



230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7-500 | Chicago, IL 60604-1413
800.621.7440 | Fax: 312.263.7462 | info@hlcommission.org | ncahlc.org

Serving the common good by assuring and enhancing the quality of higher learning

September 22, 2010

Dr. Stuart C. Lord
President
Naropa University
2130 Arapahoe Ave.
Boulder, CO 80302-6697

Dear President Lord:

Subsequent to the September 15-16, 2010 meeting of the Review Committee, I am enclosing the Committee's report of its decision regarding Naropa University. I ask that you respond to this decision by indicating your choice to concur or not to concur. The Review Committee report and your response become part of the official file and will be included with the materials sent to the next team that visits Naropa University.

The evaluation team through the team chair is also asked to respond to the Review Committee's decision. If you and the evaluation team concur with the decision, it will be the official Commission action. If you or the evaluation team do not concur with the decision, the Review Committee's report together with a new response and documentation from you will be referred to the next scheduled meeting of the Institutional Actions Council.

Please respond to the Review Committee report and action by returning this letter with the appropriate notation of your response, by fax or email no later than September 29. If you wish further clarification of these options and their consequences, please contact your staff liaison, Karen J. Solomon, Ed.D.

I appreciate your cooperation in this process.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Manning
President

CONCUR <input type="checkbox"/>	DO NOT CONCUR <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------	---

(Signature) _____

(Date) _____



**REVIEW COMMITTEE
REPORT FORM**

REVIEW COMMITTEE # 3

SESSION B

September 16, 2010

INSTITUTION:	NAROPA UNIVERSITY
TYPE OF EVALUATION:	CONTINUED ACCREDITATION <i>(5 years for next COMP)</i>
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER:	Dr. Stuart C. Lord, President
TEAM CHAIR:	Dr. Dale R. Brougher
STAFF LIAISON:	Dr. Karen J. Solomon
REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	Dr. Richard J. Sherry (Chair), Dr. Donna Marie Kempf (Recorder), Dr. Patricia A. Dolly, Dr. Paul C. Koch, Mr. Terrance A. Levenda, Dr. Elizabeth V. Swenson

INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES:

Dr. Stuart C. Lord, President
Dr. Suzanne Benally, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dr. Brian Bissell, Vice President of Business and Finance
Dr. Stuart Sigman, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mr. Martin Janowitz, Chairman, Board of Trustees

TEAM CHAIR:

Dr. Dale R. Brougher

**I. REVIEW COMMITTEE CONCLUSION ON TEAM RECOMMENDATION
(CHECK ONE):**

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

II. REVIEW COMMITTEE ACTION/RECOMMENDATION

The Committee agrees with the Team with additional reporting requirements to team's recommendation. The 2012 Focused Visit should contain the following elements in its report:

Evidence of 2011 and 2012 balanced budgets.

Evidence of adjustment of faculty/student ratio and load in order to bring the University in line with best practices for an institution of its type.

Evidence of elimination of redundant staffing and clarification of campus community roles.

Evidence of institutionalized accountability measures (identify responsibilities and timelines).

Clear indication of evidence-based, time-bound processes for decision-making.

Articulated across the board outcome-based performance measures.

Articulated and implemented processes for self-evaluation throughout the University community.

III. REVIEW COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (Criterion and Core Components noted)

- 1.d Upon review of the team report and the committee interviews, the committee concurs with findings of the visiting team.
- 2.b Upon review of the team report and the committee interviews, the committee concurs with findings of the visiting team.

IV. REVIEW COMMITTEE RATIONALE

The committee interviewed institutional representatives and the team chair confirmed progress on the issues outlined in the team's recommendation. Given the statements of the team chair and the institutional representatives, the team's recommendation was warranted along with a modification of the information to be provided for the 2012 Focused Visit.