



Park University Monitoring Report

**Submitted to the
Higher Learning Commission of the
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools**

September 2008

Dr. Beverley Byers-Pevitts, President
Park University
8700 NW River Park Drive
Parkville, MO 64152

Date

Table of Contents

1.0	The Higher Learning Commission’s Charge for the Monitoring Report	4
2.0	Summary Description of Park University	4
3.0	Park University Vision, Mission, and Core Values	6
4.0	Assessment of Student Learning	7
4.1	Chronology of Assessment Activity Since Summer 2005	7
4.1.1	A Structure for Collaborative Leadership	7
4.1.2	Summer 2005 Assessment Activity	10
4.1.3	Assessment Activity During the 2005 –2006 Academic Year	12
4.1.4	Assessment Activity - Summer 2006	15
4.1.5	Assessment Activity - 2006–2007 Academic Year	16
4.1.6	Assessment Activity - Summer 2007	19
4.1.7	Assessment Activity - 2007–2008 Academic Year and Beyond	20
4.2	Course-Embedded Assessment Using a Core Assessment Model	20
4.3	Syllabi System for Assessment and Curricular Consistency	23
4.4	Undergraduate Program Assessment	25
4.4.1	College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Assessment	26
4.4.2	School for Education Assessment	31
4.4.3	School of Business and Management	34
4.5	Graduate Program Assessment	36
4.6	General Education Review and Assessment	39
4.6.1	New General Education (Liberal Arts) Curriculum	40
4.7	Institutional-Level Assessment	44
4.7.1	Park’s Writing Competency Test	45
4.7.2	Tri-Modal Study	46
4.7.3	College Basic Academic Subjects Examination	48
5.0	Military Installation Voluntary Education Review	50
6.0	Curricular Consistency	52
6.1	University-Wide Faculty Engagement for Curricular Consistency	52
6.2	Integration of Faculty Members at Campus Centers into the Faculty of One University	54
6.3	Measures to Ensure Continuity of Programmatic and Curricular Expectations	56
6.4	Orientation of Part-Time Faculty Members to Expectations for Academic Excellence and Curricular Consistency	58
6.5	Faculty Oversight of Curricular Change	60
6.6	Advancing Curricular Consistency through Assessment of Student Learning	61
6.7	Review of Undergraduate Online Courses for Consistent Quality	63
6.8	Review of Graduate Online Courses for Consistent Quality	63

6.9	Review of Online Teaching for Consistent Quality	64
6.10	Program Review Update	65
6.11	Responsibility of College/School Deans for the Programs and Courses Offered at All Campus Centers	66
6.12	The Role of the Director of the Kansas City-Park Accelerated Programs....	66
7.0	Collaborative Process and Administrative Support	66
7.1	Changes in Administrative Positions for Increased Academic Oversight.....	68
7.2	Faculty Oversight of Academic Programs.....	72
7.3	Role of Academic Departments	72
7.4	Moving Decision-Making to the Lowest Possible Level	73
7.5	Administrative Support from the College for Distance Learning.....	74
7.6	The Faculty Senate.....	75
7.7	Park's Faculty Federation (Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement)	77
7.9	University Committees	80
7.9.1	Curriculum Committee	81
7.9.2	Graduate Academic Council.....	81
7.9.3	University Assessment Committee	81
7.9.4	Tenure Committee and Personnel Panel	82
7.9.5	Internationalization and Multiculturalism Committee.....	83
7.10	Other University Bodies with Strong Faculty Representation	83
7.11	The President's Shared Governance Commission.....	84
7.12	Faculty Credentials.....	88
7.13	New Program Development	90
7.14	Program Sustainability.....	91
7.15	Identification of Resources.....	92
7.17	Letters Regarding Collaborative Process at Park University.....	95
8.0	Preparation of the Monitoring Report.....	96
8.1	Sharing the Commission's Review Committee's Report with the Faculty....	96
8.2	Sharing Park's submission received by the Commission on January 4, 2008	97
8.3	Sharing the Commission's Analysis of Park's January Submission.....	98
8.4	Gathering Input from the Faculty Senate and Other Bodies with Strong Faculty Representation.....	99
10.0	Appendices.....	104

1.0 The Higher Learning Commission's Charge for the Monitoring Report

As stated in the September 26, 2005 report from the Higher Learning Commission Review Committee (**Appendix A**), Park University is required to submit a monitoring report to the commission by September 30, 2008. The report is to address:

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

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

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 (by October 2008), the comprehensive evaluation will occur in 2010-2011.

A July 26, 2007 email from Dr. Robert Appleton, Associate Director of the Higher Learning Commission, clarified that October 1, 2008 will remain the deadline for Park to submit a monitoring report (**Appendix B**).

2.0 Summary Description of Park University

Founded in 1875 in Parkville, Missouri, just north of downtown Kansas City, Missouri, Park University has become a comprehensive, independent Master's institution that is a

leader in higher education including online learning. In 2000, Park achieved university status and now serves more than 25,500 students annually at 43 campus centers in 22 states. In addition, there were a total of 53,400 online course enrollments in 2006-2007, making Park one of the largest providers of online learning in the country. The University is also proud of its long-standing relationship with the U.S. military, for which it has been recognized as one of the largest providers of undergraduate education to this population. Park annually educates over 16,000 military personnel and their families.

Serving an ethnically diverse student body and non-traditional adult learners has been central to Park's mission for many decades. In its first year (1875) Park enrolled women as well as men, which was unusual in the latter 19th century, and two of the original 17 students were Native Americans. During the 1940s, the University was a leader in educating Nisei students. Park was also an early integrator when it welcomed African-American students to live in its residence halls in 1950-1952.

Today Park continues to lead the way in increasing access to higher education by offering the quality undergraduate and graduate education students desire, using locations, times, and delivery formats that best serve students' needs. Providing such access has resulted in further diversity among the student population, with 700 international students from 112 countries taking courses in FY2008, and a 42 percent student representation from racial, ethnic, and cultural groups typically underrepresented in higher education. Park has been recognized repeatedly by *Hispanic Outlook Magazine* as one of the top 100 American colleges/universities in the nation graduating Hispanics, African-Americans, and Native Americans.

Park's academic structure includes a College of Liberal Arts and Sciences with a School for Arts and Humanities, a School for Natural and Applied Sciences, and a School for Social Sciences. There are also separate schools of Education, Business and Management, and Public Administration. The College for Distance Learning (CDL) provides the organizational infrastructure to support Park's many extended learning programs at campus centers as well as online programs. Each undergraduate program is

supervised by a program or department chair and each graduate program is supervised by a program director. The leadership for each school or college is provided by a dean. The Vice President for Distance Learning currently supervises the CDL and is assisted by the associate dean of that college. All deans as well as the Vice President for Distance Learning and the Associate Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs report to the Provost and Senior Vice President. The organizational chart for Academic Affairs appears in **Appendix C**.

3.0 Park University Vision, Mission, and Core Values

Vision Statement

Park University will be a renowned international leader in providing innovative educational opportunities for learners within the global society.

Mission Statement

The mission of Park University, an entrepreneurial institution of higher learning, is to provide access to academic excellence which will prepare learners to think critically, communicate effectively, and engage in lifelong learning while serving a global community.

Core University Values

- Commitment to commonalities and differences

- Commitment to community among all peoples of the world

- Commitment to lifelong learning

4.0 Assessment of Student Learning

Park's efforts since the 2005 comprehensive review by the Higher Learning Commission have moved the institution beyond accreditation compliance to a culture of assessment focused on academic achievement. Multiple assessment measurements of student performance are now used to inform curricular decisions and teaching practices in a systematic effort to improve students' mastery of course-embedded learning outcomes, as well as program competencies. The process is clearly defined, valid, and unbiased. Assessment initiatives have been designed also to improve curricular consistency across the University.

4.1. Chronology of Assessment Activity Since Summer 2005

The purpose of this chronology is to provide an overview of the multiple types of assessment initiatives that have occurred since 2005. The numerous entries in this section are summary statements to give the reader a sense of the University's comprehensive effort. More detail is presented in subsequent sections of this report along with appendices containing additional information.

4.1.1 A Structure for Collaborative Leadership

- A group of faculty members from the 2004-2005 University Assessment Committee (UAC) met weekly throughout the summer of 2005. The group represented faculty from different schools within the University and included the Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) as an *ex-officio* member. All faculty members on the UAC summer committee received additional compensation for that service.

- In the fall 2005, the UAC chair, along with four other committee members, began serving as UAC liaisons to provide assistance for specific academic areas. The liaisons met frequently with department chairs, program coordinators, and other

faculty members in their assigned areas to communicate the UAC's assessment plans. The idea of having liaisons play a significant supporting role for specific academic areas was recommended by the UAC and supported by the Provost.

- The charge for the UAC was to collaborate across the University to plan and implement systems that would improve:
 - student learning through the use of multiple, direct measures of student performance;
 - curricular consistency; and
 - collaborative process at all levels.

The UAC was assigned the responsibility and authority to approve plans for the assessment of student learning outcomes across the University. The committee was charged specifically to collaborate with the Provost, the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, the deans, and others in the development and implementation of all levels of assessment.

- A subcommittee of the UAC, the Core Assessment Committee (CAC), was formed to recommend an improved approach for comparing student learning across the University's three primary modes of instructional delivery (sixteen-week courses, accelerated eight-week courses, and online courses). Park's method of choice became course-embedded assessment, which emphasizes the use of core learning outcomes and measurements that are developed by academic departments for individual courses. Courses taught concurrently in all three modes of delivery are referred to as Tri-Modal courses, and they are used in an institutional study to compare student learning across those modes (the Tri-Modal Study). The core assessment approach was designed to achieve consistency in curriculum as well as student learning across the University, that approach is used in all modes of delivery including Park's Portfolio program. The Portfolio program is an individualized, tutorial-based instruction format.

- The chair of the UAC reported directly to the Provost and Senior Vice President, as did the Director for the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Those reporting relationships continue.

- To ensure that faculty leadership would drive assessment and collaborate closely with the administration, the Provost appointed a faculty member on the UAC to serve as Park University's Faculty Director for Assessment. That individual, who has expertise in assessment as well as research design, began meeting weekly with the Provost and the OIRA Director to advance assessment planning and implementation. In January 2006, the Faculty Director for Assessment was appointed Special Assistant to the Provost for Assessment and joined the Academic Council to provide assessment updates from the UAC/CAC and to collect feedback for those faculty committees.

- The result of the Provost working directly with the Faculty Director for Assessment, the UAC, and the OIRA director has been a successful collaborative model. The Provost and the Special Assistant to the Provost for Assessment have presented Park's core assessment model at multiple assessment conferences, including the Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) 2006 Assessment Institute and the 2006 Northumbria Assessment Conference in Durham, UK. Park's core assessment model was also recommended as a best practice by Dr. Barbara Hill of the American Council on Education at the 2006 Annual ACE Conference.

- The UAC proposed that the University's program coordinators also serve in their academic disciplines as contacts for the UAC. For many years, academic disciplines at Park have had faculty members serving as program coordinators who report to the department chairs. In some of the degree programs such as the bachelor's degree in social work, the department chair also assumes the duties of a program coordinator.
The traditional role of program coordinators has been to:

- review the credentials of individuals applying as adjuncts and approve them on a course-by-course basis;
- review and approve syllabi prepared by adjunct faculty members;
- review and approve the textbooks for courses; and
- review requests for credit as a Validated Learning Experience under existing University policy.

The UAC's idea was for program coordinators to function basically like assistant department chairs for assessment. The plan was developed during the summer of 2005 and implemented in the fall of that year. Graduate Program Directors perform a similar function for Graduate Programming.

4.1.2 Summer 2005 Assessment Activity

On the recommendation of the UAC, the Provost approved the plan for course-embedded core assessment to be required for every course offered at Park, and the (UAC and CAC) met together weekly during the summer.

- During the summer of 2005, the UAC:
 - reviewed the status of assessment activity across the University;
 - reviewed learning outcomes for individual courses and provided recommendations for measurement strategies;
 - developed a communications plan for assessment activity at Park;
 - developed guidelines for course-embedded Core Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and Core Assessments (CAs);
 - developed ways to use core assessment to also advance program-level assessment; and
 - collaborated with the OIRA and Provost on plans for institutional-level assessment.

- During the summer of 2005, the CAC:

- analyzed results and procedures used in Park's previous comparative studies of delivery modes to determine ways to increase the reliability and validity of assessment findings;
 - began assisting faculty with the development of CLOs and CAs; and
 - developed a rubric template to accommodate discipline-specific learning outcomes (a Core Assessment Rubric or CAR).
- The UAC/CAC initiated a comprehensive review by each academic discipline of their course learning outcomes, including those courses used in the general education program. Departments began reviewing their course-embedded assessments, and each faculty member was assigned to develop CLOs, CAs, and a CAR for at least one course by September 15, 2005 (See Section 4.2).
 - In a joint effort of the UAC, the OIRA, and Park's Information Technology Services, work began on a standardized, web-based, syllabus template system (See Section 4.3). The idea, generated by faculty members and supported by the administration, was to provide a syllabus template on the University's website for use by faculty members and students at all campus centers and online. UAC-approved CLOs and CAs are locked in the syllabi, while all faculty members, including adjunct faculty, are encouraged to add additional learning outcomes and other appropriate assessments. The software prohibits changes to the locked CLOs and CAs. CARs are also locked in approved syllabi. Faculty members teaching graduate courses online have the option of using the Park syllabus template or the eCollege course shell for publishing syllabi. Either way, the syllabi contain the approved core assessments.
 - The UAC/CAC and Provost also planned a session on assessment of student learning for all faculty members at the August 2005 Fall Faculty Conference.

4.1.3 Assessment Activity During the 2005 –2006 Academic Year

- The UAC/CAC updated all faculty members at the August 2005 Fall Faculty Conference, and hosted an open forum for discussion of assessment. The core assessment model was discussed in detail.
- The UAC/CAC continued to meet weekly during the academic year.
- The CAC and other liaisons from UAC helped faculty members develop their core assessments, including the scoring rubrics (CARs). The UAC selected courses with exemplary CARs and used those instruments as samples to assist faculty members who were struggling with rubric development. The UAC/CAC then reviewed all submitted CARs and provided feedback.
- Examples of other faculty assistance provided by the UAC/CAC included:
 - conducting a training session for academic directors (who work at the campus centers around the country);
 - developing and providing access to training modules to assist faculty members with core assessment;
 - collaborating with Park's Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) to provide information about best practices in assessment;
 - developing the UAC website to inform everyone about Park's assessment activities (<http://www.park.edu/assessment>);
 - developing a glossary of assessment terminology and posting that information on the UAC's website (<http://www.park.edu/assessment>);
 - conducting follow-up core assessment workshops in September and November of 2005 for program coordinators, department chairs, deans, and all interested faculty members regarding assessment initiatives;
 - meeting with faculty members to discuss options for capstone courses/projects to assess students' mastery of program competencies;

- publishing an “Assessment Brief” to disseminate information electronically to all Park faculty members about University assessment initiatives; and
 - having the Faculty Director for Assessment travel to El Paso, Phoenix, and Washington, D.C. to assist Park faculty members (including adjunct faculty) at those locations with the University’s assessment initiatives.
- Based on faculty feedback to the UAC and the Provost, the undergraduate CAR was revised to offer more flexibility in addressing discipline-specific learning outcomes. Faculty members had the choice of using the revised or the original CAR template (See Section 4.2).
 - Core assessment for more than 80 courses was completed by faculty members from various academic disciplines during September 2005. By November 2005 almost all full-time faculty members had submitted CLOs, CAs and CARs for five courses each, which provided core assessment for most courses taught in the fall 2005 semester/terms. The few faculty members who missed the deadline were reminded by a letter from the Provost, and everyone complied by the end of the fall semester/fall II term. Concurrent to each sixteen-week fall semester, Park offers two eight-week terms (Fall I and Fall II terms). By May 2006 core assessment materials for 300 courses had been submitted to the UAC.
 - The Graduate Academic Council developed and implemented a CAR specific to graduate programs. This rubric addressed, in addition to cognitive skills, abilities and dispositions of a technical, professional, and leadership nature (See Section 4.2).
 - The Graduate Academic Council developed and implemented a new course approval form. This form requires the rationale for adding the course, an identification of similar courses, and encourages collaboration with other programs to avoid duplication of curriculum. The form also requires a description

of learning outcomes and assessment instruments. Section 4.5 provides more detail about the assessment.

- UAC-approved CLOs, CAs, and CARs were added to course syllabi that were then posted on the web-based Syllabus Template System (See Section 4.3).
- The UAC and CAC, together with the OIRA, developed and implemented procedures to collect and evaluate core assessments from all three modes of instructional delivery, known as the Tri-Modal Study. This study is an institutional-level assessment for the direct comparison of student learning in the same courses taught in the 16-week semester, the 8-week term face-to-face, and the 8-week online term. Faculty members participated in assessment activities of the Tri-Modal Study. These activities consisted of an orientation to the purpose of the Tri-Modal Study, training to assist with inter-rater reliability, and the actual scoring of assessment artifacts. The spring 2006 Tri-Modal Study included courses in Parkville (16-week), Park Accelerated–Kansas City Area and Fort Bliss (both 8-week face-to-face), as well as the 8-week online term (See Section 4.7.1).
- The UAC developed procedures for departments to review or revise their departmental assessment plans, which include assessment for each degree program as well as course-embedded assessments (See Section 4.5).
- Deans and associate deans worked with the faculty members in their schools to improve program assessment. A template including examples was developed in collaboration with the deans, the UAC, and the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and shared with all faculty members.
- The Provost together with the Special Assistant to the Provost for Assessment provided assessment status reports to the University’s Board of Trustees at the board meetings.

- The UAC organized and presented an assessment update for all faculty members at the Spring 2006 Faculty Conference.
- By the end of the 2005-2006 academic year, faculty members had been working so much on assessment that Park had clearly developed a culture of assessment. Everyone began speaking in Park's new assessment language of CLOs, CAs, CARs, syllabus templates, etc.

4.1.4 Assessment Activity - Summer 2006

- Faculty members continued to work with the UAC to development CAs for all courses offered in the fall of 2006.
- UAC liaisons continued to meet regularly and work with academic departments.
- The UAC chair conducted an assessment workshop for Park's Kansas City area adjunct faculty members.
- The UAC continued assisting departments with their program assessment plans by reviewing documents and providing consultation to ensure that such plans were comprehensive (See Sections 4.4 and 4.5).
- Planning began for the 2006-2007 Tri-Modal Study. The OIRA developed procedures to collect, store, and access protocols and worked with the UAC to identify courses with approved CLOs/CAs/CARs.
- The Fall 2006 Assessment Summit was planned to accompany the August 2006 Fall Faculty Conference when all full-time faculty members would be on the Parkville campus.

4.1.5 Assessment Activity - 2006–2007 Academic Year

- The UAC hosted the second Assessment Summit for the August 2006 Fall Faculty Conference. This update and open forum engaged program coordinators, department chairs, and deans. Discussions during the summit resulted in modifications to the Tri Modal Study protocols that had been proposed by the UAC in June 2006.

- At its first introduction, use of the new standardized syllabus template system with locked CLOs and CAs reached 90 percent participation for the 8-week programs, which accounts for nearly 90 percent of Park's enrollment. Approximately 60 percent of the 16-week programs also participated in the Syllabus Template System (See Section 4.3).

- New and revised program-level assessments were reviewed by the UAC. Information about options for multiple types of program assessment and suggestions for improvements in a department's chosen program assessment were discussed. This resulted in improved assessment plans and annual assessment reports for programs.

- Templates and training were provided to assist departments with their annual assessment reports due at the end of the academic year. The UAC worked with deans, department chairs and other faculty members to establish some standardization in the reporting process and format.

- The UAC collaborated with deans to collect revised department assessment plans for approval. A November 2006 deadline was given to departments for revising their assessment plans, and some departments began submitting them as early as September of 2006. More detail is provided in Section 4.4.

- The Dean of the School for Education joined Park University in August 2006 and worked closely with faculty members to prepare the self-study for Park's fall 2007 state accreditation visit by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). The state's many standards for the education curriculum and requirements for the assessment of student learning have been addressed (See Section 4.4.2). At the August 7, 2008 meeting of the Missouri State Board of Education, all of Park's Education certification programs were approved for the maximum seven years of renewed accreditation.

- The Associate Dean of the School of Business and Management (SBM) worked with faculty members on assessment during 2006-2007. He also served *ex-officio* on the UAC during the year. One assessment initiative of the SBM was to impose a University-wide requirement that students score at least a 60 percent on the final course assessment (examination, case study, or essay) in order to pass the course. That requirement applied to all SBM courses in all delivery formats. Based on the outcomes of that policy, the SBM voted in August 2007 also to factor other course assessments into the final course grade so that the final examination was not the only determinant for passing the course.

- In keeping with a multi-year plan, a national search was conducted during 2006-2007 for a dean of the SBM. In the summer of 2007 an outstanding candidate was hired as the new dean and the associate dean returned to the faculty.

- In September 2006, the Provost charged the Director of the OIRA with conducting the day-to-day coordination required to implement the Tri-Modal Study (See Section 4.7.2). Early in the spring of 2007, a Tri-Modal Study was completed and provided assessment data for 19 courses in the SBM and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences received the Tri-Modal data, including an analysis of the results from the OIRA, which he then shared with department chairs during the spring 2007.

- Also in spring 2007, the Liberal Arts and Sciences Dean provided department chairs formatting information to standardize their program assessment reports. A deadline of June 15 was given for submission of the reports to the dean. Each report contained a narrative evaluation and a completed Program Assessment Table. The reports also described how departments use Tri-Modal assessment data. More detail is provided in Section 4.4.

- The OIRA identified a standardized test (the College Basic Academic Subjects Examination (CBASE)) as a possible source of information to supplement Park's existing institutional assessments such as the Writing Competency Test (WCT). This standardized instrument could provide data on critical thinking from questions specifically designed to measure this variable. This information, together with the written communication data provided by Park's Writing Competency Test (WCT), directly addresses the critical thinking and effective communication components of the University's Mission Statement (See Section 4.7.3) and General Education Program (See Section 4.6).
 - After consultation with the Provost, the Director of the OIRA discussed the need for a standardized exam with the General Education Taskforce during the spring and summer of 2007. The General Education Taskforce and faculty members discussed how these examinations could show useful assessment data for Park's general education competencies in general and critical thinking, in particular. The General Education Taskforce also met with the Academic Council (deans and academic vice presidents) who supported the standardized testing initiative. The topic was placed on the agenda for discussion by all faculty members at the August 2007 Fall Faculty Conference. The Provost charged the OIRA to assist the General Education Taskforce with conducting a pilot testing of the CBASE examination during 2007-2008. The pilot provided an evaluation of how well that particular standardized test matches Park's needs for general education assessment, and

has enabled the OIRA to plan the logistics for administering such an examination on a larger scale.

- Park's graduate programs have advanced their course-embedded and program-level assessments. A comprehensive self-study of the assessment for undergraduate and graduate programs in the School for Education was completed in preparation for the November 2007 accreditation visit by the Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). Details of each graduate program's assessment activity are provided in their respective reports described in Section 4.5.

4.1.6 Assessment Activity - Summer 2007

- Several members of the UAC analyzed the Tri-Modal data for their August presentation at the International Assessment Conference in Sydney, Australia. Based on that analysis, the UAC submitted recommendations for improving the evaluation of student learning across delivery formats (See Section 4.7.2).
- Assessment Reports started reaching the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences in early June 2007. The Dean carefully examined each report and provided feedback to the chairs so that all relevant data were included. Once the Dean approved a report, he forwarded it to the UAC for their review and feedback. The deans also used this information to help guide their programs toward improvement.
- By the end of the summer (2007) all departments within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences had submitted acceptable program assessment plans, which also included results from their Tri-Modal studies.

4.1.7 Assessment Activity - 2007–2008 Academic Year and Beyond

- All assessment activity has progressed and recommendations based on assessment data are informing curricular and administrative decision-making for program offerings. For example, in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, during AY 07-08, there were 199 curricular items approved, many of which resulted from the program assessment and/or course assessment (tri-modal) process.
- The 2007-2008 Tri-Modal Study has provided an improved, direct comparison of student learning across different delivery formats. Results generally indicate that this process is becoming more reliable and that learning across all modes has improved over the previous year.
- The CBASE examination piloted in 2007-2008 will continue in 2008-2009 for additional assessment of students' mastery of general education competencies.

4.2 Course-Embedded Assessment Using a Core Assessment Model

Prior to Park's core assessment initiatives and the Tri-Modal Study, attempts had been made by faculty members to compare student learning in the different modes. Unfortunately, the reliability among raters was low in those attempts due to a lack of common learning outcomes and assessments. Park's new core assessment model includes CLO statements in each course and common CAs to measure student mastery of those outcomes. To underscore the importance of the CLOs for each course, and to ensure that the CA will provide a significant student product for evaluation, the CAC and UAC determined that at least 20 percent of each course grade would be derived from the CA. Other information about Park's core assessment model is available on the UAC's website (www.park.edu/assessment) and

at <http://www.park.edu/syllabus/corelearning.aspx>. A sample of that material also appears in **Appendix D**. Since the CAs are common for a particular course, regardless of its mode of delivery, it has enabled Park to develop a scoring rubric to increase inter-rater reliability for the comparison of student learning (see Section 4.7.2). This Tri-Modal initiative at Park has continued to evolve as a useful institutional-level assessment.

By the fall of 2005, the UAC and CAC further recommended that core assessment be included in all courses, not just those being taught in all three delivery modes concurrently. All faculty members were asked to identify CLOs and CAs for each course offered at the University, and they were also encouraged to add additional learning outcomes in their courses along with appropriate assessments. The exception to this has been the School for Education where the articulation of courses within programs limits the addition of learning outcomes beyond those already in place. As outlined above, the UAC and CAC have worked closely with faculty members to provide information and assistance regarding this student learning outcome assessment approach. Examples of CLOs and CAs are provided in **Appendix E**.

The CAC and UAC developed the Core Assessment Rubric (CAR) for faculty members to use as they define their core learning outcomes and assessments operationally. Faculty members in some areas had difficulty preparing CARs and thought that such a scoring guide could not be applied in their discipline. One such area was in the visual arts and others included business and mathematics. To accommodate the needs of different academic disciplines, several format versions of

the CAR were created during 2005-2006 based on feedback from the faculty. This assistance improved the overall satisfaction of faculty members, because it recognized the discipline-specific nature of assessment. All academic disciplines now use some version of the CAR. The templates for creating CARs are provided on the UAC's website (<http://www.park.edu/assessment>) and in **Appendix F**.

Another benefit of the CAR approach has been that such scoring rubrics reinforce Park's mission of preparing students to think critically and communicate effectively. That a CAR is required for every course directly links this portion of Park's mission to all academic programs.

Core assessment elements (CLOs, CAs, and CARs) are submitted to the UAC for review and feedback. After the core assessment for a course is approved by the UAC, that component is incorporated into the course syllabus using the University's standardized syllabus template (See Section 4.3). As of the fall 2007, 493 courses had UAC-approved core assessment.

The core assessment model is providing multiple benefits for improving student learning and advancing curricular consistency at Park. Examples include:

- having clear course learning outcomes and assessments that have been reviewed by the faculty members and approved by the University Assessment Committee;
- having core learning outcomes aligned with the University's mission of preparing students who can think critically and communicate effectively;
- improving curricular consistency by having consistent learning outcomes and assessments for courses regardless of where they are taught and in what delivery format;

- having common assessments of core learning that provide comparable student work for institutional-level assessment of learning across the delivery formats of the Tri-Modal Study (See Section 4.7.1); and
- having an efficient web-based process for syllabus review and approval across Park's many campus centers.

4.3 Syllabi System for Assessment and Curricular Consistency

The concept of a mandatory web-based standard syllabus evolved in response to the need for more curriculum consistency and comparisons of programs. Since syllabi define each course and give students important information, such documents provide a means of managing curricular and class management issues. Fortunately, the major components of this syllabus system were already in place. Park's Information Technology Services (ITS) and the College for Distance Learning (CDL) had worked collaboratively to make syllabi available to faculty members as part of the University's website. Therefore, the primary consideration was how best to use this resource and how to advance communications regarding course content and expectations for learning to faculty members as well as students.

The first step was to incorporate the UAC's core assessment process (CLOs, CAs, and CARs) into syllabi to ensure curricular consistency. This was accomplished through the joint effort of the UAC, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, and Instructional Technology Services in 2006. The web-based syllabi system was launched in the fall of 2003 by Dr. Tim Westcott, who served as Interim Undergraduate Dean at that time. Dr. Westcott also led the implementation of Park's web-based attendance reporting system.

As core assessment components are approved by the UAC, the information is loaded into a storage module by OIRA personnel. This module is accessible on the

University's website and provides instant access to this information for any interested party. In addition, the core assessment information for each course is automatically loaded to the appropriate syllabus as it is created. This information is hard coded and cannot be edited.

For the fall 2007, 95 percent of the 8-week courses and 70 percent of the 16-week courses feature the new syllabus template. Approximately 90 percent of Park's students are enrolled in 8-week courses. Posted syllabi are available for review on the website at <http://www.park.edu/syllabus/List.aspx> and samples are provided in **Appendix G**.

When an adjunct faculty member is approved to teach at the University, that individual is required to obtain and use the syllabus template from Park's website. All faculty members are also encouraged to add additional learning outcomes with assessments to their syllabi, but anyone who teaches the course in any delivery format must teach the CLOs and administer the core assessment. After an adjunct faculty member has prepared the syllabus for a course, it is submitted electronically to a program coordinator for review and approval. They work with adjunct faculty members to create an approvable syllabus, which is then sent back to the instructor as well as to the website for access by students.

The core assessment presented in the syllabi is integral to the successful implementation of Park's Tri-Modal Study comparing student learning in the 16-week, 8-week, and online delivery formats (See Section 4.7). Collection and analysis of completed core assessments from these modes of instruction addresses the issues of comparability of programs, consistency of curriculum, and assessment of student learning outcomes.

Faculty members enter new syllabi or update previous syllabi by:

1. accessing the Park University website;
2. pulling down "Syllabus" on Quick Links;

3. selecting the “Faculty Entrance” option from the menu
<http://www.park.edu/syllabus/List.aspx>; and
4. following instructions for editing
<https://www.park.edu/syllabus/login.aspx> .

4.4 Undergraduate Program Assessment

Undergraduate programming is offered in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the School for Education, the School of Business and Management and the Hauptmann School for Public Affairs. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences includes the School for Arts and Humanities, the School for Natural and Applied Sciences, and the School for Social Sciences. In addition to implementing course-embedded core assessment for all programs, each degree program has an assessment plan that includes program-level assessment. Information describing program assessment is provided for faculty members on the UAC website and sample material from the website appears in **Appendix H**.

An Annual Assessment Report was submitted for each degree program in the summer 2007 and again in the summer 2008. Program faculty submitted the reports to their dean and the UAC for review and feedback. This University-wide initiative was coordinated by the UAC, and the process began with the UAC providing content and format recommendations for the Annual Assessment Reports. Although the findings indicate that programs can improve their data collection and analysis, all programs made significant progress during the past two years.

One finding of the UAC was that course-embedded assessment was more advanced for programs with Tri-Modal courses (courses taught in all three delivery modes). Programs *without* Tri-Modal courses could benefit from including more formative assessment in their reports. A sampling of feedback from the UAC on the Annual Assessment Reports is provided in **Appendix I**. The UAC’s plan for assisting those programs is to collaborate with them on an annual review of their core assessment

processes for at least 10 percent of the courses in each such program. That review would include the analysis of core assessment data to help inform faculty members' curricular decisions and academic advising as students progress through the program.

In September 2007, the Provost clarified that all assessment reports are to include formative (course-embedded) as well as summative (program-level) assessment. The UAC put forth a tremendous effort in developing the core assessment processes (e.g. Core Learning Outcomes, Core Assessments and Core Assessment Rubrics) and considers such formative data critical for improving student learning.

4.4.1 College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Assessment

In February 2006, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) initiated a comprehensive review of program assessment for the three schools within that college. The Dean communicated with all department chairs regarding the process and worked with the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs to develop a template for Program Assessment Report tables, which was also distributed to the faculty. The spring 2006 semester was used for college discussion of how to assist faculty members with the review of existing assessment plans and creation of new or updated plans.

In the fall of 2006 the Dean required departments to submit program assessment plans for each academic program. Each plan included a comprehensive narrative and a standardized assessment table. Updated plans began arriving in the Dean's office in September and continued to be submitted throughout the 2006-2007 academic year.

Because some faculty members at the University lacked experience in program assessment, the Dean carefully evaluated the plans and made suggestions to the department chairs on ways to improve. Once the Dean was satisfied with each program assessment plan, the plan was forwarded to the UAC for final review and

approval. Sample assessment plans are provided in **Appendix J** and others are available on the UAC website.

During the spring of 2007, the Dean distributed an outline for departments to use in preparing their assessment reports for the 2006-2007 year. The deadline for the submission of these reports to the Dean was late June 2007. The reports also addressed results of department courses assessed as part of the Tri-Modal Study.

As with all aspects of the program assessment, the Dean examined each assessment report and provided feedback to the chairs, often requesting that any additional relevant data be added. Once the Dean was satisfied that the report was complete and in a relatively standardized format, he forwarded each to the UAC. The Dean approved the final program assessment reports in September 2007. Program assessment results for AY 2007-2008 were received by the Dean by late August (2008) and forwarded to the UAC.

All departments in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences are using the findings in their assessment reports to modify their curriculum for enhanced student learning. Examples of such program modifications appear in the assessment reports provided in **Appendix K**. Assessment reports are also available on the UAC's website (www.park.edu/assessment).

In 2007, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences' program assessment plans for all 28 undergraduate degree programs were approved by the Dean and the UAC. Of these, assessment data were collected for 23 degree programs. Five programs did not have any graduating students in 2006-2007. In total, 188 graduating students in the 23 degree programs were assessed. In the following table, programs not having students in the Tri-Modal Study are those in which individual courses are not concurrently taught in all three delivery modes (i.e. are Tri-Modal).

Table 1A: College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Assessment

Program Assessment		Tri-Modal Study	
Program	Number of Graduating Students	Participant?	Number of Students
Art (fine art)	2	no	0
Athletic Training	8	no	0
Biology	12	yes	157
Chemistry	1	no	0
Communication Arts:	N/A	yes	85
Journalism	5	no	0
Photojournalism	0	no	0
Broadcasting	0	no	0
Public Relations	2	no	0
Comm Theory	9	no	0
Criminal Justice	16	yes	201
English	7	yes	90
Geography	2	no	0
Graphic Design	6	no	0
History	12	yes	45
Info Computer Science	6	yes	93
Interior Design	11	no	0
Math	0	yes	210
Modern Languages	1	(own version)	165
Music	1	no	0
Nursing	37	no	no
Political Science	5	no	0
Psychology	22	yes	112
Public Administration	12	no	0
Social psychology	0	yes	0
Social Work	6	no	0
Sociology	4	yes	146
Theatre Performance	1	no	0
Theatre Design	0	no	0
Totals	188		1304

During the 2006-2007 program assessment process several findings emerged. Overall, students were found to meet each program's expected learning objectives. Second, a number of assessment plans were found to need adjustments, particularly in their instrument's ability to assess individual program competencies. Based on these findings, departments revised their assessment plans. For some programs,

assessment has shown the need to modify the curriculum and improve opportunities for student learning. Five academic programs in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences already have proposed major curricular changes based on these findings.

From the 2006-2007 Tri-Modal Study, it was determined that student learning continues to need improvement in all three modes of delivery. Another conclusion was that parts of the course assessment process need adjustment to improve the effectiveness of the study itself. A faculty presentation at an international conference in August 2007 described Park's progress with the Tri-Modal Study, as well as lessons learned (See also Section 4.7.2). Faculty members are working to modify core assessment in certain courses to improve the study's validity and reliability. In addition, the same type of core assessment artifact for each course in every mode of delivery was submitted for scoring by graders other than the course instructor.

Assessment reports covering AY 2007-2008 were generally submitted during the summer 2008. Twenty-eight academic programs engaged in either program assessment and/or tri-modal assessment. The number of students assessed has increased significantly (see Table 1B below).

Table 1B: College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Assessment

Department/Program	# of Seniors Assessed	Total # of Students Assessed	Tri-Modal Assessment	Tri-Modal Students (Fall 2007)	Tri-Modal Students (Spring 2007)
Art (fine art)	5	5	no		
Athletic Training	4	20	no		
Biology	7	7	yes	103	117
Chemistry	3	4	no		
Communication Arts	-	-	yes	35	0
Journalism	5	5	no		
Photojournalism	0	0	no		
Broadcasting	4	4	no		
Public Relations	0	0	no		
Communication Theory	9	9	no		
Criminal Justice	13	13	yes	163	216

Department/Program	# of Seniors Assessed	Total # of Students Assessed	Tri-Modal Assessment	Tri-Modal Students (Fall 2007)	Tri-Modal Students (Spring 2007)
English	6	6	yes	90	90
EIL	N/A	62	no		
Geography	3	3	no		
Graphic Design	6	6	no		
History	9	12	fall 07	81	0
Info Computer Science	15	15	yes	213	99
Interior Design	11	11	no		
Legal Studies	2	2	no		
Math	0	0	yes	0	207
Modern Languages	2	2	no		
Music	0	9	no		
Nursing	38	38	no		
Political Science	1	1	no		
Psychology	22	22	yes	205	391
Public Administration	2	2	no		
Social Work	16	16	no		
Sociology	5	5	yes	163	206
Theatre Performance	1	3	no		
Theatre Design	0	0	no		

For the most part program assessment improved a great deal over the previous year, as faculty amended their assessment plans to make up for any weaknesses. Program assessment plans became simpler and provided more reliable, valid results. In addition, faculty members provided action plans for assessment plan changes as well as programmatic or curricular changes based on these results. Since some major program changes are taking effect during fall 2008, it is expected that next year's assessment will provide information as to whether these changes are having the desired effects. Generally, however, results indicate that students are meeting expectations for program "competencies." They further indicate that teaching is fairly effective. As this is still an early stage in program assessment at the university, the fact that students are now aware of this process and that faculty are making it part of their academic routine, as well as completing the cycle of assessment is indicative of the fact that assessment is working. We foresee that assessment plans will continue

to evolve for a couple more years before they stabilize, while assessment itself will be ongoing.

The Tri-Modal studies for courses taught during spring 2007 and fall 2007 show a great deal of improvement in the process. Core assessment artifacts have become the same across the three modes of delivery, while the number of missing artifacts has decreased dramatically. This has produced more reliable data with which to compare student learning across the three delivery modes.

Results of this tri-modal assessment process in CLAS are mixed. For some courses and disciplines students generally meet expectations, while for others they do not. Similarly, for some courses and disciplines students in the 16-week format demonstrate higher levels of learning, for others online students seem to be doing better.

Overall, results show improved learning from the previous year. This is probably due primarily to an improved assessment process. Similarly, 8-week students, who were very far behind in learning during the first semester of tri-modal studies, now show a great improvement. Again, this is most likely due to the fact that instructors are more familiar with the process and have their students submit the correct core assessment artifacts. Finally, already a number of programs, such as English and History, have changed their curriculum as a result of what they have learned through the tri-modal assessment process.

4.4.2 School for Education Assessment

The School for Education (SFE) formed an assessment committee called Teacher Assessment Group (TAG) for the purpose of aligning the Unit and Certification Programs with state and national standards in teacher education. The outcomes of Park's teacher education and educational leadership programs are stated as abilities which students will exhibit when they complete their program of study. These

outcomes were directly related to the mission and goals of the University and the School for Education. The TAG chair interviewed students, faculty members, and staff and worked with members of the UAC to ensure that the SFE's program assessment plan is consistent with the University's assessment system. For example, all education courses now include core assessment as directed by the guidelines of the UAC.

The SFE's assessment plan includes a systematic framework for gathering data from teacher candidates, graduates, employers, and other stakeholders over time (**Appendix L**). For each program, a set of developmental "pathways" identifies key assessment tools used at each point in the student's educational journey, including the journey into teaching. Each pathway includes the following elements and concludes with specific assessment findings

The Executive Director of the Graduate School, who is also an Associate Professor of Education and a long-time member of the UAC, worked with the Associate Dean of the SFE and the faculty to develop the school's program assessment plan. The plan for education programs is based on the University's and SFE's vision and mission statements as well as the SFE's Conceptual Framework entitled *Developing Leaders in Education*. The framework is aligned with the goals and objectives of each SFE program, and those goals and objectives are based on standards defined by the State of Missouri and professional organizations. The assessment plan is designed to measure both initial and advanced teacher candidate competence in defined areas, and to provide an assessment of overall program effectiveness at the initial and advanced certification levels.

The multiple components of the SFE's assessment plan provide a comprehensive approach to improving student learning. Each candidate is evaluated on professional dispositions before admission into the undergraduate and graduate SFE programs, and on teacher or instructional leadership dispositions at designated check points after admission and throughout their practica, student teaching, and internship. Each

course is assessed using measures designed to determine the mastery of course material, standards defined by the State of Missouri, and professional organizations. Portfolios are used also for assessment. Designated materials from each course are collected in a portfolio and are reviewed by a panel prior to graduation to determine growth in the program and evidence of competence in the related standards. For initial teacher education candidates in early childhood, elementary, middle school, secondary, and MAT programs, and advanced teacher candidates in special education, candidates also complete a teacher work sample (TWS) which is evaluated on specific criteria tied to the ability of the candidate to enhance and improve student learning as demonstrated by their ability to implement best practices in her/his educational environment. For candidates in educational leadership, an action research project and portfolio are evaluated. Finally, all graduates seeking certification must pass a standardized examination required by the State of Missouri. The results of these examinations are analyzed to determine program strengths and weaknesses. This tiered system provides both formative and summative evaluation for both the program and students.

The SFE also has conducted the following assessment activities routinely:

- Alumni Surveys (each summer-1st year and 5th year)
- Employer Surveys (each summer-1st year and 5th year)
- End of course surveys
- End of program surveys – for selected programs (such as the EDAD)
- Portfolio evaluation at program completion
- Capstone evaluation (MED) at program completion
- GPA Monitoring
- PRAXIS results monitoring
- C-BASE results monitoring
- Practicum Evaluations
- Directed Teaching Evaluations
- Teacher Work Sample evaluations

- Advisory Board Survey and interviews for the 8 certification program areas and 3 non-certification program areas
- Review of certification assessments (PRAXIS and SLLA)

The SFE also has added an annual Summer Assessment Retreat for the faculty to review all assessment data collected the previous academic year, to evaluate progress made in achieving specific goals, and to set new goals for the next academic year. Assessment results are shared with faculty members and colleagues across campus as well as with public school practitioners. The results are also posted on the SFE website (<http://captain.park.edu/EdDese/index.html>).

The November 2007 visit to Park by DESE's Evaluation Team resulted in an exit interview that was highly complementary of the SFE and the University. The SFE received a written report from the DESE Evaluation Team in June, 2008. That written report included the following commendations:

- 100 % PRAXIS II Pass Rate of SFE Candidates
- 97% First Time PRAXIS II Pass Rate of SFE Candidates
- High ranking by administrators of beginning teachers from Park University (State Survey Results)
- Conceptual framework grounded in liberal arts (DESE MoSTEP Standard 2)
- Personal attention to development of candidates (DESE MoSTEP Standard 4)
- Effective Collaborative partnerships (DESE MoSTEP Standard 7)

At the August 7, 2008 meeting of the Missouri State Board of Education, all SFE certification programs were approved for the maximum seven year re-accreditation period.

4.4.3 School of Business and Management

During the 2006-2007 academic year, the School of Business and Management (SBM) faculty adopted an assessment plan that was conceptually consistent across the business disciplines. This “apples to apples” approach is valid for all programs in the SBM. The

assessment protocol being implemented by the SBM conforms to both Park's guidelines set forth by the UAC and guidelines established by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), which call for a mission-driven assessment protocol. The undergraduate program areas in the SBM include accounting, management, economics, and business administration. The assessment plan for each SBM program area includes assessment of core learning outcomes for each course. Capstone courses are used at the undergraduate level to assess the mastery of program competencies for program assessment. Sample assessment plans from the SBM can be found on the Park University website www.park.edu/assessment.

In August 2007, the University hired the first Dean for the School of Business and Management. That individual brings much professional and academic administrative experience to the University. Under his leadership, Park has decided to pursue program accreditation for the SBM from the American Association of Colleges and Schools of Business (AACSB). As those program accreditation plans continue to develop, a new assessment oversight group is being established in the fall 2008. That group, entitled the SBM Assessment Committee, is charged with reviewing the assessment plans that identify quantifiable learning outcomes for the business core as well as each major and concentration within the SBM. The SBM Assessment Committee will work closely with the University's Assessment Committee.

While developing its overall plan the SBM Assessment Committee members will participate in the EBI Undergraduate Business Exit Study and consider the mechanisms for administering a selected assessment tool such as the ETS Major Field Test to seniors. Other tools might include the Kelly and Myer's Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (Kelley, C. and J. Meyers 1987/1989/1992. Minneapolis, MN: NCS Pearson Inc.) which can be administered to freshmen and seniors. Based on information gathered from these tests, the SBM will institute curriculum changes in SBM business core curriculum and in the curriculum for specific majors.

In 2008, the SBM will begin conducting focus groups in selected Park locations throughout the country. Each of these sessions will be facilitated by an outside

professional and will follow a common interview protocol. Results from the study will be combined with other data and used during SBM Faculty Fall Workshop to review performance and set quantifiable outcomes for future assessments.

As Park progresses toward AACSB accreditation, assessment data will be disseminated by the SBM Assessment Committee (along with analysis and suggested recommendations) to the faculty twice each year. The SBM Curriculum Committee, based on these findings, will then develop and present to the general faculty curricular proposals to improve student learning.

4.5 Graduate Program Assessment

Park graduate programs, under the auspices of the Graduate Academic Council, continue the collaborative process of establishing and maintaining a culture for assessment of student learning. These efforts have focused on the primary components of assessment process and have addressed student learning on a course-by-course and overall programmatic basis. Assessment efforts have concentrated on the development and refinement of program goals, the formulation of course-specific CLOs to support these goals, and the implementation of multiple measures to assess accurately the student learning and program effectiveness.

As noted above, graduate programs operate within the structure, policies, and procedures established by the Graduate Academic Council. The council meets monthly during the academic year and its membership includes, but is not limited to, all graduate program directors and an elected faculty member from each graduate program. This provides a consistency of expectations in the assessment of graduate student learning. The council serves as the collaborative body primarily responsible for approval of proposed or revised curriculum and oversees the assessment processes, including the evaluation of student learning and program effectiveness. The council has provided guidance through the establishment of standardized procedures for course and program approval and assessment. These guidelines provide overall structure for curriculum development and

the assessment of student learning, while at the same time allowing the necessary flexibility for programs to use processes that best support assessment of program goals, course core learning outcomes, and those specific assessments required by external accrediting agencies. Program development and revision forms have been developed and implemented to assist in this effort.

Currently, each graduate program has developed and implemented CLOs for most or all courses and these outcomes, which are included in the course syllabus and are structured to identify desired student learning, may be cognitive, behavioral, or affective in nature. These outcomes are the same for each offering of the course across all instructional modes, thereby ensuring curricular consistency in on-campus and online course formats. A list of all approved CLOs for graduate courses may be found on the University's website, <http://www.park.edu/syllabus/corelearning.aspx>. While CLOs provide the basis for curricular consistency, selected programs do allow faculty members to *add* student learning outcomes as a result of their academic strengths, and to take advantage of current local, national, and world events. All syllabi, for both on-campus and online courses, are reviewed and approved by the graduate program director before the course is offered, further ensuring curricular consistency.

Both CLOs and additional outcomes added by faculty members are assessed using multiple measures that include traditional classroom assessment activities such as student performance on tests, papers, projects, and presentations. To aid in ensuring curriculum and assessment consistency, each graduate program is implementing a core assessment activity for each course. Core assessments, which are being developed based on the same philosophical principles as the undergraduate core assessment initiative, evaluate at least 80 percent of the core learning outcomes for the relevant course, regardless of the mode of instructional delivery. Graduate CARs, while course specific, have been developed using a rubric template that has been revised to facilitate uploading to the web-site and approved by Graduate Academic Council (**Appendix M**). The template requires assessment of four facets of student learning: cognitive skills, technical/professional skills, professional dispositions, and leadership skills. Approved core assessments and

accompanying rubrics may be found on the University's website
<http://www.park.edu/syllabus/corelearning.aspx>.

In addition to processes for course specific core and faculty added outcomes, all graduate programs have procedures in place to assess overall student learning for established program competencies. While these procedures vary from program to program, summative assessment activities are designed not only to evaluate student performance, but also the effectiveness of the program's curriculum. Current summative assessments used by one or more graduate programs include comprehensive examinations, capstone course projects, portfolios, student feedback, faculty input, advisory board guidance, graduate focus group contributions, and employer feedback. The table below provides a listing of the various graduate programs and related summative assessments. More detail on each graduate program is provided in **Appendices N - Q**.

The first program assessment results regarding the graduate program in Communication and Leadership reflect the assessment of four graduating students through the following instruments: Thesis/project and comprehensive exams. This first attempt at systematic graduate assessment reveals that the assessment plan needs to be revised somewhat and indicates that more planning is necessary so that all faculty are involved in this process. Nevertheless, the assessment of student learning for the four students indicates satisfactory results regarding most desired learning outcomes.

Table 2: Graduate Program Assessments

	MAT	MED (Cert)	MED	MBA	MPA	MHL	MCL
Advisory Board	X	X	X				
Alumni Surveys	X	X	X				X
Capstone Project/Thesis			X	X	X	X	X
Written Comprehensive Exams					X	X	X
Oral Comprehensive Exams					X		

	MAT	MED (Cert)	MED	MBA	MPA	MHL	MCL
Employer/Community Feedback	X	X	X		X		X
Student Exit Surveys/Interviews	X	X			X		X
Faculty Feedback					X		X
Focus Groups (Students, including alumni)							X
Portfolio Evaluation	X	X					
Pre Admission Writing Sample					X		X
External Assessments	X	X					

4.6 General Education Review and Assessment

Park began re-evaluating its general education program in 2003. This was prompted by Professor Emeritus Jerzy Hauptmann’s 2002 commencement address, *Liberal Arts Pioneering*, which stressed the relevance of interdisciplinary study to students’ search for meaning in an interrelated world. The current General Education Committee’s work is a product of extensive collaboration between faculty members and administration. At the center of the process has been a re-examination and reaffirmation of Park University’s “literacies,” which articulate the University’s liberal arts heritage and which have been revised to incorporate the University’s growing focus on internationalization and civic engagement (**Appendix R**; also <http://www.park.edu/facultymanual/Literacies.htm>). These literacies serve as core competencies for the revised general education program that is designed to accommodate all students at all Park campus centers.

As proposed, the general education curriculum addresses a critical institutional need for consistency in the general education requirements of B.A. and B.S. degrees. This need is at once pragmatic and philosophical. A consistent general education program streamlines

advising, lays a foundation for institutional assessment, and ensures that all students have access to the same curricular opportunities and resources.

4.6.1 New General Education (Liberal Arts) Curriculum

A new General Education Program of 40 credit hours, now referred to as Park's General Education (Liberal Arts) curriculum (GE-LA), was approved during the 2007-2008 academic year. The GE-LA curriculum is anchored by the University's literacies, with an emphasis on the integration of those literacies across the curriculum (**Appendix S**). This emphasis is presented through an "interdisciplinary and integrative thinking" model which, in keeping with the current literacies, articulates a measurable competency for the general education curriculum. Also establishing a foundation for assessment, the literacies include specific standards for internationalization so that this University value can be assessed through curricular and student learning outcomes.

The proposed curriculum contains *a core of 21 hours* of specified courses or departmental equivalents required of all students at the University, regardless of academic program, location, or course delivery mode. This GE-LA core includes a first-year student liberal arts seminar required of all first-time students; an English sequence including introductory courses; a course addressing writing in the disciplines; and courses in communication arts, mathematics, computer science, and political science. In addition, students will complete at least *another 19 hours* selected from social sciences, humanities and fine arts as well as natural and applied sciences, to include a lab science.

All courses in the GE-LA curriculum meet the requirements for Park's current liberal learning courses. Each course requires completion of at least one major assignment (research, journalistic, or creative writing), or an art work or an artistic performance". Nine hours of the GE-LA coursework explicitly address the new "interdisciplinary and integrative thinking literacy." This literacy sets a standard for truly

interdisciplinary (not simply multi-disciplinary) courses. Multi-disciplinary classes ask students to view issues from a variety of perspectives. Interdisciplinary learning is the synthesis of disciplinary perspectives that create new knowledge. These nine hours of interdisciplinary and integrative content provide an opportunity for departments to explore a variety of curricula and methodologies, including team-teaching, linked courses, learning communities, and co-developed courses.

The University uses multiple assessment strategies for General Education, including course-embedded core assessment of GE courses (See Section 4.2), Park's Tri-Modal Study (See Section 4.7.2), and Park's Writing Competency Test (See Section 4.7.1). The College Basic Academic Subjects Examination (CBASE), had already been in use by the School for Education, is now being used as an additional GE-LA assessment tool (See Section 4.7.3). All courses in the new GE curriculum will be reviewed by a standing General Education Committee that will collaborate with the University's Curriculum Committee to foster curricular innovation based on the assessment of student learning outcomes.

For six years, packets used for Park's Writing Competency Test (WCT) have contained a component requiring that students apply the GE literacies when they developed their response. In May, 2007 English Department faculty members reviewed a sample of WCT bluebooks and applied the scoring guide developed by a faculty member in that department for assessing the degree to which literacies are applied in the students' responses. Analysis of these data indicated that another category should be added in the guide to allow for greater distinction between competency levels. A second scoring by the same English Department faculty in August, 2007 applied the new scoring guide. The sample was composed of equal numbers of accelerated and traditional 16-week-enrollment student documents. These data were reviewed by the chair of the English Department to ensure that the scoring guide is valid and reliable for use with the Tri-Modal Study documents currently on file. A sampling of the results is presented in **Appendix T**. Using the WCT scoring guide for Tri-Modal documents provides evidence of the extent to

which students routinely incorporate the GE literacies acquired in specified GE courses in responses to assignments in certain courses. In terms of another source of information, the scoring guides for GE courses that are part of the Tri-Modal Study typically contain a component that assesses the level of competency in specific literacies. All Tri-Modal scoring guides include a category that assesses competency level in critical thinking which is a GE literacy.

Implementing the new GE-LA curriculum consistently across student populations is only possible through collaboration among departments, campus centers and all levels of University leadership. The Faculty Senate's GE-LA Committee collaborated with individual faculty members and department chairs to determine GE-LA competencies related to the Park University literacies. Collaboration with leadership in the University's College for Distance Learning was a critical component in understanding Park's diverse student populations and devising a relevant, meaningful, and consistent "One University" GE curriculum. The University's President, Provost, and Dean's Council further assisted the committee in understanding the macro-level for the GE-LA curriculum.

The following list of general education activities documents the history and extent of the collaborative process:

- A GE Task Force was created in January 2005 in cooperation with the Faculty Senate.
- In 2005 the Task Force engaged the faculty in a conversation on interdisciplinary teaching in May and on the GE requirements in August.
- In early 2006 faculty and students discussed critical thinking and liberal arts. The GE Task Force met with the Dean of the School for Extended Learning about specific issues in distance learning.
- The GE Task Force became a Faculty Senate committee (General Education (GE) Committee) in the fall of 2006.

- A faculty survey in fall of 2006 indicated more than 80% of faculty members agreed that major changes in the GE curriculum were needed.
- After examining general education requirements at other private as well as state universities, the new GE Committee developed a revised proposal and submitted it to the deans in December of 2006, and to the Faculty Senate for feedback in January of 2007. In February, the committee requested feedback from all faculty members, department chairs, campus center directors and academic directors, and deans.
- In early spring of 2007, the Faculty Senate added an internationalization component to the literacies.
- In early spring of 2007, the GE Committee surveyed general education classes at campus centers and online to assess implementation issues.
- In March 2007, the GE Committee met with the President and the Provost to discuss administrative support for the GE plan.
- In April 2007, the GE Committee met with the deans and other stake holders and again revised the plan based on their feedback.
- In May 2007, the GE Committee presented the plan to the faculty, along with a new proposed literacy focusing on integrative learning.
- In the summer 2007, the GE Committee met with department chairs, deans and the University Assessment Committee to discuss a pilot assessment program using the CBASE standardized test.
- In August 2007, the GE Committee surveyed the faculty, met with a number of additional departments, and work on the pilot assessment program began.
- The new GE (Liberal Arts) curriculum, known as the GE-LA curriculum, came before the Faculty Senate for a vote and was approved by that body on October 20, 2007. The GE Committee worked with other faculty and the administration during the fall 2007 to incorporate the new curriculum into the new undergraduate catalog for 2008-2009.
- Based on an April 2008 communication from the Servicemembers Opportunity College (SOC), with whom Park is a charter member, the fall 2008 implementation of the new GE-LA curriculum implementation was delayed. The

SOC indicated that it anticipated making changes in upcoming months that would impact the transfer of General Education courses under that agreement. In response to that news, the Provost worked with Park's General Education Committee and the Faculty Senate to establish a Liberal Arts Implementation Task Force in the summer 2008 to review the impact of SOC and other University MOUs on the GE-LA curriculum. The task force included the:

- Faculty Senate President and Vice President,
 - members of the General Education Committee (a Senate committee),
 - Registrar,
 - Director of Park Accelerated Programs,
 - Director of State Licensure and Approvals,
 - Associate Dean of the College for Distance Learning
 - Academic deans of Park's schools and colleges,
 - Vice President for Distance Learning,
 - Associate Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and
 - Provost.
- During the summer 2008, the GE-LA Implementation Task Force investigated the transferability of the new program to determine its impact on Park's transfer students. Transfer options for the Liberal Arts Program were discussed and presented to all faculty at Park's August 2008 Fall Faculty Conference. The task force will bring recommendations to the Faculty Senate in September for consideration as part of a plan to finalize a new GE-LA curriculum for inclusion in the new catalog.

4.7 Institutional-Level Assessment

Park uses a combination of three institutional-level assessments that include a Writing Competency Test, a Tri-Modal Study (for subject content and for Park's GE-LA literacies, and the CBASE examination. Both the Writing Competency Test and the Tri-Modal Study were developed at Park and have been in use since the 1990s. The Tri-Modal Study has changed significantly over the past several years as is described below.

An additional institutional-level assessment also is under development using a group of three required English courses (EN 105, EN 106, and EN 306 -- the “English Cluster”). The core assessments already required in these classes have been designed to incorporate GE-LA literacies. Since EN306 or a department specific equivalent to EN306 is required of all students, including transfer students, those courses provide assessment data for student learning of key literacies.

4.7.1 Park’s Writing Competency Test

Most prominent among Park’s institution-wide assessment activities is the Writing Competency Test (WCT), that has been a graduation requirement since 1994. Every Park student takes the test as a prerequisite to upper-level writing courses, which in turn is often a prerequisite for capstone courses or senior seminars. The chair of the English Department serves as the WCT coordinator. Examinations from students at all campuses are scored by full-time faculty members representing many academic disciplines. Staff support for the process is provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) as well as the Academic Support Center.

The design and administration of the WCT are the result of both careful initial planning and subsequent modifications based on the University’s testing and scoring experience. Preparation sessions are conducted for Kansas City area students by the staff of the Academic Support Center, and comparable preparation is also available online. Students receive a packet of reading ten days before the test and have the opportunity to examine the material, make notes, and plan an essay on a topic of their choosing based on the readings provided. The WCT packets also include detailed instructions, a copy of the scoring rubric, and a collection of helpful hints from experienced scorers of the test. Students who do not pass the two-and-a-half hour examination receive a detailed analysis with a recommendation for re-taking the test.

The WCT has had a broad impact on writing instruction and assessment across the University. Because the WCT scorers represent a wide range of disciplines, the test has informed teaching and evaluation practices in many departments. Since the WCT involves a critical essay, the test has encouraged faculty members at all campus centers to add additional course-embedded writing assignments. The categories of the WCT rubric are also increasingly in use for assessing writing assignments. The rigor of the test has been maintained, so the increasing pass rate on the WCT over the past 4-5 years indicates student writing has been improving. The WCT cover sheet has been revised to clarify the relationship of general education competencies.

4.7.2 Tri-Modal Study

The current Tri-Modal Study is an expanded version of similar Park studies that have been implemented annually since 2000. The purpose of these studies has been to compare the quality of student learning outcomes in three modes of instruction available at Park. As previously stated, these three modes include the 16-week face-to-face semesters, 8-week face-to-face terms, and online, which is also delivered in 8-week terms. Since the Tri-Modal Study compares face-to-face learning in traditional classroom settings, it has not included Park's Portfolio Program. The Portfolio Program is an entirely individualized program taught face-to-face in one-on-one tutorial sessions with a faculty member.

Four major components are included in the current version of the Tri-Modal Study to ensure consistency in scoring and analysis:

1. A standardized syllabus template for all courses, defining what is expected of students and faculty members, provides consistency and comparability for course content. Elements of the syllabus directly related to the assessment of student learning outcomes are hard-coded into the template, and therefore cannot be edited by participating faculty members.
2. Defined Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) for each course set the standard for critical materials that are to be presented in this course.

3. Defined Core Assessments (CAs) for each course are used to collect evidence of students' mastery of CLOs.
4. A universal scoring guide is used to standardize the Tri-Modal evaluation process.

Each 16-week semester/8-week term, core assessment materials are collected from courses being taught in the Tri-Modal instruction formats. They are sent to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) which oversees the technical activities related to the Tri-Modal Study process. The core assessment materials for each course are rendered anonymously and assigned a random number for later analysis. These documents are then evaluated by teams of subject matter experts using the appropriate scoring guide. The results of this process are machine scored by the OIRA in preparation for analysis. The results of each scoring session are provided to the Provost, the deans and the faculty to inform program decisions for improved student learning. The analysis includes information specific to each mode of instruction and comparative data for the three modes (**Appendix U**).

Departmental application of this Tri-Modal assessment of student learning outcomes has resulted in course content modifications in a variety of disciplines. Examples are presented in **Appendix J** which includes assessment report summaries from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The PowerPoint from the faculty members' presentation about Park's Tri-Modal Study at the International Assessment Conference held in Australia in August 2007 is provided in **Appendix V**.

In the fall 2007, 25 courses were evaluated in the Tri-Modal scoring process. The results were distributed to Academic deans for review and evaluation together with their faculty. In the spring 2008, 20 courses were evaluated using the Tri-Modal process. Those results will be distributed by the beginning of the fall 2008 semester.

4.7.3 College Basic Academic Subjects Examination

As requested by the Provost, the Director of OIRA evaluated several standardized tests as possible sources of information to supplement existing institutional activities such as the WCT and the General Education Committee initiative. The College Basic Academic Subjects Examination (CBASE) provides data on critical thinking from questions that are specifically designed to measure this variable and have been validated using appropriate measurements. Information regarding proficiency levels in critical thinking directly addresses that component of the University's Mission Statement.

The process followed in adopting the CBASE represents a good example of collaboration at Park. The Director of the OIRA first discussed the possible use of the CBASE instruments with the chair of the GE Committee. Following that discussion of CBASE informational materials, an expanded meeting with other GE Committee members and faculty members in the English Department occurred. There was agreement that the CBASE examinations could provide useful data on critical thinking skills. The proposal for implementing the CBASE examination was next presented to the entire faculty at Park's 2007 Fall Faculty Conference. Representatives of the GE Committee and the Director of the OIRA presented the use of CBASE as a standardized measure of GE proficiencies.

The following major points were presented to the faculty regarding the CBASE.

- A standard examination would provide an outside assessment resource useful for comparing results of institutionally developed assessment measures in areas such as the quality of critical thinking skills and proficiency in overall GE concepts.
- The Higher Learning Commission expects that multiple measures are incorporated in assessment at the course, department, and institutional level. This examination would provide an additional source of information that could be used in the institutional GE assessment process.
- A standardized examination could be administered in a timely manner. These results could then be used in the development of an overall institutional plan for assessing general education that blends University and outside assessment measures.

- Combined with existing WCT information, standardized test results could provide immediate feedback on existing competency levels in communication effectiveness and critical thinking skills defined in the Park University Mission Statement. Specific links between the language of the Mission Statement and institutional assessment are required by the Higher Learning Commission.
- Standardized test results could be used in conjunction with other institutional measures to compare findings of overall proficiency in GE competencies.

Having obtained general agreement on the use of a standardized test component in GE assessment process, the Director of OIRA then consulted with the registrar in the requisite protocols for assigning course credit for meeting the requirements for demonstrating proficiency in GE activities on the CBASE examination. The University already has a policy in place for institutional credit-by-examination that includes AP, CLEP, DANTEs, and end-of-course examinations. Consistent with that policy, a course entitled GE 199 (an elective) was created for use in this pilot project. Parameters were then set in collaboration with the faculty and the registrar for the type of course credit that could be awarded for satisfactory performance on the CBASE. This process was approved by the Provost.

The project was launched during the fall of 2007 and a pilot administration of CBASE was conducted during the spring 2008. A total of 88 students from nine Campus Centers participated. The results of the three CBASE competencies, which measure levels of critical thinking, ranged from 79% of students receiving high and medium proficiency scores at the basic reasoning level to 55% receiving high and medium proficiency scores at the highest reasoning level. These and other data received from the CBASE testing are shared with all schools/colleges of the University.

The use of CBASE will continue in 2008-2009 to increase the overall “N” and provide additional information on proficiency levels in CBASE subject matter and critical thinking topic areas. The CBASE instruments are part of Park’s general

education assessment activity that also includes the WCT and a sequence of three English courses (EN105/EN106/ EN306).

5.0 Military Installation Voluntary Education Review

Park University serves military service-members at over 39 military installations across the country and online. As such, Park is subject to annual reviews or inspections from the Military Installation Voluntary Education Review (MIVER) teams; MIVERs are sponsored by the Department of Defense (DOD) and is implemented by the American Council on Education's (ACE) office of military programs; Park undergoes four to eight MIVERs annually. The purpose of a MIVER is to assess the quality of voluntary higher education program offerings at military installations and to recommend areas for improvement for the voluntary higher education programs which includes the civilian higher education institutions offering degrees on site.

MIVERS are similar to regional accreditation visits in that the higher education institution must write and submit a self-study on the degree and student service offerings at the military site. In addition a team of higher education professionals from non-DOD institutions conduct an onsite visit and:

- Review self-studies prepared by the institutions
- Attend classes
- Examine facilities
- Interview military command representatives, institutional administrators, faculty members, counselors and students.

The team develops recommendations based on policies and procedures established by the MIVER Governing Board (see below for the guiding principles), for the institutions on ways to improve programs and services. MIVER reviews are for the purpose of quality assessment and enhancement only; they neither replace nor supplant institutional or regional accreditation.

Military Installation Voluntary Education Review (MIVER) Principles of Good Practice for Voluntary Education Programs on Military Installations

Principle 1: Mission Statement and Command Support

The installation's voluntary education program evolves from an educational mission statement that is compatible with the installation's mission, reflects sound adult education principles and practices, and includes clear and measurable voluntary education program objectives. The mission statement and the program have the support of the appropriate military commander.

Principle 2: Program Management and Leadership

Managers of the voluntary education program are professional educators who effectively administer the human, fiscal, and learning resources required to meet the educational needs of the installation.

Principle 3: Student Services

The policies, procedures, and practices of the voluntary education program take into account the conditions and circumstances of servicemembers as adult learners and promote the success of those learners through appropriate counseling, testing, financial aid, and other services.

Principle 4: Resources

A sufficient reservoir of relevant instructional resources is available to the instructor for teaching support and to the student for reference, research, and lifelong learning. Facilities and technology infrastructure are appropriate to support voluntary education program objectives and services offered. Financial resources are adequate and appropriately used to accomplish the mission and achieve the objectives.

Principle 5: The Voluntary Education Program Plan

The installation has a comprehensive voluntary education program plan designed to fulfill the mission, attain the objectives, and meet the needs of the voluntary education

program. Education program planning is comprehensive, continuous, and ensures the effective application of resources in achieving program mission and objectives. Results of the program evaluation help modify and improve the program as well as provide the basis for planning. Data collection, analysis, and interpretation are used to identify and prioritize the installation's educational needs so that they may be addressed in a systematic, data-driven fashion.

ACE MIVER web site: <http://www.acenet.edu//AM/Template.cfm?Section=MIVER>

6.0 Curricular Consistency

As described in more detail below, Park has made excellent progress in ensuring curricular consistency across the University. Faculty members are engaged within their academic departments, on University Committees (e.g. the Curriculum Committee and Graduate Academic Council) and in the Faculty Senate. Two new University-wide groups with strong faculty representation are the Distance Learning Advisory Council and the General Education-Liberal Arts (GE-LA) Implementation Task Force.

Academic departments are supported by a school/college structure that includes the Graduate School and the College for Distance Learning (CDL). Academic decisions are made by faculty members, department chairs, and academic deans with guidance/approval as appropriate from the Executive Director of the Graduate School, the Associate Provost and the Provost. The Executive Director of the Graduate School functions as a graduate dean. The Interim Dean and Associate Dean of the CDL facilitate the delivery of programs offered online and at Campus Centers outside the Kansas City area.

6.1 University-Wide Faculty Engagement for Curricular Consistency

- All full-time faculty members regardless of campus center assignment have their academic appointment within an academic unit. For example, a Computer Information Sciences (CIS) professor at the Austin, Texas Campus Center is a

member of that academic department with the same status and responsibilities for the department's programs as his/her colleagues on the Parkville campus. In addition, full-time faculty members at campus centers around the country know and work with many of the part-time faculty at their respective locations. The Portfolio Program represents a multi-disciplinary program whose faculty have appointments in the Hauptmann School for Public Affairs were the program is offered.

- Faculty members work within their academic departments and schools to advance curricular consistency. In that structure, full-time faculty members work with their colleagues, department chair and dean in department meetings as well as school-wide meetings. Part-time faculty members also have the opportunity to provide input to departments (see Section 5.4 below).

- Faculty committees listed below also share responsibility for curricular consistency. Faculty members from campus centers outside the Kansas City area, and those representing online learning, are identified on the rosters of these University-wide faculty groups provided in **Appendix W**. All groups submit their recommendations to the Provost.
 - University Curriculum Committee (responsible for undergraduate programs)
 - Graduate Academic Council (responsible for graduate programs)
 - University Assessment Committee (responsible for assessment in all academic programs)
 - Senate General Education (Liberal Arts) Committee (responsible for GE planning)
 - Distance Learning Advisory Council (responsible for the distance delivery of programs)
 - GE-Liberal Arts Implementation Task Force (responsible for the implementation of the new GE-LA Curriculum)

- Internationalization and Multiculturalism Committee (responsible for sharing best practices on integrating a global and multicultural perspective to curricular and co-curricular programs)

6.2 Integration of Faculty Members at Campus Centers into the Faculty of One University

- Regardless of campus center assignment, faculty members are integrated into a faculty as a whole in multiple ways, all of which serve governance and curricular development.
 - Full-time faculty members are expected to participate in the governance of their respective department and school/college. Conference calling, travel to attend selected meetings, and new electronic video communication are all used to include faculty members at different locations. Some departments involve their distant department members more than others. All are encouraged to use the many forms of technology available for inclusion of all faculty members. This effort supports Park's strategic plan to excel as one University.
 - All full-time faculty members from around the country convene in Parkville, the administrative center, at least twice a year for full faculty conferences/forums. Fall (August) and spring (May) Full Faculty Conferences are organized by Academic Affairs in collaboration with the Faculty Senate. In January 2008, all faculty members from around the country came to Parkville for meetings with their departments and schools. They also met as groups with their deans. Full-time faculty from around the country convened for a President's Faculty Forum in Parkville in March 2008. Since all full-time faculty members from around the country came together in Parkville twice during spring 2008, the Faculty Federation determined that an additional faculty conference in May 2008 was not needed. For other events

such as Fall Opening Convocation and a Spring Faculty Recognition Ceremony, some but not all faculty members from other campus centers are in attendance.

- Small groups of faculty members and academic administrators travel to various campus centers to meet with faculty members. For example, Faculty Development Workshops have been conducted in various regions of the country where both full-time and part-time faculty members have convened for academic updates and professional development activities. Those workshops have included three and four-member teams of full-time faculty from the Parkville campus.

- Full-time faculty members at all campus centers are eligible to serve as Senators on the Faculty Senate. At least three (out of 21) Senators must be elected from among faculty members who serve outside the Kansas City area. During this 2007-2008 academic year, two of the five Faculty Senate Executive Committee members were faculty from campus centers outside the Kansas City area. Both individuals were actively engaged as officers of the Senate. They and two other Senators from non-Kansas City centers all traveled to Parkville for the monthly Senate meetings. Faculty Senators from campus centers outside the Kansas City area have been diligent in representing their constituencies and are making progress in bringing faculty members together as one university.

- Out of 46 full-time faculty members serving as Program Coordinators during 2007-2008, five were from campus centers outside the Kansas City area.

- Each faculty member, regardless of his/her campus center, is expected to serve on committees, commissions, task forces. Such faculty groups do in fact include members from outside the Kansas City area. For example, one of the three Senators serving on the Faculty Senate Bylaws Task Force together with

three academic deans is a full-time faculty member in the Washington D.C. area.

6.3 Measures to Ensure Continuity of Programmatic and Curricular Expectations

- The continuity of programmatic and curricular expectations is provided by Park's system for defining and disseminating:
 - degree program competency statements (competencies) for all students graduating with the same degree;
 - courses required for each degree program that teach the stated competencies; and
 - course-embedded learning outcomes that build program competencies and are locked in departmentally-approved syllabi.

All of these measures are determined by full-time faculty members for their discipline and are described in detail in Section 4 of this report.

- Programmatic and curricular expectations are also imbedded through the selection of texts by academic departments. All full-time and part-time faculty members use their department's approved texts.
- Park University provides release time for faculty members to serve as program coordinators within their disciplines. In that role, faculty members report to the department chairs for their discipline(s) and are responsible for reviewing/approving:
 - employment applications from individuals who wish to teach as part-time (adjunct) faculty members (on a course by course basis);
 - syllabi for use by part-time faculty members (to ensure academic rigor and curricular consistency);
 - texts (to ensure they are on the department's approved list);
 - validated learning experiences for credit; and

- performance of part-time faculty members who teach Online and in eight-week face-to-face terms. (Adjuncts teaching in sixteen-week semesters are reviewed by department chairs and full-time faculty members on the Parkville Campus Center.)

- The responsibility/authority of Program Coordinators was expanded in 2006 to include oversight of the part-time faculty's assessment of student learning. The program coordinators were already responsible for reviewing syllabi for part-time faculty, so they also were asked to ensure that the department's approved core learning outcomes and assessments of student learning were included in each syllabus. Program Coordinators also assist part-time faculty with other learning outcomes and assessments they wish to add to the core assessment.

- A Distance Learning Advisory Council has been established to provide a University Committee for Program Coordinators and other academic officers to collaborate with staff members of the CDL. The purpose of the council is to address operational issues and to advance best practice in distance education, which includes curricular consistency.

- Another measure to ensure that departments meet programmatic expectations is Park's system for hiring part-time faculty members and reviewing their teaching performance. Academics and other professionals who wish to teach part-time at Park submit an electronic application that includes their qualifications, experience and teaching philosophy. The material is reviewed by the Program Coordinator for the discipline, who determines whether the person may be added to Park's approved pool of part-time faculty members.

- Part-time faculty members are approved to teach specific courses rather than an entire academic discipline. The teaching schedules of full-time faculty are first determined and then department chairs and campus center academic directors consult Park's online database of approved part-time faculty to hire additional

instructors as needed. Part-time faculty are contracted to teach specific courses in specific terms.

- The University's performance reviews of full-time and part-time faculty members advances programmatic expectations.
 - *Full-time* faculty members participate in a rigorous, annual "Periodic Review" that provides a peer-evaluation of their teaching, scholarship and service/collegiality. That review is aligned with each full-time faculty member's Professional Development Plan, which has been negotiated with his/her department chair and approved by the dean. For all online teaching, full-time faculty members are also periodically reviewed by Park's Online Instructor Evaluation System (OIES), which includes the online equivalent to classroom observation by peers (see Section 5.9).
 - For *part-time* faculty members, separate performance review systems are used for both online teaching and face-to-face teaching. All online teaching is evaluated by Park's OIES (Section 5.9). Face-to-face instruction in the Kansas City area is evaluated by full-time faculty members in that region and instruction at campus centers is also evaluated by full-time faculty when ever possible. The Academic Director at each campus center outside the Kansas City area conducts an annual observation (evaluation) of each faculty member's teaching at their location. The campus center Academic Director's teaching performance is observed by one of Park's three Regional Academic Directors (RADs; See also Section 5.4).

6.4 Orientation of Part-Time Faculty Members to Expectations for Academic Excellence and Curricular Consistency

Part-time faculty members are oriented to understand the expectations for academic excellence and curricular consistency in multiple ways:

- All part-time faculty members in the Kansas City area are invited to an annual orientation program hosted in August. In that session, expectations for teaching are discussed and everyone learns about Park's system for posting syllabi, attendance and grades. Similar orientation sessions are provided at campus centers for part-time faculty members.
- At each campus center, faculty meetings are conducted by the center's Academic Director at the beginning of each term to update both part-time and full-time faculty members. The University also employs three Regional Academic Directors (RADs) who are responsible for oversight of the Academic Directors in their region of the country. RADs travel to campus centers for consultations as needed and provide guidance for working with faculty members as well as assistance with academic issues such as grade challenges. The RADs report to the Associate Dean of the College for Distance Learning and serve as liaisons with Park's administrative offices.
- Part-time faculty members receive a departmentally-approved syllabus for each course and are invited to discuss their ideas for additions to the syllabi with the disciplinary Program Coordinators.
- Part-time faculty members may make recommendations to Program Coordinators regarding course texts. A select list of approved texts is available per course to ensure curricular consistency and only those texts are used at all campus centers and for all delivery modalities.
- Information about academic programs, courses and syllabi, including the undergraduate and graduate catalogs, is available online for all part-time faculty members.
- All part-time faculty members are provided a Park email account which is to be used for all their work, including course work. Faculty members can access Park's

PirateNET portal (<https://piratenet.park.edu/ics>) to work with their mail, courses, and to perform their other Park duties.

6.5 Faculty Oversight of Curricular Change

- All full-time faculty members at all campus centers are expected to participate in the process for curricular review and change. As equal members of their academic departments, they are to collaborate with their colleagues on:
 - determining/updating the curriculum;
 - determining program competencies and assessments for each program (together with the University Assessment Committee);
 - determining course-embedded learning outcomes and assessments (together with the University Assessment Committee); and
 - reviewing assessment data and making curricular adjustments for improved student learning.

- As described above, full-time faculty members at a distance serve as voting members on University-wide groups with responsibility for curriculum (e.g. university committees, task forces, councils, and advisory groups as well as the Faculty Senate).

- When faculty members propose curricular changes, they first present the change(s) to their department colleagues for discussion and approval. In the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS), which includes the School for Arts and Humanities, the School for Social Sciences and the School for Natural and Applied Sciences, all curriculum proposals go to the CLAS Chairs' Council for approval after they have been endorsed by a department. As for other universities, the position of department chair is a faculty position at Park. In Park's School of Business and Management, School for Education and Hauptmann School for Public Affairs, proposals for curricular change go to all

faculty members within that school for consideration prior to review by the University Curriculum Committee or Graduate Academic Council.

- From the schools, proposals for *undergraduate* curricular change move to the University Curriculum Committee and those for *graduate* curriculum move to the Graduate Academic Council for discussion and vote. The recommendations from these faculty groups are then submitted to the Provost for approval. If the curricular change is for a new course or program, then the University Assessment Committee (UAC) reviews the course-embedded assessment, or program assessment, respectively.

- Once curricular change has been approved, it is added to the appropriate catalog both online and in the next printed catalog. Changes to specific courses (e.g. core learning outcomes) are added to the department's approved, locked syllabi. When any faculty member accesses a course syllabus to teach, the core elements that have been approved by the department appear. Additional communication occurs between part-time faculty members and Program Coordinators regarding learning outcomes, course materials and learning assessments. Almost all Program Coordinators are full-time faculty members, but a few part-time faculty members are sometimes employed to serve in that role. All Program Coordinators report to department chairs, unless they also serve as department chairs, in which case they report to deans.

6.6 Advancing Curricular Consistency through Assessment of Student Learning

As described in Section 4, the University has implemented multiple assessment initiatives to ensure curricular consistency. They include the:

- Tri-Modal Study, designed to assess the quality of student learning in subject matter specific courses (i.e. courses in the major; Section 4.7.2),

- GE Literacies Project using Park's Tri-Modal model to assess Park's literacies (see below), and
- pilot study of CBASE (Section 4.7.3).

Common core assessments are utilized to provide the reliability and validity of results for the comparison of student learning across delivery modes. Regardless of the mode utilized, students are provided with the same information and they exhibit similar levels of proficiency. Core assessment has made such Tri-Modal evaluations possible, because it provides consistency in expected learning outcomes as well as assessment artifacts for analysis.

Courses included in the Tri-Modal Study emphasize subject matter content. To identify curricular consistency in general education competencies (literacies), the following measurement processes are utilized:

- A scoring guide developed for analyzing the presence of general education literacies in test results was adapted to investigate appropriate materials from the Tri-Modal Study. The results of this analysis provide evidence of the extent to which students routinely incorporate the GE literacies in responses to assignments in courses.
- As another source of information on curricular consistency, the scoring guides for GE courses that are part of the Tri-Modal Study many times have a component that assesses the level of proficiency in specific literacies. This information is reviewed to determine the extent of student mastery of course requirements in all modes of instruction. The scoring guides for all courses include a component directly related to the assessment of proficiency in critical thinking.
- The core assessment activity in EN 306B, a graduation requirement for most curricula, was modified to incorporate GE literacies in the mandatory assignment.

This change will provide data on the capability of students to apply GE concepts in various subject matter assignments.

- A pilot study of the CBASE was implemented in 2007-2008 to provide an outside source for comparison to the results of institutional GE assessment measures. This test was administered to students from all campus centers. The results provide quantitative evidence for overall competency levels in general education.

6.7 Review of Undergraduate Online Courses for Consistent Quality

All undergraduate online courses are developed and reviewed according to Park's Online Quality Standards Review (QSR). This review is based upon Park's online policies as well as the University of Maryland's Quality Matters rubric. That rubric is available on the web at www.qualitymatters.org (*Comparison of the Quality Matters Rubric to Accreditation Standards for Distance Learning*). Park reviewers are full-time faculty who are certified QM Reviewers. Quality Matters (QM) is a review program for online courses developed under a FIPSE grant at the University of Maryland. The QM program has received national recognition for its peer-based approach to quality assurance and continuous improvement in online education.

The QM toolset and the QM review process are:

- based in national standards of best practice, the research literature and instructional design principles;
- designed to promote student learning.
- integral to continuous quality improvement; and
- part of a faculty-driven, collegial peer review process.

6.8 Review of Graduate Online Courses for Consistent Quality

The Graduate Quality Standards Review (GQSR) process and guiding document were developed in 2006 through a collaboration of all graduate program directors and graduate faculty representatives (**Appendix X**). The review's primary purpose

is to provide structured guidance for graduate online course development and delivery, while simultaneously allowing collegial discussion and input during the development process. The GQSR supports curricular articulation and instructional consistency through required online processes that allow the flexibility needed by graduate programs to offer quality online coursework. Specifically, the GQSR provides guidance for online instructional best practices and outlines course requirements. Those requirements for online courses (e.g. learning outcomes/assessments) are identical to those for the same courses being taught on-ground.

6.9 Review of Online Teaching for Consistent Quality

The Online Instructor Evaluation System (OIES) is a dual mentoring and evaluation process for online instructors (**Appendix Y**). Unlike traditional "snapshot" models of teacher evaluation, the OIES spans an entire term, emphasizing professional growth over time. Evaluators are full-time Park faculty members who teach online. They work closely with instructors on aspects of online teaching excellence. Early work with an evaluator is formative in nature, and the process culminates in a summative evaluation that is sent to the Coordinator of Online Faculty Evaluation and the instructor's academic department. OIES results are used also in the Instructor Scheduling System to help determine an instructor's rating for class scheduling purposes.

Online instructors at Park are evaluated the first term they teach for the University, and then once every five terms (e.g., an annual performance review). If an instructor is to teach a recently developed or revised course, the instructor will be evaluated. Any instructor who has been cited for late grade submission or attendance records (via an Administrative Report per CDL Policy) may be evaluated further as well.

Table 3: OIES Process Used at Park

1.	Approximately three weeks before the term begins the instructors participating in the OIES receive a notification letter from the Coordinator of Online Faculty Evaluation.
2.	An introductory letter from the evaluator is also sent at that time.
3.	Approximately 1-2 weeks before the term begins, the evaluator completes a Pre-term Review of the instructor's course to ensure that the instructor is ready to begin the term. Every two weeks during the term, the evaluator reviews the instructor's facilitation of the course and sends him/her a report. These formative reviews are a critical part of the OIES mentoring process. The Pre-term Review and Formative Reviews are all confidential and are not shared with anyone except the instructor.
4.	Based on the instructor's formative reviews, the evaluator assists the instructor in developing online facilitation skills and in addressing any problems that may be encountered in the course.
5.	The term culminates with a Summative Evaluation that addresses the instructor's overall teaching and facilitation skills.
6.	In addition to the evaluator's review, instructors are required to submit a self-review. This is a reflective exercise which instructors are expected to update every two weeks during the term. A final completed version is submitted to the evaluator.
7.	The Summative Evaluation, self-review, student course evaluation results, and course syllabus are forwarded to the Coordinator of Online Faculty Evaluation.

6.10 Program Review Update

During 2007-2008, the deans worked to formalize policy and procedures for academic program review, which did not occur in a systematic way in 2005. The current draft of the program review process, which has been under consideration by the Faculty Senate since September 2007, is provided in (**Appendix Z**). Faculty in nine academic degree programs have agreed to participate in formal program review during 2008-2009, which will place the University on a review cycle that will assure the currency of all academic programs within a five year period. Funds have been

budgeted to enable departments to include external reviewers for all academic programs.

6.11 Responsibility of College/School Deans for the Programs and Courses Offered at All Campus Centers

Academic programs and courses are the responsibility of academic departments which report to the academic deans. Each dean's charge includes the monitoring of content and standards for all programs delivered at all campus centers and online. Academic deans conduct school-wide meetings with faculty members to discuss program content, standards and the assessment of student learning. Both they as well as the departments' chairs work collaboratively with the Curriculum Committee, the University Assessment Committee, and, when graduate programs are involved, with the Graduate Academic Council.

6.12 The Role of the Director of the Kansas City-Park Accelerated Programs

The Kansas City-Park Accelerated Programs are under the leadership of a Director who is a staff member. That individual supports curricular consistency by ensuring that Park's academic policies and procedures for program delivery are followed in the Kansas City-Park Accelerated Programs (weekend, evening eight-week programs). In that role, he collaborates with deans, department chairs and program coordinators who represent the disciplines offering degrees and/or courses in the Kansas City-Park Accelerated Program.

7.0 Collaborative Process and Administrative Support

In addition to the collaboration and administrative support described for assessment in Section 4 and curricular consistency in Section 5, Park University's administrative

structure has changed over recent years for increased academic support and oversight. One example of the effectiveness of that structure is the recent report from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). DESE cited numerous strengths for Park's School for Education (SFE). In that report, DESE also commended the Administration for its collaborative support for the SFE.

The University President frequently meets with Park University Trustees and shares information about all divisions of the University. The President serves as a Trustee of Park University and shares all communications from the Commission with the Board. Letters from both the current and immediate past Board chairs document the Board of Trustees' knowledge of all information related to the Commission (**Appendix AA**).

Through its Academic Affairs Committee, the Board of Trustees receives reports regarding academic affairs from the Provost, the Vice President for Distance Learning and the Associate Provost. All Trustees receive the Academic Affairs Report submitted for each Board meeting. In addition, faculty representatives elected by the Faculty Federation meet annually with the Board's Academic Affairs Committee to deliver a faculty report and discuss issues with those Trustees. For the May 2008 faculty report, both the out-going chair and the in-coming chair of the Board of Trustees were in attendance along with the President.

Article 14.2 of the 2005-2009 Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement stipulates that the Faculty Senate President is entitled to submit to the Board of Trustees a written report (Senate Board Report) regarding faculty activities and issues. A Senate Board Report may be included for each regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Trustees if it is submitted to the Provost at least 21 days prior to the date upon which materials are to be sent to the Trustees. Reports of issues that have been submitted to the Provost have been submitted to the Board without change. It is also the case that, in addition to the annual face-to-face faculty report by the Federation-elected team, the University President has invited other faculty members to deliver Board presentations about their activities.

7.1 Changes in Administrative Positions for Increased Academic Oversight

Since the Commission’s visit in 2005, the level of responsibility/authority for a number of administrative positions has changed. The changed positions and titles are presented in Table 4 below. Personnel announcements were communicated to the University community, sometimes accompanied by press releases. All changes have been part of a consistent academic plan to establish schools/colleges with deans, all of whom work closely with their respective departments and faculties to ensure appropriate management oversight of academic programs for a University whose enrollment has increased by 51% over the past six years (AY 2001-AY 2007). This structure is reflected in the Academic Affairs organizational chart (**Appendix C**).

Table 4: Positions within the University that Carry Responsibility for Assigning Faculty to Teach or for Reviewing Programs

Position/Title	Type of Change	Date of Change
Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS)	New, dean position: Three existing schools (the School for Arts and Humanities, the School for Social Sciences, the School for Natural and Applied Sciences) were combined into the Park University College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS).	The founding dean of the CLAS, Dr. Thimios Zaharopoulos, was hired July 1, 2005 .
Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS)	Change of Position: The individual who had been serving as the head of the School for Arts and Humanities was promoted to the position of Associate Dean for the CLAS and began reporting to the new dean. The structure was widely communicated across the University.	The Associate Dean of the college is Dr. Mark Noe. He began reporting to Dean Zaharopoulos on July 1, 2005 .

Position/Title	Type of Change	Date of Change
Executive Director, Graduate Studies	<p>Title Change from of Graduate and Professional Studies: The Executive Director position was a title change from Dean for the Graduate School. This title change was part of Park’s reorganization to create a separate deanship for the School for Education and the School of Business & Management (rather than those areas remaining the responsibility of the graduate dean, whose former title was Dean of Graduate and Professional Studies with oversight of the Graduate, Education, and Business and Management Schools).</p>	<p>The Executive Director of Graduate Studies, Dr. Larry Ewing, assumed the role on October 1, 2006 after the position was vacated. Dr. Ewing has been functioning as a graduate dean in that he has had academic oversight responsibility for graduate standards and policies. In 2006, he declined the title of “Graduate Dean”, because he planned to retire. In 2007-2008, he continued in the position because Park’ education programs were scheduled for reviewed by the Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). Dr. Ewing has been willing to perform the duties of a graduate dean, but has preferred the title of Executive Director of the Graduate School.</p>
Associate Dean, School for Education (SFE)	<p>Replacement (same title): The former associate dean left the position for health reasons. In 2008, the title for that leadership position for the SFE will change from Associate Dean to Dean of the SFE for consistency with the academic structure.</p>	<p>The Associate Dean, Dr. Josephine Agnew-Tally, was hired on August 15, 2006.</p>
Graduate Program Director; M.A. in Communication & Leadership	<p>Replacement (same title): The former Graduate Program Director was assigned increased responsibilities as the Associate Dean of the CLAS, so a new hire was needed for this director position.</p>	<p>The Director, Dr. Lora Cohn, assumed the role on August 15, 2006.</p>

Position/Title	Type of Change	Date of Change
Dean, Hauptmann School for Public Affairs (HSPA)	Title Change from Associate Dean of the HSPA to Dean: The change to a dean title also carried an increased expectation for growth in the HSPA. This represented a return to an historic title for the HSPA and was also consistent with the current academic structure.	The former Associate Dean, Dr. Laurie DiPadova-Stocks, was promoted to the Dean of the HSPA on October 1, 2006.
Director, Graduate Education Programs	Replacement: The former Graduate Director of Education Programs became the new Executive Director of Graduate Studies.	The current Director of Graduate Education Programs, Dr. James Singer, was hired August 1, 2007.
Associate Dean, College for Distance Learning (CDL)	New position: In an effort to bring the administration of the two schools within CDL together (School for Online Learning and School for Extended Learning), Park ceased having a separate associate dean for each school in favor of having one dean and one associate dean for all of CDL. Many of the students at Park's campus centers also take Online classes, so the new structure provides for greater coordination and collaboration.	The Associate Dean of CDL, Dr. Roxanne Gonzales-Walker, was hired into that position March 12, 2007.
Dean, School of Business and Management (SBM)	New position to replace associate dean position: As part of Park's reorganization, the position of associate dean was changed to dean.	Dean, Dr. Alphonso Ogbuehi, was hired August 13, 2007.

Position/Title	Type of Change	Date of Change
Dean, College for Distance Learning (CDL)	Position Vacancy: When this deanship became vacant, the long standing Vice President for Distance Learning, Dr. Tom Peterman, assumed leadership of CDL on an interim basis. Dr. Peterman originally developed the School for Online Learning and School for Extended Learning, which together became the College for Distance Learning. A search for a new dean for CDL is to be conducted.	This change occurred November 1, 2007 . Dr. Peterman is providing continuing leadership together with Dr. Roxanne Gonzales-Walker, Associate Dean of the CDL. (The dean position for the CDL was filled from September 2006 to October 2007 and is currently vacant.)
Director, Center for Leadership	New position: This is a new University-wide center at Park and part of the Hauptmann School for Public Affairs (HSPA).	The Director, The Honorable Kay Barnes, former Mayor of Kansas City, Missouri was hired on May 2, 2007 .
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA)	Replacement hire/Title change: The former Associate VPAA left the University and a new Associate VPAA was hired. The University then changed the title to Associate Provost and VPAA. The Associate Provost and VPAA reports to the Provost and Senior Vice President of Park.	Dr. Marilyn Bartels was hired May 15, 2007 as Associate VPAA. She was promoted to Associate Provost and VPAA on August 10, 2007 .
Dean, School for Education	New position: This is a new position to replace the associate dean position and thereby complete the structure so that each school/college is headed by a dean.	Dr. Josephine Agnew-Tally, former Associate Dean, was hired as the Dean of the School for Education on July 1, 2008 .
Department Chairs and Program Coordinators	Since 2005, the responsibility and authority of department chairs and program coordinators have expanded to include improved oversight of academic programs.	Since 2005 (Please see narrative below.)

7.2 Faculty Oversight of Academic Programs

The responsibility/authority of department chairs, graduate program directors, and deans has expanded since 2005 to enhance departmentally based management of academic quality across the University. The assessment of student learning is an excellent example of this effort. In January 2008, the Commission commended the University on its progress in implementing a comprehensive assessment system. Another example of increased quality oversight is Park's revised annual peer review of faculty performance (Park's Periodic Review System), created during the Faculty Federation (faculty union) and University negotiations for the 2005-2009 Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement (FCBA). The annual peer review system is driven by academic departments in collaboration with deans and is in its third year of providing useful data about the teaching, scholarship and service/collegiality of the full-time faculty.

7.3 Role of Academic Departments

The expansion of department-based oversight has included the responsibilities listed below. The functions that have been expanded since 2005 are noted. *These activities constitute increased academic oversight by faculty within the discipline and in accordance with the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement.* In September 2007, the Provost shared with the Faculty Senate a matrix describing the roles and responsibilities of the faculty, deans, department chairs, and program coordinators within the entire academic structure (**Appendix BB**). The Provost requested Senate feedback on the matrix when it was shared in September 2007 but has not received feedback from the Faculty Senate.

Table 5: Key Departmental Functions

Departmental Functions	Status Since 2005
Academic advisement	Ongoing
Curriculum review/development	Increased leadership from chairs and deans

Departmental Functions	Status Since 2005
Assessment of student learning	Expanded activities (e.g. program assessment, annual assessment reports)
Departmental standards review	Continuous development
Course rotation schedule review	Increased review activity
Textbook selection per course	Ongoing
Peer review of full-time faculty performance	Formalized since 2005
Departmental budget preparation and management	New Strategic Budget Review Process for faculty, chairs and deans since fall 2006
Program review	Formal process initiated 2007
Syllabi review for adjunct faculty	Ongoing
Review/approval of applications for adjunct faculty	Ongoing
Performance review of adjunct faculty	Online Instructor Evaluator System developed for review of Adjuncts' Online teaching

7.4 Moving Decision-Making to the Lowest Possible Level

Park has a structure in which faculty members participate in decision-making within their respective academic units as well as in their school and/or college. The deans then advocate for the faculty in their areas and also work together as a team in the Academic Council to provide strategic leadership for Park's academic programs. The University also has a Faculty Senate to represent the faculty body and to bring the collective voice of the faculty directly to the Provost. The President and Provost meet regularly with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and attend Senate meetings.

In response to the faculty's request for more clarification about roles and responsibilities within the academic structure, the Academic Council developed a comprehensive plan that addresses the principle of subsidiarity. That matrix for academic decision-making identifies groups/individuals who provide input, who make recommendations and who make decisions (**Appendix BB**). Where appropriate, decisions are made at the lowest possible level and reports are provided

to more senior academic officers who are also responsible for academic quality and growth.

The decision-making matrix was forwarded to the Faculty Senate as a draft for discussion/feedback and has been under review by the Faculty Senate since October 2007. The University's goal is to balance the principle of subsidiary with the need to maintain consistent standards and practices for the University.

7.5 Administrative Support from the College for Distance Learning

The College for Distance Learning (CDL) was established in 2003 by combining Park's School for Extended Learning (SEL) and School for Online Learning (SOL). Some faculty members mistakenly refer to CDL as the "Center for Distance Learning," but past catalogs document that there never has been a "Center for Distance Learning". Before 2003, only the SEL and SOL existed. Long before 2003, the SEL provided the administrative infrastructure/services for Park's many Campus Centers in support of face-to-face instruction. Since the late 1990s, the SOL has provided the administrative services for online delivery. Both SEL and SOL have always been charged with facilitating the implementation of academic programs and decisions made by the full-time faculty.

The CDL does not and has never functioned as an academic college. The CDL has neither its own separate faculty nor degree programs of its own. Although faculty members at a distance and faculty members who have some administrative assignment with the CDL are sometimes referred to at Park as "CDL faculty" or "Distance faculty," each full-time faculty member has his/her appointment in an academic department that reports to an academic dean (i.e. College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, School of Business and Management or School for Education). The CDL's role is one of coordinating the administrative services to improve academic program delivery.

The Associate Dean of the College for Distance Learning reports to, and works closely with, the Vice President for Distance Learning (VPDL). The VPDL reports to the Provost and Senior Vice President. Both the Associate Dean and the VPDL attend weekly meetings of the Academic Council, which includes all other academic deans, the Executive Director of International Affairs and Study Abroad, the Dean of Student Services and the Associate Provost. Other individuals such as the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment also attend Academic Council on occasion. These individuals collaborate with faculty members in all disciplines at all campus centers and that information is shared weekly in Academic Council.

To support Park's Online and face-to-face courses at Campus Centers outside the Kansas City area, certain full-time faculty members have as part of their assignments the task of working with CDL in providing technical and administrative services. Those faculty work with CDL staff to administer Park's Online course development, train faculty to teach Online, assist in managing the Online platform, implement the Online Instructor Evaluator System, and also implement *Quality Matters* (see Section 6.7). They only report to the Associate Dean/Dean of CDL for their administrative work (not for academic decisions). *The CDL, therefore, is Park's administrative services unit that is responsible for delivering Online as well as distance campus center face-to-face programs that have been approved by the faculty.* This structure has been in place since 2005, and the improvements made since then have increased oversight and efficiency in the way Park serves its students.

7.6 The Faculty Senate

A University Faculty Senate Policy Statement was approved by the President in January of 2006 (**Appendix CC**). The Faculty Senate exercises responsibility for representing the collective voice of the faculty on issues not covered by the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement. According to the Faculty Senate Policy Statement, the purpose of the Faculty Senate is to provide the forum and mechanism through which the faculty collaborates with the Administration to advance the goals of the

University. The Administration communicates frequently with the Senate leadership, attends Senate meetings and delivers reports at those meetings as well as answers questions. Faculty Senate recommendations are carefully considered by the Provost as well as the President. Examples are provided below which demonstrate that the Faculty Senate represents the faculty body and that the Administration supports that role.

The Faculty Senate selects the members of Senate Committees that regularly report back to the Senate. Although University Committees submit their formal recommendations to the Provost, the Provost in Fall 2007 suggested that such recommendations be communicated concurrently to the Faculty Senate as information items. While the Faculty Senate focuses on University-wide policies, programs and standards, the faculty members also work within their departments, schools and colleges to bring their departmental standards and programs school/college committees and University committees.

Under the Faculty Senate Policy Statement and the Faculty Senate draft bylaws, the Senate has played a key role in the decision-making process for University-wide academic policy and programs. For example, the new General Education (Liberal Arts) Program was developed by a Faculty Senate committee, shared with all faculty members and approved by the Faculty Senate. This accomplishment resulted from four years of discussions among all faculty members in department and school/college meetings as well as in the Senate and also between the faculty and the Administration. The Faculty Senate's endorsement of the new General Education Program was accepted by the Provost and President, both of whom had been involved in the process. In a similar fashion, the Faculty Senate recommended, three years ago, that the foreign language requirement be increased, and that Faculty Senate recommendation was endorsed by the Administration.

In January 2008, the Provost established a Senate Bylaws Task Force charged with reviewing the current policy as well as a draft of the Senate bylaws. The Senate

Bylaws Task Force is composed of three Senators, including the President of the Faculty Senate, and three deans (the deans of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the School of Business and Management, and the Hauptmann School for Public Affairs). The task force completed its review of the bylaws at the end of August 2008 and the bylaws are being submitted for approval by the Board of Trustees in October 2008.

7.7 Park's Faculty Federation (Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement)

As stated previously, the Faculty Senate is not the only faculty body at Park University. Park has a faculty union, the Faculty Federation, associated with the American Federation of Teachers Union. As the exclusive bargaining agent for full-time faculty members, the Faculty Federation has negotiated multiple contracts with the University, all of which have been approved by the Board of Trustees. The current Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement (FCBA) is a four-year contract that runs through August 14, 2009. The Faculty Federation negotiates wages, hours, and working conditions with the University and other issues which impact the agreement between the faculty as a whole and the University.

7.8 Faculty/Administration Communication

In addition to the standard academic channels of communication, there are numerous opportunities for the faculty and administration to collaborate as groups either face-to-face, via teleconference, web-based videoconference or via other online technology. Examples include numerous standing meetings, councils, and other such groups as listed below:

- The Faculty Federation and the University Administration periodically negotiate a Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement (FCBA). The FCBA permits the partners to re-negotiate any portion of the document by mutual agreement. This

- occurred in 2006-2007 regarding the issue of post-tenure review of faculty members.
- The President meets periodically with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Federation (Faculty Union) to discuss their concerns and suggestions for open communication on issues of mutual concern.
 - In the spring of 2007, the chairs of the departments in the School for Social Sciences (Social Work, Criminal Justice, Psychology/Sociology, and Social Sciences) began weekly meetings to collaborate on curriculum, including program assessment. The Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences frequently attends those meetings. This has served to improve communication and has enriched the multidisciplinary perspective within the school.
 - Faculty members meet monthly in school meetings with their respective dean. The faculty of the three schools of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences also meet together as a college four times each academic year.
 - All department and program chairs meet at least monthly as a group with their respective dean.
 - During 2007-2008, the President met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee monthly during the academic year together with the Provost and Associate Provost, to review agenda items for the Senate meetings. All three administrators also attend the Faculty Senate meetings as frequently as possible to deliver updates and answer questions.
 - In August 2007, the Provost and Associate Provost initiated a monthly informal lunch for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Federation officers.
 - For ongoing University-wide basic communication and planning, the President chairs a monthly Administrative Council that includes the vice presidents, executive directors, and directors of all divisions of the University, including all deans and associate deans. The group advises the President and the senior officers on University matters, such as emergency management planning.
 - All academic vice presidents, deans, associate deans, and directors of academic support units (e.g., the registrar) meet at least monthly as an Academic Advisory

- Group to brainstorm operational issues. The President of the Faculty Senate now attends those meetings to provide input and carry information back to the Senate.
- All academic vice presidents, deans, the Executive Director of International Affairs, and the Special Assistant to the Provost meet weekly with the Provost and Associate Provost as an Academic Council.
 - The Provost has standing weekly meetings with all deans.
 - The President, Provost and deans met frequently with the Senate's General Education Committee during 2006-2007. The Provost also met with the General Education-Liberal Arts Implementation Task Force, that he convened during the summer 2008.
 - The University's Personnel Panel, a faculty body elected by the Faculty Senate, reviews and makes recommendations to the Provost on promotion and sabbatical decisions.
 - The University's Tenure Committee, a faculty body elected by the Faculty Senate, reviews and makes recommendations to the Provost on tenure decisions.
 - Another document that provides evidence of collaboration among faculty as well as between the faculty and administration is the recent review of Park University's internationalization efforts by the American Council on Education. That document (**Appendix DD**) highlights the many collaborative successes of Park University.

Beginning in the summer 2007, the Faculty Senate and Office of Academic Affairs collaborated to plan and implement UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute's (HERI) survey for all full-time and part-time faculty members of the University during the 2007-2008 academic year. The survey provides comprehensive data regarding the faculty's view of the University. Over 250 full-time and part-time faculty members completed the survey, and the raw data were received by Park in late August 2008. Those data are being analyzed by a team of faculty members working with the Senate and Academic Affairs, and the results will be shared broadly for use in improving the collaborative process and faculty engagement at Park University.

7.9 University Committees

In addition to the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Federation (described above), there are, and have been, multiple University Committees with strong faculty representation which exercise responsibility regarding academic policy and program approval. Those committees are described in Table 6 below and in the narrative that follows.

Table 6: University Committees

University Committee	Membership Composition	Primary Charge
Curriculum Committee	All faculty	Reviews/approves undergraduate curriculum and makes recommendations to the Provost
Graduate Academic Council	All faculty	Reviews/approves graduate curriculum and makes recommendations to Provost
University Assessment Committee	All faculty	Reviews/approves course-embedded core learning outcomes/assessments, program-level assessment and departmental assessment plans
Tenure Committee	All faculty	Reviews tenure applications and makes recommendations to the Provost
Personnel Panel	All faculty	Reviews applications for promotion, sabbatical, contract continuation and conversion to tenure track and makes recommendations to the Provost
Internationalization and Multiculturalism Committee	Mostly faculty, plus several staff members who work with international students/programs	Advocates for incorporating global and multicultural perspectives into curricular and co-curricular programs; makes recommendations to schools/colleges
Institutional Review Board	Mostly faculty, plus the Assistant General Counsel and Associate Provost	Reviews/approves requests for using human subjects or vertebrate animals in research or teaching activities

The Faculty Senate selects the all-faculty members of Senate Committees as well as University Committees, with the exception of the University Assessment Committee (for which the Senate selects a representative). Except for one or two instances, the

Administration has always endorsed all membership selections of the Faculty Senate for all University Committees and other University-wide bodies that are not Senate Committees.

7.9.1 Curriculum Committee

Of the hundreds of undergraduate and graduate curricular recommendations that have been forwarded to the Provost from University Committees each year since 2005, all but two have been approved. That record clearly establishes that the faculty has had, and continues to have, primary responsibility for the curriculum. It also demonstrates that the deans, Associate Provost and Provost have been working effectively with these University oversight committees.

7.9.2 Graduate Academic Council

Information regarding the shared governance and academic oversight provided by the Graduate Academic Council appears in Section 4.5.

7.9.3 University Assessment Committee

The University Assessment Committee (UAC) was already in place in 2005 and consistently and considerably has advanced its work since that time (Section 4.1). The University Assessment Committee in collaboration with the rest of the faculty, deans and the Provost has driven Park's excellent progress in assessment. A Faculty Director of Assessment also was appointed with release time to work with the UAC and Park's Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. The UAC voting members have always been faculty members, and all initiatives proposed by that group have been supported by the Provost, President and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. Many of those recommendations have included

increased funding for projects and travel, including funds for three UAC members to deliver a presentation in Australia about Park's institutional (Tri-Modal) study that compared student learning in courses taught concurrently in three different modalities. The UAC's excellent work provides more evidence that the faculty exercise primary responsibility for academic oversight and that their recommendations are supported by the Administration.

7.9.4 Tenure Committee and Personnel Panel

The University's tenure and promotion processes and criteria are governed by the University's 2000 Faculty Manual as well as a broad definition for scholarship based on the Ernest Boyer model of scholarship that appears in the 2005-2009 Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement (FCBA), last negotiated between the Faculty Federation and the University in 2005. Since that time, departments have been working to articulate their discipline-specific criteria for scholarship/creative achievement. For example, a half-day session was devoted to this activity at the August 2007 Fall Faculty Conference. One day of the August 2008 Fall Faculty Conference was also dedicated to this effort. The School for Education and some departments in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences have completed their discipline-specific criteria. Where such criteria are lacking, the University follows existing policy (i.e. in the 2000 Faculty Manual and the FCBA) regarding expectations for teaching, scholarship, service and collegiality.

During 2007-2008, the academic deans worked with the Faculty Senate to update the promotion and tenure guidelines for the Faculty Manual. This action represents another collaborative effort between the Administration and the faculty. The Academic Council, which includes deans, academic directors, the Associate Provost and the Vice President for Distance Learning, prepared a draft document updating the tenure and promotion guidelines in the Faculty Manual and shared the document with the Faculty Senate (**Appendix EE**). The Faculty Senate received the Academic

Council’s draft document for review in October 2007 and communicated back to the Provost via email on March 12, 2008 stating that the Senate hoped to have a counter-proposal to submit to the Administration by the end of the semester. The Provost has been informed that the document shall be submitted during the fall 2008.

7.9.5 Internationalization and Multiculturalism Committee

Park’s Internationalization Committee led a University-wide discussion of best practices for internationalizing curricular and co-curricular programs and conducted an institutional self-study as part of Park’s participation in the American Council on Education’s (ACE) Internationalization Laboratory (2005-2008). Park received a highly complimentary report from ACE, which is provided (**Appendix DD**). During 2007-2008, that University Committee’s charge and title were expanded to include multiculturalism and the committee became the Internationalization and Multiculturalism Committee. That change was based upon a recommendation from the Internationalization Committee and the enthusiastic endorsement of ACE. The committee’s charge is to work with faculty across the University to find more ways to incorporate global perspectives and an appreciation for diverse cultures into Park’s curricular and co-curricular programs.

7.10 Other University Bodies with Strong Faculty Representation

Table 7: Other University Bodies

University Body	Membership Composition	Primary Charge
Shared Governance Commission	Majority faculty, some Staff, several Students and Alumni, and two Trustees (appointed by the President with recommendations from all divisions, the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Federation)	To discuss the meaning of shared governance at Park University and to create a working definition of shared governance for Park University as well as guidelines for implementation (Appendix FF). The Commission completed its task in the fall 2008.

University Body	Membership Composition	Primary Charge
Faculty Senate Bylaws Task Force	Three Senators (selected by the Senate President) and three deans (appointed by the Provost)	To review the existing Faculty Senate Policy Statement and the 2004 draft of the Senate Bylaws and to make recommendations on both to the Senate and the Provost to agree on bylaws to be taken to the Board of Trustees for approval. The Task Force completed its work in August 2008.
Distance Learning Advisory Council	All Program Coordinators (over 40 faculty members) and six staff members from the College for Distance Learning, including the Associate Dean of the CDL	To review the academic and administrative process for delivering approved programs, both Online and at all Campus Centers outside the Kansas City area. The Council began meeting in the summer 2008 and is ongoing.
Liberal Arts Program Implementation Task Force	Faculty Senate President, General Education Committee, CDL staff and leadership, Director of KC – Park Accelerated Program, Director Portfolio Program, Dean of College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Associate Provost and VPAA	To review the University’s military MOUs and including articulation agreements such as the agreement with Servicemembers Opportunity College (SOC) and plan the implementation of the new Liberal Arts Program. The Task Force is to complete its task in the fall 2008.
Search Committees and other Ad Hoc Committees	Faculty members to represent their discipline as well as the University, Administration as appropriate	As per University need

7.11 The President’s Shared Governance Commission

The 2006-2007 academic year brought a re-commitment to the spirit of shared governance at Park University with President Byers-Pevitts' appointment of a Shared Governance Commission. The President invited Dr. Walter Kisthardt, the Chair of the Department of Social Work, and Judge Ann Mesle (Kansas City), Chair of the Trusteeship Committee of the Board of Trustees, to co-chair the commission. After seeking recommendations and nominations, Dr. Byers-Pevitts appointed representatives from all constituencies of the University community. The

commission included graduate and undergraduate students, three alumni, fifteen faculty members, ten staff members, plus two Trustees and the President, who also serves on the Board of Trustees.

The commission was charged with developing a “working definition” of shared governance for Park. The commission convened five two-hour meetings between November 2006 and May 2007. The overwhelming consensus among members of the commission was that the process was very worthwhile, and many positive outcomes were achieved.

The commission was successful in generating a working definition of shared governance for Park University, which appears below. This definition was the result of discussions and debates during commission meetings. The definition also included feedback from numerous faculty, students, and staff, across the University, who had the opportunity to comment on the definition, both online and in conversations with their representatives.

Working Definition of Shared Governance for Park University

Approved by the President's Shared Governance Commission

May 2, 2007

At Park University, we define shared governance as both process and outcome. In a culture of collaboration, open and honest communication, and mutual trust, all constituents have an opportunity to shape decisions in accordance with the mission and vision of the University.

1. Shared governance means that all constituents of the University community have the opportunity to shape the decisions that will affect them and will benefit the community as a whole in support of the University's mission.
2. Shared governance may be understood as both a desirable process and an outcome. It embraces a set of principles and practices under which all constituents of the University community participate in decisions about the operation of the institution.
3. Shared governance is fostered and promoted in a culture of collaboration, open and honest communication and mutual trust, and is about how and why decisions are made. We recognize there are many decision makers at every level, but ultimately many decisions are made under the authority of the Board of Trustees.
4. In the spirit of shared governance, decision makers at every level of the organization will consider the interest of all who will be directly affected and will provide rationale if asked.
5. Inclusion, a spirit of interdependence, and a shared sense of the mission and purpose of the institution are considered as key criteria in all decisions.

In addition to a working definition, the commission also developed nine “behavioral indicators” to help encourage shared governance activity. Those indicators are as follows.

1. The decision/proposal has been assessed in terms of its consistency with Park’s mission, vision, core values, policies, agreements, procedures, strategic plan, and its contribution to the greater good of the University.
2. The decision/proposal has been shared with colleagues on both sides of the decision-making organizational chart.
3. The proposal/decision and desired outcomes have been formulated in writing.
4. The written proposal has been made available to stakeholders who will be mostly directly impacted.
5. Feedback from stakeholders regarding potential costs, benefits, unanticipated consequences and concerns has been discussed, reviewed, and recorded.
6. Research has been done to promote an informed decision.
7. The rationale for the final decision has been shared and discussed with stakeholders.
8. A comprehensive strategy has been developed that reflects collaboration in implementing the decision.
9. A plan has been developed to evaluate the decision to assess the extent to which it accomplished the desired outcomes.”

The commission’s deliberations have had a positive impact on shared governance and the awareness of it at Park. Shared governance has become more evident in daily discourse among faculty and staff members. Chairs have noted that more faculty members include shared governance in discussions at the departmental level. A survey to gather the impressions of faculty members and staff about shared governance revealed the following information.

- Faculty members and staff support the principles and spirit of shared governance.
 - There is a sense of cautious optimism regarding the work of the commission.
- People conveyed the hope that the University will pursue a critical examination of

policies and procedures on decision making to foster an atmosphere of open and honest communication.

- There are many examples of how shared governance is occurring. The University seeks to affirm these efforts and continue to identify processes that advance Park's working definition of shared governance. One example is Park's process for participatory budget preparation.

In 2006, the President formed an Enrollment Management Task Force that included faculty and staff members who could provide expertise as well as broad representation for the University's divisions. After many meetings and presentations that involved many others, the task force produced a detailed report with recommendations in 2007. The University's new Park Student Success Center (PSSC), a one-stop enrollment services center, was a key recommendation of the Enrollment Management Task Force. The individual who chaired the task force now serves as Park's Associate Dean for Enrollment Services leading the new PSSC.

During 2005-2006, prior to establishing the Shared Governance Commission, the President hosted a series of ten Faculty Engagement Dinners at her home. The purpose of the dinners was to invite discussion about the University with the President and the Provost. The faculty members were selected in such a way that they had dinner with colleagues from other schools and colleges to promote non-disciplinary discussion about the University. Each of the ten faculty groups included individuals from the various representative academic disciplines to encourage the sharing of ideas. Many faculty members expressed their appreciation.

7.12 Faculty Credentials

The issue of faculty credentials emerged from the desire of the Board of Trustees and senior administrators to increase the number of terminal degree prepared faculty members at Park. Having a terminal degree appropriate to one's academic

discipline is an important factor for fulfilling the access to academic excellence mission of the University as well as for tenure and promotion.

As of fall 2007, 100 faculty members have terminal degrees. The University has six tenured faculty members whose highest degree is a masters, and in 2006-2007 a faculty member in Communication Arts whose highest degree is an M.A., but who has twenty years professional experience in the field, was promoted to the rank of professor. The culture at Park has been changing, however, and faculty members now realize that a terminal degree or in rare cases, professional equivalence, is necessary for gaining tenure or promotion. The Faculty Manual lists the expectations of faculty for achieving various academic ranks. That document, which dates back to 2000, calls for a terminal degree for the rank of assistant professor and above. The Provost has based his recommendations for promotion and tenure on the Faculty Manual. A terminal degree is also expected for tenure, but the Faculty Manual acknowledges the possibility that someone without a terminal degree might be deserving of tenure due to exceptional merit and value to the University. Not least to be considered, terminal degrees are crucial in accrediting body evaluations of an institution. The guidelines for tenure and promotion from the Faculty Manual are presented in **Appendix GG**.

In addition to working with their departments, academic deans have been working with the Faculty Senate to update the Tenure and Promotion Section of the Faculty Manual. At the beginning of the fall 2007 semester, the Faculty Senate received a document representing the collective thoughts of the deans on the tenure and promotion process. Input from the Faculty Senate will be sent to the Provost, who will then call a joint meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Deans' Academic Council to discuss the matter further. Because Park has a unionized faculty, the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement (FCBA) also must be considered to ensure that the Faculty Manual is consistent with that document. The current FCBA is provided as **Appendix HH**.

In 2004-2005, the University implemented a Grow Your Own (GYO) program. That program provides partial tuition support for selected full-time Park faculty members who are completing their terminal degrees. A faculty committee selects candidates on a competitive basis, and there are currently eight faculty members in the GYO program. Several people have completed their doctorates with financial support from this Park program.

7.13 New Program Development

Proposals for new academic programs periodically emerge from collaboration of faculty members with their department chairs and deans. Proposals for undergraduate programs are considered by the University Curriculum Committee (UCC), and proposals for graduate programs are considered by the Graduate Academic Council (GAC). Recommendations from these two faculty groups flow to the Provost for approval. Oversight and guidance is provided by the deans and Provost to ensure due diligence. Where needed, input from other University units such as the Office of International Affairs and Study Abroad is also sought. As a result of the collaborative nature of the process, the Provost has been able to approve every recommendation of the UCC and the GAC for new programs. Several degree proposals have progressed through Park's internal approval process and are await the outcome of the Monitoring Report submission for approval by the Commission.

The staff of the Office of International Affairs and Study Abroad (OIASA) collaborates with faculty members across academic disciplines to provide global educational programming. The office has an advisory board with broad representation by faculty members. In a relationship with the American Council on Education (ACE), Park faculty members worked with the (OIASA) to develop best practices for the internationalization of curricular and co-curricular activities. The information in **Appendix DD** documents the participation of numerous

faculty and staff members in an effort to perpetuate Park University's global perspective for student learning.

7.14 Program Sustainability

A number of Park's degree programs have individual national or regional academic or professional program accreditation (e.g., education, social work, nursing, athletic training). Other programs are seeking academic accreditation. In each case, the self-study required for accreditation has been developed by the program faculty. Such efforts address program quality and sustainability. In September 2007, the School for Education completed a comprehensive Self-Study Report in preparation for the November site visit by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). DESE evaluates Park's education programs as part of their standard seven-year review cycle. A primary charge for the recently appointed Dean of the School of Business and Management is to pursue AACSB accreditation. Also during 2007-2008, several other programs in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences participated in comprehensive program review in collaboration with the Dean, the Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, and the Provost. Those data are utilized to inform the on-going University budget process so that appropriate resources are allocated.

Park also has the resources to ensure program sustainability. The University's budget has increased from \$32,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 to \$74,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, and has been invested heavily in the people, infrastructure, and technology necessary to support academic programs. Full-time faculty salaries have increased 5% each year for at least the past five years, a collective 25 percent in all salary ranges, and will continue to do so pursuant to the terms of the FCBA. As a result, those salaries are highly competitive with the University's IPED peer institutions. New degree programs and areas of concentration have been added over the past five years, and the number of people holding faculty

rank at Park has increased from 102 in 2002 to 154 (132 full-time) for 2008. That number does not include adjunct faculty members.

Since faculty retention is critical for program sustainability, the University continues to provide significant support for faculty development, including:

- a new orientation and mentoring program to support new faculty members;
- faculty professional travel (increased from \$25,000 in 2001 to over \$100,000 for 2008);
- program-related international travel (in addition to the funds for conference travel);
- a Faculty Endowed Funds Program for scholarly activity;
- the Grow Your Own Program to help outstanding full-time faculty members complete terminal degrees;
- a Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning for programming and opportunities for faculty mentoring and teaching support;
- an external peer-reviewed journal (*Insight*) for Park faculty scholarship (a CETL initiative); and
- an Office of Sponsored Programs to assist faculty members with grants.

7.15 Identification of Resources

The commitment of financial resources for Park programs evolves out of the normal budget process in accordance with the University's strategic plan. During the 2006-2007 academic year, the budget process was revised to include additional budget hearings for increased transparency. Each academic area completes a budget request form that includes a specific reference for each budget item to the University's strategic plan, *Explorations and Transformations 2012: Access to Excellence*.

The new budget process and timetable were widely communicated to the faculty beginning in the fall 2006. This transparent process includes budget meetings

with the Faculty Senate leadership and the leadership of the Faculty Federation, together with deans and other administrators. Each academic department also conducted budget meetings. All academic budget requests are available to the faculty on an internal web portal.

The allocation of numerous University resources is specified in the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement (FCBA) negotiated between the faculty and the administration. One important resource provided pursuant to the FCBA is funding for faculty academic travel. According to the FCBA, a pool of funds equivalent to \$800 per full-time faculty member is to be made available each year. The University, however, has far exceeded that support level each year for the past several years. Most faculty have traveled and those who did received at least \$1400 each. Faculty with multiple professional development trips approved often received over \$2000 per year in academic travel support.

Park continues to be generous in granting release time to compensate faculty members for contributing to the University in non-teaching roles. For example, release time is provided for service as a department chair, program chair, director, or program coordinator. Faculty members serving as directors of academic initiatives also receive release time in recognition of those efforts.

The Provost maintains a contingency budget each year that is used to assist academic programs with unexpected needs. For example, approximately \$15,000 was provided for the renovation and furnishing of new space for the Center for Excellence and Teaching Learning (CETL). Those resources were in addition to an increased operating budget for CETL for 2007-2008. The CETL is directed by a team of three faculty members who work with other faculty members from across the University on programming of faculty interest (<http://www.park.edu/cetl/about.html>; **Appendix II**). The Executive Director of CETL has a half-time assignment for that work, and the two other faculty

members working in CETL each receive a ½ time assignment to work on teaching and learning initiatives with all faculty.

The process for reviewing and approving new faculty positions is also collaborative. Department chairs with their faculty submit requests with rationale for new faculty to the deans. The deans make staffing requests early in the fall and then submit a prioritized list with rationale to the Provost. The Provost meets with each dean to discuss the requests and then submits his recommendation for new faculty positions to the President. Academic Affairs works with academic departments to conduct program review, and those data are used to inform decisions regarding faculty needs. During 2006-2007, 15 full-time faculty members were hired for the 2007-2008 academic year. Of those, nine were new and six were replacement positions. Over the past three years, 64 new faculty members have been hired.

7.16 Development of the University's Master Facilities Plan

During the spring of 2005, President Byers-Pevitts appointed a Master Planning Commission to develop a Parkville Campus Master Facilities Plan to include in the University's strategic plan entitled *Explorations and Transformations 2012: Access to Excellence*. This commission constituted the University's primary advisory body during the facilities planning process. The 21 commission members were selected for their varied backgrounds (representing student, faculty, staff, alumni, and trustees) and the ability to represent and understand multiple perspectives and the interests of Park's many constituencies.

During the planning process 14 focus groups were convened to listen to the concerns of members of those constituencies. The board dedicated a major portion of its annual retreat to development of the new Master Facilities Plan. Faculty members as well as staff and community leaders participated in many of these focus groups. Several sessions of the University Faculty Senate provided

additional opportunity for participation in the planning process. Students participated in both student focus groups and at hearings of the Park Student Government associations.

The Board of Trustees approved the Master Facilities Plan for the Parkville Campus in May 2006 as part of the strategic plan of the University. As contemplated by this plan, development of architectural design guidelines soon followed. The Board of Trustees approved those guidelines in January 2007. This was immediately followed by the design of the initial major project envisioned in the plan, new student residences, and a fitness center. The University utilized a design-build project delivery method to expedite completion of the new residence halls. The development of the design guidelines and the design of the new structures included ongoing collaboration among many interested constituencies throughout the University and the Parkville Community. Students moved into two new residence halls for the fall 2008 semester

As part of the facilities plan the University recognized that the successful implementation of a multi-phased campus building program would be easier if a single set of planning guidelines informed the design process. For this reason, the plan also called for the adoption of a set of academic planning guidelines for consistency. The past practice of collaborating with the affected University constituencies will continue to ensure that all ideas and concerns are addressed.

7.17 Letters Regarding Collaborative Process at Park University

Supporting evidence for the effectiveness of Park's collaborative processes is provided by multiple letters from faculty member. Groups of faculty were invited to submit letters and some submitted documents while others did not. **Appendix JJ** includes letters from:

- Dr. Walter Kisthardt, Co-chair of the President's Shared Governance Commission, about the collaborative process and success of that commission;
- Dr. Virginia Brackett, Chair of Park's Liberal Arts Committee (General Education group) about the collaborative process and successful approval of the University's new general education program;
- Dr. Amber Dailey, Director of Park's Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL), regarding the accomplishments resulting from the faculty members and administration's CETL collaborations to advance professional development for faculty members and to recognize faculty members for their teaching and scholarly efforts; and
- David Monchusie, Chief Information Officer (also teaches), regarding the collaboration between Park's Information Technology Services and the faculty.

8.0 Preparation of the Monitoring Report

The preparation of Park University's Monitoring Report involved the assistance of many faculty, staff and trustees of the University. The draft report was made available to the Board of Trustees and several Trustees responded with comments. As documented by the information provided below, the process was collaborative and systematic.

8.1 Sharing the Commission's Review Committee's Report with the Faculty

In October 2007, the three page report of the Review Committee was posted on a University website along with a draft of the Monitoring Report. The faculty was notified that the materials were available on the website for their review and feedback to the Provost. The Review Committee's report had already been shared

with the Faculty Senate several months prior to the drafting and posting of the Monitoring Report.

8.2 Sharing Park's submission received by the Commission on January 4, 2008

The Monitoring Report, received by the Commission on January 4, 2008, was also posted on the University's Assessment website for all faculty members to view. That website is the same one used to post the draft Monitoring Report during the fall of 2007 for faculty review and comment. The changes that were made to the report as a result of feedback were also posted for faculty review.

In fall 2007, the Faculty Senate requested that the University not submit the Monitoring Report early. The concern expressed was that the assessment was not finished. To explain the Monitoring Report and the rationale for early submission, the Provost communicated with the faculty both in writing and in oral reports at Faculty Senate meetings (as well as to the deans of colleges and schools and to the Federation Leadership). The message repeated to the faculty was:

- that confirmation had been received from the Commission that Park would still have until October 2008 to obtain approval for the Monitoring Report and that the University may submit the document early;
- that assessment activity is never "finished," but rather an ongoing process of data collection, analysis and application to improve student learning;
- that since there had been such excellent progress on assessment, curricular consistency and collaborative processes, the University was confident of a positive outcome from the early submission; and
- that Park could only gain from an early submission because either of the two possible outcomes would move the University forward.
 - Outcome 1: The Commission would accept the Monitoring Report and whatever feedback received by the University would be helpful.

- Outcome 2: The Commission would request additional information and provide feedback about what is needed from the University. That outcome also would be very helpful to guide our work and move the University one step closer to a successful monitoring report by October 2008.

The list of talking points the Provost used for his report at the January 16, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting is provided (**Appendix KK**). Select Faculty Senate leaders did not believe that the faculty had a meaningful role in preparing the Monitoring Report due to the differing opinions on the submission date. Some Faculty suggested comments but the majority of faculty did not submit any comments.

8.3 Sharing the Commission's Analysis of Park's January Submission

At the February 13, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting, the Provost verbally shared the Commission's analysis of the Monitoring Report Park submitted in January 2008. In his report to the faculty, the Provost shared that the Commission:

- deemed Park's progress on the assessment of student learning to be more than satisfactory;
- requested some supplemental information/evidence regarding how Park is ensuring curricular consistency across the University, especially for the many Campus Centers; and
- requested more information about how a collaborative process is being achieved.

The Provost notified the Faculty Senate that supplemental information was being prepared in response to the Commission's analysis of Park's January 4, 2008 document, and that a draft of that information would be posted for all faculty to review (**Appendix LL**). That information was posted on April 8 on the same University Assessment website used to post prior documents for the Monitoring

Report. At the April Faculty Senate meeting, the Provost delivered a progress report on the preparation of the supplemental information for the Monitoring Report. He explained that the subheadings in the posted document represented questions raised by the Commission's analysis. He also reminded the faculty that the supplemental information with appendices was posted on the website for all to view and again asked for faculty feedback, by extending the date to April 30, 2008.

8.4 Gathering Input from the Faculty Senate and Other Bodies with Strong Faculty Representation

During the summer of 2007, the faculty was informed that the University planned to prepare the Monitoring Report for early submission to the Commission. On July 18, 2007, the Provost met with both the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Federation leadership and requested input from them for the Monitoring Report. In response, the Provost received input on July 27, 2007 from the Faculty Senate President that included the feedback from the Faculty Federation. The points in that communication that were confirmed to be accurate were all included in the Monitoring Report (e.g., regarding the budget process, the summer collaboration between the Faculty Senate and the Administration in organizing a "highly successful Fall Faculty Conference", and information regarding the Shared Governance Commission). All faculty as well as staff members were invited to submit input on several occasions beginning in the fall 2007.

Because assessment of student learning is an important component of the Monitoring Report, the Provost sent the draft Monitoring Report specifically to the University Assessment Committee on October 3, 2007 asking for their feedback (**Appendix MM**). In addition, the draft Monitoring Report was posted on October 5, 2007 on the University's Assessment website for review and comment by all faculty members. The open comment period for faculty feedback

was extended until November 1, 2007. Faculty received multiple email notices about the web postings of the draft Monitoring Report, and the Provost announced the opportunity for review and feedback in his report at the October 2007 Faculty Senate meeting, as well as during meetings with other University committees.

The Provost received numerous email responses regarding the Monitoring Report from faculty and staff members, samples of which are provided (**Appendix MM**). The vast majority of the emails from faculty and staff members contained helpful corrections of dates/details as well as some stylistic editing. All corrections/suggestions confirmed to be accurate and appropriate were included in the final Monitoring Report.

During the summer 2008, the University community was notified that supplemental information was being integrated into the Monitoring Report which had been submitted to the Commission in January 2008. Faculty and staff members were also informed that:

- the newly revised Monitoring Report was posted in mid-July on a University website for them to review and provide feedback,
- everyone's comments/edits would be considered carefully, and
- the University's final Monitoring Report will be submitted to the Commission in September 2008.

In summary, all faculty members had multiple opportunities to provide input for the development of the Monitoring Report. Feedback was invited from individuals as well as groups such as the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Federation, the Academic Council and the Executive Staff. In addition to the faculty, the draft report was made available to all staff members and to the Board of Trustees. Many individuals provided feedback, and those who chose to participate played a meaningful role in the preparation of the Monitoring Report.

9.0 Defined Terms

Academic Director (AD) - The AD serves program coordinators, department chairs, and members of the University Assessment Committee by functioning as a point of contact at the University's campus centers located throughout the country.

CBASE - The College Basic Academic Subjects Examination, which is a standardized examination of general education competencies.

Campus Center - A designation in Park's system that refers to either a physical location where the University offers academic programs or online. Students enrolled exclusively online and not associated with any of Park's physical locations have a separate Campus Center designation for tracking purposes.

Campus Center Director - A full-time staff member at one of Park's Campus Centers who serves as the local administrator and point of contact for administrative offices on the Parkville Campus.

College for Distance Learning - The College at Park University providing infrastructure for administrative and academic support for program delivery at Campus Centers outside the Kansas City area and online.

Core Assessment - A direct measurement of at least $\frac{3}{4}$ of the Core Learning Outcomes (CLOs) for any particular course. CLOs and CAs are required components of each course syllabus. The rubric used to score a CA (see CAR) is uniform for all sections of a course regardless of where the course is taught or in which delivery format.

Core Assessment Committee (CAC) - A subcommittee of the University Assessment Committee (UAC) that was charged with the development and implementation of course-embedded core assessment for all courses at the University.

Core Assessment Rubric (CAR) - A scoring guide adopted by a department and used for grading core assessments (CAs) to determine students' mastery of core learning outcomes (CLOs).

Core Learning Outcome (CLO) - Course-embedded learning outcome defined by program faculty, approved by the University Assessment Committee and required for the course regardless of who teaches, where the course is taught or in what delivery format the course is taught.

Department Chair - A full-time employee of the University who provides academic leadership for a department. The department chair position is an appointed position, and they serve at the pleasure of their associate dean/dean.

Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement - The union contract with the faculty (see Faculty Federation).

<http://www.park.edu/facultysenate/documents/FACULTYCOLLECTIVEBARGAININGAGREEMENT.pdf>.

Faculty Federation - Park's faculty union, which is Local 3576 of Missouri Federation of Teachers, American Federation of Teachers, AFLCIO.

Graduate Quality Standards Review - The standards and process defined by the Graduate Academic Council for quality review of graduate online course design.

Information Technology Services (ITS) - Park's technology services component. Visit ITS Online at <http://captain.park.edu/its/>. (CETL)

Literacies - Park's term for the competencies of the general education program.

Online Instructor Evaluations System (OIES) - Park's system of standards and process for reviewing the online teaching performance of faculty.

Online Instructor Evaluators – Park faculty who use the OIES to review online teaching for the University.

Park Accelerated- Kansas City Area - Park's programs offered in the eight-week (accelerated) format in the Kansas City area. Visit <http://www.park.edu/KC/>.

Personnel Panel - A panel of full-time faculty members elected by the faculty to review the performance of other full-time faculty members, and to make recommendations to the Provost regarding the reappointment or promotion of faculty Members.

Program Chair - A full-time employee of the University who provides academic leadership for an academic program. The program chair position is an appointed position, and they serve at the pleasure of their associate dean/dean.

Program Coordinators (PC) - Program Coordinators are faculty members (content experts) with administrative duties related to quality control for programs in their area of academic expertise. PCs report to their respective department chairs, unless they also serve as the department chair. Visit <http://www.park.edu/facultymanual/ProgramCoordinatorDuties.htm>

Program Director - A full-time employee of the University who provides academic leadership for a graduate program. The Program Director position is an appointed position, and they serve at the pleasure of their associate dean/dean.

Quality Matters - The standards and process used for quality review of undergraduate online course design. Quality Matters was developed under a FIPSE grant at the University of Maryland.

Shared Governance Commission – A commission established by Park’s President for the purpose of defining shared governance for the University.

Syllabus Template System - Park’s web-based syllabus review and posting system that utilizes a template to standardize course syllabi and enable programs to lock approved core assessment elements.

Tri-Modal - Refers to the Tri-Modal Study (see Tri-Modal Study)

Tri-Modal Study - Park’s institutional-level assessment to compare student learning in 16 week, face-to-face courses, 8 week face-to-face courses, and online courses.

UAC Liaisons - Members of the University Assessment Committee with additional responsibilities for coaching individuals and groups of faculty about core assessment.

University Assessment Committee (UAC) – A University Committee of faculty members charged with setting standards for the assessment of student learning and assisting academic departments with their development and implementation of assessment. See <http://www.park.edu/assessment/>

Writing Competency Test (WCT) – A Park developed assessment of students’ critical thinking and writing skills that is a graduation requirement for all undergraduates. The WCT is also used as an institutional-level assessment of these competencies.

10.0 Appendices

Appendix	Appendix Item	Report Section
A	HLC Report September 26, 2005	1.0 HLC Charge
B	July 26, 2007 Email from Dr. Appleson	“
C	Academic Affairs Organizational Chart	2.0 Park Description
		7.1 Changes in Administrative Positions for Increased Academic Oversight
D	Core Assessment Information from UAC Website	4.2 Core Assessment
E	Sample Core Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and Core Assessments (CAs)	“
F	CARs Templates	“
G	Sample Syllabi Using the Standardized Template	4.3 Standardized Syllabus System
H	Information about Program Assessment from the UAC Website	4.4 Undergraduate Program Assessment
I	UAC Assessment Report Review	“
J	Sample Undergraduate Assessment Plans	4.4.1 College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
K	Sample Undergraduate Program Assessment Reports	“
L	SFE Undergraduate Assessment	4.4.2 School for Education
M	Graduate Course Scoring Rubric (CAR)	4.5 Graduate Program Assessment
N	Assessment Report for the MEd and MAT Degrees	“
O	Assessment Report for the MPA Degree	“
P	Assessment Report for the HCL Degree	“
Q	Assessment Report for the MBA Degree	“
R	Literacies for General Education Program	4.6 General Education Review and Assessment
S	New General Education Program	4.6.1 New General Education Program
T	WCT Project for Literacy Assessment	“
U	Tri-Modal Study Results	4.7.2 Tri-Modal Study
V	Analysis of Tri-Modal Study	“
W	Committee Rosters Showing University-wide Faculty Participation	6.1 University-Wide Faculty Engagement for Curricular Consistency

Appendix	Appendix Item	Report Section
X	Graduate Quality Standards	6.8 Review of Graduate Online Courses for Consistent Quality
Y	Online Instructor Evaluation System OIES	6.9 Review of Online Teaching for Consistent Quality
Z	Program Review Information	6.10 Program Review Update
AA	Letter from Board of Trustees Chair	7.0 Collaborative Process and Administrative Support
BB	Matrix for Showing Roles and Responsibilities for Academics	7.3 Role of Academic Departments
-	-	7.4 Moving Decision-Making to the Lowest Possible Level
CC	Faculty Senate Policy	7.6 The Faculty Senate
DD	Park University's Internationalization Efforts Report by ACE	7.8 Faculty/Administration Communication Opportunities
		7.9.5 Internationalization and Multiculturalism Committee
		7.13 New Program Development
EE	Faculty Manual Tenure and Promotion Proposal	7.9.4 Tenure Committee and Personnel Panel
FF	Working Definition of Shared Governance	7.10 Other University Bodies with Strong Faculty Representation
GG	Faculty Manual Tenure and Promotion	7.12 Faculty Credentials
HH	Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement	“
II	Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning	7.15 Identification of Resources
JJ	Faculty Member Letters	7.17 Letters Regarding Collaborative Process at Park University
KK	Provost Talking Points	8.2 Sharing Park's Submission Received by the Commission on January 4, 2008

Appendix	Appendix Item	Report Section
LL	Notice of Supplemental Information	8.3 Sharing the Commission's Analysis
MM	Samples of Faculty Email Feedback	8.4 Gathering Input from the Faculty Senate and Other Bodies with Strong Faculty Representation