

**REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION VISIT**

TO

**University of Kansas  
Lawrence, Kansas**

**February 9 – 11, 2015**

FOR

**The Higher Learning Commission**  
A commission of the North Central Association

**EVALUATION TEAM**

George Bodner, PhD, Distinguished Professor, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907

Juan Franco, PhD, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, University of Nebraska – Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68588

Lori Franz, PhD, Professor of Management, University of Missouri – Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211

Ingrid Gould, MA, Associate Provost, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637

Charles R. Middleton, PhD, President, Roosevelt University, Chicago, IL 60605

Jocelyn Milner, PhD, Associate Provost, University of Wisconsin – Madison, Madison, WI 53706

Terry Potter, PhD, Associate Vice Chancellor, University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, Denver, CO 80217

John Schuh, PhD, Distinguished Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011

Westley Tschetter, MBA, Vice President of Finance and Business, South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD 57007

Michael Wright, MA, Senior Director, DePaul University, Chicago, IL 60604

Craig Schnell, PhD, Professor of Pharmaceutical Sciences, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND 58108 (Chair)

## Contents

I. Context and Nature of Visit.....	3
II. Commitment to Peer Review .....	4
III. Compliance with Federal Requirements.....	4
IV. Fulfillment of the Criteria for Accreditation .....	5
a. Criterion One.....	5
b. Criterion Two.....	8
c. Criterion Three .....	14
d. Criterion Four .....	21
e. Criterion Five.....	28
V. Team Recommendation .....	38
VI. Embedded Changes in Affiliation Status .....	39
VII. Additional Comments and Explanations.....	N/A
Attachments	
a. Interactions with Constituencies.....	40
b. Documents Reviewed .....	45
c. Federal Compliance Worksheet.....	48
d. Multi-Campus Report(s) (if applicable).....	69

## I. CONTEXT AND NATURE OF VISIT

### A. Purpose of Visit

The Team conducted a comprehensive evaluation visit that included a multicampus review.

### B. Institutional Context

The University of Kansas (KU) is a public teaching and research university established in 1865 and has been continuously accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association since 1913. It is comprised of three campuses located in Lawrence (KU), Kansas City (Kansas University Medical Center (KUMC)), and Overland Park (Edwards Campus) and two satellite medical campuses located in Salina and Wichita.

Academically, the Lawrence campus consists of a College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and nine schools. The KUMC campus, established in 1905, has three professional schools. The Edwards Campus was started in 1975. As a whole, KU offers over 360 academic degree programs including baccalaureate (139), masters (130), and doctoral (100) degrees to ca. 28000 students of broad diversity.

Since the last comprehensive visit in 2005, the University has undergone very significant changes. Major leadership on all campuses has changed (Lawrence: Chancellor, 2009; Provost, 2010; Medical Center: Exec Vice Chancellor, 2013; and Edwards Campus: Vice Chancellor, 2013). Under this new leadership, three major transformative initiatives have been undertaken: (1) *Bold Aspirations* – a new, five-year, comprehensive strategic plan for 2012 – 2017; (2) *Changing for Excellence* – an overhaul of administrative function; and (3) *Far Above: The Campaign for Kansas* – a \$1.2 billion fundraising campaign. These new initiatives were undertaken to deal with significant challenges over the decade dealing with major decreases in state funding and declining enrollment numbers.

The Institution has strongly integrated planning with the other significant initiatives to meet the goals of the new Chancellor “to improve experiences for undergraduate students, enhance scholarship across all disciplines, and ensure proper resources to meet these goals.” In addition, additional goals were designed to address changes in admissions, retention, and graduation rates. All of these goals were derived and intertwined with the mission of KU “to educate leaders, build healthy communities, and make discoveries that change the world.”

### C. Unique Aspects or Additions to the Visit

None

### D. Additional Locations or Branch Campuses Visited (if applicable)

Two members of the Team visited the Kansas University Medical Center campus. The Multicampus Visit Report is found in Appendix D.

**E. Distance Delivery Reviewed**

Distance delivery was reviewed. The Team Report is found in Criterion 3.

**II. COMMITMENT TO PEER REVIEW****A. Comprehensiveness of the Self-Study Process**

The *Self-Study* process began approximately two years before the actual visit of the comprehensive evaluation team, wherein the Chancellor formed a nine-person steering committee. From the steering committee, four chairs were chosen to lead subcommittees to address the criteria. Each subcommittee prepared draft reports which were submitted to the steering committee for review. A writing group was formed to prepare a draft of the *Self-Study* Report. The draft report was shared widely across the Lawrence campus with administrators, faculty, staff, and students for review and comment. A final Self-Study Report was released in December 2014.

**B. Integrity of the Self-Study Report**

The Team found the *Self-Study* Report to be well written and presented a balanced view of the status of the Institution. The report was organized in a manner reflecting the criteria and core components with summaries of each core component. At the close of each criterion, there was a series of statements entitled: summary, strengths, challenges, and future directions. Throughout the process, there was a plethora of information and evidence provided in special websites, the electronic resource room, and a flashdrive provided to each team member.

**C. Adequacy of Progress in Addressing Previously Identified Challenges**

There were no recommended challenges provided in the 2005 Comprehensive Report. There were suggestions in the Advancement Section dealing with admission changes, global awareness, assessment review, regulatory relief, and infrastructure issues. Each of these issues has received considerable attention in this last decade embedded within the strategic planning process.

**D. Notification of Evaluation Visit and Solicitation of Third-Party Comment**

The Institution has made appropriate notifications to the community, alumni, local businesses, through press releases, email newsletters, and advertisements in newspapers to announce the HLC visit and solicit third party comments. The Team received seven third party comments.

**III. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS**

The Compliance with Federal Requirements Document was reviewed by two independent reviewers provided by the Higher Learning Commission. The report is found in Appendix C.

#### IV. FULFILLMENT OF THE CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

**CRITERION ONE: MISSION.** The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

**Core Component 1A:** The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

**Subcomponent 1.** The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.

**Subcomponent 3.** The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission.

**Team Determination:**      Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**1.A.1.** The current mission statement was approved by the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) in 1992 following a process involving a faculty committee and input from the University stakeholders. The mission provides for instruction, research, service, international dimension, and values. This mission statement has remained essentially unchanged but has been reviewed periodically on three occasions involving strategic planning (2000, 2008, 2010) processes. From the strategic planning process in 2010, a shorter strategic mission statement was derived: "To lift students and society by educating leaders, building healthy communities, and making discoveries that change the world." Likewise, the KU Medical Center also has developed a Mission Statement, approved by the KBOR in 2011, providing for education, research, patient care, and service.

**1.A.2.** Consistent with the Mission Statement which guided the latest strategic plan, *Bold Aspirations*, KU offers more than 360 degree programs in over 160 fields in programs on the various campuses throughout the state and online. To meet the changing needs of education and be responsive to state needs, since the last accreditation visit KU has added and/or modified academic programs in engineering, pharmacy, medicine, nursing, journalism, education, liberal arts and sciences, music, social welfare, architecture and design, health professions, business, and law. KU maintains a comprehensive program of student services and co-curricular activities to support its curricular programs which are organized under the Office of Undergraduate Studies and Office of Student Affairs: an Advising Center, Career Center, Writing Center, First Year Experience, and New Student Orientation.

The student enrollment profile consists primarily of Kansas residents but there are notable increases in U.S. non-resident students, international students, and under-represented groups. New efforts are directed at increasing enrollment from all of these

groups.

**1.A.3.** Guided by the current strategic plan, *Bold Aspirations*, and an initiative entitled, *Changing for Excellence*, resource allocation has been directed by the goals of the strategic plans. The progress made each year is assessed and documented in annual reports.

**Core Component 1B:** The mission is articulated publicly.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.

**Subcomponent 2.** The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.

**Subcomponent 3.** The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**1.B.1.** The Institution's mission is clear and articulated to the public by various means, including the website (About KU) and numerous publications, and is an integral part of the University's strategic planning. It can also be accessed through the Chancellor's and Provost's websites.

**1.B.2.** The mission statement was approved by the Kansas Board of Regents in 1992 and has been refreshed three times, in 2000, 2008, and 2010. The University of Kansas Medical Center Mission Statement was approved by the Kansas Board of Regents in 2011.

**1.B.3.** The planning process was led by the Chancellor and included various Committees which developed the university's priorities guided by the mission statement. Special focus was placed on the following priorities: quality education, research, and providing resources.

**Core Component 1C:** The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**1.C.1.** The Institution has taken several steps to address its role in a multicultural society guided by a *Statement on Diversity and Inclusion*; the policy of Non-discrimination, Equal Opportunity, and Affirmative Action; and *Bold Aspirations* (Goal 5). In particular, the Institution has hired a Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Equity.

**1.C.2.** The Institution has enhanced its effort to recruit a more diverse faculty, staff, and student body. Of special note is a program which brings minority visiting professors to campus for a semester. It is used as a recruitment tool and over the years, eleven professors have been hired through this program. Eight of these professors are currently on the KU faculty; the other three have retired. Additionally, between 2009 and 2014, of 312 newly hired faculty, 26% were minority.

**Core Component 1D:** The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

**Subcomponent 1.** Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.

**Subcomponent 3.** The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**1.D.1.** KU strives to serve the public good by providing programs, activities, Centers and Institutes, and educational partnerships that serve the entire state. *Bold Aspirations* (Goal 4) focuses on public service to the Institution's constituents and stakeholders. The Medical Center, for example, has expanded its programs to Salina and Wichita. It has developed online programs at the bachelor's, master's, doctorate and certificate program in nursing and is developing programs in Social Welfare and Business.

**1.D.2.** The Institution has made it clear through its actions that its primary goals are to educate the citizens of Kansas, to conduct research to benefit the state, the nation and the world. It does not engage in generating funds for investors.

**1.D.3.** Many of the academic programs have Community Advisory Boards which help guide their direction. Constant interaction with public officials and the Alumni Association also help discern the public's needs. Of special note are the Kansas Biological and Geological Surveys that KU administers. KU provides training to community self-responders through the Kansas Law Enforcement and Training Center and the Kansas Fire and Rescue Training Institute.

**Team Determination on Criterion One:**

- Criterion is met  
 Criterion is met with concerns  
 Criterion is not met

**Summary Statement on Criterion:**

The evidence presented in the *Self-Study* and discussions with constituent groups clearly indicate that Criterion 1 and its Core Components have been met. KU has a stable mission statement that pervades the Institution and its stakeholders, and it has been reviewed periodically and definitely guides strategic planning and aligns the academic educational, research activities, and budgeting priorities of the Institution. The mission also directs the Institution's activities in addressing its role in multicultural and global societies. KU provides a plethora of public outreach programs and activities to serve the communities throughout the entire State of Kansas, allowing a constant interaction with public officials, alumni, and other community groups. While KU serves the State admirably as its flagship institution, it also recognizes its obligations to the nation and world.

**CRITERION TWO: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct.** The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

**Core Component 2A:** The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and processes for its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
 Core Component is met with concerns  
 Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

- All Kansas University (KU) policies are housed in a content management system, a "Policy Library," where everyone is free to search and access them. This transparency upgrade is not yet as well-known as KU would like, and they are at work promoting it. They are also weighing options to make the Policy Library available to employees whose positions do not grant them access to computers. The policies in this "collection" constitute the full panoply one would expect of a serious research university, covering staff, students, faculty, administration, and board. Although there



has been much consternation on campus about the Kansas Board of Regents-initiated social media policy that did not benefit from as much campus input as customary, most policies are widely respected.

- KU has created what they refer to as a "robust series of offices and functions to assure that all areas of the university act ethically and with integrity," including the Office of General Counsel, as well as offices for Audit, Institutional Compliance, and Export Compliance. Last year saw the debut of the Office of Institutional Compliance to draw together a raft of disparate compliance functions from across the Lawrence campus.
- KU's commitment to operating with integrity can be seen throughout the comprehensive collection of well-thought-out policies and procedures that relate to all members of the campus community, faculty, students, or staff. Existing policies and procedures are periodically examined for continued relevance, revised as necessary, and collected into a web-based, searchable Policy Library that receives more than 15,000 views a month.
- Policy development at KU is proactive in recognizing and then acting on new areas of needed attention. It is also appropriately reactive, as can be seen in the University's response to actions of the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) on issues such as the development of post-tenure review.
- KU has undertaken a comprehensive approach to the prevention of sexual harassment and assault through their Office of Institutional Opportunity and Access. Evidence for the success of this program can be seen in the high levels of both faculty and student completion of training. Evidence can also be seen in the mandatory education programs on alcohol and drug education and on safety and sexual harassment recently implemented for new students.
- At a time when incidents highlighting the absence of ethical practice in intercollegiate sports are common, KU is to be commended on their response to serious problems encountered among staff in Kansas Athletics that was brought to their attention in 2009. KU is very attentive to the exalted role of athletics on campus and the need to adhere to the multiple and growing number of regulations designed to keep the engine of sports in check. NCAA violations are investigated promptly, using outside counsel when necessary. Education sessions and social media keep staff, athletes, and fans up to date on compliance matters. A Whistleblower Hotline outside Athletics helps preserve the appearance and reality of independent examination of reports.
- It should be noted that KU is the only university supervised by KBOR that has a comprehensive University Senate that encompasses faculty, staff, and student senates that facilitates shared governance. The *Self-Study* cites numerous examples of the involvement of appropriate groups of students and/or faculty in efforts that lead to the shaping of the institution's response to the need for either new or revised policies and procedures.

**Team Observation:**

KU strives to create an ethical environment based on values enacted through collaborative governance structures and extensive training programs for both faculty and students. The *Self-Study* illustrated an Institution that regularly solicits input from

faculty in response to issues, as they arise. During the open forum, however, some faculty who attended expressed concern about the use of this ad hoc approach as opposed to traditional approaches to “shared governance” that involve elected representatives of the various governing bodies, including the Faculty Senate and the University Senate. They also expressed concern about whether the input provided by the ad hoc committees was being listened to, particularly by the Regents, or whether these committees were tasked with providing input after decisions had already been made.

**Core Component 2B:** The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

**Team Determination:**      Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

- In much the same way that the KU Policy Library provides an unusually clear level of transparency about policies and procedures that affect students, staff, and faculty, KU has developed a "single content management system to standardize the look and feel of the KU website" devoted to providing information about academic programs, costs of attending the institution, and accreditation relationships. Institutional academic requirements are readily available, and all schools maintain websites that provide information for individual majors or programs.
- Similarly, admissions standards have recently changed significantly, but all admissions information is on a single website to "ensure accuracy, availability, and easy accessibility." Potential students and the public, both those utterly unfamiliar with KU as well as those considerably better versed, will find clear details about program offerings as well as their requirements and costs. KU maintains an Office of Admissions "Affordability Tab" that provides information about the costs at KU compared to its AAU peers, the average cost of tuition, and a cost calculator that integrates financial and scholarship options.
- KU is to be commended for its explicit recognition of the challenges associated with maintaining easily accessible information about campus programs that are in a constant state of flux.
- KU is to be commended for both the quantity and quality of handbooks available to faculty, students and staff. A search for "handbooks" in the Policy Library returned more than two dozen hits for categories ranging from dispute resolution for unclassified professional staff to student misconduct policies, voting policies, performance evaluation, tuition assistance, military leave, political activity, graduate student handbooks, student access services, and a host of other categories. Once again, KU's commitment to clear and consistent website navigation is to be commended.

**Core Component 2C:** The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

**Subcomponent 1.** The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.

**Subcomponent 2.** The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.

**Subcomponent 3.** The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.

**Subcomponent 4.** The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**2.C.1.** The Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) has a set of established principles and operating procedures to guide its governing roles. The responsibilities of KBOR are consistent with similar groups that oversee public universities. They have an appropriate role in appointing and evaluating the chief executive officer of the university, maintaining physical assets, developing policies such as the recently implemented post-tenure review, and approving new programs.

**2.C.2.** KBOR has an appropriately wide range of committees and councils that address issues within the purview of the Board and provide explicit relationships with diverse populations including students, faculty, and clerical and support staff.

KBOR mandates that appropriate data will be collected. These categories include student performance, the effectiveness of academic advising, retention and rate of graduation data, faculty salaries and age distribution as compared with peer AAU institutions, and mandated reviews of academic programs every eight years. Peer institutions, however, often mandate review of programs more frequently, often using a time period of five years.

**2.C.3.** The Kansas Board of Regents is remarkably free of untoward political influence. Membership must reflect both political parties and an appropriate geographical distribution of members. KBOR is, therefore, sufficiently autonomous, and KU has negotiated a significant change in its own autonomy to handle admissions, and procurement, since the 2005 *Self-Study*. KBOR also has a conflict-of-interest policy, with potential conflicts entered into the record of KBOR meetings.

**2.C.4.** The chancellor is the chief executive officer with legal authority for directing the university and final authority for all personnel decisions. Oversight of academic matters is delegated to faculty, staff, and students through University Senate Rules and

Regulations and Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations. KBOR is responsible for generic policies applicable to the six Regents universities, but the implementation of these policies rests with the faculty and administration of each university. The most commonly cited KU examples of this are the recent implementations of post-tenure review and the social media policy.

**Team Observation:**

Sentiment was expressed, strongly in some quarters, that KBOR summarily dismissed the concerns and perspectives of the faculty regarding the social media policy. Concern was also expressed, about the perception that the faculty has lost control over the curriculum, particularly within the context of the KU Core curriculum. Consideration might, therefore, be paid to the formation of a standing committee (UCCC) within the Faculty Senate charged with overseeing the core curriculum.

**Core Component 2D:** The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

**Team Determination:**      Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

- KU has a long history of commitment to freedom of expression and uses the AAUP Statement of Principles as the foundation upon which its position on academic freedom is based. Academic freedom and freedom of expression are described as core values of the institution, which have been actively defended periodically as needed.
- KU faculty is accustomed to having considerable input into policies that touch freedom of expression. The KBOR-initiated social media policy developed in the wake of a professor's 2013 tweet-gone-viral did not solicit that customary level of faculty input, causing much uproar on campus and across the Kansas system. The tweet itself caused much rancor in some circles across the state of Kansas and beyond.
- Since then, KU has been immersed in the disagreement over possible forms of resolution of the use of social media. The attention on campus that has been devoted to ways of responding to actions of KBOR and the explicit participation of faculty in creating this response indicate the institution's commitment to freedom of expression.

**Core Component 2E:** The institution ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.

**Subcomponent 2.** Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.

**Subcomponent 3.** The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**2.E.1.** KU's "robust policies and administration structures" for effective oversight of research integrity are exemplary. The structure includes offices of Research Integrity, the KU Writing Center, and the KU Libraries in addition to traditional Institutional Review Boards and the IACUC, created to oversee proposals for experiments or studies in which human and/or animal rights need to be protected.

**2.E.2.** Like many of its peer institutions, KU has adopted the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) responsible conduct of research tutorial, with excellent responses from graduate student satisfaction surveys about the value of the training they received.

KU has built an emphasis on research integrity into the Code of Students Rights and Responsibilities as well as the Code of Faculty Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct. The institution recognizes the importance of not just training faculty, students, and staff in the responsible conduct of research but also monitoring compliance through the office of Research Integrity.

Training in responsible conduct of research (RCR) is coordinated by the Office of Graduate Studies and the Research Integrity unit in the Office of Research. Completion of RCR training among graduate students has not hit KU's goal, but satisfaction of students who have completed this training is exemplary.

**2.E.3.** KU's efforts to ensure the integrity of research can be appreciated by considering the detail and rigor of the Animal Care Unit (ACU) on the Lawrence campus and the Laboratory Animal Resources department at the School of Medicine. Further evidence can be found in the policies and procedures described in the Handbook for Faculty and Unclassified Staff at the Medical School and the Scholarly Misconduct section of the University Senate Rules and regulations for the Lawrence campus.

There is evidence of a commitment to due process of procedures outlined in documents related to faculty academic misconduct, student academic misconduct, student non-academic misconduct.

**Team Determination on Criterion Two:**

Criterion is met  
 Criterion is met with concerns  
 Criterion is not met

**Summary Statement on Criterion:**

The *Self-Study*, websites, documents, and discussions during the team visit confirm that KU, flagship public university of the State of Kansas, acts with integrity across all aspects of its program, fostering conduct within its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions that is ethical, responsible, and openly communicated not only to faculty, staff, and students at the University but also to the community it serves. The University has developed an unusually comprehensive collection of well-thought-out policies and procedures to govern the conduct of students, faculty, and staff as they carry out the wide variety of complex activities that characterize a large, research-intensive university. KU is to be commended on their efforts to adopt a consistent approach to communicating these policies and procedures openly using a uniform web design and linking these policies and procedures to a searchable “KU Policy Library” website.

**Team Observation:**

What may be missing from KU’s focus on integrity is a distinctive institutional integrity statement. A specific statement may enhance strategic planning and fulfillment of those plans.

**CRITERION THREE: Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support.**

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

**Core Component 3A:** The institution’s degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

**Subcomponent 1.** Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.

**Subcomponent 3.** The institution’s program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**3.A.1.** All academic programs at the University undergo periodic review and many of the professional programs also undergo reviews by specialized accrediting agencies. All new courses and programs undergo rigorous review before approval. The right of faculty to oversee the curriculum is guaranteed by university policies, and the annual review of faculty includes an evaluation of the syllabi of the courses they teach for currency and rigor. The definition of a credit hour is included in the rules of the Faculty



Senate.

**3.A.2.** All bachelor's, master's, and doctoral programs define and publish their learning goals, and the learning goals are differentiated by degree level (for examples Spanish BA, MA, and PhD; speech language and hearing masters and doctorate; journalism BS, MS, and PhD). Similarly, the learning goals for certificate programs are differentiated from those for the related degree program. There are also (6) clear learning goals defined and published for the general education curriculum.

**3.A.3.** Academic programs at the University share identical learning goals and quality measures irrespective of the delivery mode or location. The consistency is guaranteed through course and program review. The University's compliance and standards at their additional campuses were affirmed during an HLC multilocation site visit (to the KU Public Management Center and the Salina Regional Health Center) in 2013. A specific example is the MSW that is offered in-class at the Lawrence Campus and online and as a hybrid format at locations in the western portion of the state.

**Core Component 3B:** The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

**Subcomponent 1.** The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.

**Subcomponent 3.** Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.

**Subcomponent 4.** The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.

**Subcomponent 5.** The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**3.B.1.** The University engaged in a 4-year long process that examined its previous decentralized approach to general education, with requirements spanning from minimal core requirements to a 72-hour general education curriculum that had been in existence from 1987 to 2012. This broad-based endeavor led to the adoption of a new core curriculum, the KU Core, in 2013 that has 6 learning goals and 12 specific outcomes. The measures associated with the new curriculum incorporate experiential

learning, and the goals include the development of particular skills and the acquisition of a breadth of knowledge that equip students for lifelong learning. The goals also include the study of diversity, ethics, and social responsibility and integration of knowledge across areas of study. At this stage, it is too early to assess the new curriculum or to compare it to the previous curriculum; however, the University demonstrated an ability to assess the impact of the core curriculum on students.

**3.B.2.** The core curriculum is goal- and outcome- driven and provides a liberal education. The purpose of which is to impart skills and knowledge for lifelong learning. The purpose, content, and learning outcomes of the core curriculum is articulated.

**3.B.3.** All undergraduate students complete the same core curriculum that includes a process for assessing student learning and the outcome of the learning goals as well as collecting, analyzing, and communicating information. The outcomes of the previous core curriculum were affirmed in the responses of students who completed the NSSE and/or other surveys. Students in masters programs, including terminal and professional master's degrees, as well as students in doctoral programs, typically undertake a thesis or dissertation that requires research and/or an independent investigation.

**3.B.4.** The Institution's commitment to educating students in human and cultural diversity is evident in the core curriculum that includes 91 courses that encompass an investigation of the diversity of the human experience in the U.S., and 268 courses that examine perspectives in the global community. In addition, a BA requires proficiency in a language other than English, and there are 40 language programs available at the undergraduate level. In addition, nearly a quarter of undergraduate students engage in a study abroad program. The University also has an Office of Multicultural Affairs, an Office for International Programs, and a Center for Women & Gender Equity, that positively contribute to a diverse and inclusive campus environment.

**3.B.5.** The University has developed four research themes and had \$260M in research expenditures in FY 2013. Of particular note is the School of Pharmacy that ranks second among all Schools of Pharmacy in the U.S. in NIH funding. Tenured and tenure-track faculty have a 40% research workload. The faculty have received an impressive array of distinguished research awards. There are also 90 distinguished research professors. Undergraduate students have the opportunity to participate in research and directed study experiences, and an impressive 68% of senior students who responded to a survey indicated that they had performed or exhibited work outside of a classroom assignment. Undergraduate research is further encouraged through the University's Journal of Undergraduate Research and through its hosting of symposia targeting all students. The University also provides support and encouragement for research by graduate students through financial support, hosting events, and recognizing achievements by graduate students. Independent research projects are part of the required graduate curriculum in most all disciplines.



**Core Component 3C:** The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.

**Subcomponent 2.** All instructors are appropriately credentialed, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.

**Subcomponent 3.** Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.

**Subcomponent 4.** The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.

**Subcomponent 5.** Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.

**Subcomponent 6.** Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**3.C.1.** The University has developed adequate policies on faculty performance, responsibilities, conduct, and evaluation to ensure that faculty understand the expectations of the University. At the main campus, 70% of faculty are tenured or tenure-track, and the workload of such faculty is 40:40:20 (teaching:research:service, respectively). The number of faculty has increased over the last several years, and the number of student credit hours taught by tenured faculty is comparable to AAU peers. There is a very low turnover (<5% per year) of faculty.

**3.C.2.** Of the tenure and tenure-track faculty, 98% have the terminal degree for their discipline, and the remaining faculty are hired by some programs (e.g., in the Arts) on the basis of their professional experiences. The majority of nontenure-track faculty also have a terminal degree. The departments are charged with verification of the credentials of their nontenure-track faculty.

**3.C.3.** Tenured and tenure-track faculty undergo continuous evaluation and improvement through multiple (at least 5) mechanisms, including student course evaluations, annual evaluation of faculty, progress toward tenure review, promotion/tenure review, and post-tenure review. Nontenured faculty are evaluated annually by their units. The reappointment of nontenured faculty requires a satisfactory review.

**3.C.4.** The University provides instructional support and resources for faculty, including activities provided through the Center for Teaching Excellence and the Center for

Online and Distance Learning. The University recognizes and supports faculty through teaching awards as well as research and travel support to enable faculty to stay abreast with their discipline.

**3.C.5.** University policies require that faculty are available for consultation with students. The NSSE and Senior student surveys affirm that the overwhelming majority of students believe that this is the case.

**3.C.6.** All job descriptions for staff include minimum qualifications. Most student affairs positions not only require a bachelor's degree but also list master's or even a doctoral degree as a preferred qualification. Many of the student-support units hold memberships in the appropriate national professional association and stay abreast with current best practices. The support units are responsible for the evaluation, mentoring, and professional growth of their staff. Examples of support units that provide professional development opportunities for their staff include the Undergraduate Advising Center, the Financial Aid and Scholarship Office, and the Writing Center.

**Core Component 3D:** The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.

**Subcomponent 3.** The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.

**Subcomponent 4.** The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).

**Subcomponent 5.** The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**3.D.1.** KU has appropriate support services for student learning. The Institution has recently created an Office of Undergraduate Studies, which working in conjunction with Student Affairs, coordinates an enhanced Undergraduate Advising Center and Office of First Year Experiences as well as other necessary undergraduate academic support functions, including a campus writing center, a career center, and several units which provide course based tutoring and assistance. Planning has focused on creating a better learning environment campus-wide to achieve higher graduation and first year retention

rates. There is a network of committees and taskforces that provide analysis and recommendations to guide the design and delivery of student retention and support for success as administered by this network of support service providers.

**3.D.2.** A campus wide Learning Management System (Blackboard) is used which offers online course level support to learners.

New admission standards, which will be implemented in 2016, will strive to recruit better prepared students. A remedial course in mathematics is offered for those students who are not prepared to enter the college level math sequence. New international cohorts will participate in specially designed first year courses and experiences to prepare them for academic success. Articulation agreements with community colleges allow transfer students to matriculate into appropriate courses.

**3.D.3.** The Undergraduate Advising Center assists students who have not been accepted into degree programs in aligning their career goals and interests with academic course planning.

Advising is also provided in academic units, both at the college and department level. Additional professional advisor positions have been created in recent years and many units, such as engineering, still rely on the positive touch of faculty advisement.

Online and web-based advising support is available to students with degree planning and audit software. All advising has been restructured and the institution strives for continual improvement as part of their retention efforts.

**3.D.4.** Effective teaching is supported by the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE), the Center for Online and Distance Learning (CODL), and the KUMC Teaching and Learning Technology (TLT) program. In 2013-2014, 75 courses, including three large core courses, were completely redesigned with the help of these units to facilitate more engaged learning and improved technology use. A variety of events and training opportunities exist for faculty and other teaching staff who seek teaching ideas and encouragement.

**3.D.5.** The KU libraries provide a welcoming space for student learning and collaboration with two floors of the library devoted to the “Learning Studio” where students have access to group and individual work space and modern technologies to support their work. The libraries support a comprehensive set of electronic databases and resources available on location and online. They provide ample support to acquaint students and faculty with use of resources with technology and development of information literacy skills, including teaching a component of the University 101 course. In addition to the Learning Studio, the library houses an instructional lab, computers an array of high tech tools with staffing to assist users.

**Core Component 3E:** The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

**Subcomponent 1.** Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                   Core Component is met with concerns  
                                   Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**3.E.1.** KU has a broad array of co-curricular programs which support the educational experience. The Student Involvement and Leadership Center (SILC), residential learning opportunities, the Honors Program, undergraduate research opportunities, student government, and an extensive set of clubs and organizations all provide valuable leadership and practical extension of academic learning. The Institution is committed to international programs, offering a large and varied set of study abroad opportunities along with numerous on-campus multicultural activities. The new student orientation includes a common book experience as well as the opportunity to reside in a themed learning community.

**3.E.2.** Claims made in KU publications and web-based materials were supported by observations and evidence gathered during the site visit. Data and user evaluations are collected, analyzed, and shared so that programs and activities are accurately represented. NSSE data from student surveys support the claims made.

**Distance Education Evaluation:**

KU offers a set of online learning options appropriate for its statewide mission, making KU programs available across the state and beyond. The Ph.D. in Pharmaceutical Chemistry and the Masters in Special Education are exemplary degree programs which meet specific industry and educational needs, as do distance programs in Nursing (BSN), Occupational Therapy, and the College of Education. Online degrees are being planned by the Business School and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. A wide variety of online and hybrid undergraduate courses are available for students who opt for them. Planning and development of online course offerings occur in the offering college/school and is subject to scrutiny via the curricular approval, evaluation, and hiring processes of KU. KU faculty develop and approve all courses, assuring the quality will match the face-to-face equivalent. Online student support is available in the form of online advisors for some graduate programs and online information for students not on campus. In addition to the Center for Online and Distance Learning and the Teaching and Learning Technologies offices which provide support for hybrid and blended courses as well as distance learning assistance, KU employs a corporate partner (Everspring) which works with faculty on course design. Proctored testing is available for use by any instructor wishing to employ it in an online course.

**Team Determination on Criterion Three:**

- Criterion is met  
 Criterion is met with concerns  
 Criterion is not met

**Summary Statement on Criterion:**

KU offers the broad spectrum of undergraduate, graduate, certificate, and professional programs, along with the learning appropriate activities and services that are expected of a major university. They have been very deliberate in creating valuable educational experiences for students through the KU Core general education requirements, a plethora of co-curricular activities which complement curricular efforts, as well as varied support services from advising to tutoring, to further their success. Well-qualified faculty and staff are in place to serve the instructional mission and they are provided the resources, training, and support for effective teaching.

**CRITERION FOUR: Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement.** The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

**Core Component 4A:** The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning.

**Subcomponent 3.** The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.

**Subcomponent 4.** The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.

**Subcomponent 5.** The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.

**Subcomponent 6.** The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and AmeriCorps).

**Team Determination:**  Core Component is met  
 Core Component is met with concerns  
 Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**4.A.1.** KU has a process of program review for all of programs that is mandated by the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR). The review process, initiated by KU Office of the Provost in collaboration with the KBOR, requires the review of all academic degree/major programs on an eight-year cycle. The last cycle was completed in 2013 and a new cycle will be initiated in 2015. There is 100% compliance because of origins of the process as a mandate of KBOR. Program review uses a set of criteria and questions set by KBOR and amplified by the KU administration, faculty, and staff, that has a focus on strengths, weaknesses, and plans for program improvement.

**4.A.2.** The program review process includes the preparation of a unit *Self-Study* and subsequent review by internal committees including the Executive Council of Graduate Faculty and Provost Review Committee. Summary findings are sent to the KBOR. KU provides departments with a robust set of data on students, faculty, staff, curriculum, finances, research activity, and peer data to support self-study preparation. The *Self-Study* includes sections on student learning assessment. Program faculty, deans, and the provost's office use a rating rubric to evaluate the reports and recommendations for improvement resulting from the review. Several examples were provided in the KU *Self-Study* and statements were validated by a review of information in Campus Labs (the online repository for the 2015-2023 review cycle) and discussion during the site visit. For the 2015-2023 cycle, KU plans to separate out the graduate program reviews in a way that more readily allows review by the Executive Council of the Graduate Faculty. In summary, KU has an effective program review process that demonstrates responsibility for the quality of educational programs and attention to continuous improvement.

**4.A.3.** KU accepts for transfer credit-bearing courses from regionally accredited colleges and universities, and from AP and CLEP testing. The policies for transfer and test credit, and courses that transfer are published on the admissions web site. Reviews of courses for transfer involve admissions staff and discipline-based faculty, especially in relation to state-wide KBOR-initiated transfer initiatives. KU has a policy for credit by departmental exam (Faculty Senate Rules Article V). KU does not currently offer dual credit, although we learned during the visit that planning is underway to launch dual credit in Fall 2015. Review of the evidence supports that KU administration, faculty and staff exercise responsibility and oversight for the credit it offers and other credit it awards.

**4.A.4.** There is a faculty-driven course approval and change process, and the faculty of the College and the schools hold responsibility for oversight of the curriculum, as specified in Faculty Senate documents (Article V, Section 2). Faculty are responsible to set standards for learning and learning goals within their courses and academic programs. The *Self-Study*, resource room materials, and discussions on site confirmed that accountability for these responsibilities are embedded in the assessment and program review process. Discussions and a review of the Faculty Senate documents confirmed that KU has no university-level curriculum committee or programs/academic planning committee. Consequently, cross-campus committees of faculty and staff have been convened to oversee shared activities such as the KU Core curriculum.



**4.A.5.** The University has programs and professional schools that are appropriate for external accreditation and are accredited by external bodies. The accreditations of each are in good standing. A full listing was available to the reviewers and a list of programs is at [http://www.oirp.ku.edu/hlc2015/Profiles\\_Fall14\\_1-210.pdf](http://www.oirp.ku.edu/hlc2015/Profiles_Fall14_1-210.pdf)

**4.A.6.** KU utilizes a variety of sources to obtain information on the success of its graduates. Career services are both centralized and decentralized. Nearly all academic units collect some data on graduates. KU has begun a formal tracking system for graduates, and standardized information will be available in the future from a centralized website at <http://career.ku.edu/employmentdata>. Additionally, for undergraduates, a summary of the future plans of bachelor's graduates is included in the College Portrait <http://www.collegeportraits.org/KS/KU>. Collection of employment information for PhD graduates is mostly located in the departments and assembly of information for campus-level review and public disclosure is in its infancy.

**Team Observation:**

KU is to be lauded for taking on the hard work of general education reform and putting in place the KU Core. As a learning outcome-based general education program it should serve students well. However, with 1,400 courses in the mix at the time of the visit, and growing, the possibility exists for management and assessment to become overwhelming over time. KU will need to be attentive both to how well the KU Core works for learning, but also how well it works structurally and fiscally.

**Core Component 4B:** The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.

**Subcomponent 3.** The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

**Subcomponent 4.** The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**4.B.1.** KU has an established pattern of commitment to assessment of learning in relation to general education, which has evolved over time. Through 2012, KU did a portfolio assessment of 120 graduating students annually that involved interviews with

faculty centered around student progress on six learning goals. Accumulated evidence, documented on the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) website and shared with deans, informed the development of the KU Core, the general education program for undergraduates implemented in 2013. KU also experimented with standardized tests (CLA and the ETS Proficiency Profiles) and the AAC&U VALUE rubrics. Current and planned assessment efforts are derived from lessons learned from past projects.

**4.B.2.** Assessment of the KU Core is linked to the six learning goals and outcomes associated with courses approved for the KU Core. This rubric-based approach is being overseen by the University Core Curriculum Committee, which will evaluate the findings annually to make sure that the courses are delivering on learning expectations. Discussions with the faculty and staff confirmed strong participation and engagement by those offering courses in the KU Core. The assessment of KU Core is planned for a five to six year cycle. The plan is in place and the process details are being developed.

Program review also extends to co-curricular and academic support programs as appropriate. The Student Affairs division has a process for review of all of its programs. The Division has adopted the CAS Learning and Developmental Outcomes as a framework for their divisional goals and outcomes. Each department within Student Affairs is responsible for identifying learning and development outcomes that satisfy at least one goal.

**4.B.3.** The Institution's *Self-Study* enumerated examples of how assessment improved the Curriculum, including the size of specific Chemistry courses and a revision of curriculum to include additional course offerings in the Bachelor's Degree in Health, Sport, and Exercise Science. Interviews with faculty support the conclusion that the assessment program is providing insight to make improvements.

**4.B.4.** Starting in 2013, KU implemented a comprehensive assessment plan for academic programs. The plan is well documented at <http://assessment.ku.edu>. All degree/major programs are required to establish learning goals and set a plan for measuring student progress on learning. Some activity must be conducted annually and all goals must be assessed in a six-year period. Some assessment methods must be direct assessments of student work using rubrics. It is flexible enough to serve both liberal arts programs and professional programs that have specialized accreditation without requiring a burden of "double-do" of assessment work. Periodically the information so collected is to be used to inform program improvements.

The assessment plan and collection of information is supported by training sessions and through department consulting by an assessment coordinator who is housed in the Center for Teaching Excellence. An annual symposium on assessment will launch in April 2015. The work of the assessment coordinator, which is liberally praised, is an important component of success. The assessment plan is also supported by an online collection tool from a vendor called Campus Labs, which has been artfully deployed by OIRP. The collection tool is part of the infrastructure that assures compliance and



accountability. A demonstration and review of content in Campus Labs showed a very high rate of participation and almost all programs are on schedule with submission of learning outcomes, and the required reports on assessment activities.

Faculty expressed appreciation for the growing culture of assessment that shifts the focus from teaching quality to learning and succeeding with the students you have. KU has experienced a lot of change and faculty expressed the focus on assessment and support of this activity as a “good kind of change” that is focused on learning and student success. The KU Core curriculum committee and the assessment committee were seen as productive loci of faculty collaboration by participating faculty.

**Team Observation:**

KU has launched a number of initiatives, many supported by technology, that are intended to improve the quality of the student experience. KU may benefit from a bit more consideration given to how to know which of these initiatives are really having the biggest positive impact. Over time, it may be better to amplify the most successful approaches and discontinue those with little positive impact.

**Core Component 4C:** The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.

**Subcomponent 3.** The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.

**Subcomponent 4.** The institution’s processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**4.C.1.** KU has recognized the need to improve retention, graduation rates, and timely progress to degree for decades and set in motion a data-driven plan for improvement. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) collects data on student retention, and completion. Data are publicly available on the OIRP website at <http://www2.ku.edu/~oirp/attendance/index.shtml> .

**4.C.2.** Over the past five years, KU has begun to address retention. As part of the strategic plan *Bold Aspirations*, KU has set a goal of a 90% new freshman retention rate

and 70% graduation rate. A comprehensive strategic plan for student success, launched in Fall 2014, included a number of actions to improve student progress to degree. Improvements on retention and graduation rates have been difficult to achieve given open admissions at the undergraduate level, but selective admissions standards will be implemented for the Fall 2016 entering class.

**4.C.3.** Additional initiatives underway to improve retention include technology supported programs such as Starfish/MySuccess early warning system, advising dashboard in Tableau, and EAB Student Success Collaborative platform. KU will need to develop a process to evaluate what works and what deserves long term continued investment. And, more importantly, will need the determination to fully implement and really make and stay with changes that will have an impact.

**4.C.4.** The Graduate in Four (GIF) task force report also identified strategies to improve retention. Several initiatives launched by the GIF project have had visible impacts. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences adopted a policy requiring declaration of a major no later than completion of 60 credit hours. Enrollment holds may be placed on students who do not declare a major in a timely fashion, and this has caused the percent of upperclassmen with declared majors to improve steadily. A communication strategy to emphasize taking more than 12 credit hours in a term was initiated. Degree plans will be published for all undergraduate programs in the catalog.

Students we spoke to have a strong attachment to the University. They respect and believe in the mission of the institution. These beliefs go a long way in retaining students in the competitive market place in which KU resides.

#### **Team Observation:**

The percentage point gap between KU's graduation rate and first year retention rate is rather significant. KU should carefully consider a focus on ways to improve the graduation rate. One opportunity to improve this would be to address the issue of when KU students are unable to get into their intended major because of a GPA that doesn't meet the admission requirements. These students very often have no viable options in similar programs available to them and many end up going to other institutions that have majors that they can enter.

Efforts may be needed to make retention at KU a whole campus effort and focus. Although a planning committee is essential and is in place, the retention emphasis needs to be communicated very broadly to get wide buy-in. It would seem advisable to make sure student affairs and the academic units are integrated into the planning and expectations.

KU should commit resources to fully develop a comprehensive enrollment management plan which would encompass transfer student enrollment, distance learning, international admission, retention of current students, and recruitment activities. There does not seem to be a cohesive effort behind the many enrollment/retention initiatives. Nor does it seem that there is the sense of urgency among staff and faculty to the level in which is likely necessary considering the future enrollment trends and future financial

outlook. Plans for international student enrollment, however, seemed very ambitious and too optimistic. If even partially successful, it would require a plan to address the special needs of these students.

**Team Determination on Criterion Four:**

- Criterion is met
- Criterion is met with concerns
- Criterion is not met

**Summary Statement on Criterion:**

KU had demonstrated with evidence that it takes responsibility for the quality of its educational programs and has processes in place for assessment and program improvement; the components of criterion four are met. Program review takes place on a regular basis and is supported by actions at the level of the deans offices, the Provost's office, and the KBOR. There are processes in place to oversee the courses taught by KU and also the additional credit KU awards in transfer and based in external testing. Expectations and processes are in place for assessment of student learning both for all of the academic programs KU offers and for undergraduate general education. As for program review, assessment activities are supported by faculty committees that have leadership from the provost's office. Both program review and assessment are supported by an online infrastructure that both delivers information to and collects information from the academic units in a systematic way that supports accountability for effective processes. KU has established plans for improvement of undergraduate retention and graduation rates and has supported goals with a number of changes including putting in place new student support systems and preparations to implement more selective admissions standards. KU is to be lauded for an impressive and energetic array of new activities and ambitious directions.

KU administrators, faculty, and staff are encouraged to take a cross-cutting look at the range of activities and initiatives in support of improving the undergraduate experience and consider how the ambitious goals for retention and graduation and quality educational experience can best be realized, through some additional comprehensive planning.

**CRITERION FIVE: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness.** The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

**Core Component 5A:** The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

The University of Kansas has worked diligently to change its mix of funding given a decline in the percentage that state support contributes to the financing of the university. Tuition revenue has surpassed state appropriations as an income source from FY 2000 through FY 2014. Various annual financial reports are published that describe the

University's financial position.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.

**Subcomponent 3.** The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.

**Subcomponent 4.** The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.

**Subcomponent 5.** The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

**Team Determination:**      Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**5.A.1.** Over the last decade, and particularly during the most recent five years, the University of Kansas has had a significant decrease in state general funds as a consequence of declining state revenues and then as a result of large State of Kansas tax cuts. In order to maintain resources to support its mission, tuition has been increased such that over the past decade the ratio of state appropriations to tuition for the Lawrence campus has changed from 52%/48% to 34%/66%. In constant dollars, general use funding per full time equivalent student (FTE) was \$14,468 in Fiscal Year 2004. This amount grew to \$17,979 per FTE in Fiscal Year 2014 according to the *Self-Study*. Undergraduate tuition for nonresident students, according to the *Self-Study*, covers 156.7% of GU educational costs on the Lawrence campus.

A five-year tuition enhancement plan concluded in FY 2007. By the end of the plan, the University had increased tuition revenues by \$50 million annually. Proposals for each of the five years were developed on the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on University Funding, composed of students, faculty, and staff and had strong student support. Tuition enhancement funded 100 new faculty positions, increased faculty salaries by nine percent, added over 45 FTE staff positions, raised unclassified staff salaries by six percent, increased graduate teaching assistant salaries by 30%, expanded graduate research assistant tuition, and created 50 GTA/lecturer positions. The plan also set aside additional funding for need-based financial aid. While the State has not allocated any sustained general support increases in recent years, it has provided important targeted budget increases: 1) expanding the engineering program in 2011 with funding in the amount of \$3.5 million per year for the next 10 years starting in FY 2013; 2) funding for 12 Foundation Distinguished Professors in 2012 with \$3 million annually beginning in FY 2013; and 3) \$25 million state-financed bonds issued in FY 2015 for the Medical Education Building at KUMC.

In August 2014, Standard & Poor's lowered the state's bond rating to AA from AA+, citing a lack of "structural balance between revenues and expenditures." Earlier, in May 2014, Moody's downgraded the Institution to Aa2 from Aa1 based on "pressures related to the state's budgetary challenges, as well as declining enrollment." This could mean that borrowing money in the future will be more expensive for the university and have an adverse effect on capacity to debt finance new facilities or improvements.

The main campus in Lawrence occupies approximately 1,000 acres and has over 200 buildings. Ten of KU's 13 schools are based in Lawrence, as are internationally recognized museums, libraries, research centers, and laboratories. The Lawrence campus also provides oversight for additional locations in several Kansas cities including Garden City, Hays, Kansas City, Fort Leavenworth, Salina, Topeka, and Wichita. Since 2005, over \$478 million in capital improvements have been completed on the Lawrence and Edwards campuses.

In 2012-2013, the University developed a comprehensive Campus Master Plan for the Lawrence and Edwards campuses to guide investment in the physical campuses from 2014-2024. Findings from the master plan document the need for additional space for classrooms, laboratories, and research. It also identifies deferred maintenance needs of \$300 million including mission-critical facilities, such as science facilities and utilization of existing classroom and teaching laboratory space. Thus, the institution has the analyses in place to effectively plan future investments and management of its physical resources. Despite its planning for deferred maintenance, the resources to implement the plan do not appear to be available.

Priorities are set using a Capital Projects Committee. On an annual basis, the Lawrence and Edwards campuses receive \$9.4 million in State of Kansas funds for Repair and Rehabilitation funds to support the maintenance of academic and research buildings resulting in only 0.75% of the insurance value of the buildings. This amount likely will decline in future years. The percentage would be much lower if infrastructure/utilities 'below' the ground were considered. The amounts for maintenance are very inadequate for long term facility maintenance, even though additional resources are provided by the Institution.

The Medical Center engaged in a master planning process in 2010-12. The Facilities Master Plan outlines the facilities needed to support 21<sup>st</sup> century educational methods and practices and to accommodate expansion of KU Hospital and university research programs. Findings from the planning process identified a need for improving and replacing current space and adding new space for a projected increase in medical school enrollments and research activities. The KU Endowment Association provides an important source of funding for the University. According to the 2014 Annual Financial Report, the net assets of the Endowment Association as of June 30, 2014, exceeded \$1.725 billion. The Endowment Association provided \$119.4 million of support the University in FY 2013.

**5.A.2.** The Institution is fully accountable to the Kansas Board of Regents relative to financial matters, budgetary policies, and audit and financial compliance. The University maintains control over tuition revenue collected from students. Since 2007, a Tuition Advisory Committee (TAC), composed of students, faculty, deans, and administrators along with staff support, convenes each spring semester to make a recommendation to the chancellor on tuition for the upcoming academic year. Students from the Lawrence Campus who serve on this body are recommended by the president of the student body. Faculty are recommended through faculty governance processes.

Resource planning for the Lawrence Campus begins in the fall and continues throughout the year. Beginning with fall meetings, the Vice Provost for Administration and Finance, the Provost, the vice provosts and the deans describe resource needs for the current fiscal year and beyond. This is followed each spring with resource planning meetings with each dean, vice provost, and major unit director to discuss priorities, planning, budget, and staffing. A member of the governance committee on Planning and Resources also attends each meeting and reports back to the University Senate. In addition, the Tuition Advisory Committee meets throughout the spring to outline and recommend priorities for KU's tuition proposal to the Kansas Board of Regents.

During FY 2014, the Lawrence campus shifted from an incremental to an all funds budget process. The all funds budget approach has goals designed to encompass the budgeting of all sources of funding, to inform budget development with cost drivers and quality metrics, to enable comprehensive budget understanding and budget transparency for all stakeholders, and to create budgetary incentives to grow enrollment and sponsored research, and to reward accountability.

The University prepares a consolidated annual financial report after the close of each fiscal year. The University does not have its own audit but is part of the State of Kansas audit. The total net position of the University as of June 30, 2014, according to the 2014 *Annual Financial Report* was "...\$1,069.7 million, a \$21.5 million increase over the prior year, or a 2.1% increase in net position."

**5.A.3.** The mission of the University is operationalized in its strategic plan and progress toward the goals of the strategic plan is reported to stakeholders through annual reports. The 2014 *Annual Report* included metrics that illustrate progress toward the achievement of the goals of the strategic plan as well as strategies that are employed to make progress toward achieving the goals of the strategic plan. Highlights include increases in federal research expenditures, a reduction in the median time for doctoral students to complete their degrees, growth in material transfer agreements, and an increase in the dollar amount of philanthropic gifts. Examples of areas where progress has not been made from FY 2010 through FY 2013 include the percent of "minority staff," and student participation in study abroad. Administrators and faculty freely acknowledged that the strategic plan is a work in progress and improvements still need to be made in a number of its aspects.

**5.A.4.** Goal 5 of *Bold Aspirations* has four strategies focused on fostering an



excellent and diverse faculty and staff: (1) enhance the recruitment process for excellence in hiring, (2) develop and retain talent and leadership, (3) be accountable (faculty and staff evaluation), and (4) enhance the diversity of faculty, staff, and the student body.

The University understands that faculty and staff are its most valuable resources. The Institution has a stable employee base and continues to invest in sufficient faculty and staff to support its operations. KU is committed to ensuring that it has outstanding faculty and staff. In FY 2004, there were 954 full time faculty (excluding lecturers) on the Lawrence campus. In FY 2014, there were 1,020. Part of the notable tuition enhancement increase in the mid-2000s was specifically targeted to increase the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty. Resignations and terminations of faculty historically have been very low with a turnover rate that is typically less than 5 percent.

The Institution conducts compensation studies to assure its position meets market conditions. The last State of Kansas salary increases was 1.5 percent increase in FY 2009. After no increases in FY 2010 or FY 2011, student members of the Tuition Advisory Committee recommended tuition increases to provide faculty and staff salary increases of at least 2 percent in FY 2012, FY 2013, FY 2014, and FY 2015. Compared to Midwest peer group of institutions, KU faculty compensation typically has been 98% to 100% of the comparison group weighted average.

In 2011, the University introduced Hiring for Excellence search strategies to increase the diversity of candidate pools and ensures that KU hires faculty members who will succeed. The program has increased the likelihood of a successful and diverse search outcome from historically underrepresented groups. Evidence of the success of this institutional strategy includes a program of expanded searches in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences that provided 14 additional candidates; of these, six have been hired.

All staff and faculty job postings are required to have position descriptions that identify required qualifications that candidates must meet in order to be hired. The hiring manager or search committee must ensure that the candidate offered the position meets all required qualifications and has the appropriate skills, knowledge, and experiences for the position.

*Far Above: The Campaign for Kansas* calls for \$300 million in support of recruiting and retaining the most distinguished faculty and providing the physical and financial resources needed to succeed. Compensation studies have been completed for non-faculty staff positions. As of August 2014, 31 percent of 2,100 reviewed positions have received increases to put them closer to market rates.

Staff are required to undergo an annual review of strengths and opportunities for growth with a self-evaluation and manager-evaluation section. KU has recently

purchased and will be implementing a new competency-based performance management and learning management system to facilitate staff development and performance review. KU is also in the process of implementing a post-tenure review process.

Staff and faculty are offered a variety of opt-in and required training to further their professional development and/or to comply with regulations. Courses offered by Human Resources, Information Technology, KU Libraries, Environmental Health and Safety, and other departments range from one-hour to multi-day sessions. Participation in these programs requires supervisory approval but does not require the use of paid leave time to attend.

Training related to specific job duties is offered, and sometimes required, for faculty and staff. This includes training related to FERPA, HIPAA, human subjects, animal subjects, hazardous waste handling and disposal, ADA, risk management, sexual harassment, and compliance.

**5.A.5.** According to the *Self-Study*, units are responsible for budgeting and managing funding that is available to the unit. Operating budgets are tracked centrally. *Budcast*, is a reporting system that tracks budgets and is available to unit heads and budget managers. Managers meet monthly with the comptroller and office staff to review budgets, budgetary processes, and adjustment for succeeding years. Units are expected to reconcile budgets monthly. The process outlined in the *Self-Study* was confirmed in conversation with budget managers during the campus visit. The budget development and oversight process used by the Medical Center is similar to the process described above. Annual financial reports are prepared to conform with GASB (Governmental Accounting Standards Board) principles.

**Core Component 5B:** The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

The nine-member Board of Regents is the governing board of the state's six universities and the statewide coordinating board for the state's 32 public higher education institutions. The board's structure and reporting mechanisms ensure that it is knowledgeable about KU and its needs. Through its decision-making structures, reporting requirements, and evaluation of the Chancellor, the board provides institutional oversight.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.

**Subcomponent 2.** The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight for the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.

**Subcomponent 3.** The institution enables the involvement of its administration, faculty, staff, and



students in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**5.B.1.** Nine individuals comprise the Board of Regents (BOR) (<http://www.kansasregents.org/>). Board members provide oversight for Kansas's six public universities and represent all of the Congressional districts as well as both political parties, with no more than five members being appointed from one political party or the other. The Board is served by an extensive staff according to the *Self-Study*.

Interviews with Board members during the Team's visit indicated that the Board members are enthusiastic in their support of the University, knowledgeable about their operations, and committed to its growth and development. Monthly Board meetings are held. The KBOR provides oversight of the Chancellor and receives a number of routine reports and briefings. Among these is the annual financial report. The KBOR approves KU's revenue structure including tuition and fees.

**5.B.2.** Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort. The structure, functions, and rules of governance are formalized in the following documents: University Senate Code (CODE), University Senate Rules and Regulations (USRR), and Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSRR). The Medical Center has a governance system separate from the Lawrence Campus.

**Core Component 5C:** The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

Since 2000, KU has engaged in three, inclusive comprehensive planning exercises. The most recent resulted in *Bold Aspirations*, the plan for the Lawrence and Edwards campuses and the Medical Center Strategic Plan. Both comprehensive plans focus on education, research, human resources, diversity, and using the university's resources for public impact. Strategic plans are integrated with the comprehensive campus master plans. Resource allocation decisions are tightly coupled to strategic plans.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.

**Subcomponent 3.** The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.

**Subcomponent 4.** The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current

capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.

**Subcomponent 5.** Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

**Team Determination:**     Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**5.C.1.** The Institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting. The University has policies, procedures, and practices in place to enhance communication across constituencies and engage them in university governance. The governance system ensures broad participation by faculty, staff, and students in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes; and, in the case of Student Senate, for allocating approximately \$20 million annually in student fees. The presidents of the Lawrence and Medical Center faculty senates sit on the KBOR Council of Faculty Senate Presidents.

The institutional plan is aligned to mission and budget as evidenced by resources deployed to priorities stated in the various planning documents. The plan embraces by providing resources for the following goals:

Goal 1 — Energizing the Educational Environment: The University has reorganized existing resources and added other resources, which have been allocated to enhance undergraduate education.

Goal 2 — Elevating Doctoral Education by tripling the amount of funding for doctoral fellowships.

Goal 3 — Driving Discovery and Innovation to fund research initiatives.

Goal 4 — Engaging Scholarship for Public Impact to bring innovation to the marketplace for the benefit of society and the university and to develop, expand, and promote experiential learning on the campus.

Goal 5 — Developing Excellence in People in order to attract and retain excellent faculty and staff.

Goal 6 — Developing Infrastructure and Resources such as KU's 2014–2024 Campus Master Plan that includes extensive analysis and reports on space and classroom and to acquire funding from the state and from private sources to improve the physical infrastructure of the campus such as the new \$70.5 million School of Business building, to be completed in 2016, which is being funded primarily through private support and systematic program review for academic units.

**5.C.2.** The University engages in systematic program review. The most recent cycle was completed in 2013. According to the *Self-Study*, “In order to support KU's retention initiatives, the university has established first-year seminars, a Common Book program, the experiential learning collaborative, an office for undergraduate research, additional focus on study abroad, internship opportunities, and other student-focused

retention programs. Programs are assessed routinely and expanded and modified as needed based on that assessment.” A number of these initiatives are still in the nascent stage and work is in process to expand and shape them to achieve the goals that have been established for them. For example, according to the *Self-Study*, students were enrolled in a first year seminar in 2013, and 608 first year students enrolled in an orientation course.

**5.C.3.** The Institution plans based on a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution’s sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.

In the 2010–2011 academic year, the campus and Lawrence community engaged in a strategic planning process to create a five-year plan that would transform the University at all levels to meet state demand for a world-class research university. This effort resulted in *Bold Aspirations*.

The resulting priorities became KU’s four strategic initiative themes:

1. Sustaining the Planet, Powering the World.
2. Promoting Well-Being, Finding Cures.
3. Building Communities, Expanding Opportunities.
4. Harnessing Information, Multiplying Knowledge.

**5.C.4.** A variety of plans has been developed to address various issues related to developing adequate revenue to accomplish the mission and goals of the University. Among these are plans identified in the *Self-Study* and included financial aid, enrollment management, research and “significant investments were made centrally to elevate and enhance the university’s market position and market profile.” Examples of success in this area are increases in licensing revenue, licensing agreements, patent issues, and industry-sponsored research.

**5.C.5.** State of Kansas support for higher education has declined over the past decade. The federal research budget is stable at best. Tuition cannot be increased enough to cover shortfalls from state budget cuts and declines in Kansas resident students.

Leadership at KU has moved aggressively over the last decade to manage the impact of these fluctuations. The University heavily lobbied the Legislature so that programs important to the state (School of Pharmacy and School of Engineering) would receive strategic investments to allow enrollment growth to provide an increased number of engineers and pharmacists for Kansas.

Enrollment management, while still focused on recruiting talented students from within the state, has strategically increased investments to increase out-of-state and international enrollment, resulting in a change of enrollment mix from a longtime 70 percent in-state/30 percent out-of-state student mix to a current 65 percent/35 percent mix. In addition, the creation of the Center for Online and Distance Learning and a

partnership with Everspring are increasing the numbers of students taking online courses and enrolling in online degree programs. The KU Academic Accelerator Program's goal is to double international student enrollment.

First-year enrollment has increased each of the past three years, and overall enrollment increased in Fall 2014. The University is monitoring growth carefully, as leaders are aware that exceeding approximately 30,000 students will require growth in physical infrastructure.

Research funding from federal and state agencies, foundations, and companies is particularly sensitive to economy-driven fluctuations. Estimates of annual research are produced with these potential fluctuations in mind and reflects the best available information and current thinking of senior leadership. Estimates of future resources are based on conservative principles using appropriate models.

**Core Component 5D:** The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

**Subcomponent 1.** The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.

**Subcomponent 2.** The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

**Team Determination:**      Core Component is met  
                                    Core Component is met with concerns  
                                    Core Component is not met

**Evidence:**

**5.D.1.** The University of Kansas publishes an annual document related to its strategic plan (*Bold Aspirations*). The *2014 Strategic Plan Annual Report* included such information as metrics related to the strategic plan, the strategic plan itself, and a narrative of examples of progress made by the university as illustrated by various initiatives and programs.

An annual financial report as well as a more detailed report entitled "Annual Financial Information" are published. Other units and programs also publish periodic reports and messages.

**5.D.2.** Through the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, the University uses several data bases to track its performance to improve institutional effectiveness. The Office of Enrollment Management and units dedicated to improving student retention and graduation rates started using data analytic tools to improve student recruitment, retention, and progression. Data are collected and reports about progress toward goal or project completion to match the strategic plans are made.

Kansas utilizes a form of performance-based budgeting for higher education. Each year, KU reports to the Kansas Board of Regents on its progress on several key

performance indicators.

The Lawrence Campus and the Medical Center provide data for planning and management information including academic, human resources, financials, space usage, student administration, financial aid, and enrollment management.

KU managed the effects of the federal government shutdown and sequestration on its research operation through careful planning. Use of internal funds, such as those from *Changing for Excellence*, along with leveraging federal research dollars, will be key to remaining competitive.

**Team Observation:**

Serious consideration to faculty and staff salaries is necessary. KU has managed to keep up with its peers in recent years through modest increases. But as the economies in other states improve, KU may find itself once again falling behind and at the risk of losing its strongest faculty members and administrators if salary increases remain low.

**Team Determination on Criterion Five:**

- Criterion is met
- Criterion is met with concerns
- Criterion is not met

**Summary Statement on Criterion:**

The University of Kansas has engaged in a planning process that has resulted in a strategic plan entitled *Bold Aspirations* that guides its planning and operations. Examples abound through a review of the University's web sites and printed documents that demonstrate how this process guides the university's activities. The University has responded to a decrease in state appropriations for operating expenditures by increasing tuition through a five-year plan completed in 2007 and developing other resources through initiatives such as *Changing for Excellence*, a restructuring initiative of administrative and operations activities, the development of an Enrollment Management office, and *Far Above: The Campaign for Kansas*, a fund raising campaign with a goal of \$1.2 billion that in all likelihood will exceed its goal. The University leadership regularly partners via a consultative culture of the University with formal and informal constituent leadership by University Senate, Faculty Senate, Student Senate, Unclassified Professional Staff Senate, and University Support Staff Senate on the Lawrence campus, Medical Center Faculty Senate, as well as various committees and task forces that engage in shared leadership with senior administrators.

**V. TEAM RECOMMENDATION**

## A. Affiliation Status

1. **Recommendation:** Approve re-accreditation for a 10-year period.
2. **Timing for Next Reaffirmation Evaluation:** 2024 - 2025
3. **Rationale:** The University of Kansas has met all of the criteria and core components and federal compliance requirements for continued accreditation. This last decade has occurred in an environment of rapid change being both very fulfilling and very challenging as the Institution has undergone a culture change as it adapts to new leadership and environmental forces. Many aspects of this rapid change are still a work-in-progress. KU is guided by a strong, current, and publically articulated mission statement, driving a systematic and integrated strategic planning process entitled *Bold Aspirations*. The Institution operates ethically with integrity, having a comprehensive collection of policies and procedures, publically available in the Policy Library. The Institution values and is strongly committed to freedom of expression. KU has developed an excellent learning environment for its students embedded within a very strong research environment. The learning environment is characterized by excellence in curricular components, comprised of strong disciplinary courses and programs based on learning outcomes. Currency is maintained by a regular program review and assessment processes. Especially noteworthy is the reformation of general education into the KU Core. The learning environment is also supported by a plethora of services such as advising, a teaching center, and assessment procedures. A strong array of co-curricular services and activities strongly support the academic programs. The Institution has also created innovative methods to address important issues as diversity, sexual harassment, retention, and graduation rates. KU has also had to deal with serious challenges such as significant decreases in state financial support and decreasing/fluctuating enrollment. In its response to financial pressures, the Institution looked inward using a process entitled *Changing for Excellence* to find efficiencies and funds to advance critical parts of the Institution. In addition, the University has initiated a bold fundraising campaign, *Far Above: The Campaign for Kansas*. KU has very strong support from its stakeholders – administrators, faculty, staff, students, alumni, and the Kansas Board of Regents. Faculty and staff are appropriately credentialed, and there are many development programs for their advancement. Students are particularly strong ambassadors. The Institutional leadership has provided great, astute forward vision followed with subsequent action to advance the Institution. KU, as the public research flagship institution, has an impressive commitment to the State of Kansas, serving its constituents and communities in many mutually beneficial ways by expanding its programs and activities for the State. Notable is the role of the Kansas University Medical Center in expanding its programs to Wichita and Salina. In summary, it was clear to the team that KU deserves a recommendation for continued accreditation.
4. **Criterion-related Monitoring Required (report, focused visit):** None
5. **Federal Compliance Monitoring Required (report, focused visit):** None

**B. Commission Sanction or Adverse Action: None****VI. EMBEDDED CHANGES IN AFFILIATION STATUS**

Did the team review any of the following types of change in the course of its evaluation? Check Yes or No for each type of change.

- Yes  No Legal Status
- Yes  No Degree Level
- Yes  No Program Change
- Yes  No Distance or Correspondence Education
- Yes  No Contractual or Consortia Arrangements
- Yes  No Mission or Student Body
- Yes  No Clock or Credit Hour
- Yes  No Additional Locations or Campuses
- Yes  No Access to Notification
- Yes  No Access to Expedited Desk Review
- Yes  No Teach-out Arrangement
- Yes  No Other Change



## Appendix A

### Interactions with Constituencies

Title	Department		Title	Department
Chancellor	Office of the Chancellor		Executive Director	Lied Center
Provost	Provost		Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Admissions	Mathematics
Chair	Kansas Board of Regents		Associate Professor	Mechanical Engineering/Bioengineering
President/CEO	Kansas Board of Regents		Associate Professor	Mechanical Engineering
Director	Academic Achievement and Access Center		Professor/Director	Molecular Biosciences/Office for Diversity in Science Training
Assistant to the Senior Vice Provost	Academic Affairs		Associate Professor	Music
Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs	Academic Affairs		Assistant Professor	Music Education & Music Therapy
Director	Academic Programs for Excellence		Associate Professor/Director of Faculty Programs	Music Therapy and Music Education/International Programs
Vice Provost for Administration & Finance	Administration and Finance		Assistant Vice Provost/Director	Office of First-Year Experience
Associate Professor	African and African American Studies		Director	Office of Multicultural Affairs
Associate Professor	Architecture		Public Affairs Officer	Office of Public Affairs
Executive Chairman	Bioscience and Technology Business Center		Associate Vice Chancellor	Office of Research
Associate Vice Provost/Budget Director	Budget Office		Associate Vice Chancellor	Office of Research
Associate Professor	Business		Director of External Affairs	Office of Research
Professor/Director, International Center for Ethics in Business	Business		Facilities Manager	Office of Research
Assistant Vice Provost - Capital Planning & Space Management	Campus Operations		Interim Vice Chancellor for Research	Office of Research
Director	Center for Online and Distance Learning		Chief Business and Financial Planning Officer	Office of the Chancellor
Director	Center for Teaching Excellence		University Ombuds	Ombuds Office
Documenting Learning Specialist	Center for Teaching Excellence		Associate Dean/Professor	Pharmaceutical Chemistry
Professor/KU Faculty Athletics Representative	Chemical & Petroleum Engineering		Foundation Distinguished Professor/Director, Kansas Vaccine Institute/Director, Higuchi Biosciences Center	Pharmaceutical Chemistry
Professor	Chemistry		Clinical Assistant Professor/Director	Pharmacy Practice/Multicultural Pharmacy Scholars Program
Distinguished Professor	Child Language		Professor	Physics and Astronomy
Associate Professor	Civil, Environmental and Architectural Engineering		Director	Policy Office
Associate Professor	Classics		Associate Professor/Director, Center for Global & International Studies	Political Science



<b>Title</b>	<b>Department</b>		<b>Title</b>	<b>Department</b>
Administrative Director, Student Academic Services	College of Liberal Arts & Sciences		Associate Vice Provost/Chief Procurement Officer	Procurement Services
Dean	College of Liberal Arts & Sciences		Professor/Chair	Psychology
Director of Student Academic Services	College of Liberal Arts & Sciences		Associate Professor	Psychology & Research in Education
Dean's Project Leader for Online Program Development/Professor	College of Liberal Arts & Sciences/Psychology		Director	Public Affairs
Associate Professor	Communication Studies		Director	Research Integrity
Associate Professor/Chair	Communication Studies		Dean	School of Architecture, Planning and Design
Executive Director	Continuing Education		Assistant Dean of Academic Programs, Director of Student Academic Services	School of Business
Director	Counseling and Psychological Services		Dean	School of Business
Associate Professor	Curriculum and Teaching		Professor	School of Business
Associate Professor	Curriculum and Teaching		Professor and Stockton Faculty Fellow	School of Business
University Architect/Director	Design & Construction Management		Professor/Associate Dean of Faculty Development and Research	School of Business
Professor/Chair	Ecology and Evolutionary Biology		Dean	School of Education
Professor	Economics		Director of Advising/Director of Multicultural Scholars Program	School of Education
Doctoral Student	Educational Leadership and Policy Studies		Dean	School of Engineering
Professor and Chair	Educational Leadership and Policy Studies		Director of Undergraduate Academic Services	School of Engineering
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Program Development	Edwards Campus		Office Manager	School of Engineering Undergraduate Programs
Assistant Vice Chancellor of Enrollment and Student Services	Edwards Campus		Assistant Dean, Student Services Coordinator	School of Journalism and Mass Communications
Vice Chancellor	Edwards Campus		Associate Professor/Director of Special Projects & Innovation	School of Journalism and Mass Communications
Distinguished Professor/Chair	Electrical Engineering and Computer Science		Associate Professor/Interim News & Information Chair	School of Journalism and Mass Communications
Executive Director	Emily Taylor Center for Women & Gender Equity		Dean	School of Journalism and Mass Communications
Assistant Professor	English		Professor	School of Journalism and Mass Communications
Associate Director of Freshman-Sophomore English	English		Dean	School of Law
Professor	English		Professor	School of Law
Assistant Vice Provost	Enrollment Management		Professor	School of Law
Assistant Vice Provost/Director	Experiential Learning		Assistant Professor	School of Music
Acting Vice Provost	Faculty Development		Dean	School of Music

<b>Title</b>	<b>Department</b>		<b>Title</b>	<b>Department</b>
Associate Director, Academic Programs	First-Year Experience		Director of Student Services	School of Music
Associate Professor	French & Italian		Dean	School of Pharmacy
Custodial Supervisor	FS Zone Maintenance		Director	School of Pharmacy
Assistant Dean	Graduate Studies		Professor	School of Public Affairs and Administration
Dean	Graduate Studies		Professor/Director, Institute for Policy and Social Research	School of Public Affairs and Administration
Director of Graduate Enrollment	Graduate Studies		Interim Dean	School of Social Welfare
Executive Director	Hilltop Child Development Center		Assistant Vice Provost, Shared Service Centers	Shared Service Centers
Associate Professor	History		Campus Administration & Operations Finance Manager	Shared Service Centers
Distinguished Professor/Director, Hall Center for the Humanities	History		Professor/Director, Gerontology Center	Sociology
Associate Professor/Director	History/Center for East Asian Studies		Associate Professor	Spanish & Portuguese
Associate Vice Provost for Human Resource Management	Human Resource Management		Professor	Spanish & Portuguese
Director	Human Resource Management		Professor/Chair	Special Education
Associate Professor	Indigenous Studies		Associate Professor/Associate Dean	Special Education/School of Education
Chief Information Officer	Information Technology		Clinical Assistant Professor	Speech-Language-Hearing
Chief of Staff	Information Technology		Professor/Chair	Speech-Language-Hearing
Director	Information Technology		Collection Manager	Spencer Museum of Art
Director	Information Technology		Director	Spencer Museum of Art
Director	Information Technology		Doctoral Student in Ecology & Evolutionary Biology	Student
Director	Information Technology		Doctoral Student in Pharmacy	Student
Director	Information Technology		Junior in Journalism	Student
Director of Technology	Information Technology		Junior in Political Science	Student
Program Director	Information Technology		Junior in Pre-Medicine	Student
Director	Institutional Compliance		Senior in American Studies and Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies	Student
Director of Accessibility & ADA Education	Institutional Opportunity & Access		Senior in Anthropology	Student
Assistant Director	Institutional Research & Planning		Senior in Biochemistry	Student
Assistant Director/Special Assistant to the Senior Vice Provost	Institutional Research & Planning		Senior in Biology	Student
Program Manager	Institutional Research & Planning		Senior in Biology	Student
Research Analyst	Institutional Research & Planning		Senior in Marketing	Student
University Director	Institutional Research & Planning		Student Body President/Senior in Journalism	Student
University Director	Internal Audit		Assistant Vice Provost	Student Affairs
Assistant Vice Provost	International Programs		Associate Vice Provost	Student Affairs

<b>Title</b>	<b>Department</b>		<b>Title</b>	<b>Department</b>
Assistant Vice Provost	International Programs		Director of Student Affairs Research	Student Affairs
Media Manager	Kansas Public Radio		Program Coordinator	Student Affairs
Senior Vice President for Communications	KU Alumni Association		Program Director-Student Money Management Services	Student Affairs
Associate Athletic Director - Administration	KU Athletics		Vice Provost for Student Affairs	Student Affairs
Associate Athletics Director - Compliance	KU Athletics		Director	Student Housing
Associate Athletics Director - Student Athlete Support Services	KU Athletics		Locksmith	Student Housing
Athletic Director	KU Athletics		Director	Student Involvement & Leadership Center
Assistant Vice President for Development	KU Endowment		Director	Study Abroad
President	KU Endowment		Professor	Theatre
Senior Vice President for Development	KU Endowment		Senior Judge	U.S. District Court - District of Kansas
Interim President/Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Innovation & Entrepreneurship	KU Innovation & Collaboration		Vice Provost & Dean of Undergraduate Studies	Undergraduate Studies
Assessment and Strategy Librarian	KU Libraries		Assistant Vice Provost	University Career Center
Assistant Dean of Content & Access Services	KU Libraries		Administrative Associate Sr	University Governance
Assistant Dean of Research and Learning	KU Libraries		Retired Staff	University Governance
Interim Dean	KU Libraries		Associate Director	University Honors Program
Interim Dean of Libraries	KU Libraries		Director	University Honors Program
University Archivist	KU Libraries		Associate Professor	Urban Planning
Executive Vice Chancellor	KU Medical Center		Associate Professor/Chair	Urban Planning
Director	KU Memorial Unions		Associate Professor	Visual Art
Director	KU Recreation Services		Director, Chief of Staff	Watkins Health Services
Chief Executive Officer	Lawrence Arts Center			
CEO	Lawrence Chamber of Commerce		Associate Dean for Finance	KUMC - School of Medicine
Vice President, External Affairs	Lawrence Chamber of Commerce		Associate Dean for Medical Education	KUMC - School of Medicine
Sports Marketing Manager	Lawrence Convention and Visitors Bureau		Associate Dean for Student Affairs	KUMC - School of Medicine
City Manager	Lawrence, Kansas		Director of Assessment and Evaluation	KUMC - School of Medicine
Associate Dean of Graduate Studies	KUMC		Executive Dean	KUMC - School of Medicine
Associate General Counsel	KUMC		Research Integrity Officer	KUMC - School of Medicine
Associate Vice Chancellor for Finance	KUMC		Senior Associate Dean for Medical Education	KUMC - School of Medicine
Director of Human Research Protection Program and HSC	KUMC		Vice Chancellor for Clinical Affairs	KUMC - School of Medicine
Director of Institutional Animal Care	KUMC		Dean	KUMC - School of Medicine Salina Campus

<b>Title</b>	<b>Department</b>		<b>Title</b>	<b>Department</b>
Vice Chancellor for Administration	KUMC		Dean	KUMC - School of Medicine Wichita Campus
Vice Chancellor for Finance/CFO	KUMC		Associate Dean of Graduate Programs	KUMC - School of Nursing
Vice Chancellor for Research	KUMC		Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs/ Clinical Professor	KUMC - School of Nursing
Vice Chancellor of Student Services	KUMC		Director of Business & Fiscal Affairs	KUMC - School of Nursing
Senior Vice Chancellor/Dean	KUMC - Academic Affairs and Student Affairs/School of Medicine and School of Health Professions		Dean of Faculty Affairs	KUMC - Wichita Campus
Vice Chancellor/Dean	KUMC - Academic Affairs/Graduate Studies		Professor and Chair	KUMC - Hearing and Speech
Principal Research Analyst	KUMC - Enterprise Analytics		Director of Finance and Administration	KUMC - School of Health Professions

## Appendix B

### Principal Documents, Materials, and Web Pages Reviewed

Category	Item
	University of Kansas Self Study Document
Academic Info & Data	Academic Catalog 2014-15
Academic Info & Data	Academic Program Proposal
Academic Info & Data	Guide to the KU Core (website)
Academic Info & Data	Higher Learning Commission Multi-Location Visit Report
Academic Info & Data	Jay Docs
Academic Info & Data	KBOR Transfer and Articulation Council (TAAC) Course Transfer/Reverse Transfer Communication Plan (Admissions website)
Academic Info & Data	KS System Wide Transfer Course Matrix, Summer 2014
Academic Info & Data	KU Alcohol and Drug Policies brochure
Academic Info & Data	KU among first to sign declaration on open access policies
Academic Info & Data	KU Institutional Hotline & Helpline
Academic Info & Data	KU Keys to Civility for Students and Faculty Members brochure
Academic Info & Data	KU Organizational Chart
Academic Info & Data	KU Sexual Harassment & Sexual Violence Information for Students
Academic Info & Data	KU Sexual Harassment Information for Parents and Others
Academic Info & Data	Nominate a Course for the KU Core
Academic Info & Data	Statement of HLC Affiliation Status
Academic Info & Data	The KU Center for Online and Distance Learning
Annual Reports	Chancellor Annual Report 2013
Annual Reports	Chancellor Annual Report 2014
Annual Reports	KU Alumni Association Annual Report 2013
Annual Reports	KU Endowment Annual Report 2013
Annual Reports	KU University Career Center Annual Report 2012-2013
Annual Reports	University Core Curriculum Committee (UCCC) Annual Report 2012-13
Assessment	Academic Catalog 2014-15
Assessment	Clery Act Compliance Information
Assessment	Student Affairs - 27 reports
Assessment	The Clery Act Annual Security Report, 2013
Financial	KU Annual Financial Report FY2013
Financial	KU Annual Financial Report FY2014
Financial	KU Comprehensive Fee Schedule FY 2014

<b>Category</b>	<b>Item</b>
Financial	KU Comprehensive Fee Schedule FY 2015
Financial	KU Operating Budget Summary FY 2013
Financial	KU Operating Budget Summary FY 2014
Financial	KU Operating Budget Summary FY 2015
Financial	Tuition Enhancement Funds Status Report Fall 2007
Handbook/Policies	Animal Care Unit
Handbook/Policies	Code of Faculty Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct
Handbook/Policies	Curricula, Academic Standards, and Degree Requirements, Faculty Responsibility for Establishment of
Handbook/Policies	Department of EH&S
Handbook/Policies	Discrimination Complaint Resolution Process
Handbook/Policies	Export Controls
Handbook/Policies	Faculty Evaluation Policy for Tenure-Track and Tenures Faculty Members
Handbook/Policies	Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSRR)
Handbook/Policies	Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSRR), Article VI
Handbook/Policies	Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff
Handbook/Policies	Individual Financial Conflict of Interest Policy
Handbook/Policies	Institutional Biosafety Committee
Handbook/Policies	Institutional Conflict of Interest Policy
Handbook/Policies	Intellectual Property Policy for the Lawrence Campus
Handbook/Policies	Inventor Conflict of Interest Policy, Management of
Handbook/Policies	IT Security at KU
Handbook/Policies	KBOR Minutes Nov 14-15, 2012 (Post-Tenure Review Policy)
Handbook/Policies	KBOR Policy Manual Chapter II C 8 (Evaluation of Faculty and Post-Tenure Review)
Handbook/Policies	KU Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities
Handbook/Policies	KU Office of Research: Research Integrity
Handbook/Policies	KU Research Compliance Hotline
Handbook/Policies	Orientation Guide
Handbook/Policies	Overview of University Governance Committees
Handbook/Policies	Post-Tenure Review
Handbook/Policies	Sexual Harassment
Handbook/Policies	Social Media Guidelines
Handbook/Policies	Social Media Policy Communication from University Governance April 30, 2014
Handbook/Policies	Student Conduct Process

<b>Category</b>	<b>Item</b>
Handbook/Policies	University Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCPT) Standards and Review Procedures
Handbook/Policies	University Core Curriculum Committee (UCCC), Procedures and Criteria for Appointment
Handbook/Policies	University Senate Code
Handbook/Policies	University Senate Rules and Regulations (USRR)
Handbook/Policies	University Senate Rules and Regulations (USSR) Article II Section 1 (Academic Work and Its Evaluation)
Handbook/Policies	Whistleblower Policy
KUMC	KUMC Annual Report 2013
KUMC	KUMC Audit Report FY 2013
KUMC	KUMC Campus Facilities Master Plan
KUMC	KUMC Extramural Funding FY 2013
KUMC	KUMC Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff
KUMC	KUMC Policy and Procedures: Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct
KUMC	KUMC Strategic Plan 2011-2016
Reports	KBOR Foresight 2020 Progress Report 2014
Reports	KBOR Foresight 2020 Summary Overview
Reports	University Core Curriculum Committee (UCCC) Policies, Procedures, and Understandings
University Planning	Bold Aspirations (Strategic Plan)
University Planning	Bold Aspirations Annual Report 2012 (Strategic Plan)
University Planning	Bold Aspirations Annual Report 2013 (Strategic Plan)
University Planning	Bold Aspirations Annual Report 2014 (Strategic Plan)
University Planning	Changing for Excellence Budget Report to Executive Committee
University Planning	Changing for Excellence Phase 1
University Planning	Changing for Excellence Phase 2: Budgeting Process
University Planning	Changing for Excellence Phase 2: Business Centers
University Planning	Changing for Excellence Phase 2: Construction
University Planning	Changing for Excellence Phase 2: Facilities
University Planning	Far Above: The Campaign for Kansas
University Planning	KU Campus Master Plan 2014-2024: Executive Summary
University Planning	KU Campus Master Plan 2014-2024: Presentation to Kansas Board of Regents
University Planning	Research and Graduate Studies Strategic Plan 2012-13



## Appendix C

### DETAILED REVIEW OF FEDERAL COMPLIANCE

The Institution's Federal Compliance Filing was reviewed by two reviewers (C. Wilson and M. Perkins) selected by the Higher Learning Commission personnel. Their report follows.

This Review Team found three areas for clarification:

- (1) Consortial Relationships. There was a consortial relationship agreement with Great Plain Interactive Distance Education Alliance that was pending approval as a substantive change. *Approval was received 03 Feb 2015.*
- (2) Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information. Reviewers found that HLC affiliation was not found in the KU catalog. Correction was made.
- (3) Evaluation of Program Length and Assignment of Credit Hours. KU requires 30 credit hours for a master's degree. In the Law School, there were two master's programs requiring only 24 credit hours. Lengthy explanation provided by Law School dean explaining differences in discipline of law.

---

#### Assignment of Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

*Address this requirement by completing the "Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours" in the Appendix at the end of this document.*

---

#### Institutional Records of Student Complaints

*The institution has documented a process in place for addressing student complaints and appears to be systematically processing such complaints as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.*

1. Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints as well as the history of complaints received and processed with a particular focus in that history on the past three or four years.
2. Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.
3. Verify that the evidence shows that the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this process into its review and planning processes.
4. Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.
5. Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.
6. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:  
 X The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: A review of numerous documents and intranet sites including the Complaint Log 2004-present, Student Affairs website, Policy Library website and handbooks provides clear evidence of an accessible, written process that is followed for complaints. KU demonstrates that complaints are handled in a timely manner and result in policy and procedure changes as warranted.

Additional monitoring, if any:

---

### Publication of Transfer Policies

*The institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.*

1. Review the institution's transfer policies.
2. Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and program-specific articulation agreements.
3. Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its web site) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.

Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions and any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. Note whether the institution appropriately lists its articulation agreements with other institutions on its website or elsewhere. The information the institution provides should include any program-specific articulation agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution under Commission review: 1) accepts credit from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; 2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements that it accepts; or 3) both offers and accepts credits with the other institution(s).

4. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The team verified that KU follows the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) requirements for admission of a transfer student. KU has articulation agreements at the institutional and program level with local community colleges and other institutions that both offers and accepts credits. The team verified that transfer of undergraduate credit is published on the Undergraduate Admissions website, in the Policy Library and academic catalog for the academic colleges and schools e.g. Liberal Arts and Nursing colleges were sampled and verified. The CredTran is easily accessible for current and prospective students to use in determining what courses and credit hours are likely to transfer in. The graduate transfer credit policy was verified as readily accessible on the Policy Library and in the KBOR Transfer and Articulation website that lists Course Equivalency Guides.

Additional monitoring, if any:

---

### Practices for Verification of Student Identity

*The institution has demonstrated that it verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided to the student through distance or correspondence education and appropriately discloses additional fees related to verification to students and to protect their privacy.*

1. Determine how the institution verifies that the student who enrolls in a course is the same student who submits assignments, takes exams, and earns a final grade. Consider whether the institution's approach respects student privacy.
2. Check that any fees related to verification and not included in tuition are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance courses (e.g., a proctoring fee paid by students on the day of the proctored exam).
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: KU issues students a unique identification number and an online username with students selecting a unique password to access online learning material. The team verified that the Center for Online and Distance Learning policy and procedure including providing face-to-face proctoring of exams, verifying a photo ID, at various on and off campus locations for no cost. Students may also be proctored by a contracted service, ProctorU that provides secure online proctoring at a cost listed on their website. The team verified that courses requiring proctored exams are noted in the schedule of classes.

Additional monitoring, if any:

---

### Title IV Program Responsibilities

*The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program.*

**This requirement has several components the institution and team must address:**

- **General Program Requirements.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area.*
- **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion Five if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)*
- **Default Rates.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its three year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note for 2012 and thereafter institutions and teams should be using the three-year default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact Commission staff.*
- **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.*
- **Student Right to Know.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion One if the team determines that disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)*
- **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook. Note that the Commission does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.*
- **Contractual Relationships.** *The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require Commission approval and has not received Commission*

*approval the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Contractual Change Application on the Commission's web site for more information.)*

- **Consortial Relationships.** *The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require Commission approval and has not received Commission approval the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Consortial Change Application on the Commission's web site for more information.)*
1. Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.
  2. Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution's compliance or whether the institution's auditor in the A-133 has raised any issues about the institution's compliance as well as look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.
  3. If an institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the federal compliance portion of the team report and whether the institution appears to be moving forward with corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.
  4. If issues have been raised with the institution's compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution's ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity (*Core Component 2.A and 2.B*).
  5. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
    - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
    - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
    - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
    - The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: General Program Responsibilities- KU reports compliance with all applicable regulations pertaining to Title IV programs including the annual independent audits. The team reviewed the most recent A-133 audits of 2012 and 2013 that showed no deficiencies. A Department of Education Review occurred in 2009 with no findings or follow-up required. The Title IV Program Participation Agreement was reapproved with full certification until March 31, 2017 as verified by the team. Financial Responsibility Requirements- There has been no concerns over KU's financial ratios. Default Rates- The team verified that the three year default rates for 2009, 2010 and 2011 respectively are 4.3%, 5.5% and 5.6%. The team verified a variety of resources available to students and parents to minimize student loan debt and default on student loans e.g. entrance and exit counseling, loan repayment charts and KU's Student Money Management Services. Disclosures- The team reviewed sample emails sent to inform students about where to find online consumer information as well as an annual security and fire safety report and locations of policies and

procedures. KU is in compliance with the Clery Act in maintaining a website for compliance information, has a campus alert system, and crime report form. The Athletics website was reviewed and contains Athletic Disclosure Reports 2006-2014. Right to Know- The team reviewed a comprehensive listing of consumer information on the Financial Aid and Scholarship website with associated policies and procedures in the Policy Library. Students are informed each semester via email or hard copy about the location of consumer information. Academic Progress and Attendance Policies- The team reviewed the policy on Satisfactory Academic Progress on the Financial Aid & Scholarship website and verified that it is accessible to students. The team verified that an attendance policy is located on the Policy Library website pertaining to Federal Pell Grant and Federal Direct Loan and Federal Perkins Loan recipients. Contractual Relationships- KU reports no contractual relationships requiring approval by HLC. Consortial Relationships- **KU reports having one consortium agreement with Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance that is pending HLC approval as a substantive change.**

Additional monitoring, if any:

---

### Required Information for Students and the Public

1. Verify that the institution publishes fair, accurate, and complete information on the following topics: the calendar, grading, admissions, academic program requirements, tuition and fees, and refund policies.
2. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: In the team review of the catalog, student handbooks and the website e.g. the consumer information and student resources web pages; it was verified that there is consistent, fair, accurate and accessible information about tuition and fees, program requirements, refund policy, admissions, grading and the calendar.

Additional monitoring, if any:

---

### Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information

*The institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with the Commission and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.*

1. Review the institution's disclosure about its accreditation status with the Commission to determine whether the information it provides is accurate and complete, appropriately formatted and contains the Commission's web address.
2. Review institutional disclosures about its relationship with other accrediting agencies for accuracy and for appropriate consumer information, particularly regarding the link between specialized/professional accreditation and the licensure necessary for employment in many professional or specialized areas.
3. Review the institution's catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, and information provided by the institution's advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate information to current and prospective students about its accreditation, placement or licensure, program requirements, etc.
4. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
  - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
  - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
  - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
  - The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The team viewed the KU YouTube and various websites e.g. Admissions and Institutional Research and Planning and the Campuses tab; and documents such as KU's College Portrait, doctoral program profiles, KU profiles, and the catalog. The MyKU intranet also provides information on its student tab. All information was found to be consistent and informative in communicating about programs, admission and licensure requirements, locations and policies. The "about KU" website discloses information about the Kansas Board of Regents. The team reviewed the catalog and found clear information on specialized accreditation for various programs as well as the numerous letters of accreditation and document in the Compliance Resource Room that details initial, full or continuing accreditation for all appropriate programs. Additionally, the HLC and specialized accreditation affiliations were located on the Registrar's website. The HLC mark of affiliation and full information was also found on the Institutional Research and Planning website. **However, the HLC affiliation was not found in the KU Catalog.**

Additional monitoring, if any:

---

### Review of Student Outcome Data

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether it is appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs it offers and the students it serves.
2. Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about academic programs and requirements and to determine its effectiveness in achieving its educational objectives.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
  - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.



- \_\_\_ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- \_\_\_ The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- \_\_\_ The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The team reviewed a sample of program reviews e.g. Chemistry, Education-Curriculum & Teaching, Music and Social Welfare. Each, outlined by program levels, contained student program outcome data appropriate to the discipline and level, and program plans that related to the findings. There were varying degrees of program outcome details with Music and Chemistry having less outcome information and Education and Social Welfare having in-depth detail including licensure and placement information. The program plans for each of the sampled programs will lead to changes in student admission requirements, program improvements such as revised and new courses, and faculty and facility enhancements.

Additional monitoring, if any:

---

### Standing with State and Other Accrediting Agencies

*The institution has documented that it discloses accurately to the public and the Commission its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditor and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.*

*The team has considered any potential implications for accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or loss of authorization in any state.*

***Important note: If the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is now or has been in the past five years under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action (i.e., withdrawal, suspension, denial, or termination) from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor or a state entity, then the team must explain the sanction or adverse action of the other agency in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report and provide its rationale for recommending Commission status in light of this action. In addition, the team must contact the staff liaison immediately if it learns that the institution is at risk of losing its degree authorization or lacks such authorization in any state in which the institution meets state presence requirements.***

1. Review the information, particularly any information that indicates the institution is under sanction or show-cause or has had its status with any agency suspended, revoked, or terminated, as well as the reasons for such actions.
2. Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution's capacity to meet the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the Commission staff liaison immediately.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The list of program specific accreditations was reviewed and found to have initial, full or continued accreditation for all of its programs.

Additional monitoring, if any:

### Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment

*The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comments. The team has evaluated any comments received and completed any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments. **Note that if the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comment relate to the team's review of the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report.***

1. Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including sample announcements, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.
2. Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow-up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The team reviewed the press release, email newsletter and advertisements placed in different venues to announce the HLC visit and solicit third party comments.

Additional monitoring, if any:

### Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Panel

Provide a list materials reviewed here:

Federal Compliance Resource Room

University of Kansas Academic Catalog 2012-13 and 2013-14: 1) transfer policies for Nursing and Liberal Arts & Sciences

KU Policy Library: 1) Student Records Policy and complaint procedure 2) Grievance Policy and Procedure for Graduate Students 3) Discrimination Complaint Resolution Process 4) Transfer of Undergraduate Level Credit 5) Satisfactory Academic Progress

KU Website- About KU, Admissions, Registrar, Student Affairs, Institutional Research and Planning, Student, Campuses and Academics tabs, Ombudsman Office, Financial Aid & Scholarships, Center for Online and Distance Learning, Athletics, the Public Safety Office, and College Portrait

Kansas Board of Regents- Data, Research & Planning Report about program credit hours Comprehensive Fee Schedule, Transfer & Articulation-with course equivalency guides

University Differential Tuition Report

Student Complaint Log 2004-2014

Handbooks: Undergraduate Student Handbook, School of Nursing Handbook and Graduate Mechanical Engineering Manual pertaining to grievance procedures

Kansas Board of Regents Policy Manual

KU Code of Student Rights & Responsibilities

Schedule of Classes

Financial Statements & audit 2013-2014

KU 2013 and 2012 Annual Financial Reports

2014-15 Financial Aid Guide

Student Money Management Services

Email to students pertaining to financial aid & scholarships

Annual Security Report and Cleary Act Compliance information

Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act Report

Attendance Patterns

Graduation Rates for Pell Grant and Stafford Loan Recipients

Retention and Graduation Report

Program Review Cycle

Program Reviews-Chemistry, Education, Music and Social Welfare includes program outcome data and improvement plans

Accreditation letters for various programs

HLC Statement of Affiliation

Press release and advertisement for HLC visit

KU YouTube video

## Appendix

### Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Program Length and Tuition, Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours

Institution under review: University of Kansas

#### Part 1: Program Length and Tuition

##### Instructions

The institution has documented that it has credit hour assignments and degree program lengths within the range of good practice in higher education and that tuition is consistent across degree programs (or that there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).

Review the *"Worksheet for Use by Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours"* as well as the course catalog and other attachments required for the institutional worksheet.

#### Worksheet on Program Length and Tuition

##### A. Answer the Following Questions

Are the institution's degree program requirements within the range of good practice in higher education and contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

Yes

No

Comments: The review team has examined submitted materials and has determined that the institution generally adheres to federal definitions in assigning program length and credit hours when setting up and scheduling courses which collectively lead to a program. Master's degrees were assigned at least 30 credit hours (see exception below.) All Bachelor's degrees were assigned to at least 120 hours.

**The visiting site team should review the two master's programs below to ascertain why they are less than 30 credit hours.**

- **American Legal Studies – Master LLM – 24 credits**
- **Elder Law – Master LLM – 24 credits**

Materials reviewed:

- KU Credit Hour Definition
- KU Lawrence Campus Program Inventory
- KUMC Program Inventory
- Academic Catalog 2013-14

- Academic Catalog 2014-15
- Semester Assignments for Courses

Are the institution's tuition costs across programs within the range of good practice in higher education and contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

Yes  No

Comments: The review team has examined submitted materials and has determined that the institution's costs are in line with good practice and support academic achievement. Costs are consistently applied across disciplines.

Materials reviewed:

- University Differential Tuition Report FY 2003 – FY2010
- University of Kansas Comprehensive Fee Schedule FY 2014
- University of Kansas Comprehensive Fee Schedule FY 2015

#### **B. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate**

Is any Commission follow-up required related to the institution's program length and tuition practices?

Yes  No

Rationale:

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

## **Part 2: Assignment of Credit Hours**

---

### **Instructions**

In assessing the appropriateness of the credit allocations provided by the institution the team should complete the following steps:

1. Review the Worksheet completed by the institution, which provides information about an institution's academic calendar and an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats, and the institution's policy and procedures for awarding credit hours. Note that such policies may be at the institution or department level and may be differentiated by such distinctions as undergraduate or graduate, by delivery format, etc.
2. Identify the institution's principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level. The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:
  - Associate's degrees = 60 hours

- Bachelor's degrees = 120 hours
  - Master's or other degrees beyond the Bachelor's = at least 30 hours beyond the Bachelor's degree
  - Note that one quarter hour = .67 semester hour
  - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.
3. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution.
- At semester-based institutions courses will be typically be from two to four credit hours (or approximately five quarter hours) and extend approximately 14-16 weeks (or approximately 10 weeks for a quarter). The description in the catalog should indicate a course that is appropriately rigorous and has collegiate expectations for objectives and workload. Identify courses/disciplines that seem to depart markedly from these expectations.
  - Institutions may have courses that are in compressed format, self-paced, or otherwise alternatively structured. Credit assignments should be reasonable. (For example, as a full-time load for a traditional semester is typically 15 credits, it might be expected that the norm for a full-time load in a five-week term is 5 credits; therefore, a single five-week course awarding 10 credits would be subject to inquiry and justification.)
  - Teams should be sure to scan across disciplines, delivery mode, and types of academic activities.
  - Federal regulations allow for an institution to have two credit-hour awards: one award for Title IV purposes and following the above federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. Commission procedure also permits this approach.
4. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course. Pay particular attention to alternatively-structured or other courses with particularly high credit hours for a course completed in a short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor.
5. **Sampling.** Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution and the range of programs it offers.
- At a minimum, teams should anticipate sampling at least a few programs at each degree level.
  - For institutions with several different academic calendars or terms or with a wide range of academic programs, the team should expand the sample size appropriately to ensure that it is paying careful attention to alternative format and compressed and accelerated courses.
  - Where the institution offers the same course in more than one format, the team is advised to sample across the various formats to test for consistency.
  - For the programs the team sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several of the courses in the program, identify the contact hours for each course, and expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.
  - The team should pay particular attention to alternatively-structured and other courses that have high credit hours and less frequently scheduled interaction between the students and the instructor.

- Provide information on the samples in the appropriate space on the worksheet.
6. Consider the following questions:
- Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution?
  - Does that policy address the amount of instructional or contact time assigned and homework typically expected of a student with regard to credit hours earned?
  - For institutions with courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy also equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the timeframe allotted for the course?
  - Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that the Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)
  - If so, is the institution's assignment of credit to courses reflective of its policy on the award of credit?
7. If the answers to the above questions lead the team to conclude that there may be a problem with the credit hours awarded the team should recommend the following:
- If the problem involves a poor or insufficiently-detailed institutional policy, the team should call for a revised policy as soon as possible by requiring a monitoring report within no more than one year that demonstrates the institution has a revised policy and evidence of implementation.
  - If the team identifies an application problem and that problem is isolated to a few courses or single department or division or learning format, the team should call for follow-up activities (monitoring report or focused evaluation) to ensure that the problems are corrected within no more than one year.
  - If the team identifies systematic non-compliance across the institution with regard to the award of credit, the team should notify Commission staff immediately and work with staff to design appropriate follow-up activities. The Commission shall understand systematic noncompliance to mean that the institution lacks any policies to determine the award of academic credit or that there is an inappropriate award of institutional credit not in conformity with the policies established by the institution or with commonly accepted practices in higher education across multiple programs or divisions or affecting significant numbers of students.

---

## Worksheet on Assignment of Credit Hours

- A. Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team** (see #5 of instructions in completing this section)

The team reviewed the following sample of programs and courses for assignment of credit hours:



- Bachelor of Science in Business
  - ✓ BE 301 Managerial Economics
  - ✓ FIN 310 Finance
  - ✓ MGMT 310 Organizational Behavior
  - ✓ MKTG 310 Marketing
- Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Psychology and Research
  - ✓ PRE 811 Analysis of Variance
  - ✓ EDUC 800 Education as a Field of Scholarship
- Master of Science in Journalism
  - ✓ JOUR 803 Survey of Mass Media & Popular Culture
- Doctor of Medicine (M.D.)
  - ✓ ANAT 847 Developmental Neurobiology
  - ✓ PHSL 844 Neurophysiology
- Bachelor of Science in Geology
  - ✓ GEOL 101 The Way the Earth Works
  - ✓ PHSX 114 College Physics I
  - ✓ MATH 115 Calculus I

## B. Answer the Following Questions

### 1) Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

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

Yes                       No

Comments: One policy is used and works for all delivery formats.

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

Yes                       No

Comments: The syllabi reviewed for the above referenced courses confirmed credit hour assignment is consistent with institutional policy (and federal definition) whether the course was delivered in a traditional face-to-face format, as a hybrid class with part of the course delivered online, 100% online delivery, or compressed format (a couple of the syllabi reviewed were for night classes). Assignments and expressed student responsibility appeared to meet substantive interaction expectations by both instruction and student.

For institutions with non-traditional courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy equate credit hours with

intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the timeframe and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

Yes  No

Comments: n/a

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

Yes  No

Comments: The institution's policy on assignment of credit hours is the same as the federal definition. Therefore, the two align.

## 2) Application of Policies

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

Yes  No

Comments: The team reviewed the syllabi of twelve courses. In addition, for several courses, there were multiple syllabi. The review found that all courses had been assigned credit hours in line with college (and federal) policy.

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

Yes  No

Comments: Of the syllabi reviewed, learning outcomes appeared to be appropriate and aligned with the assignment of credit hours.

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

Yes  No

Comments: A few of the courses reviewed were either hybrid or completely online. In addition, several courses were offered in a somewhat compressed delivery as they were night courses. All courses appeared to be scheduled and set up consistent with the institution's policies.

If the institution offers alternative delivery or compressed format courses or programs, are the learning outcomes reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit? Are the learning outcomes reasonably capable of being fulfilled by students in the time allocated to justify the allocation of credit?

Yes  No

Comments: The institution offers compressed courses which appear to be assigned credit hours based upon consideration of length of enrollment period and in conjunction with the institution's policy on credit hour assignment.

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

Yes  No

Comments: In reviewing a sampling of bachelor, master, and doctoral programs, the team found the institution consistently assigned credit to courses based upon the institution's credit hour definition.

### C. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

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

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

Yes  No

Rationale: In reviewing the cited programs and courses, all reviewed appeared to have met the institutional definition of credit hour, which is also the federal definition.

Identify the type of Commission monitoring required and the due date: None

### D. Identify and Explain Any Findings of Systematic Non-Compliance in One or More Educational Programs with Commission Policies Regarding the Credit Hour

### Part 3: Clock Hours

Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs in clock hours?

Yes  No

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

Yes  No

**If the answer to either question is “Yes,” complete this part of the form.**

#### Instructions

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

Complete this worksheet **only if** the institution offers any degree or certificate programs in clock hours OR that must be reported to the U.S. Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs. Non-degree programs subject to clock hour requirements (an institution is required to measure student progress in clock hours for federal or state purposes or for graduates to apply for licensure) are not subject to the credit hour definitions per se but will need to provide conversions to semester or quarter hours for Title IV purposes. Clock-hour programs might include teacher education, nursing, or other programs in licensed fields.

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

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

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

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

### Worksheet on Clock Hours

**A. Answer the Following Questions**

Does the institution's credit to clock hour formula match the federal formula?

Yes  No

Comments:

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

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

Yes  No

Comments:

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

Yes  No

Comments:

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

Yes  No

(Note that the team may approve a lower conversion rate than the federal rate as noted above provided the team found no issues with the institution's policies or practices related to the credit hour and there is sufficient student work outside of class as noted in the instructions.)

**C. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate**

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

Yes  No

Rationale:

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

## **Appendix D**

### **Multi-Campus Visit Report**

**Name of Institution:** University of Kansas

**Name/Address of Branch Campus:** University of Kansas Medical Center

**Date and Duration of Visit:** February 10, 2015, 3 hours

**Reviewer(s):** Terry Potter and Wesley Tschetter

#### **Campus Overview**

Provide a brief description of the scope and operations of the campus. Include information about consortial or contractual arrangements, if applicable.

The University of Kansas Medical Center (KUMC) is a campus of the University of Kansas located in Kansas City. The Campus is overseen by an Executive Vice Chancellor who reports to the KU Chancellor and is assisted by five Vice Chancellors (for Academic and Student Affairs, Clinical Affairs, Research, Finance, Administration), three Deans (for the Schools of Medicine, Nursing, and Health Professions), an Associate Vice Chancellor for Outreach, an Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enterprise Analytics, and eight Directors.

The three schools (Medicine, Nursing, and Health Professions) include at least 1,029 full time, 204 part-time and 2,333 volunteer faculty and 112 administrative staff. In Fall 2014, there were 3,371 students pursuing MD, PhD, and MS degrees, plus several specialized graduate and a few baccalaureate degree programs through the School of Health Professions. The student headcount also includes almost 800 medical graduates enrolled in residency programs at the University of Kansas Hospital. As the only medical school in Kansas, the Medical School helps to serve the clinical needs of the rural population within the state by delivery of the MD curriculum at additional locations in Wichita and Salina.

The student services include both academic facilities: several libraries, an IT Help Desk and Training, a Wireless Network, and Teaching & Learning Technologies; services such as: Counseling and Educational Support, Enrollment Services, Office of Admissions, Office of International Programs, Office of Student Life, Ombudsman's Office, Student Financial Aid and Student Health Services; as well as facilities such as a Fitness Center and a Bookstore.

There were no disclosed consortial or contractual arrangements for delivery of instructional material. The University of Kansas Hospital, as well as the hospitals in Wichita and Salina, are independent of the University; however, several members of the leadership of the University serve on the Board of the Hospital.

**History, Planning, and Oversight**

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the effectiveness of the institution's planning, governance and oversight processes at the campus and in relationship to the broader systems of the institution, particularly as they relate to enrollment, budgeting, and resource allocation at the institution. (Core Components 1.d, 2.a, 2.b, 2.d, and 3.d)

**Evidentiary Statements:**

Since the last accreditation review, the University of Kansas Medical Center (KUMC) has seen significant growth in its educational, research, and clinical activities. Enrollment has undergone a dramatic (37%) increase from 2,458 students in Fall 2003 to 3,371 students in Fall 2014. In the past five years, the operating expenses have increased from approximately \$275M in 2010 to \$328M in 2014. Its research revenues continue to grow, and its research foci include a National Cancer Institute designated Cancer Center (established in 2012) and a National Institutes of Health designated Alzheimer's Disease Center. In FY 2013, the faculty obtained 136 NIH awards and initiated a 40 percent increase in the number of Cancer Center clinical trials. The dramatic growth in clinical services and the research enterprise required creation of new organizations and extensive collaborations with KU Hospital, clinical affiliates, several academic organizations, community representatives, private foundations, and the state legislature. Planning is based on priority areas congruent with the mission, and building on areas of strength and areas of need.

The campus undergoes strategic planning activities that are coordinated between the university, the hospital, and the schools at KUMC. The strategic plans for the KUMC and its component schools was reviewed within the past two years and a progress report towards the goals and objectives was developed in 2014.

**Judgment of reviewer(s):**

- X The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

**Facilities and Technology**

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the institution's facilities and technology at the campus and their suitability to the needs of the students, staff and faculty, as well as the educational offerings. Consider, in particular, classrooms and laboratories (size, maintenance, temperature, etc.); faculty and administrative offices (site, visibility, privacy for meetings, etc.); parking or access to public transit; bookstore or text purchasing services; security; handicapped access; and other (food or snack services, study and meeting areas, etc.). (Core Components 2.b, 3.c, 3.d, and 4.d)

**Evidentiary Statements:**

A centralized information technology group, Information Resources, provides connectivity for students with the medical library as well as desktop computer support, networking, telecommunications and phone support, web content management, custom application development, media production, learning management system support, information security, and financial systems.

The Teaching & Learning Technologies (TLT) department provides students, faculty, and staff with support for the successful integration of educational technology into the learning environments. This includes: Online Learning/Blackboard, Video Conferencing/Polycom, Web-conferencing/Adobe Connect, Electronic Testing/ExamSoft, Podcasting/Camtasia Relay, Online



Surveys/Vovici, Audience Response Systems/iClickers, and Virtual Worlds/Second Life. Wireless Internet connection is available in all learning spaces, rooms, and laboratories. Examples of the success of these facilities is provided by the ability to provide distance learning to the students in the MD programs at Wichita and Salina and to students in the School of Nursing distance learning programs.

The Center for Interprofessional Education and Simulation provides a state-of-the art simulation skills laboratory where students from multiple disciplines and programs learn alongside each other in real-life simulations.

Examples of the many resources, services and facilities provided for students, as well as faculty, by The Division of Student Services include the Writing Center that offers one-on-one writing consultations for students, and the Writing Consult Center that provides teaching and editing services to faculty and investigators to increase faculty productivity in grants, scholarly publications, and research projects. The Division of Student Services also provides other programming and services that support the emotional, intellectual, personal and professional growth of students.

**Judgment of reviewer(s):**

- X The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

**Human Resources**

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on appropriateness of faculty and staff qualifications, sufficiency of staff and faculty for the campus, and the processes for supporting and evaluating personnel at the campus. Consider the processes in place for selecting, training, and orienting faculty at the location, as well as the credentials of faculty dedicated to the campus and other faculty. (Core Components 2.b, 2.c, 3.b, 3.c, and 3.d)

**Evidentiary Statements:**

All tenured and tenure-track faculty possess a terminal degree in their discipline, and the campus has an established tenure and promotion process. Training for faculty includes resources for new faculty, mentoring for junior faculty, professional development for all faculty, a faculty leadership academy, as well as programs for women in medicine and science, and a fund for medical alumni innovative teaching.

In the interdisciplinary graduate programs in the biomedical sciences, only members of the graduate faculty may teach courses for graduate credit, supervise master's programs and theses, or serve on doctoral committees. The Office of Graduate Studies examines and approves all applications for graduate faculty status submitted by the degree granting departments and graduate faculty are appointed with dissertation, regular or special status.

Selected faculty and staff from the KUMC participate in the recently established Leadership Training and Jayhawk Success Academy, as well as programs offered by the Administrative Management Institute.

The campus Office of Postdoctoral Affairs holds a number of events on professional and career development as well as workshops on scientific writing that provide support for postdoctoral

scholars.

**Judgment of reviewer(s):**

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

**Student and Faculty Resources and Support**

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the student and faculty services and academic resources at the campus, as well as the processes to evaluate, improve, and manage them. Consider, in particular, the level of student access (in person, by computer, by phone, etc.) to academic advising/placement, remedial/tutorial services, and library materials/services. Also, consider the level of access to admissions, registration/student records, financial aid, and job placement services, as well as attention to student concerns. Finally, consider the resources needed by faculty to provide the educational offerings. (Core Components 1.d, 2.c, 3.c, 3.d, and 4.d)

**Evidentiary Statements:**

The Office of International Programs (OIP) provides opportunities including support of travel abroad for students, faculty, and staff as well as many other opportunities for interaction from all three schools to become personally and intellectually familiar with the people, ideas, and customs of other nations. The Office has increased student participation in international experiences 66%, and created programming and training promoting the value of cross cultural experiences while developing cross cultural competencies necessary for success working with diverse populations.

The Office of Cultural Enhancement and Diversity promotes incorporation of diversity and cultural competency into curricula, the research enterprise, and the delivery of healthcare by assisting in recruiting a diverse student body and faculty and preparing students for leadership roles in the state of Kansas. One example of the activities of the Office is the forming of a partnership with the University of Missouri – Kansas City to administer the Greater Kansas City Health Professions Pipeway Initiative, a bi-state endeavor to provide encouragement and opportunities to minority students in the Kansas City area who are interested in health professions and other science-intensive careers. Other examples are the initiatives to benefit minority faculty, including: mentoring programs, facilitation of research, and collaborative efforts with the Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development office to advance the careers of minority faculty; as well as student programs such as professional development seminars, personal, academic and career counseling, and the Center of Excellence and Health Careers Pathways Program.

**Judgment of reviewer(s):**

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

**Educational Programs and Instructional Oversight**

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the institution's capacity to oversee educational offerings and instruction at the campus. Identify whether the institution has adequate controls in place to ensure that information presented to students is ample and accurate. Consider consistency of curricular expectations and policies, availability of courses needed for program and graduation requirements, performance of instructional duties, availability of faculty to students, orientation of faculty/professional development, attention to student concerns. (Core Components 1.d, 2.c, 3.a, 3.c, 4.b, and 4.c)

**Evidentiary Statements:**

The ability of the campus to provide many of its degree programs (and, in particular, the MD and the RN to BSN) programs at a distance is a service to the State that is critical, and its importance cannot be over-emphasized.

The School of Nursing offers bachelor, master, and doctoral degrees, as well as continuing education programs, accelerated curriculum, online classes, and an RN to BSN option for registered nurses. This latter program is very valuable with more health care facilities raising the expected qualifications for nursing from an RN to a BSN. Students, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, learn in different settings with a focus on evidence-based practice and nursing practice education. For example the Silver City Health Center, which is owned and operated by the School and is recognized by the National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA) as a Level 3 "Patient-Centered Medical Home", is the only academic nurse-managed health center in the region. This clinic provides high-quality primary care, in-depth clinical evaluation and a range of program-specific health services to residents of Wyandotte and Johnson counties.

**Judgment of reviewer(s):**

- X The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

**Evaluation and Assessment**

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the institution's processes to evaluate and improve the educational offerings of the campus and to assess and improve student learning, persistence, and completion sufficiently to maintain and improve academic quality at the campus. Consider, in particular, the setting of outcomes, the actual measurement of performance, and the analysis and use of data to maintain/improve quality. Identify how the processes at a campus are equivalent to those for assessment and evaluation on the main campus. (Core Components 2.c, 3.b, 3.c, 3.d, and 4.d)

**Evidentiary Statements**

Of the 16 degree programs that undergo accreditation by a professional or specialized accreditation agency, all are currently accredited with no conditions or concerns. The M.D. program at the University of Kansas received an eight-year accreditation from the LCME in 2014. This accreditation includes the sites at Wichita and at Salina (the Salina campus has an entering class of 8 students with 32 students enrolled for the 4-year undergraduate medical program). The School of Medicine began offering courses to medical students in their third and fourth years at Wichita in 1971 to meet the demand for more physicians in the state. The ability to deliver first and second year coursework from KUMC by interactive television and podcasting to Wichita enabled its expansion to a full, four-year program at this site. The further expansion of the MD program to Salina in 2011 is aimed at increasing the availability of physician care in rural Kansas. The performance of students in the phase I and II exams is similar for those who

received their instruction at the Wichita site and those students who received in-class instruction at KUMC. The efforts of the School in successfully delivering their program, as well as the provision of financial support to students at distant sites, has resulted in 45% of the graduates of the MD program are focused on Family Medicine, and the program ranks number 2 in the country in the proportion of its graduates entering the fields of primary care.

All degree programs undergo a university-mandated periodic review at least every 8 years. For programs that also undergo specialized accreditation, when possible, these reviews are aligned with the program's accreditation cycle. The reviews are monitored by the Office of Academic Affairs and forwarded to the Board of Regents.

The Schools and/or programs monitor the performance of their students through a variety of parameters. For example, the Office of Graduate Studies monitors the performance of its students through a number of criteria including time to degree, publications, and where the students go for their postdoctoral studies; the School of Medicine monitors performance on the USMLE, the residency match, as well as feedback on the performance of its former students during their residency and on alumni surveys.

**Judgment of reviewer(s):**

- X The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

**Continuous Improvement**

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements that demonstrate that the institution encourages and ensures continuous quality improvement at the campus. Consider in particular the institution's planning and evaluation processes that ensure regular review and improvement of the campus and ensure alignment of the branch campus with the mission and goals of the institution as a whole. (Core Components 2.c, 2.d, 3.c, 3.d, and 4.c)

**Evidentiary Statements**

In the fall of 2012, several departments began to implement the principles of the Malcolm Baldrige Quality Improvement Program, a division of the National Institute of Standards and Technology in the U.S. Department of Commerce. The Baldrige Criteria provide a validated, comprehensive management approach that focuses on results in organizational and personal learning, and knowledge sharing to improve service to the KUMC campus. An employee Engagement Survey, based on the "Are We Making Progress" instrument will be conducted annually. The results are compiled into areas of strengths and opportunities for improvement.

Changing environments of the campuses, education and healthcare, the community, state, nation, and world influence the need for relevant and outcome focused professional faculty and staff development. The leadership of the campus will continue to work with The University of Kansas Hospital, The University of Kansas Physicians, and the clinical foundations to deliver the education, research, and training necessary to maintain and improve the campus and its activities.

**Judgment of reviewer(s):**

- X The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.