



**REVIEW COMMITTEE  
REPORT FORM**

**REVIEW COMMITTEE # 1**

**SESSION A**

**September 26, 2005**

<b>INSTITUTION:</b>	<b>PARK UNIVERSITY</b>
<b>TYPE OF EVALUATION:</b>	<b>Continued Accreditation (Institution's Request)</b>
<b>CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER:</b>	<b>Beverley Byers-Pevitts, President</b>
<b>TEAM CHAIR:</b>	<b>Dr. Joseph B. Miller</b>
<b>STAFF LIAISON:</b>	<b>Robert R. Appleson</b>
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS:</b>	<b>William J. Shustowski, Jr. (Chair), Rebecca L. Sherrick (Recorder), Brenda Beckman, James Cicarelli, Robert L. Funaro, Cheryl L. Jacobsen</b>

---

**INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES:**

Dr. Beverley Byers-Pevitts, President  
 Dr. Michael Droge, Provost and Senior Vice President  
 Ms. Clarinda Creighton, Vice President/Student Services  
 Dr. Gary Heisserer, Assistant Vice President/Academic Affairs

---

**TEAM CHAIR OR TEAM REPRESENTATIVE:**

Dr. Joseph B. Miller

---

**I. REVIEW COMMITTEE ACTION (CHECK ONE):**

1. The Review Committee agrees with the Evaluation Team's recommendation and adopts it as Commission action without modification or with minor modification(s). The position of the Committee is explained in the Rationale section of this report.
2. The Review Committee disagrees with the Evaluation Team's recommendation and provides new wording for the Commission action that is noted on the attached Worksheet and explained in the Rationale section of this report.

**PARK UNIVERSITY**

Page 2

**II. IDENTIFY THE TOPICS AND ISSUES DISCUSSED**

- Overview of Park University's request for Review Committee consideration
- Overview of team visit and report
- Design and status of undergraduate and graduate learning assessment programs
- Consistency of undergraduate and graduate curricula
- Collaborative practices and processes at Park University

**III. SELECT THE COMMITTEE'S ACTION/RECOMMENDATION.**

- A. The Review Committee believes that the institution meets the Commission's Criteria/Core Components for Accreditation.
- B. The Review Committee believes that the institution meets Commission's Eligibility Requirements for candidacy status.
- C. The Review Committee believes that the institution is pursuing a course of action that if continued, could lead the institution to be in jeopardy of no longer meeting one or more of the Criteria/Core components for Accreditation (*Placed on Notice*).
- D. The Review Committee believes that conditions exist at the institution which endanger its ability to meet one or more of the Criteria/Core Components for Accreditation (*Probation*).
- E. The Review Committee believes that the institution fails to meet one or more of the Criteria/Core Components for Accreditation or fails to fulfill the expectations of the Candidacy Program (*Withdrawal of Affiliation*).

**IV. STATE THE RATIONALE FOR THE ACTION/RECOMMENDATION.**

The Review Committee's recommendations regarding Park University are intended to provide the institution with the opportunity to document its progress in three specific areas:

- undergraduate and graduate student learning assessment;
- consistency of curriculum; and
- collaborative processes in relation to new program development, identification of resources, faculty credentials and program sustainability.

This recommendation is consistent with the finding of the Evaluation Team that all three areas require continued attention and the assertion of the institution that already it is making significant progress, particularly in relation to assessment. The monitoring report will allow Park to present evidence in support of its position.

**Worksheet**

The Review Committee recommends that Park University be required to submit a monitoring report to the Commission by 30 September 2008 that addresses the following:

Undergraduate and graduate student learning outcome assessment;

Consistency of curriculum; and

**PARK UNIVERSITY**

Page 3

Collaborative processes, particularly in relation to new program development, identification of resources, faculty credentials and program sustainability.

Pending review of the monitoring report, the institution's next comprehensive evaluation will be scheduled for 2014-2015. In the event the report is found to be inadequate, the comprehensive evaluation will occur in 2010-2011.

The Review Committee recommends also that Park University be permitted to add, without seeking Commission approval, new master's programs in areas where the institution currently offers baccalaureate degrees.