats.

As evidenced by the consistency with which representatives of all constituencies, including the NU Board of Trustees (BOT), leadership, staff, faculty, and students, NU's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations. All could speak to a recent process of updating the mission.

Through caring faculty and staff and diversity-related programming and events, NU prepares students to play roles in a multicultural society, and NU's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity.

Actions and decisions taken by the institution reflect their commitment to the greater Boulder community, as evidenced by the many collaborations, such as internship opportunities and practicum sites, available in the greater Boulder area.

As evidenced in NU's external audit and budget documents, the institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other institutional spending.

2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

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

2.A - Core Component 2.A

The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University (NU) documents its policies in appropriate publications such as the NU Faculty Policy and Procedure Handbook (Faculty Handbook), Student Handbook, Employee Handbook, 2018-19 NU Degree Course Catalog (Catalog), and the NU Board of Trustees Manual (BOT Manual). The Faculty Handbook list policies for areas such as faculty responsibility, grievance procedures and non-discrimination policy. The Student Handbook covers areas related to student code of conduct policies and procedures and provides a directory of resources related to an array of needs such as accessibility, childcare, and diversity. The Catalog covers programmatic requirements, academic procedures such as transfer of credits, and financial aid services. The Employee Handbook includes policies regarding employee benefits such as holidays, parenting leave, ADA and employee code of conduct, anti harassment among others. In Team interviews, students and faculty confirmed that they are aware of where to find these handbooks on the My Naropa website.

Integrity and ethical values guide the BOT's work. The BOT Manual details the Trustees' responsibilities, including their responsibility for hiring and engaging with the President, maintaining oversight of NU's financial stability through reviewing and approving the institution's budget and participation in fundraising. BOT members reported that they delegate the day-to-day operation to the President and his or her administration, as stated in the manual, and the President concurred. A review of the Conflict of Interest (COI) Policy adopted in 2007 and COI signature forms indicated that BOT members are required to annually sign a document acknowledging that they received and understand the policy.

The institution operates with integrity in its business practices. NU business affairs undergo independent audit by certified accountants through the firm Plante and Moran, PLLC. A review of the three audits from 2016 to 2018 demonstrates that NU is in compliance with government auditing standards. The auditors make a report for the BOT during meetings that are open to the entire school community for transparency. Interviews with the President and Vice President for Operations confirmed this process.

The Student Handbook describes NU's academic integrity policies and procedures. Academic honesty is viewed as a code of conduct issue that, if not followed, may lead to failure in the course upon first infraction and suspension, expulsion, or a revocation of a degree upon subsequent infractions. The Dean of Naropa College for undergraduate students and the program chair for graduate students reported that they conduct investigations as outlined in the Student Handbook. Interviews with faculty confirm that the formal policies for student discipline are followed.

The Catalog describes the importance of the mission-based contemplative education that is inherent in the undergraduate and graduate curriculum. Faculty explained that, as part of the contemplative experience, students process their personal narratives and history as a way to comprehend and learn to address social injustices in an ever-changing society. This, according to students, means sometime revealing trauma histories and discrimination experiences in their class assignments. The Team learned from interviews with staff and the Title IX Coordinator, that students, staff, and faculty are made aware through required trainings and communications about Title IX as articulated in an October 15, 2018 memo to students, faculty and staff. Faculty also explained that they are mandatory reporters and are to report students experiences related to Title IX shared in class assignments confidentially to the Title IX coordinator. In graduate student forums, students endorsed an understanding of this policy. Because contemplative education requires this high level of self-disclosure in assignments across all programs, the Team recommends that NU takes an additional step to inform students that their faculty members are mandatory reporters by, for example, adding it to course syllabi, along with the Title IX statement, to ensure students understand the limits of confidentiality when they disclose personal trauma, discrimination, harassment and/or other matters that pertain to Title IX reporting.

NU offers counseling services through the NU Student Counseling Center, which is staffed primarily by students completing practicum requirements through their clinical/counseling graduate programs. According to interviews with the counseling staff, approximately 30% of graduate students seek counseling at the Center, which elevates the potential for dual relationships between student-therapist and student-patient. Counseling Center staff reported that the Center works to ensure that student-therapists are not matched with student-patients from their cohort. The Team recommends that the School document this process to ensure transparency and to reduce possible ethical concerns of dual relationships.

In interviews, staff indicated that computer safeguards are in place to protect student, faculty and staff email accounts, namely requiring usernames and passwords. Interviews confirmed that email passwords change every 90 days to reduce cyber attack risk. Username and passwords are also required when accessing the institution's remote NU portal in which library resources and third vendor software are made available. According to the Director of Information Technology, the School also offers faculty, staff, and students the opportunity to enroll in a multifactor authentication process.

In regards to compensation practices, according to Team interviews, the institution in the past few years has begun the process of benchmarking faculty salaries at the fifty percent mark in comparison to similar institutions. Faculty and staff members reported to the Team that recent hires have been compensated at higher salaries as a way to stay competitive in the hiring process. NU can better support faculty and staff by refining, benchmarking, and clearly communicating equitable faculty salary policies and practices.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.B - Core Component 2.B

The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University (NU) presents itself clearly to its students, parents and to the public. The NU website, NU Degree Course Catalog 2018-19 (Catalog), and Student Handbook provides students, parents and the public with comprehensive information about NU, including clearly articulated mission, heritage and identity statements. For example:

- The website states that pedagogy at NU is drawn from eastern teaching philosophies.
- Degree requirements, program curriculum, and requirements for majors and minors are listed on the website and in the Catalog.
- Contact information for various departments including Academic Affairs, Campus Safety and Security, and Student Financial Service are found on the website
- Contact Information for housing, Title IX officer, ADA accommodations and key positions providing leadership for diversity are also available in the Student Handbook.
- The website presents tuition costs and fees and an Undergraduate Degree Plan Net Price Calculator.

Interviews with students confirmed that they are aware of how to find appropriate student service support for specific needs. Students reported that help is easily available and that they go to their advisor to get direction when needed.

NU clearly notes its not-for-profit status and accreditation status with the Higher Learning Commission on the School's website, including a link to the 2015 self-study submitted to the Higher Learning Commission for public consumption. The institutional accreditation webpage includes the HLC Mark of Affiliation link.

NU is cognizant of its responsibilities to present itself accurately to the public. A link to consumer information is on the website under the "About" banner. The information provided at <https://www.naropa.edu/about-naropa/student-consumer-information.php> includes the Annual Security and Fire Safety Report from 2015-2018, student complaint process, job placement rates for undergraduate and graduate students, and undergraduate retention rates.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.C - Core Component 2.C

The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University's (NU) Board of Trustees (BOT) bylaws require twelve to twenty eight trustees including the President of the Institution, the Faculty and Student Trustee. According to the BOT Manual, Trustees are defined as "stewards and fiduciaries of the University, [they] are ultimately responsible for the financial wellbeing of Naropa, including its capital assets, operating budgets, fundraising and endowments." The Board is required to annually sign a Conflict of Interest Policy to ensure that the institution is not "legally (or otherwise) vulnerable to criticism, embarrassment, or litigation in the opinion of responsible stakeholders." which was signed by board members in their 2018 September board meeting. The BOT Manual and Bylaws formally outline the BOT's autonomy and oversight. According to the president, updating of the BOT Manual and Bylaws began in February 2019 and is anticipated to be completed in June 2019.

Interviews with BOT members confirmed that they are guided by the mission and see their role as advisory. Minutes from 2017 and 2018 BOT meetings and Team interviews with BOT members confirm that they oversee the financial health of the school and make decisions on behalf of the school accordingly. The BOT recognizes that while they aid in fundraising efforts and are required per the BOT Manual to make "a significant portion of the University's unrestricted annual fund," NU is highly dependent on revenue generated from tuition. BOT members acknowledged that tuition, as the main revenue source, can be problematic if student enrollment drops below intended targets over consecutive admission cycles and a discussion of the school's fluctuating enrollments is captured in the February 18, 2018 BOT meeting minutes.

BOT members reported that they have recently made changes to how they operate their meetings by adopting a consent agenda and using their remaining time to focus on pertinent data and discussions germane to the health of the school. In responding to the financial needs of the school, BOT members indicated that they have shifted the process of how Trustees are involved in recruiting new donors and that they now review academic programs' vitality and sustainability to meet the demands

of the students and the Boulder community. In sum, the BOT focuses its work on the priorities of the school.

Minutes of the June 2018 BOT meeting include discussion of a projected \$1.8 million dollar deficit. The Finance and Sustainability Committee introduced, and the BOT subsequently adopted, a proposal for the administration to develop a Fiscal Sustainability Plan. That plan is in place and documents provided to subsequent BOT meetings demonstrate progress toward plan goals.

The BOT delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and curriculum responsibility to the faculty. Administration confirmed that their decision-making occurs without infringement from the BOT. Faculty confirmed that they have oversight of the curriculum.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.D - Core Component 2.D

The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University (NU) declares its commitment to academic freedom in the Faculty Handbook. According to the Handbook, NU adopts the 1940 joint statement of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges that declares that “Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interests of either the individual teacher or the Institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.”

In an open forum meeting with members of the faculty, faculty stated that they have oversight of the curriculum and course design through their program learning outcomes. The Academic Affairs office reviews every course syllabus every term to ensure they conform to the standard syllabus template, yet instructors can freely choose assignments and readings with the exception of the undergraduate seminars in which faculty have agreed upon base reading selections that are common across seminar sections. Faculty reported that they are encouraged to submit their research at conference presentations and that NU provides faculty with some professional development funds. Faculty summarized that they have freedom of expression in teaching, scholarship, and addressing institutional matters.

In Team interviews, undergraduate and graduate students endorsed their own freedom of expression. The students stated that because of the small class size they felt safe and comfortable expressing their views and that they are quite vocal in classroom discussions. Students identified multiple ways of expressing their concerns. For example, they described an active student government group called the Student Union of Naropa (SUN). According to the Student Handbook, SUN's purpose is to “gather and represent the student voice, empower student engagement, and provide and support student opportunities for student leadership.” According to the Student Handbook and the BOT Manual in Article III of the bylaws, a student sits on the BOT for a two-year term. The February 2018, June 2018 and September 2018 minutes from the board meetings document that the student representative gave updates and expressed a variety of concerns relating to food insecurity issues, library resource needs and diversifying faculty. Students in the undergraduate forum interviews agreed that for students of color there may be challenges to discussing issues regarding their experiences as people of color, belonging and inclusivity, but summarized that, overall, they do have freedom of expression in voicing concerns, learning experiences, and addressing institutional matters.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.E - Core Component 2.E

The institution's policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students and staff.

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.
2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.
3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University (NU) provides oversight to ensure the integrity of research. NU has an Institutional Review Board (IRB) through which all research conducted by NU faculty and students must be approved. NU's IRB is registered with the US Department of Health and Human Services and they follow federal policies and recommendations for approving all research protocols.

Committee members stated that the committee includes five members (three faculty, one staff and one community member). Interviews confirmed that committee members stay updated in IRB protocol and procedures by examining federal trends and policies consistently as they review and make determinations on IRB submissions. Interviews with committee members and review of IRB documents such as the NU IRB Brief Summary and Training document, and the My Naropa IRB page detailed that the IRB utilized CITI training until October 2018 and has replaced this training with modules and quizzes created by the IRB Committee. The IRB page on My Naropa provides resources to guide and support the submission of a proposal, such as guidelines for preparing the proposal and investigator responsibilities. The Team supports the IRB committee's initiative to implement recurrent training of committee members to stay updated on research ethics.

Students receive active guidance and support in ethical use of information in several ways. A policy on authorized use of NU computing resources is available in the Student Handbook. The policy makes clear statements regarding copyright violations and unethical use of computers.

Interviews confirmed that the school's librarian meets with every first year student through their writing seminar course to provide instruction on obtaining research materials and on ethical use of resources (i.e. copyright and fair use laws). The library resource page on My Naropa provides copyright tools to users and offers librarian assistance in helping to answer any questions related to copyright and fair use if needed. Graduate students are provided ethical use of information during orientation and in preparing for their thesis. Faculty interviews confirmed that students are provided direction on ethical use of information and academic honesty during first year.

NU's concern for academic honesty begins with its policies and procedures for such, available in the Student Handbook. The Handbook provides examples of actions that violate academic integrity such as policies related to the unauthorized use of emails, privacy, and records. Team interviews confirm that faculty discuss with students intended and unintended plagiarism, how to avoid both, and other

policies regarding academic integrity. Statements about academic honesty are in the master template for course syllabi . NU has a policy on academic integrity and the 2017-18 Student Conduct Data Report summarizes actions taken to enforce its policies on student conduct.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

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

Evidence

Naropa University (NU) operates with integrity in its financial, academic, and auxiliary functions. Mission, tradition, program requirements, admission requirements, time to completion, costs to students, and accreditation status are available on the website including a consumer information page that meets Department of Education requirements. Policies and processes to ensure academic integrity and ethical practice are published in various handbooks. NU's counseling center provides counseling to its students and the Team affirms their attempts to avoid dual relationships between student-therapist and student-patient. Interviews with members of the Board of Trustees (BOT) and administration confirm that the BOT considers its constituents and acts with integrity in its oversight. BOT bylaws delegate day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and oversight of the curriculum to the faculty; administration and faculty agree that they are free to do so. Freedom of expression in teaching, scholarship, learning and voicing concern over institutional matters was confirmed in interviews with faculty, staff and students.

3 - Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

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

3.A - Core Component 3.A

The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University (NU) uses traditional higher education systems and standards to establish and maintain levels of performance appropriate to the certificate or degree awarded. Credit hour requirements for all degrees and certificates and minimum grade point requirements for undergraduate and graduate programs are detailed in the NU Degree Course Catalog 2018-19 (Catalog) for each program. Courses are designated as graduate (500 and above) and undergraduate (100–499) and a review of select syllabi indicate that course work and expectations correspond to those levels.

According to the Catalog, NU uses the higher education standard of a minimum of 120 credit hours for the Bachelor of Arts degree and requires a minimum GPA of 2.0. The Bachelor of Arts Degree consists of 30 credits of core curriculum, at least one major (36–60 credits), and electives for a total of 120 credits. Undergraduate students are required to complete at least 60 credit hours while in residence and a capstone project for each degree program.

Graduate degree requirements vary by program; NU offers 15 Master of Art degrees requiring 36–63 credit hours and a Master of Divinity degree requiring 72 credit hours. All graduate programs require a minimum GPA of 2.0 and submission of a graduate thesis. Several of the graduate programs also require practicums and/or internships, as evidenced through the academic catalog and described in conversations with graduate program faculty.

To ensure programs stay relevant, NU engages in an annual internal curriculum review process for each department, as evidenced through annual program review samples for the Environmental

Studies and Resilient Leadership programs and through conversation with faculty. Faculty members explained the annual curriculum review process to the Team and emphasized the use of data (student survey, enrollment, retention, etc.) to inform decisions about the program. The Director of Institutional Research affirmed that she provides weekly data updates to each department. Several faculty members shared that their departments regularly engage in conversations about the data during their routine department meetings and they provided examples of how they had used the data to inform program-level changes. As detailed in the evidence/documents provided and confirmed through conversation with faculty, a robust process for curricular changes is consistently utilized.

A review of the recently updated (Fall 2018) Syllabus Template and conversations with faculty members confirmed that all syllabi are reviewed to check for appropriate course learning outcomes, content, assignments, and other compulsory elements (e.g., disability accommodation). Faculty members reported that if a syllabus does not contain the required content, it is returned to the instructor for revision and re-submission to Academic Affairs.

Learning goals are outlined on the website for all undergraduate and graduate programs and NU's undergraduate curriculum includes six "essential learning outcomes" articulated at introductory, milestone, and capstone learning levels. Although it was apparent through conversations with faculty and students all are aware of the learning outcomes, the HLC peer review team recommends consideration of the addition of the institutional and program learning outcomes for undergraduate and graduate programs be added to the Catalog in order to provide additional awareness for students and faculty which would further support achievement of the learning outcomes.

As evidenced on the website and in the Catalog, NU offers two modes of program delivery: residential and distance. In order to ensure the quality of programs regardless of location or mode of delivery, NU utilizes quality control mechanisms (e.g., syllabus expectations, program learning outcomes assessment, and consortium agreements) as evidenced through the syllabus template, Faculty Handbook, website, and Team conversations with faculty members, the Director of Online Education and the Associate Provosts.

A review of the distance learning program quality and consistency document (11/2018), and a conversation with the Director of Online Education confirmed that quality control mechanisms are in place for online courses. Faculty members are trained on the LMS platform before providing online instruction and resources for additional training and assistance are available through the Director and from distance learning office staff. NU maintains membership in the National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) as designated on the SARA website.

According to the NU website, NU currently offers three low-residency graduate degree programs. Each requires online plus residential face-to-face components. There is also one low residency non-credit extended studies program, Authentic Leadership, that is similarly structured.

NU provided copies of consortium agreements with the University of Colorado at Boulder (6/2018) and contractual agreements with the Royal University of Bhutan (10/2018) and Where There Be Dragons (3/2017) for undergraduate study-abroad programs.

A detailed 2017-2018 faculty credentialing worksheet used by the Associate Provosts for course assignments confirmed NU's use of a comprehensive credentialing course alignment process. Associate Provosts shared an explanation of, and documentation and outcomes from, a thorough review process that they used to check appropriate credentialing of faculty for all courses, in both delivery modes, and consequent adjustments that were made to faculty assignments.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.B - Core Component 3.B

The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The general education core curriculum at Naropa University (NU) as outlined in the academic catalog supports its mission of being the "leading institution of contemplative education in North America." The Three Pillars of a Naropa Education (contemplative inquiry, diversity and inclusion, and sustainability) are articulated and guide curriculum development. During the site visit, faculty shared examples of how they use the mission and pillars to guide the development of courses and one example from December 2018 Academic Council meeting minutes mapped a new sustainability seminar to be implemented in Fall 2020. Faculty also shared that the pillars and mission are guiding conversations in relation to the incorporation of the arts into the core curriculum (confirmed by a review of December 2018 Academic Council meeting minutes).

NU's commitment to the alignment of the core curriculum with the mission is exemplified in the requirement of the Contemplative Learning seminar and Body/Mind area course requirements to be completed at NU as established in the academic catalog. Faculty shared with the Team how the Contemplative Learning seminar, a required course for undergraduate students, was strategically designed to ensure students understand contemplative inquiry (one of the three pillars).

The core curriculum consists of five, 3-credit seminar courses, and 15 credits selected from five content areas (according to the academic catalog). NU shares the "purpose, content, and intended learning outcomes of the core curriculum are to reflect the distinctiveness and priorities of contemplative education, imparting the broad-based knowledge, skills, and attitudes

that Naropa graduates ideally embody.”

Outlined on the college website and syllabus samples provided, NU has established Six Essential Learning Outcomes for its general education program.

1. Critical Thinking (Disruptive Scholarship) Students demonstrate reflexive and discourse community analysis, incorporating diverse perspectives, toward critiquing (and disrupting) normative thinking, theories or praxis.
2. Non-conceptual Knowing (Embodied Presence) Students access and embody direct experience.
3. Complexity (Radical Interdependence) Students identify the interdependent nature of experience.
4. Resilience (Rigorous Flexibility) Students generate flexibility in response to challenge or change.
5. Compassion (Spiritual Warriorship) Students apply emotional literacy in the cultivation of compassionate action.
6. Innovation (Creative Action) Students apply creativity to problem-solving.

Through open forum discussion with faculty, it was apparent the core curriculum is grounded in the framework developed by the institution, and is reflective of the distinctiveness and priorities of a NU contemplative education. Faculty members described their involvement in a deliberate, collaborative process to develop and articulate this set of outcomes.

NU's core curriculum as described in the 2018-19 Academic Catalog introduces students to a range of skills related to collecting, analyzing, discovering and communicating information. A review of course descriptions from the core curriculum (COR 115 writing seminar; COR 150 diversity seminar) substantiate the claim that opportunities are provided for students to engage with modes of inquiry and in adapting skills to changing environments. The NU website describes two faculty-led contemplative psychology and neuroscience laboratories that provide opportunities for students to engage in the collection, analysis, and communication of information in the context of original research.

The recently implemented Capstone Festival offers solid evidence of NU's commitment to provide opportunities for students to engage in the collection, analysis and communication of information throughout their degree programs. During this annual event, undergraduate students deliver senior projects from the senior level capstone courses. Sample syllabi from several undergraduate capstone courses (capstone syllabus samples document) provided evidence to support this claim. A review of the Capstone 2018 presentation document and promotional flyer revealed this annual week-long community event involves students presenting readings, research findings, performances, workshops, or business-plan pitches to an audience of students, faculty, staff, alumni, family members, and community leaders.

Evidence was also provided to support this core component at the graduate level. Sample syllabi reviewed (ENV 701 Nonprofit Management and Social Entrepreneurship; WRI 601 Poetics Seminar; REL 600 Meditation Practicum) provided clear evidence of opportunities for graduate students to engage in collecting, analyzing and communicating information. As noted in the academic catalog, counseling and MDiv degree students are required to complete pre-professional internships and thesis courses, and MA Transpersonal Art Therapy and other graduate counseling students are required to complete a nine-month to one year required internship.

To support its claim that the education offered by NU recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work, NU provided examples that align with their mission and heritage. For example, the 2018-19 Academic Catalog notes that the undergraduate core curriculum is designed to offer students an opportunity to learn about themselves, understand relationships with others who are inherently different from themselves, and engage in service on behalf of communities and the planet. In the Catalog and detailed in seminar course descriptions, undergraduate students are required to take a 3-credit core diversity seminar (COR 150) that focuses on the development of knowledge, critical thinking, analytical skills, and interpersonal and inter-group interactions necessary for living and working in a society characterized by diversity. In addition, students are required to take 3 credits from the Cultural and Historical Studies core area courses which are aligned with established learning goals (e.g. hold multiple perspectives/engaging complexity and ambiguity; understand present and historical systems of oppression, etc.).

Study abroad programs are available to provide opportunities for students to experience cultural diversity; evidenced through agreements with the Royal University of Bhutan (10/2018 agreement) and Where There Be Dragons (3/2017 agreement).

Course descriptions demonstrate how graduate programs address diversity and inclusivity. Examples included the Master of Divinity (REL 615 Power, Privilege and Diversity) and MA Resilient Leadership (ENV 637 Ecological Justice) courses. Additional evidence included a sample syllabus for the graduate counseling program, which requires a 3-credit course on diversity and inclusivity as applicable to counseling skills (CNSS 610 Social and Multicultural Foundations). Team conversations with graduate program faculty and an internship site directory (6/2018) for graduate programs support the claim the university recognizes and supports the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.

As evidenced through the Faculty Handbook (pg. 72) and supported by conversations with faculty and associate provosts and a review of a 2017-18 promoted faculty members' curriculum vitae, NU expects faculty members to engage in scholarly research to achieve ascension through the faculty ranking structure.

Evidence of student contributions to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge include the published requirements of the undergraduate capstone festival (capstone syllabus samples document, festival schedule, capstone 2018 presentation), and graduate program research requirements (detailed in the Catalog and a review of graduate level syllabi).

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.C - Core Component 3.C

The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.
2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.
3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.
4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.
5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.
6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University (NU) has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty to oversee classroom and non-classroom responsibilities. NU's faculty roster reflects 71 ranked faculty, including 59 full-time and 12 half-time faculty. According to NU's common data set, the current faculty to student ratio is 9:1.

As detailed in the 2018-19 Faculty Handbook, full-time faculty members are appointed to one of four core faculty academic ranks, specifically, Assistant Professor; Associate Professor; Full Professor; or University Professor. The Handbook also detailed the ranks of instructor and four levels of adjunct faculty, with position descriptions outlined in the faculty handbook. NU defines a full-time teaching load for core faculty as twenty (20) credit hours; typically, 10 credit hours per faculty member, per term. The full-time teaching load for instructors is twenty-four (24) credit hours, 12 credit hours per instructor, per term. Instructors are not required to attend Academic Council meetings or to participate in the governance of the university, as per the faculty handbook (2018-2019).

Faculty qualifications and expectations are detailed in the 2018-19 Faculty Handbook. Conversations with faculty during the site-visit confirmed they are responsible for developing and overseeing the curriculum, student advising/mentoring, and course development and delivery. To ensure appropriate expectations for student performance, NU uses a sample syllabus template, which includes expectations for program and course level learning outcomes, and the criteria for the grading and evaluation of student work (located in the 2018-2019 faculty handbook and supported through

conversations with faculty during the site-visit). Through conversations with faculty, the designated assessment leaders, and associate provosts, it is clear that all faculty are required to be actively engaged in the assessment of student learning and faculty were able to speak to assessment principles and details.

The 2018-19 Faculty Handbook articulates expectations concerning the rights and responsibilities of NU faculty members. A review of faculty credentials during the site visit verified the application of established policies and practices. As evidenced in the Handbook and discussed with associate provosts, faculty are required to hold a graduate degree above the level of instruction for all terminal degree or professional terminal degree programs. A Team member reviewed a document detailing faculty credentialing policies, including alternative credentialing for individual programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels, with the associate provosts.

NU has established policies and practices for selecting qualified faculty candidates during the hiring process (as detailed in the Faculty Handbook). The faculty hiring process and related forms are posted on the MyNaropa site. An associate provost confirmed that the process includes a thorough review of credentials prior to any official hiring and reported that she reviews all course assignments. The Team reviewed a recently (2017-18) completed, detailed audit of faculty credentialing.

The associate provost reported that, given the unique contemplative education approach, she collaborated with faculty and with external sources to develop the alternative credentialing policies. The policy and alternative credentialing documents demonstrate that this is an extensive process that requires faculty input. The associate provost noted that the process of developing credentialing policies has helped faculty to clarify alternative credentialing for nontraditional courses (e.g. Herbal Medicine) and areas needing clearer evidentiary documentation (e.g. Meditation Instruction). She also shared that NU has started the process of documenting Naropa Meditation Instructor training certification and the equivalent across program areas, a process that she expects to complete prior to the fall 2019 semester. Documentation of alternative credentialing included Excel spreadsheets that provide education and licensure details.

The credentialing audit document indicated that all faculty now meet or exceed course-specific credentialing requirements. According to the associate provost, the audit revealed that 16 former faculty members, including one ranked faculty who is completing a PhD and 15 adjuncts, did not meet credentialing requirements. Several of these were faculty for courses in the MA Contemplative Education program, which has been discontinued, and the majority will be required to update clinical licensure in order to be rehired. Three faculty members listed on the roster held B.A degrees. One of the three has been dismissed from the institution, and the other two teach in the summer writing program and meet alternative faculty qualifications as highly regarded members of the writing community with numerous publications. This was confirmed through a review of curriculum vitae and supporting documentation.

Faculty members are evaluated annually through the faculty annual evaluation process, as evidenced through a review of annual faculty review documents from 2015-2016, and 2017-2018. As noted in the annual faculty review documentation provided and through conversation with the associate provost, the process involves multiple levels of review (peers, program chairs, deans) and the monitoring of yearly goals and outcomes, which provide the basis for feedback and development toward promotion. Faculty are also required to review and receive feedback from the program chair on student course evaluations annually, as detailed in the 2018-19 Faculty Handbook, which also notes that faculty members are expected to reflect upon and address areas of student concern.

Clearly defined processes for faculty promotion are outlined in the Faculty Handbook. The associate provost shared a draft of proposed revisions to the faculty evaluation policies, procedures and criteria rubric, which she reported are being developed in collaboration with faculty. The draft demonstrates NU's commitment to enhancing the faculty evaluation process in order to ensure the quality of instruction provided to students.

NU offers support for developing grant funding opportunities to help faculty members efforts to stay current in their respective fields of study. Professional development support is outlined in the Faculty Handbook and includes funding opportunities for degree work, attendance at conference presentations; faculty education leading to certification, degrees, etc. This support was corroborated through Team discussion with faculty members. Additional opportunities for faculty development include a sabbatical leave opportunity, new faculty orientation program, and the annual faculty evaluation process, which are detailed in the Faculty Handbook and were also confirmed during conversation with faculty members.

Office hours are required of all full-time and part-time faculty, as documented in the Faculty Handbook. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data suggests that student engagement with NU faculty is positive for both undergraduate and residential graduate students. Core faculty are required to provide academic counsel to students, setting educational and career goals, in collaboration with the university's Advising and Student Retention Services, Writing Center, and Academic Support services as detailed in the Handbook.

NU offers an array of student support services. A review of the Employee Handbook indicates that staff personnel are required to be appropriately qualified for any position held. Additional evidence to support this claim includes revised position descriptions for the undergraduate academic advising team members (retention specialist job description document), cross-training workshops for student affairs personnel (student affairs professional development document), and annual training for the financial aid staff (professional development and experience for student financial aid document). NU encourages staff members to pursue training and development opportunities as a requirement of the individual professional development process outlined in the handbook. The Human Resources department has implemented a series of online training modules focused on diversity, inclusion, and oppression for all new staff, as evidenced through a review of two sample training modules, "Creating a Culture of Respect", and "Fostering an Inclusive Community".

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University (NU) offers student support services suited to the needs of its student populations. As evidenced through conversations with students, staff and faculty during the on-site visit, and through a review of the college website, student handbook and documents indicated below, NU support services include the following :

- Office of Accessibility (web-page and disability form screenshot)
- Office of Community-Based Learning and Career Development (web-page)
- Office for Inclusive Community (web-page and events calendar)
- Contemplative Practice Opportunities (events calendar)
- Office of Financial Aid (web-page)
- Registrar (web-page)
- Resident Life and Student Housing (web-page and 2018-2019 student handbook)
- Student Counseling Center (web-page)
- International Student Advisor (web-page)
- Transportation, including bike shack, city bus passes, etc.(web-page)
- Office of Veteran Services (events calendar)
- Student health insurance (web-page and 2018-2019 student handbook)
- Partnerships with area fitness centers (2018-2019 student handbook)

In interviews with Team members, faculty, students and staff shared that NU utilizes a learning management system and provides wireless internet, practice rooms for music students, and library services to support the academic needs of students.

NU reports that they regularly survey undergraduate and graduate students regarding student

satisfaction with specific services. Survey data from 2017 is available online and demonstrates that 94% of undergraduates report being satisfied with their NU experience and would choose NU again if provided the opportunity. Similar results were reported by graduate student respondents, with 89% reporting satisfaction with NU. For both undergraduates and graduates, the lowest satisfaction scores are related to technology and food-service options. Team meetings during the site-visit indicated that NU is aware of these reported weaknesses and is working to address them.

As evidenced through the organizational structure outlined in the Employee Handbook, the university website, and supported through conversation with students and the academic advising staff, NU provides individualized academic advising services aimed at matching incoming and matriculated students to appropriate courses, instructors, and support services. A document that identifies several types of Living and Learning Communities confirmed that first year students are required to complete a one-credit course titled Living and Learning Communities.

The Learning Commons, which encompasses the Academic and Student Affairs departments, provides support to student academic success through undergraduate advising (academic catalog and academic advising office web-page), academic coaching (academic coaching brochure and web-page) and the writing center (web-page). NU does not offer remedial course work for students.

According to the website and supported through conversation with faculty and staff, advisors are available in the Learning Commons office to assist students in navigating academic policies and procedures, tracking degree requirements and to assist with creating course schedules each semester. As documented in the faculty handbook and confirmed through conversation with faculty and students during the site visit, all core faculty are also required to provide academic advising support to students, serving “as program advisor in a student’s major, identifying research directives for degree completion, or ensuring that academic requirements coincide with a student’s personal and professional objectives.”

According to the website and Team conversations with graduate program faculty and students, graduate advising is located within each program’s main office and all graduate students are assigned an academic advisor.

Faculty, administrators, staff and students described various resources and infrastructure to support effective teaching and learning for faculty and students, and a description of each is available on NU's website:

- Allen Ginsberg library
- Paramita Library
- Nalanda Arts Library
- Naropa University Digital Archives and Records
- University of Colorado (CU) at Boulder's Norlin Research Library access
- MyNaropa student portal system that includes an eLearning system for residential and distance learning courses, an ePortfolio system (required for all undergraduate students in the core seminar courses), an LMS system for faculty and students, and technical support services
- Laboratories (W.D. Jones Community Greenhouse and the Consciousness Laboratory)
- Student Computer Labs on each campus
- Meditation Halls on each campus
- Performing Arts Center and practice space

According to a Finance and Sustainability Committee consent agenda dated 1/25/2019, upgrades to

Lincoln Hall through donor funds were completed during the 2018 winter holiday break and included new furniture, paint and trim, carpeting, and blinds. The Team visited the building and found a light, airy environment conducive to learning. According to a tour guided by the Director of Safety, Facilities and Operations and the Director of Information Technology, technology upgrades are in process, including increasing bandwidth, installation of emergency power and back up disaster recovery systems, and researching for a new LMS system.

NU supports both undergraduate and graduate student research projects, including graduate theses and undergraduate capstones requirements. A review of Naropa's website includes the following resources that provide guidance and support in the effective use of research and information:

- NU Library instruction and resources, including library staff instruction
- Research database access
- Reference and research services
- Institutional Review Board
- Research laboratories and programs

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

3.E - Core Component 3.E

The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.
2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University (NU) offers co-curricular programs that contribute to the educational experience of its students and are suited to the Naropa mission. The office responsible for co-curricular programming (as evidenced by the student life website), is Student Affairs, which consists of Student and Campus Life, Residence Life and Student Housing, Student Counseling Center, Accessibility Resources, International Students and Scholar Services, and Veterans Success Services.

Conversations with students and staff and document review confirm that NU offers numerous student and campus life organization opportunities and events as described on the website, including:

- New Student Orientation (Event Schedule and powerpoint presentation)
- Student Group Orientation (How to Start or Revive your Student Group document)
- Student Organizations (listed on a web page)
- Student Union of Naropa (web page and meeting minutes 2.12.18)
- Student Engagement Awards (Engagement Awards Information document)
- Community Leadership Series (Event Brochure)

The Residence Life and Student Housing 2017-2018 event calendar lists many activities that are focused on developing a sense of student belonging.

In addition, Naropa offers:

- Student Counseling Center events (2018 Events Calendar)
- International Student Orientation (Schedule document)
- Service-learning opportunities (2019-2020 Vision and Strategic Goals document, list of agencies in the greater Boulder area)
- Veterans Student Support group and Veterans Day events (2018 Events Calendar)
- Office for Inclusive Community events (web page)
- Center for Culture, Identity and Social Justice events (2015-2017 Events Calendar)
- Sustainability Events (Brochures)
- Contemplative Practices and Traditions events (2018 Events Calendar); and

- Community Practice Day events (2018 Events Calendar)

NU shared the results of the 2018 NSSE, demonstrating that 95% of first-year students noted during the school year they connected their learning to societal problems and issues. Similarly, 79% of seniors reported they connected their learning to societal problems and issues. Many of the graduate programs at NU (as noted in the Catalog) incorporate practicum and internship experiences.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.S - Criterion 3 - Summary

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

Evidence

Through clear documentation substantiated by thoughtful and engaging conversations with administration, faculty, staff and students, the Team is confident that Naropa University (NU) offers quality education that is consistent across its few, select delivery methods. Graduate and undergraduate programs have established assessment protocols and use them to maintain current programs that require appropriate levels of student performance. NU has established learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, and certificate programs and all faculty seem to be actively engaged in the assessment of student learning. NU provided evidence of support for student learning and effective teaching. NU offers a number of co-curricular programs that contribute to the educational experience of its students and that align with its mission.

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.

4.A - Core Component 4.A

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

Rating

Met

Evidence

As a result of HLC's 2015 Continued Accreditation process, the visiting Team wrote that, “[w]hile clearly committed to program review, Naropa University's (NU) process is still undeveloped enough to lead the team to judge that the Core Component is met with concerns.” (20150309 Continued Accreditation-Team Report). In particular, the Team found that program-level learning outcomes were insufficient, that faculty and staff needed training in order to develop the outcomes and related assessment plans, that rubrics were still in development, and that the implementation of a software tool (WEAVE) was in progress but not completed.

Since that visit, NU has matured the processes for assessment and program review. NU provided

evidence of regular program reviews of varying types, ranging from an annual check-in (Annual Program Review, or APR) to more detailed reviews, such as the seven-year external program review examples from the Music undergraduate and Religious Studies masters-level programs). Faculty recommend outside reviewers and the office of the provost makes the selection. Interviews with faculty made clear that this is standard practice across the University. The Team explored several examples of each type of review as well as the repository and tracking system for annual program reviews, which provided evidence of a widespread process and careful tracking thereof. Examples included:

Annual Program Review Self-Study documents reviewed include:

- Annual Program Review Response Form ENV15-16
- BA Annual Program Review and CfC
- MFA APR and CfC
- MA Religious Studies
- REL BA response to AA integration
- Ecopsychology Proposal for the 2017 Academic Plan

Seven-Year External Reviews:

- INTD
- MA Religious Studies
- External Review Report Music

NU provided an example of a case-study of program review and improvement, in the case of the Environmental Studies Department's 2015 APR which led to several enhancements to their BA and MA programs, including changes to learning outcomes, faculty teaching, and even program marketing. In this example, there was evidence that program review did look holistically at the program, from learning to the programs' financial viability. This case study showed a several-year process of review, change, and evaluation of results. Interviews with faculty confirmed that this is standard practice at Naropa.

NU evaluates all the credit it transcripts. The Registrar reported that her office is responsible for overseeing the application of all credit policies, including transfer credit. She affirmed that Naropa does not award credit for experiential learning. The institution follows standard practice in using ACE recommendations for military-related credit. The Catalog articulates NU's credit policies. Internal documents like the Primer for Evaluating Transfer Credit demonstrate that administrative resources are available to guide the consistent application of policies to student records. The Request to Apply Transfer Credits form demonstrates the communication to the student of the outcome of the award of credits presented in addition to that record being housed in the institution's system. When Naropa relies on the services of a third party, it is in the standard case of the translation and review of foreign credentials.

The Registrar confirmed that, while the faculty delegate day-to-day transfer-credit decisions to her office, that faculty are routinely engaged whenever there is an unusual question about applicability, and in most cases regarding graduate-level transfer.

NU faculty report that they are responsible for curriculum and the Faculty Handbook articulates standardized processes for the creation and revision of courses and programs. Multiple interviews with faculty and academic staff confirmed that these processes are known and

followed. Minutes and forms provide additional support that course prerequisites and course content are in the domain of the faculty and that these are issues with which they regularly concern themselves.

Course rigor and consistency is the province of faculty and evidenced in the Faculty Handbook where the responsibilities of the two Curriculum Committees (undergraduate and graduate) are described. The Area Requirement Guidelines document ensures that courses designed for use as a Core Area Requirement meet certain criteria of rigor and area consistency. Course and program creation/revision adheres to a four-level process, based on the scope of the proposal; this is described in the Curriculum Change Approval Process document provided as evidence for 3A, and to which multiple interviewees referred in the course of the visit.

Faculty proposing new graduate programs and courses must, in the curriculum development process, articulate the standards for graduate level education held by their program and how each course meets those standards. The Graduate Curriculum Committee ultimately reviews and approves these proposals. Interviews with members of these committees confirmed their commitment to this rigor.

NU does not engage in any dual-credit programs.

NU presents the guidelines for faculty credentialing in a Faculty Qualifications Policy.

NU maintains specialized accreditation for three programs and a state approval for the Elementary Education degree. These accreditations are appropriate to these programs. There is a tentative plan to pursue CACREP accreditation for the graduate counseling programs, according to the Academic Plan 2017-2020 and an interview with academic leadership and faculty. That same interview confirmed that NU continuously reassesses the opportunity for additional, appropriate programmatic accreditations.

NU monitors their graduates using standard internal instruments (alumni surveys) and external ones (Student Tracker data) to gain insights into the activities of students who withdraw or graduate from NU. The Office of Institution Research disseminates a study (Post Graduation Survey Results) every two years that analyzes their alumni population. The next report is planned for summer 2019. The 2015-16 edition draws a picture of NU alumni, down to the program level. NU might consider whether they can produce this report more frequently, as more timely insights into student employment outcomes would be a valuable addition to the program review process.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.B - Core Component 4.B

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University's (NU) last HLC visit resulted in a Team determination to embed monitoring in "program review and assessment" into this 2019 comprehensive review. The 2015 Team reported that "[w]hile clearly committed to program review, Naropa's process is still undeveloped enough to lead the team to judge that the Core Component is met with concerns (20150309 Continued Accreditation-Team Report)." In particular, the Team found that program level learning outcomes were incomplete, that faculty and staff needed training, that rubrics were still in development, that the implementation of a software tool (WEAVE) was in progress but not completed.

In the intervening four years NU has made significant progress in developing their assessment practices.

First, and seemingly key to this development, NU determined that the WEAVE system in implementation was actually an *obstacle* to the growth of assessment at NU due to the steep learning curve of the system. Faculty described it as neither intuitive nor helpful so they made a deliberate decision to abandon it in favor of a system of Word documents. This was recommended by colleagues from another institution whose advice they sought. A Team Member reviewed the electronic storage system and found it to be satisfactory. A faculty member commented that the pervading culture at NU was one where people interact best in person and the WEAVE system seemed alien to them in this respect as well.

Second, and also an important aspect to the integration of assessment at NU, was that faculty assumed the day-to-day responsibility for assessment, whereas before the process was managed by an administrator. In several sessions, faculty members referenced this change as a key turning point in their perspective on assessment. Faculty also cited the respectful and nurturing support of an Associate Vice Provost as being instrumental to this process in the years since the last team's visit.

NU clearly states program level learning goals ("PLOs"), on their website and, when the course is

dedicated to a particular degree, also in the course syllabus.

NU performs a regular cycle of assessment of PLOs, on a rolling calendar set by each program. These assessments are centrally housed in a shared drive in the Office of Academic Affairs and the Team was able to review this to determine that there is an active process for collecting and tracking in these assessment results.

NU has provided as evidence samples of the rubrics developed and used by faculty for the assessment of outcomes in the Core and PLO areas, as well as some samples of the completed assessment activities for several courses. Faculty are able to adapt a general rubric form, within certain bounds, to the needs of their particular department; for instance, one department prefers to rate on a 6-point scale while another has elected a 12-point one. Structurally, however, the PLO assessment and reporting process is common across NU, which has allowed faculty across disciplines to discuss assessment with each other, which they attest in interviews to be a common occurrence, and for the two Curriculum and Assessment Committees to read and review all documents with a common understanding.

NU is currently undertaking a full curricular mapping project, in which they are evaluating course outcomes and their relation to program outcomes. This will comply with and strengthen the Curricular Arc described throughout the evidence provided.

In a thirty-five page report entitled the Co-curricular Assessment Report (2015-18), NU presents mission-centric co-curricular learning outcomes, ties them to specific co-curricular activities, and documents three years of inferential assessments and the resulting plans for change. Staff from eight support functions (the offices of Student and Campus Life; Student Counseling; Accessibility; International Students and Scholars Services; Housing and Residence life; Veteran Success; Sustainability; and Contemplative Practices) report that they have collaborated to develop student learning outcomes in nine areas of learning: creativity; career pathways; communication skills; community connections; contemplative practices; diversity, inclusion and social justice; health; leadership; and sustainability. The report provides, for each of the nine areas, a learning outcome, a list of student events that have addressed that outcome at least once over the past year (some, for example, are annual events), the number of hours devoted to the activity and the number of participants. Notes about each event are provided and include purpose and/or impact statements.

For example, in the Creativity area of learning, the student outcome is, "Students practice art forms that cultivate creativity and embodied presence." Thirty-three events are listed and the table demonstrates that the events engaged 6 of the nine offices. An African Dance class in Fall 2018 lasted 6 hours, attracted 34 participants, and staff who assessed the event documented their analysis as: "Internationally renowned dance artist and musician Fara Tolno taught dances from Guinea, West Africa, leading participants first through stretching and strengthening exercises and facilitating embodied practice of each movement, as well as choreography. Impact: Student feedback was overwhelmingly positive, expressing appreciation for the opportunity to embody a creative art form from another culture, for the health and stress-relief benefits as well as sense of community and connection. Classes were attended by 14 and 20 students and community members. A strong student group/coalition formed in Spring 2018 and continues to advocate strongly for more opportunities to practice the arts at Naropa." The assessment tables for each area of learning is followed by a list of future plans (goals) that flow from the assessment notes and events related to the area of learning. For Creativity, 11 goals are listed along with 10 events. The sections end with a Reflection Statement that often integrates findings with the findings in other areas of learning.

NU faculty were clear in interviews that assessment makes their programs better, with one faculty member observing, to general agreement of colleagues in the room, that assessment has turned out to be something that, as faculty they were already doing in a sense (and so was not actually an extra burden on them), and that doing assessment in this way was simply something one must do to be a good teacher." Some program faculty have even included students in their assessment conversations and cited examples of students contributing meaningfully to the PLO of a program.

NU has established good-practice assessment processes and methodologies which involve most faculty; faculty with whom the team spoke were engaged in assessment and clearly fluent in the processes involved. NU has moved from a cumbersome workflow system to a simple Word document model, which seems to have had a salutary effect on the adoption and engagement of assessment. Further, the team was gratified to learn in an interview with the assessment leaders that NU now has plans for their next phase of assessment, which will include the formation of a database (planned summer 2019) of assessment results for better analysis and study, as well as some early ideas about how to build and strengthen formative assessment processes, as their program now is strictly summative and they are eager to bring assessment to a student level.

--

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.C - Core Component 4.C

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

Naropa University (NU) attends to their key student metrics. Apart from the typical institutional attentions paid to these metrics, NU took the additional step of securing a grant to experiment with new forms of student support and an intentional set of curricular improvements. This grant ended shortly after the prior team's visit and NU has hired a consultant to help them develop a new Title III grant. NU shared with the Team that the real learning resulting from this program was that additional staffing is not the sole solution to their retention challenges, a valuable insight.

NU collects data through reporting and surveys of students and graduates and uses it to inform decision-making. In interviews with Board of Trustees members, faculty, and administrative staff, they reported with enthusiasm that data is now routinely provided by the IR department. Many community members spoke of the Director of Institutional Research as a new and valuable resource for their decision-making efforts. Further, several faculty expressed a growing familiarity with, and similar level of appreciation for, financial data, especially as it pertained to their programs.

According to the "About Us" section of the website, the one-year retention rate for first-time, first-year students improved from 56% in 2006-07 to 76% in 2017-18; and from 51% to 54% for the general undergraduate population during the same timeframe. The overall six-year graduation rate increased from 28% for the 2006 cohort of first time, degree seeking students to 37% for the 2012 cohort of first time, degree seeking students. Graduation rates for the graduate student population ranged between 79% and 85% over the same time period. It is difficult to attribute general increases in student persistence to any one factor, but it is likely that the strategic prioritization of retention efforts and improved use of data analyses is having a positive impact.

According to the President, ongoing review of fluctuating retention and graduation rates prompted NU to prioritize improvement efforts by defining, in the Vision 2022 Strategic Plan, Objective 4-C: "We will increase the recruitment and retention of a diverse student body. Three important steps towards implementing the goal: 1. Implement programs designed to recruit and retain underrepresented students; e.g., bridge program, peer mentorship, expansion of Office for Inclusive Community identity groups, scholarships. 2. Establish identity-informed policies and procedures responsive to the needs and experiences of underrepresented students. 3. Create institutional accountability for faculty and staff to develop in the area of cultural responsiveness while offering continued workshops and trainings and establishing institutional measures to acknowledge development."

A supporting Retention Plan defines appropriate and attainable goals. It has been prepared, and progress is monitored, by a committee consisting of Deans, Associate Deans, the Director of Advising and Academic Coaching, and the Director of Institutional Research. The plan establishes specific benchmarks for increasing retention and graduation rates for graduate and undergraduate programs. It also establishes the expectation that when a program's rates fall below the target range, that program will undergo internal and external review to determine viability. New strategies developed by the committee include a redesign of First Year Seminar, a new faculty advising program pilot, two living and learning community pilots, and an increase in numbers and training of housing staff. According to the Fall 2018 Retention Plan Update, the overall undergraduate retention rate increased from Fall 2017 by 1% (75% to 76%). The committee's analysis of results seems logical and they report that it is being used to inform improvements. For example, one conclusion in the Fall 2018 Update is that, "Improvements in one year retention were achieved for all but incoming junior transfer students which makes sense since nearly all the new initiatives were focused on incoming students with fewer than 30 credits, although some sophomores did live in on campus housing or participate in living and learning communities. Of note, retention of students of color also improved but at rates slightly behind the overall retention rates. Additional review is being done in light of combining of the offices of Student Affairs and Inclusive Community in Fall 2018."

NU conducts appropriate, good-practice data-collection with respect to retention, persistence, and completion. NU appears to use all methods available, from federal datasets (IPEDS, Clearinghouse) to standardized tests (NSSE) and internally-developed survey instruments (Naropa Incoming Student Inventory). Using such tools, NU faculty and staff provided examples of some meaningful interventions on flagging metrics in an effort to provide good stewardship of both their fiscal and mission-related responsibilities.

An example of how NU analyzes data and uses it to recommend improvements was provided by the Director of Institutional Research. She shared a report entitled, "Retention Trends by Ethnicity" in which she presents relevant data and trend tables as well as her analysis of them. The data led her to conclude that, "Finally, I plotted the graduation rate on a chart with the number of diversity initiatives offered each year...After a series of diversity initiatives introduced in 2002, there is clearly a steady increase in the percentage of non-white graduate students who completed a degree beginning with the incoming class of 2004. After several years with no new diversity initiatives introduced, you begin to see an overall decline in completions for non-white graduate students beginning with the 2010 incoming class." Dissemination of this report led to the development and implementation of new diversity initiatives.

NU continues to work with Noel Levitz to understand and use enrollment-related data, and the Team learned in interviews with the Marketing and Enrollment leadership that they are soon to embark on

the creation of personas and corresponding lead generation analytics with some new third-party vendors. These personas are informed by an analysis of their own graduates, in which they analyzed the factors that made them successful at NU. The enrollment team expressed a commitment to finding the right students for NU both to improve their enrollment numbers, but also in an effort to bolster retention post-enrollment.

NU faculty members noted that they have participated in making difficult decisions when review of programs has identified that a program has not adequately served students. Through program reviews conducted by faculty, programs have been sunset or wholly reconfigured to promote better enrollment, retention, and completion outcomes. For example, the Early Childhood Education program was pivoted into an Elementary Education program because it was not felt that adequate career possibilities were available with the original degree.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary

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.

Evidence

Naropa University (NU) meets Criterion 4, having now a solid culture and process of program review and assessment. The institution is still in the early stages of comprehensive program review and assessment, but in interviews with a diverse array of constituents, all were able to uniformly describe the current assessment culture and the path leading to it. Concurrent with this new culture of assessment and review is a blossoming culture of data-informed decision making based on a developing series of reports and datasets now coming from their Office of Institutional Research. The relatively new processes themselves will need to be assessed and refined and faculty, staff, and administration seem prepared to do so in order to mature and stabilize the processes over time.

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

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. The institution plans for the future.

5.A - Core Component 5.A

The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Rating

Met

Evidence

According to Naropa University's (NU) Federal Compliance Filing and a review of the past three years' audit statements, there are no audit findings and no concerns regarding composite financial ratios. The most recent three annual Federal Financial Composite Ratios are: 2.4 for 2014-15; 2.4 for 2015-16, and 2.5 for 2016-17. These scores identify NU as "financially responsible" according to federal standards.

A powerpoint presentation that the Vice President for Operations reported presenting to the Academic Council entitled, "Academic Council Presentation: University Budget Dialogue" summarizes NU's analysis of their fiscal situation. It presents peer comparisons of expense distribution proportions that indicate NU's distributions are roughly similar to their peers' distributions. It also indicates that NU's total expense cost per student FTE is the highest; \$26,330 compared to the 5 peers which range from \$11,141 to \$22,201. The powerpoint also explores best practices in Not For Profit stewardship, including a Board of Trustees Fiscal Responsibility Checklist, and it reiterates the framework of a "Roadmap to Successful Stewardship". The roadmap serves as an acknowledgement that NU is responding appropriately to benchmark data.

A memo dated 8.2.18 to the NU community from the Vice President for Operations presents, in more detail, the roadmap to stewardship as a "framework for fiscal sustainability". It begins by explaining the Composite Financial Index (CFI) and presents NU's CFI scores. At an open forum session that included members from all internal constituencies, Team members asked how the shared awareness of these budget problems has impacted their work and, in response, heard testimonials from faculty and staff about how the need to become more sustainable has caused them to work more closely together. A show of hands indicated that most of the people in the room concurred that they have more meaningful dialogues and make more deliberate plans than they have in the past. When asked to what they attributed this change, they identified changes in leadership and the flattening of the organizational chart and reported that faculty and staff are now more likely to work directly with the President and/or his cabinet members.

NU has made the strategic goal to "create new online or low-residency degree programs," accomplishable by developing and implementing a process for feasibility study. A review of two recent New Program Proposals, one for a BA in Elementary Education and one for an Art Therapy program, indicated that both conformed to a comprehensive template. Each begins with a description of how the program advances the NU mission and strategic plan and includes a rationale and justification for offering the program, market research and the occupational outlook for relevant jobs, enrollment projections and marketing plans, a discussion of university fit and exploration of impact on existing programs, timelines for implementation, curriculum and degree requirements, delivery method, program goals and outcomes and how they will be measured and assessed (assessment plans), identification of the program's structure, administration, and staffing, and infrastructure and learning resource needs. Each was accompanied by a three-year projection of enrollments, projected revenue and expenses. The Elementary Education proposal included a marketing message and plan developed by Vermillion Design and Digital; a 2017-18 Recruiting and Marketing Plan prepared by two program Faculty; and a grant proposal dated 1.26.17 along with the ensuing award letter dated 2.4.17 from Meyercord Family Office allocating \$800K over three years to NU to invest in the program.

Enrollment Management officials reported to the Team that the need for more clinical mental health counseling seats led to a Clinical Mental Health Counseling Mindfulness-Based Transpersonal Counseling Hybrid Proposal. The proposal includes completion data for NU and 11 comparison institutions, the occupational outlook, and other elements similar to the proposals identified above.

The NU Summary of Endowment Operating Policies includes a Spending Policy that allows for appropriation for distribution each year up to 5% of the endowment funds' prior calendar year-end market value. The president reported that this benchmark is routinely met.

A document entitled "Strategic Plan Investments" outlines the financial commitments that have been planned for each Create 2020 strategic goal. A report to the Board of Trustees (BOT) dated 10.22.18, Recruitment Strategies and Commitments, details progress toward the individual enrollment strategies outlined in the Admissions and Recruitment Strategic Plan, including utilization and training of work-study students, an earlier timeline for financial aid packaging and reworking of related student messaging, and enhancing admissions office staffing by hiring an office assistant and an additional admissions counselor (an investment of approximately \$66K). The same BOT submission includes an update from the Office of Development that identifies progress on their strategic objectives, including restructuring and achieving an initial \$6M benchmark on their capital campaign, Now and Next. It also forecasts the office's 2018-19 fundraising benchmarks.

The institution monitors expenses at the program level through annual and longitudinal program

review reporting as outlined in the Team's response to Criterion 4. They have recently developed a position for an Academic Affairs Budget Manager whose job is to liaison with deans and directors in order to support their budget development work. No revenues are provided to a superordinate entity.

Staffing is sufficient to support current operations. The faculty/student ratio is 9/1 and faculty members are appropriately qualified and trained as outlined in the Team's response to Criteria 3 and 4. The Vice President for Operations serves as NU's chief financial officer. He is experienced and his tenure coincides with the timeline during which faculty and staff have perceived a positive change in transparency and collaboration. As NU begins to make and implement decisions about their priority goal of consolidating campuses, they will want to consider appointing both chief operating and chief financial officers. Since the Provost's unexpected resignation in December, two Associate Provosts are currently sharing the Provost position. Team interviews with the two Associate Provosts indicated that they have developed a manageable system for sharing of responsibilities and a congenial working relationship. Faculty members testified that they feel more involved in governance with this new system of team leadership.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.B - Core Component 5.B

The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.
2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.
3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Rating

Met

Evidence

According to the Vice President for Operations (VPO), over the past two years the Naropa University (NU) Board of Trustees (BOT) has changed dramatically in how often their committees meet and in the depth of discussion with administration, moving from occasional phone calls to weekly calls. BOT members spoke to the Team about the need for, and their commitment to, responding in a much shorter time frame than in past years. One BOT member stated, "It is more of a real-time job to be a board member, to meet more often, and to have constant conversation about projects. The margin of error is smaller so we need to be better-educated about the world around us. A generic understanding is not enough." At the same time, members of administration and the BOT concurred that the BOT is supportive, sharing expertise and allowing the administration to manage while insisting on accountability for meeting the administration's identified outcomes. A BOT member explained that learning together about dashboards has fostered this type of relationship, and a review of BOT minutes from 2017 and 2018 affirms that appropriate roles are reflected during meetings.

The VPO also reported that in the past two years a team-oriented approach has replaced the earlier hierarchical structure. For example, joint senior staff meetings began in 2017. The meetings evolved into a more formal University Leadership Group (ULG). According to the group's charter, which includes a Proposal for ULG Structure and Membership, the group began by exploring NU's "challenges with communication, decision making, and silos," by designing a "cross-functional team that examines and responds to large, strategic opportunities and challenges [and] that can share information and make decisions around cross-functional proposals. The document group designed their purpose statement, "ULG is a group of staff and faculty who: 1. Identify strategic and operational challenges and opportunities and develop proposals for action; 2. Weigh-in on proposals from Subgroups when cross-functional consultation is needed; 3. Serve as a network for communication and information sharing; 4. Ensure the active pursuit of strategic goals and objectives (currently as defined in Create 2022, but also beyond); 5. Provide opportunities for the leadership

development needed to meet these goals and objectives."

Another change that has worked to flatten NU's organizational structure and facilitate communication, according to the VPO, is that the Registrar and Financial Aid now report to the VPO and can bring their needs directly to him.

Board of Trustees (BOT) members reported that they are expected to contribute to NU and confirmed the statement that the BOT has donated more than \$2M to the \$10M capital campaign.

NU engages its faculty, staff, and students in governance. One elected faculty member and a student elected by the Student Union of Naropa (SUN) are voting members of the BOT.

An example of using effective structures to engage appropriate curricular expertise in advancing a strategic goal is found in the Draft Academic Plan 2017-2020. It provides a record of the process in which the faculty senate (Cauldron) played a key role in programmatic sustainability by conducting a ten-day review in which they approved substantive changes to five programs:

- creation of a hybrid version of the Masters in Divinity;
- efficiencies in the MA, Religious Studies;
- a certificate and course-sharing in the MA Ecopsychology,
- the addition of a Contemplative Neuroscience concentration to the BA in Contemplative Psychology, and
- discontinuance/redesign of MA Contemplative Education.

Through this effort, Cauldron also identified five programs that had been or would be discontinued and lists ideas for new programs.

To enhance the engagement of the faculty in the process of resource allocation, NU has recently invested in the hire of a full-time Academic Affairs (AA) Budget Manager. A meeting with the Vice President for Operations, the Controller, and the new, experienced AA Budget Manager conveyed that, in the two months since this position was filled, they have established forms, tools, and a budget process to use this position as a liaison, promoting transparency and benchmarking of key performance indicators and enabling faculty to contribute meaningfully while minimizing the time it takes away from their classroom responsibilities. She reported that she has met with each program chair and is beginning to understand the needs and opportunities of each program and is using that understanding to map budgets according to programs. She plans to use the next year to develop the institution's awareness of, and to refine, the new processes.

NU reports that the President meets with the following groups on a regular basis: Cabinet (bi-weekly), individual members of Cabinet (weekly), Cauldron (three times/month), the BOT Chair (weekly), president's office staff (weekly), Benefit Committee (quarterly), Legal Committee (monthly), Academic Council (monthly), the BOT Executive Committee, Finance and Sustainability Committee, Development Committee (monthly), and with the Staff Executive Council and SUN (the student government) at least once per semester. In an open forum interview that included representatives of all internal constituencies, faculty and staff members raised hands to demonstrate agreement with an individual faculty members' statement that, over the past two years, "communication has been unleashed!" to underscore his point that staff, faculty, administration, and academic affairs are working together," more often and more intelligently."

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Evidence that planning at Naropa University (NU) is inclusive, integrated, and deliberately aligns resource allocation with mission, priorities, its own capacity, and environmental scanning include:

- A review of integrated planning documents that begins with an overall institutional plan (Create 2022) and extends consistent goals and priorities through supporting plans through key areas, including a Master Academic Plan, Development's Naropa Now and Next Campaign Plan, Admissions and Recruitment Strategic Plan, a University Retention Plan, and program assessment plans that are reviewed and updated annually.
- Board of Trustees (BOT) members spoke to the Team about the need for, and their commitment to, being engaged and responsive. One BOT member stated, "It is more of a real-time job to be a board member, to meet more often, and to have constant conversation about projects. The margin of error is smaller so we need to be better-educated about the world around us. A generic understanding is not enough." The BOT member referenced specific dashboards that are shared during meetings.
- For example, the Master Academic Plan shows that Academic Affairs' goals have been formulated in response to enrollment trend data. Another example, the Now and Next Campaign document shows that planning for gift campaigns is informed by levels of institutional aid and needs of programs and academic centers.
- The Team's discussion with the President's Cabinet verified that Cauldron members have recently taken on a budget role as the University Planning and Resource Committee (UPARC), just as Team dialogue with faculty senate (Cauldron) members report that they have taken on a corresponding role as the Academic Affairs Planning and Resource Committee (AAPARC). The restructuring was designed to establish forums for deeper discussion that would drive planning and resource allocation. Members of both groups indicated that this new structure is

more proactive and engages more community members. The Vice President for Operations attends meetings of both groups and reported that the restructuring was needed to project resource allocations further out because, "We should be worrying about 2021-22 now, not 2020-21."

- Members of Cauldron reported that they added the AAPARC responsibilities after discussing the best composition of a committee that would make budget recommendations to the Provost and that this enables faculty participation in governance to funnel through program chairs.
- A document entitled, "Strategic Plan Investments" outlines the resources that are needed to accomplish each of the five Create 2022 overarching strategic goals and the Team found evidence that some of those resources have been allocated, for example, a contract with Ellucian demonstrates that NU has invested in its goals to "overhaul our data systems management to provide a consistently user-friendly experience that allows for inter-departmental collaboration, document tracking, and integrated administrative services." The President described the process used to explore the technology infrastructure and select the Ellucian product. He stated that, "There wasn't a person who will be affected who was not involved." Interviews with faculty and staff support this statement.
- Strategic Goal 2, "We will optimize our use of space in a way that advances our mission and values..." is a direct response to the increasing cost of maintaining multiple campuses in an increasingly expensive Boulder real estate market. This is supported by the President's description of a ten-year plan to consolidate, take advantage of the potential of the most coveted campus real estate and maximize the use of a campus that, unlike the other campuses, is not land-locked. A tour of that campus indicates that the facilities are contemporary, spacious, and there is room for growth within the existing structures and for building new facilities. The President and a board member reported that they are experienced real estate professionals.
- The Director of Institutional Research indicated that the implementation of a data governance group and overhauling data systems has led to more collaboration between offices, a more user-friendly experience, and is helping to roll out more online and blended programs.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.
2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Team meetings with the President, Vice President for Operations, Controller, and Board of Trustees and faculty and staff representatives indicate that Naropa University (NU) has taken steps to more systematically improve its performance.

NU is extending its development of metrics and quantifiable documentation of operational performance to the department level. Board members, administration, faculty and professional staff were able to speak to the Team about their work to develop guiding key performance indicators (KPIs) within their programs over the past four years. Community members report that they continue to learn about what types of data are available and about how to use KPI. Many spoke to enhanced procedural and technology systems that they believe are improving the tracking and sharing of data, and are making the data more easily accessible to decision-makers. The hiring of a Director of Institutional Research is an example of an improvement that has been made; many community members reported that her assistance and reports have made their jobs easier and their decision-making more meaningful. Other examples include more detailed admissions funnel targets and tracking reports, discount rate reports, more frequent registration updates, and new housing revenue and capacity dashboards. Some of these improvements have not been in place long enough to be assessed for their impact, but faculty and staff report that they believe that transparency has improved and that they expect the new Ellucian data system to also contribute to more effective tracking, reporting, and use of metrics.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.S - Criterion 5 - Summary

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. The institution plans for the future.

Evidence

The Naropa University (NU) experience of the Team was appropriately summarized by a faculty member during a large open forum interview that included representatives of all internal constituencies. He reported, and most of the people in the room raised hands to demonstrate agreement, that, over the past two years, "communication has been unleashed!" He reiterated a theme that the Team experienced in many conversations throughout the Team visit about various areas working together "more often and more intelligently." Community members could point to specific changes that helped them move in this direction, including changes in leadership, a flattening of the organizational structure and new reporting assignments, and utilizing a team approach to leadership.

Naropa's resources have been strained by enrollment challenges, yet the Team found that the institution has taken the difficult steps necessary to refine its program portfolio and to add contemporary programs. Transparency in the budget process was demonstrated and participants at the large interview session testified that their work to be more efficient has also served to make them more collaborative and effective. The plan to consolidate campuses in a high-end real estate market is well-considered and managed by a President and Board of Trustees member who are experienced real estate professionals.

Members of NU at all levels are participating in processes designed to assess and review programs in ways that will enable NU to respond to future challenges and opportunities. The Create 2022 Strategic Plan is supported by corresponding, focused plans in the areas of enrollment, academic affairs, development and retention.

Review Dashboard

Number	Title	Rating
1	Mission	
1.A	Core Component 1.A	Met
1.B	Core Component 1.B	Met
1.C	Core Component 1.C	Met
1.D	Core Component 1.D	Met
1.S	Criterion 1 - Summary	
2	Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct	
2.A	Core Component 2.A	Met
2.B	Core Component 2.B	Met
2.C	Core Component 2.C	Met
2.D	Core Component 2.D	Met
2.E	Core Component 2.E	Met
2.S	Criterion 2 - Summary	
3	Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support	
3.A	Core Component 3.A	Met
3.B	Core Component 3.B	Met
3.C	Core Component 3.C	Met
3.D	Core Component 3.D	Met
3.E	Core Component 3.E	Met
3.S	Criterion 3 - Summary	
4	Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement	
4.A	Core Component 4.A	Met
4.B	Core Component 4.B	Met
4.C	Core Component 4.C	Met
4.S	Criterion 4 - Summary	
5	Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	
5.A	Core Component 5.A	Met
5.B	Core Component 5.B	Met
5.C	Core Component 5.C	Met
5.D	Core Component 5.D	Met
5.S	Criterion 5 - Summary	

Review Summary

Conclusion

The people of Naropa University have worked together diligently over the four years since the last HLC visit to address the concerns of that visiting team. The experience of the Team was appropriately summarized by a faculty member during a large open forum interview that included representatives of all internal constituencies. He reported, and most of the people in the room raised hands to demonstrate agreement, that, over the past two years, "communication has been unleashed!" He reiterated a theme that the Team experienced in many conversations throughout the Team visit about various areas working together "more often and more intelligently." Community members could point to specific changes that helped them moving in this direction, including changes in leadership, a flattening of the organizational structure and new reporting assignments, and utilizing a team approach to leadership.

NU's resources have been strained by enrollment challenges, yet the Team found that the institution has taken the difficult steps necessary to refine its program portfolio and to add contemporary programs. Transparency in the budget process was evident through records of meetings, presentations, and memos and participants at the large interview session testified that their work to be more efficient has also served to make them more collaborative and effective. The plan to consolidate campuses in a high-end real estate market is well-considered and managed by a President and Board of Trustees member who are experienced real estate professionals. Financial projections are made with the expectation of ongoing attention to efficiency as well as effectiveness.

Members of NU at all levels have developed and are able to speak to their own participation in processes designed to assess and review programs in ways that will enable NU to respond to future challenges and opportunities. The Create 2020 Strategic Plan is supported by corresponding, focused plans in the areas of enrollment, academic affairs, development and retention.

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation

Met

Sanctions Recommendation

No Sanction

Pathways Recommendation

Eligible to choose

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.



Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

This worksheet is to be completed by a Federal Compliance reviewer or by the peer review team that conduct the on-site visit. If a Federal Compliance reviewer completes the form, the reviewer will evaluate the materials in advance of the visit and refer any issues to the team for further exploration and confirmation. The team chair will confirm that the team has reviewed the Federal Compliance reviewer's findings, make any necessary adjustments to the worksheet following the on-site visit, and submit the worksheet as part of the team's final report.

The Federal Compliance reviewer or the team should review each item identified in the *Federal Compliance Filing by Institutions* (FCFI) and document their findings in the appropriate spaces below. Peer reviewers are expected to supply a rationale for each section of the Federal Compliance Evaluation. Refer to the [Federal Compliance Overview](#) for information about applicable HLC policies and explanations of each requirement.

Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution's ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in the appropriate parts of the team report. If the team recommends monitoring on a Federal Compliance Requirement in the form of a report or focused visit, the recommendation should be included in the Federal Compliance monitoring sections below and added to the appropriate section of the team report.

Submission Instructions

Federal Compliance reviewer: Email this worksheet and the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours* in an editable format to the team chair. The team chair's email address is provided in the Assurance System.

Team chair: Send the draft of this worksheet and the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours* to the HLC staff liaison for review and then to the institution for corrections of errors of fact. Submit the final worksheets to HLC at finalreports@hlcommission.org.

Institution under review: Naropa University

Please indicate who completed this worksheet:

Evaluation team

Federal Compliance reviewer

To be completed by the evaluation team chair if a Federal Compliance reviewer conducted this part of the evaluation:

Name:

I confirm that the evaluation team reviewed the findings provided in this worksheet.

Assignment of Credits, Program Length and Tuition

(See FCFI Questions 1–3 and Appendix A)

1. Complete the [Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours](#). Submit the completed worksheet with this form.
 - Identify the institution's principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level (see the institution's Appendix A if necessary). The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:
 - Associate's degrees = 60 hours
 - Bachelor's degrees = 120 hours
 - Master's or other degrees beyond the bachelor's = At least 30 hours beyond the bachelor's degree
 - Note that 1 quarter hour = 0.67 semester hour.
 - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.
 - Review any differences in tuition reported for different programs and the rationale provided for such differences.
2. Check the response that reflects the evaluation team or Federal Compliance reviewer's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

All bachelor's degrees require 120 hours. Master's degrees require from 38 to 72 hours. The cost per credit for all programs is the same, though undergraduate programs do have a flat tuition for 12-18 credits per semester.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Records of Student Complaints

(See FCFI Questions 4–7 and Appendixes B and C)

1. Verify that the institution has documented a process for addressing student complaints and appears to be systematically processing such complaints, as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.
 - Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints, its complaints policy and procedure, and the history of complaints received and resolved since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC.
 - Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.
 - Verify that the evidence shows that the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this process into improvements in services or in teaching and learning.
 - Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.
 - Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Naropa University (NU) has documented policies and processes for addressing student complaints. A document entitled "Student Complaints 2015-2018" provides a three-year review of complaints received according to the type of complaint. For each type, it provides a description of the resolution and what was learned from the processes, demonstrating that NU systematically processes and addresses the complaints. The Team recommends adding a column to this matrix that identifies an average response time in order to further inform those processes.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Transfer Policies

(See FCFI Questions 8–10 and Appendixes D–F)

1. Verify that the institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies should contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.
 - Review the institution’s transfer policies.
 - Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and for specific programs and how the institution publicly discloses information about those articulation agreements.
 - Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its website) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.
 - Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. The information the institution provides to students should explain any program-specific articulation agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution (1) accepts credits from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; (2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements; (3) both offers and accepts credits with the institution(s) in the articulation agreement; and (4) what specific credits articulate through the agreement (e.g., general education only; pre-professional nursing courses only; etc.). Note that the institution need not make public the entire articulation agreement, but it needs to make public to students relevant information about these agreements so that they can better plan their education.
 - Verify that the institution has an appropriate process to align the disclosed transfer policies with the criteria and procedures used by the institution in making transfer decisions.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution's transfer policies are stated on its web site and in its catalog. The institution has no articulation agreements. The institution has policies and processes that help guide the evaluation of transfer credit. Team meetings with the Registrar demonstrated that transfer evaluations and decisions are guided by the policy.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Practices for Verification of Student Identity

(See FCFI Questions 11–16 and Appendix G)

1. Confirm that the institution verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided through distance or correspondence education. Confirm that it appropriately discloses additional fees related to verification to students, and that the method of verification makes reasonable efforts to protect students' privacy.
 - Determine how the institution verifies that the student who enrolls in a course is the same student who submits assignments, takes exams and earns a final grade. The team should ensure that the institution's approach respects student privacy.
 - Check that any costs related to verification (e.g., fees associated with test proctoring) and charged directly to students are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance or correspondence courses.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution verifies student identities with unique login and passwords, the use of official institutional email addresses, and student IDs with pictures. According to the Director of Information Technology, NU does not charge fees related to verification.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Title IV Program Responsibilities

(See FCFI Questions 17–24 and Appendixes H–Q)

1. This requirement has several components the institution must address.
 - The team should verify that the following requirements are met:
 - **General Program Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities.
 - **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 5 if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)
 - **Default Rates.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its three-year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note that for 2012 and thereafter, institutions and teams should be using the three-year default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact the HLC staff.
 - **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.
 - **Student Right to Know/Equity in Athletics.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 2, Core Component 2.A if the team determines that the disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)
 - **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Policies.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook and online. Note that HLC does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance unless required to do so by

state or federal regulations but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.

- **Contractual Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Contractual Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)
 - **Consortial Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Consortial Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)
- Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.
 - Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution's compliance or whether the institution's auditor has raised any issues in the A-133 about the institution's compliance, and also look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.
 - If the institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the Federal Compliance portion of the team report and whether the institution appears to be moving forward with the corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.
 - If issues have been raised concerning the institution's compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution's ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity (*Core Components 2.A and 2.B*).
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
- The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate

reference).

Rationale:

The institution's Title IV program was recertified in 2017. Its most recent Title IV program review was in 1995. The institution has not been audited or inspected since its last HLC comprehensive evaluation.

The institution's composite ratios have been 2.4 to 2.5 for the last several years. There have been no fines, penalties, letters of credit or other requirements imposed by the Department of Education.

The institution's student loan default rates have been between 2.5 and 5.9 for the last three years. No issues have been raised by these default rates. Students interested in private student loans receive one-on-one counseling with a financial aid counselor.

The institution has made the appropriate disclosures available to the public. Policies and processes are in place to ensure this information is correct. The institution does not offer athletic programming.

The information on satisfactory academic progress is made available to students on the institution's web site.

The institution appears to be in compliance with HLC expectations regarding contractual and consortial relationships.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Required Information for Students and the Public

(See FCFI Questions 25–27 and Appendixes R and S)

1. Verify that the institution publishes accurate, timely and appropriate information on institutional programs, fees, policies and related required information. Verify that the institution provides this required information in the course catalog and student handbook and on its website.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution publishes required information in its catalog, student handbook, and on its website. The institution has recently formed a University Review committee that brings together a cross-departmental team to help ensure that accurate information is communicated to students and the public.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information

(See FCFI Questions 28–31 and Appendixes T and U)

1. Verify that the institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with HLC and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.
 - Review the institution’s disclosure about its accreditation status with HLC to determine whether the information it provides is accurate, complete and appropriately formatted and contains HLC’s web address.
 - Review the institution’s disclosures about its relationship with other accrediting agencies for accuracy and for appropriate consumer information, particularly regarding the link between specialized/professional accreditation and the licensure necessary for employment in many professional or specialized areas.
 - Review the institution’s catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, website and information provided by the institution’s advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate, timely and appropriate information to current and prospective students about its programs, locations and policies.
 - Verify that the institution correctly displays the Mark of Affiliation on its website.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution correctly displays the HLC mark of affiliation, and the institution has no other accreditation relationships.

The institution appears to provide accurate, timely, and appropriate information to students about its programs and policies.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Review of Student Outcome Data

(See FCFI Questions 32–35 and Appendix V)

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether they are appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs the institution offers and the students it serves.
 - Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about planning, academic program review, assessment of student learning, consideration of institutional effectiveness and other topics.
 - Review the institution’s explanation of its use of information from the College Scorecard, including student retention and completion and the loan repayment rate.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The Director of Institutional Research, administrators, and faculty members provided examples of how the institution uses student outcome data to evaluate their own effectiveness and to make planning decisions. The Team verified that the institution is using retention rate and graduation rate information from the College Scorecard and that the institution is using employment rate and loan repayment information.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Student Outcome Data

(See FCFI Questions 36–38)

1. Verify that the institution makes student outcome data available and easily accessible to the public. Data may be provided at the institutional or departmental level or both, but the institution must disclose student outcome data that address the broad variety of its programs.
 - Verify that student outcome data are made available to the public on the institution’s website—for instance, linked to from the institution’s home page, included within the top three levels of the website or easily found through a search of related terms on the website—and are clearly labeled as such.
 - Determine whether the publication of these data accurately reflects the range of programs at the institution.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The student outcome data is made available to the public on the institution’s website. This data includes both graduate and undergraduate programs and does appear to accurately reflect the range of programs offered by the institution.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Standing With State and Other Accrediting Agencies

(See FCFI Questions 39–40 and Appendixes W and X)

1. Verify that the institution discloses accurately to the public and HLC its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditors and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.

The team should consider any potential implications for accreditation by HLC of a sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or of loss of authorization in any state.

Note: If the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is now or has been in the past five years under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action (i.e., withdrawal, suspension, denial or termination) from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor or a state entity, then the team must explain the sanction or adverse action of the other agency in the body of the assurance section of the team report and provide its rationale for recommending HLC status in light of this action.

- Review the list of relationships the institution has with all other accreditors and state governing or coordinating bodies, along with the evaluation reports, action letters and interim monitoring plans issued by each accrediting agency.
- Verify that the institution's standing with state agencies and accrediting bodies is appropriately disclosed to students.
- Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution's capacity to meet HLC's Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the HLC staff liaison immediately.

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC's requirements.
- The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution does not have any specialized, professional, or institutional accreditations other than HLC.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment (FCFI Questions 41–43 and Appendix Y)

1. Verify that the institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third-party comments. The team should evaluate any comments received and complete any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments.

Note: If the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comments relate to the team's review of the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the appropriate section of its report in the Assurance System.

- Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including copies of the institution’s notices, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.
 - Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
- The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution informed the following constituencies of the opportunity for public comment: Current students, alumni, local community members, parents, donors, prospective students.

The institution used the following means to notify these constituencies: E-newsletter (Naropa Weekly), website homepage (Naropa.edu), Daily Camera (local newspaper), social media Facebook), Boulder Weekly (local newspaper), email blasts to alumni, parents, and donors.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Competency-Based Programs Including Direct Assessment Programs/Faculty-Student Engagement

(See FCFI Questions 44–47)

1. Verify that students and faculty in any direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution have regular and substantive interactions: the faculty and students communicate on some regular basis that is at least equivalent to contact in a traditional classroom, and that in the tasks mastered to assure competency, faculty and students interact about critical thinking, analytical skills, and written and oral communication abilities, as well as about core ideas, important theories, current knowledge, etc. (Also, confirm that the institution has explained the credit hour equivalencies for these programs in the credit hour sections of the Federal Compliance Filing.)
 - Review the list of direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution.
 - Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty in these programs regularly communicate and interact with students about the subject matter of the course.

- Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty and students in these programs interact about key skills and ideas in the students' mastery of tasks to assure competency.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
- The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution has no competency-based programs.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list of materials reviewed here:

<https://www.naropa.edu/about-naropa/student-consumer-information.php>

<https://www.naropa.edu/the-naropa-experience/experience-naropa/index.php>

<https://www.naropa.edu/admissions/index.php>

<https://www.naropa.edu/about-naropa/ways-to-engage.php>

<https://www.naropa.edu/admissions/bachelors/how-to-apply.php>

<https://www.naropa.edu/admissions/masters/how-to-apply.php>

<https://www.naropa.edu/you-are-ready/masters/index.php>

<https://www.naropa.edu/about-naropa/accreditation/index.php>

<https://www.naropa.edu/admissions/student-resources/career-services/index.php>

<https://www.naropa.edu/about-naropa/graduationretentionrates.php>

<https://www.naropa.edu/admissions/student-resources/career-services/post-graduate-activities.php>

<http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?s=CO&l=93&ct=2&ic=1&id=127653#retgrad>
<http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?s=CO&l=93&ct=2&ic=1&id=127653#retgrad>

<https://www.naropa.edu/documents/departments/institutional-research/GraduationRatesbyProgram.pdf>
<https://www.naropa.edu/academics/masters/creative-writing-low-residency/about/index.php>
<https://www.naropa.edu/academics/masters/clinical-mental-health-counseling/art-therapy/index.php>
<https://www.naropa.edu/academics/bachelors/elementary-education/about.php>
<https://www.naropa.edu/academics/masters/clinical-mental-health-counseling/somatic-counseling/bodypsychotherapy/index.php>
<https://www.naropa.edu/the-naropa-experience/student-affairs/campus-safety/index.php>
<https://www.naropa.edu/admissions/student-resources/student-support/disability-services.php>
<https://www.naropa.edu/academics/extended-studies/certificate-programs/31.0599-Gedt.html>
<https://www.naropa.edu/admissions/affording/title-iv-funds-policy.php>
<https://www.naropa.edu/academics/distance-learning/complaint-process.php>
https://www.naropa.edu/documents/departments/institutional-research/CDS_2018-2019.pdf
<https://www.naropa.edu/documents/departments/institutional-research/Fall2018EnrollmentbyProgram.pdf>
<https://www.naropa.edu/admissions/affording/undergraduate-costs-aid/index.php>
<https://www.naropa.edu/admissions/affording/graduate-costs-aid/index.php>

Syllabi reviewed by the Federal Compliance reviewer and re-reviewed by a Team member:

Core Curriculum

- ART311 Mixed Media (3)
- COR110 Writing Seminar I: Art of the Engaged Writer (3) 2 different sections
- ENV223 Field Ecology (3)
- MUS250 Music Cultures of the World (3)
- PSYB255 Body-Mind Centering (3)
- REL346 Wisdom and Compassion: The Buddhist Path (3)

BA Elementary Education

- EDU150 Foundations of Education for a Diverse Society (3)
- EDU330 Holistic Teaching Traditions (3)
- EDU420 Energy and Expression in (3)

BA Music

- MUS210 Musicianship II: The Practice of Notation (3)
- MUS380 Advanced Audio Recording and Production (3)
- MUS360 Musicianship III: The Art of the Chart (3)

BA Environmental Studies

- ENV253 Environmental Economics (3)
- ENV321 Geology (3)
- ENV480 Senior Project (3)

MFA Creative Writing

- WRI640 Poetics Seminar: Women Writers (3)
- WRI648E Craft of Writing: Contemplative (6)
- WRI715 Poetry Workshop: (3)
- WRI791WE Spring Writers Practicum (1)

MDiv

- REL600 Meditation Practicum I: Seeds of Peace (3)
- REL615 Power, Privilege, and Diversity (3)
- REL779 Interreligious Dialog (3)

MA Clinical Mental Health Counseling – Contemplative Psychotherapy & Buddhist Psychology

- CNSC610 Social and Multicultural Foundations (3)
- CNSC770 Family Systems (3)
- CNSC823 The Art of Contemplative Clinical Mental Health Counseling (3)

Online

- EDU735E Transforming Instruction (3)
- ENV701E Nonprofit Management & Social Entrepreneurship (3)
- PSYE630E Transpersonal Psychology (3)
- WRI735E Craft of Writing: Contemporary (6)



Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours

Institution Under Review: Naropa University

Review the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*, including all supplemental materials. Applicable sections and supplements are referenced in the corresponding sections and questions below.

Part 1. Institutional Calendar, Term Length and Type of Credit

Instructions

Review Section 1 of Appendix A. Verify that the institution has calendar and term lengths within the range of good practice in higher education.

Responses

A. Answer the Following Question

1. Are the institution's calendar and term lengths, including non-standard terms, within the range of good practice in higher education? Do they contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

Yes No

Comments:

The institution has standard 15-week semester.

B. Recommend HLC Follow-Up, If Appropriate

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's calendar and term length practices?

Yes No

Rationale:

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

Part 2. Policy and Practices on Assignment of Credit Hours

Instructions

Review Sections 2–4 of the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*, including supplemental materials as noted below. In assessing the appropriateness of the credit allocations provided by the institution the team should complete the following steps. The outcomes of the team’s review should be reflected in its responses below.

- 1. Format of Courses and Number of Credits Awarded.** Review the *Form for Reporting an Overview of Credit Hour Allocations and Instructional Time for Courses* (Supplement A1 to the *Worksheet for Institutions*) completed by the institution, which provides an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats.
- 2. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution (see Supplements B1 and B2 to *Worksheet for Institutions*, as applicable).**
 - At semester-based institutions courses will be typically be from two to four credit hours (or approximately five quarter hours) and extend approximately 14–16 weeks (or approximately 10 weeks for a quarter). The descriptions in the catalog should reflect courses that are appropriately rigorous and have collegiate expectations for objectives and workload. Identify courses/disciplines that seem to depart markedly from these expectations.
 - Institutions may have courses that are in compressed format, self-paced, or otherwise alternatively structured. Credit assignments should be reasonable. (For example, as a full-time load for a traditional semester is typically 15 credits, it might be expected that the norm for a full-time load in a five-week term is 5 credits; therefore, a single five-week course awarding 10 credits would be subject to inquiry and justification.)
 - Teams should be sure to scan across disciplines, delivery mode and types of academic activities.
 - Federal regulations allow for an institution to have two credit-hour awards: one award for Title IV purposes and following the federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. HLC procedure also permits this approach.
- 3. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course (see Supplement B3 to *Worksheet for Institutions*). Pay particular attention to alternatively structured or other courses completed in a**

short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor that have particularly high credit hour assignments.

4. **Sampling.** Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution and the range of programs it offers.
 - For the programs sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several courses, identify the contact hours for each course, and review expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.
 - At a minimum, teams should anticipate sampling at least a few programs at each degree level.
 - For institutions with several different academic calendars or terms or with a wide range of academic programs, the team should expand the sample size appropriately to ensure that it is paying careful attention to alternative format and compressed and accelerated courses.
 - Where the institution offers the same course in more than one format, the team is advised to sample across the various formats to test for consistency.
5. **Direct Assessment or Competency-Based Programs.** Review the information provided by the institution regarding any direct assessment or competency-based programs that it offers, with regard to the learning objectives, policies and procedures for credit allocation, and processes for review and improvement in these programs.
6. **Policy on Credit Hours and Total Credit Hour Generation.** With reference to the institutional policies on the assignment of credit provided in Supplement A2 to *Worksheet for Institutions*, consider the following questions:
 - Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution?
 - Does that policy address the amount of instructional or contact time assigned and homework typically expected of a student with regard to credit hours earned?
 - For institutions with courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy also equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame allotted for the course?
 - Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

- If so, is the institution's assignment of credit to courses reflective of its policy on the award of credit?
 - Do the number of credits taken by typical undergraduate and graduate students, as well as the number of students earning more than the typical number of credits, fall within the range of good practice in higher education?
7. If the answers to the above questions lead the team to conclude that there may be a problem with the credit hours awarded the team should recommend the following:
- If the problem involves a poor or insufficiently detailed institutional policy, the team should call for a revised policy as soon as possible by requiring a monitoring report within no more than one year that demonstrates the institution has a revised policy and provides evidence of implementation.
 - If the team identifies an application problem and that problem is isolated to a few courses or a single department, division or learning format, the team should call for follow-up activities (a monitoring report or focused evaluation) to ensure that the problems are corrected within no more than one year.
 - If the team identifies systematic noncompliance across the institution with regard to the award of credit, the team should notify the HLC staff immediately and work with staff members to design appropriate follow-up activities. HLC shall understand systematic noncompliance to mean that the institution lacks any policies to determine the award of academic credit or that there is an inappropriate award of institutional credit not in conformity with the policies established by the institution or with commonly accepted practices in higher education across multiple programs or divisions or affecting significant numbers of students.

Worksheet on Assignment of Credit Hours

A. Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team

Core Curriculum

- ART311 Mixed Media (3)
- COR110 Writing Seminar I: Art of the Engaged Writer (3) 2 different sections
- ENV223 Field Ecology (3)
- MUS250 Music Cultures of the World (3)
- PSYB255 Body-Mind Centering (3)
- REL346 Wisdom and Compassion: The Buddhist Path (3)

BA Elementary Education

- EDU150 Foundations of Education for a Diverse Society (3)
- EDU330 Holistic Teaching Traditions (3)
- EDU420 Energy and Expression in (3)

BA Music

- MUS210 Musicianship II: The Practice of Notation (3)

- MUS380 Advanced Audio Recording and Production (3)
- MUS360 Musicianship III: The Art of the Chart (3)

BA Environmental Studies

- ENV253 Environmental Economics (3)
- ENV321 Geology (3)
- ENV480 Senior Project (3)

MFA Creative Writing

- WRI640 Poetics Seminar: Women Writers (3)
- WRI648E Craft of Writing: Contemplative (6)
- WRI715 Poetry Workshop: (3)
- WRI791WE Spring Writers Practicum (1)

MDiv

- REL600 Meditation Practicum I: Seeds of Peace (3)
- REL615 Power, Privilege, and Diversity (3)
- REL779 Interreligious Dialog (3)

MA Clinical Mental Health Counseling – Contemplative Psychotherapy & Buddhist Psychology

- CNSC610 Social and Multicultural Foundations (3)
- CNSC770 Family Systems (3)
- CNSC823 The Art of Contemplative Clinical Mental Health Counseling (3)

Online

- EDU735E Transforming Instruction (3)
- ENV701E Nonprofit Management & Social Entrepreneurship (3)
- PSYE630E Transpersonal Psychology (3)
- WRI735E Craft of Writing: Contemporary (6)

B. Answer the Following Questions

1. Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

a. Does the institution’s policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution? (Note that for this question and the questions that follow an institution may have a single comprehensive policy or multiple policies.)

Yes No

Comments:

The institution’s credit hour policy is based on the amount of work represented in the achievement of learning outcomes and is not specific to any particular delivery format.

b. Does that policy relate the amount of instructional or contact time provided and homework typically expected of a student to the credit hours awarded for the classes offered in the delivery formats offered by the institution? (Note that an institution's policy must go beyond simply stating that it awards credit solely based on assessment of student learning and should also reference instructional time.)

Yes No

Comments:

The institution defines a credit hour as the amount of work represented in the achievement of learning outcomes (verified by evidence of student achievement) that reasonably approximates one hour (50 minutes) of classroom or direct faculty instruction, and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work (i.e., Carnegie Unit Credit Hour).

c. For institutions with non-traditional courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

Yes No

Comments:

The institution defines a credit hour as the amount of work represented in the achievement of learning outcomes (verified by evidence of student achievement) that reasonably approximates one hour (50 minutes) of classroom or direct faculty instruction, and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work (i.e., Carnegie Unit Credit Hour).

d. Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

Yes No

Comments:

The credit hour policy is within the range of good practice.

2. Application of Policies

a. Are the course descriptions and syllabi in the sample academic programs reviewed by the team appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

Yes No

Comments:

The course syllabi reviewed had appropriate course descriptions and assignments that reflected the policy on the award of credit.

- b. Are the learning outcomes in the sample reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit?

Yes No

Comments:

The course syllabi reviewed had appropriate learning outcomes.

- c. If the institution offers any alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the course descriptions and syllabi for those courses appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of academic credit?

Yes No

Comments:

The course syllabi reviewed for the alternative-delivery and compressed-format courses had appropriate course descriptions and assignments that reflected the policy on the award of credit.

- d. If the institution offers alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the learning outcomes reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit? Are the learning outcomes reasonable for students to fulfill in the time allocated, such that the allocation of credit is justified?

Yes No

Comments:

The course syllabi reviewed for the alternative-delivery and compressed-format courses had appropriate learning outcomes.

- e. Is the institution's actual assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution reflective of its policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

Yes No

Comments:

The institution's assignment of credit for the vast majority of its courses is reflective of its policy on the award of credit. The institution has recently implemented low-residency

courses and Team review of two sample syllabi (WRI791, 1 hour, and WRI648, 6 hours) indicated that they provided less detail about the credit hour assignments and time expectations than the traditional syllabi. The Team recommends the same level of detail be applied to future low-residency syllabi as is used in face-to-face courses.

C. Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

Review the responses provided in this worksheet. If the team has responded “no” to any of the questions above, the team will need to assign HLC follow-up to assure that the institution comes into compliance with expectations regarding the assignment of credit hours.

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution’s credit hour policies and practices?

Yes No

Rationale:

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

D. Systematic Noncompliance in One or More Educational Programs With HLC Policies Regarding the Credit Hour

Did the team find systematic noncompliance in one or more education programs with HLC policies regarding the credit hour?

Yes No

Identify the findings:

Rationale:

Part 3. Clock Hours

Instructions

Review Section 5 of *Worksheet for Institutions*, including Supplements A3–A6. Before completing the worksheet below, answer the following question:

Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs in clock hours or programs that must be reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs?

Yes No

If the answer is “Yes,” complete the “Worksheet on Clock Hours.”

Note: This worksheet is not intended for teams to evaluate whether an institution has assigned credit hours relative to contact hours in accordance with the Carnegie definition of the credit hour. This worksheet solely addresses those programs reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes.

Non-degree programs subject to clock hour requirements (for which an institution is required to measure student progress in clock hours for federal or state purposes or for graduates to apply for licensure) are not subject to the credit hour definitions per se but will need to provide conversions to semester or quarter hours for Title IV purposes. Clock hour programs might include teacher education, nursing or other programs in licensed fields.

Federal regulations require that these programs follow the federal formula listed below. If there are no deficiencies identified by the accrediting agency in the institution’s overall policy for awarding semester or quarter credit, the accrediting agency may provide permission for the institution to provide less instruction so long as the student’s work outside class in addition to direct instruction meets the applicable quantitative clock hour requirements noted below.

Federal Formula for Minimum Number of Clock Hours of Instruction (34 CFR §668.8):

- 1 semester or trimester hour must include at least 37.5 clock hours of instruction
- 1 quarter hour must include at least 25 clock hours of instruction

Note that the institution may have a lower rate if the institution’s requirement for student work outside of class combined with the actual clock hours of instruction equals the above formula provided that a semester/trimester hour includes at least 30 clock hours of actual instruction and a quarter hour includes at least 20 semester hours.

Worksheet on Clock Hours

A. Answer the Following Questions

1. Does the institution’s credit-to-clock-hour formula match the federal formula?

- Yes No

Comments:

2. If the credit-to-clock-hour conversion numbers are less than the federal formula, indicate what specific requirements there are, if any, for student work outside of class.

3. Did the team determine that the institution’s credit hour policies are reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that if the team answers “No” to this question, it should recommend follow-up monitoring in section C below.)

Yes No

Comments:

4. Did the team determine in reviewing the assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution that it was reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

Yes No

Comments:

B. Does the team approve variations, if any, from the federal formula in the institution's credit-to-clock-hour conversion?

Yes No

C. Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's clock hour policies and practices?

Yes No

Rationale:

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:



Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

INSTITUTION and STATE:	Naropa University, CO
TYPE OF REVIEW:	Standard Pathway Comprehensive Evaluation
DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:	Year 4 Comprehensive Evaluation will include a visit focused on program review and assessment and the effectiveness of Naropa's planning to address declining enrollments and the development of potential areas of enrollment growth. Visit to include a Federal Compliance Reviewer: Dr. Robert Norwood.
DATES OF REVIEW:	3/11/2019 - 3/12/2019

X No Change in Institutional Status and Requirements

Accreditation Status

Nature of Institution

Control: Private NFP

Recommended Change: No change.

Degrees Awarded: Bachelors, Masters, Specialist

Recommended Change: No change.

Reaffirmation of Accreditation:

Year of Last Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2014 - 2015

Year of Next Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2024 - 2025

Recommended Change: No change.

Accreditation Stipulations

General:

Prior HLC approval is required for substantive change as stated in HLC policy.

Recommended Change: No change.

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Additional Location:

Prior HLC approval required.

Recommended Change: No change.

Distance and Correspondence Courses and Programs:

Approved for distance education courses and programs. Approval for correspondence education is limited to courses and one program.

Recommended Change: No change.

Accreditation Events

Accreditation Pathway

Standard Pathway

Recommended Change: No change.

Upcoming Events

Comprehensive Evaluation: 2024 - 2025

Year 10 Comprehensive Evaluation

Recommended Change: No change.

Monitoring

Upcoming Events

None

Recommended Change: No change.

Institutional Data

Educational Programs

Undergraduate

Certificate	1	_____
Associate Degrees	0	_____
Baccalaureate Degrees	10	_____

Graduate

Master's Degrees	9	_____
Specialist Degrees	1	_____
Doctoral Degrees	0	_____

Recommended Change:

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Extended Operations

Branch Campuses

None

Recommended Change: No change.

Additional Locations

Nalanda Campus, 6287 Arapahoe Ave, Boulder, CO, 80303 - Active

Paramita Campus, 3285 30th St., Boulder, CO, 80301 - Active

Recommended Change: No change.

Correspondence Education

23.1302 - Creative Writing, Master,

Recommended Change: No change.

Distance Delivery

13.01 - Education, General, Master, Contemplative Education

23.1302 - Creative Writing, Master, Creative Writing

38.0201 - Religion/Religious Studies, Master, Contemplative Religions with a concentration in Contemplative Judaism

38.0202 - Buddhist Studies, Master, Buddhist Studies

38.0206 - Jewish/Judaic Studies, Post-Baccalaureate Certificate, Contemplative Judaism

42.01 - Psychology, General, Master, Transpersonal Psychology

Contractual Arrangements

05. AREA, ETHNIC, CULTURAL, GENDER, AND GROUP STUDIES - Bachelor - Bachelor - 05. AREA, ETHNIC, CULTURAL, GENDER, AND GROUP STUDIES (Study Abroad) - Where There Be Dragons

None

Recommended Change: No change.

Consortial Arrangements

None

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Recommended Change: No change.
