



2021 ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW FORM

Note to reviewers: The primary purpose of the annual report review process is to make sure that CNME-accredited and candidate ND programs are addressing any outstanding recommendations within the specified time period, and that they are otherwise remaining in compliance with CNME accreditation standards and policies.

Primary Reviewer: Dr. Amanda Alexander Secondary Reviewer: Dr. Susan Tebb

Bastyr University

Recommendations adopted by the Council on May 13, 2021

Outstanding Recommendation

Recommendation IV-2: The team is concerned that adjunct faculty do not receive regular periodic performance reviews. The program needs to ensure that performance reviews are regularly and consistently performed for all faculty. (Std. IV, Sec. C, Para. 2)

Did information and/or documentation provided demonstrate progress in addressing the recommendation?

- Yes _____ (*There is evidence of progress*)
- No _____ (*There is no evidence of progress*)

Is there sufficient information and/or documentation to decide whether the recommendation has been fully addressed?

- Yes _____ (*Remove recommendation*)
- No _____ (*Require continued reporting*)

If the recommendation has not been fully addressed and the program will require more than two years (or the time period previously specified by the Council) to address it, has the program met the requirements for an extension based on “good cause” as stated in the CNME Policy on Enforcement of Standards?

- Yes _____ (*Extend time period for _____ [not to exceed six months, if the program has already had two years to address the finding]; indicate the basis for this suggestion in the Comments section below*)
- No _____ (*Initiate immediate adverse action; indicate the basis for this suggestion in the Comments section below*)

COUNCIL ON NATUROPATHIC MEDICAL EDUCATION

P.O. Box 178, Great Barrington, MA 01230 | 413.528.8877 | 413.528.8880 FAX

If the time period for addressing the recommendation is extended, should the program be placed on a sanction (i.e., Letter of Advisement, Probation, or Show Cause)?

- *Yes* _____ *(Indicate the basis for this suggestion in the Comments section below)*
- *No* _____ *(Indicate the basis for this suggestion in the Comments section below)*

Areas of Interest adopted by the Council on May 13, 2021

Outstanding Area of Interest

Area of Interest IV-1: Faculty members reported widely that the brief onboarding/orientation process was inadequate. There needs to be a more thorough orientation/onboarding process for new faculty. (Std. IV, Sec. C, Para. 1)

Did information and/or documentation provided demonstrate progress in addressing the area of interest?

- *Yes* _____ *(There is evidence of progress)*
- *No* _____ *(There is no evidence of progress)*

Is there sufficient information and/or documentation to decide whether the area of interest has been fully addressed?

- *Yes* _____ *(Remove recommendation)*
- *No* _____ *(Require continued reporting)*

(Note: the USDE two-year rule does not apply to areas of interest, since they do not represent a finding of non-compliance.)

Outstanding Area of Interest

Area of Interest IV-2: Several faculty members are carrying loads above 36 credits without being designated as core faculty; this poses possible legal issues, as well as a fairness issue. (Std. IV, Sec. F, Para. 2)

Did information and/or documentation provided demonstrate progress in addressing the area of interest?

- *Yes* _____ *(There is evidence of progress)*
- *No* _____ *(There is no evidence of progress)*

Is there sufficient information and/or documentation to decide whether the area of interest has been fully addressed?

- Yes_____ (*Remove recommendation*)
- No_____ (*Require continued reporting*)

(*Note: the USDE two-year rule does not apply to areas of interest, since they do not represent a finding of non-compliance.*)

Areas of Interest adopted by the Council on October 21, 2021

Outstanding Area of Interest

Area of Interest IV-3: (formerly Recommendation IV-1) The team is concerned that during the past three years around 19% of core faculty have resigned, and either have been replaced by adjunct faculty or have not been replaced; this has had an adverse impact on program quality, faculty and student morale, and faculty ability to meet service and research/scholarship expectations. The University needs to effectively address this high level of faculty turnover. (Std. IV, Sec. B, Para. 1 & 2)

Did information and/or documentation provided demonstrate progress in addressing the area of interest?

- Yes_____ (*There is evidence of progress*)
- No_____ (*There is no evidence of progress*)

Is there sufficient information and/or documentation to decide whether the area of interest has been fully addressed?

- Yes_____ (*Remove recommendation*)
- No_____ (*Require continued reporting*)

(*Note: the USDE two-year rule does not apply to areas of interest, since they do not represent a finding of non-compliance.*)

Residency Program Findings adopted by the Council on May 13, 2021

Outstanding Residency Program Findings

None

Reviewer's Comments

*Use this section—and attach additional sheets if necessary—for the following purposes:
(1) to explain the basis for your conclusions regarding the recommendations and areas of interest above, and*

(2) to note any problematic areas in the report that may indicate a new compliance issue with CNME's accreditation standards and policies.