

Assurance Argument
Saint John's University - MN

2/19/2018

1 - Mission

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

1.A - Core Component 1.A

The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

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.
2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

Argument

The Trustees and leadership of Saint John's University (SJU) regularly review the University's mission to ensure it remains relevant to its students and to the needs and expectations of the larger world. The SJU Board of Trustees approved a revised [Mission and Vision](#) statement on November 21, 2015 as part of a strategic planning process completed during 2015 and 2016. The Mission Statement reads as follows:

Grounded in Catholic and Benedictine values and tradition, Saint John's University provides young men a distinctive residential liberal arts education, preparing them to reach their full potential and instilling in them the values and aspiration to lead lives of significance and principled achievement.

The mission and vision support a set of core values related to community, openness to learning, respect for persons, depth of understanding, sacredness, and passion for excellence that are central to the SJU student experience and to decision-making about the university's priorities and directions.

College of Arts and Sciences

Our programs, services and student profile are consistent with our mission. At the undergraduate level, the College of Arts and Sciences provides programs and experiences that are principally residential; we offer no undergraduate on-line programs, nor do we offer accelerated programs or other programs for non-residential students. The vast majority of our degree programs are in arts and sciences disciplines. Even our professional academic programs (Accounting and Finance, Elementary Education, Global Business Leadership, and Nursing) are fully grounded in the liberal arts and liberal learning. All programs share the same common curriculum. The university's steadfast commitment to residential liberal arts education has been essential to our distinction and success.

The university achieves its mission in partnership with the College of Saint Benedict (CSB). SJU and CSB share the same fundamental commitment to providing a high quality residential, liberal arts experience to students framed by the Catholic intellectual tradition. As single-sex institutions, each

college's mission and vision is particularly attentive to gender and gender development.

SJU and CSB together offer 35 [academic majors](#) and 41 minors leading to the bachelor's degree. In 2016-17, 65 percent of all undergraduate [degrees conferred](#) by Saint John's University were in arts and sciences disciplines.

In fall 2017, the University [enrolled](#) 1,706 first-year to senior students. 86 percent of all students live in campus residential facilities, nearly all of the remainder living in neighborhoods in nearby St. Joseph. We overwhelmingly enroll traditional-age undergraduate students. In fall 2017, 99 percent of all undergraduates were under age 23.

Our graduates resoundingly endorse the liberal arts education they experienced at CSB and SJU. We survey alumni three years after having earned their degree. Among alumni who earned their baccalaureate degree at SJU between 2010 and 2014, nearly 90 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "the liberal arts education I received at CSB/SJU has contributed significantly to my personal and professional development." Among [2014 graduates](#), 94 percent rated the quality of instruction they received as undergraduates as good or excellent, and 86 percent indicated they would choose SJU again if they could start over.

Budgeting is closely aligned with our joint strategic plan, ensuring that the mission guides the operations and financial choices of the college. Among the objectives included in [Strategic Directions 2020](#) is a commitment to create a long-range economic model to ensure financial sustainability and the achievement of our mission. Approved by the Board of Trustees in 2016, the [economic model](#) established a set of strategic assumptions that express key operational and mission values and articulated a set of key financial levers by which financial sustainability could be achieved in both the short-term and the long-run. The financial levers allow the university to establish a series of broad multi-year revenue and expenditure goals and targets for the period FY 2017 to FY 2020. Alignment of planning and budget priorities is addressed in greater detail in Criterion 5.C.

School of Theology and Seminary

The [mission of the Saint John's School of Theology and Seminary](#), approved by the school's Board of Regents in March 2006, expresses our commitment to academic, spiritual, pastoral and professional formation. It reflects our call as a school and our commitment to a community of faculty, staff, students, and board members. It positions the school in the Roman Catholic and Benedictine communities, identifying our service to those particular communities and to the church at large as that of a worshipping academic community with a distinctive liturgical, ecumenical, Benedictine character that studies the Christian tradition and forms students for ministry. The School of Theology and Seminary continually adapts to its vision, strategic plans, and curriculum to respond to the changing ecology within graduate theological education.

The School of Theology and Seminary is [accredited](#) by the Association of Theological Schools in the U.S. and Canada and offers [graduate programs](#) leading to master's degrees as well as a variety of non-degree study options. In fall 2017, the [SOT enrolled](#) 95 full-time and part-time students. It typically confers between 20 and 30 graduate degrees each year in theology, theological studies, divinity, ministry, liturgical studies and liturgical music.

Sources

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Academic Majors and Minors
- ATS Reaccreditation of SOT in 2008
- IR_Class of 2014 Alum Survey
- IR_Degrees Conferred by Discipline
- IR_Fall 2017 Enrollment Summary
- IR_Fall 2017 SJU Enrollment CAS SOT
- PRES CSBSJU_SD 2020 Bd Approved_20150518
- PRES SJU_Mission and Vision
- SDC_EconomicModelContext_2015Fall.pdf
- SOT_Grad Degrees
- SOT_Mission

1.B - Core Component 1.B

The mission is articulated publicly.

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

Argument

The university's mission statement and supporting vision and value statements are widely accessible to internal and external constituencies. The CSB/SJU web page provides ready access from the front page. The mission statement is included or referenced by weblink in both the [Faculty Handbook](#) and the [Administrative and Support Staff Handbook](#). It also is front and center with university trustees; board and committee agendas routinely reflect components of the mission.

The university's mission is central to and reflected in the vision statement and four key strategic directions that frame the [Strategic Directions 2020](#) plan approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2015.

Further reflecting the integration of mission and vision, *Strategic Directions 2020* asserted four core commitments to our students:

1. A **rigorous and engaging liberal arts education** that prepares students for fulfilling and meaningful lives and careers.
2. A **personal teaching and learning experience** that encourages self-reflection, engaged dialogue, and critical assessment.
3. A **powerful and lasting experience of community** shaped and sustained by our Catholic and Benedictine values and characterized by a commitment to leadership and service.
4. A **transformational experience** that inspires men to reach their full intellectual, spiritual, physical, and social potential.

Strategic Directions 2020 identifies 17 [outcome benchmarks](#) that fulfill the plan's goals and the university's broader mission. We update the metrics annually and provide them to our Board of Trustees as part of their regular review of the plan.

Sources

- FHB January 2018
- PRES CSBSJU_SD 2020 Bd Approved_20150518
- SD 2020 Outcome Metrics.pdf

- SJU Admin-Support Handbook (FINAL COPY 2.2018).pdf

1.C - Core Component 1.C

The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Argument

The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University are committed to the promotion of a diverse community, one in which students, faculty, and staff venture from their comfort zones for the sake of learning, develop a critical perspective on the creation of difference, and pursue self-exploration with the knowledge that understanding yourself requires engagement with others.

We have devoted considerable attention to intercultural learning, diversity, and inclusion. Our Common Curriculum includes an [intercultural learning requirement](#) designed to help students develop a greater understanding of diversity while recognizing that individual values are shaped by one's own unique background and context. Beyond the curriculum, CSB and SJU together sponsored two Inclusion Visioning Days in fall 2016 and spring 2017 that together included several hundred faculty, staff and students. Those meetings resulted in a strong [commitment to inclusivity](#), which we expect to approve during the 2017-18 academic year.

The [Intercultural Directions Council](#) (IDC), a shared CSB/SJU committee created in 2005 comprised of faculty, staff and students, plays a key leadership role in relation to the university's diversity and inclusion objectives. It seeks to develop shared understandings and promote actions that advance intercultural competence, to foster a genuinely inclusive intercultural community, to promote active learning toward intercultural competence, and to improve recruitment and retention of a diverse educational community (students, workforce, and management).

Strategic Directions 2020 addresses two key imperatives: defining our distinction in higher education and assuring that our curricular and co-curricular experience and practice adapts to the needs, expectations, and aspirations of a 21st century student body. It includes a number of specific goals and benchmarks related to diversity and inclusivity:

- *Develop and implement a professional development program that strengthens the faculty and staff's ability to meet the needs of the student body. Professional development programming will include enhanced preparation for diversity and intercultural literacy.* In September 2015, the university received a grant from the [Andrew W. Mellon Foundation](#) to focus on professional development for first-year symposium (FYS) faculty to address successfully teaching, advising and engaging an increasingly diverse student body. The multi-pronged approach included an extensive review of current practices, multiple and dynamic faculty development opportunities and a "crossover evaluation" conducted in partnership with the College of Saint Benedict. In December 2017, CSB and SJU received an additional \$600,000 grant from the Mellon Foundation to support initiatives focused on inclusive pedagogy and community building. [BECOMING Community](#) will design and undertake a practice of on-going community transformation based on transformative inclusion. Our goal is to prepare and enable our

students, faculty, and staff to move beyond learning about oppression to become agents of change dismantling oppression. The Council of Independent Colleges selected CSB and SJU to participate in the [Diversity, Civility, and the Liberal Arts Institute](#). CSB/SJU will send a team of faculty and administrators to participate in this program to develop realistic plans to enable their institutions to strengthen diversity and civility on campus, both inside and outside the classroom.

- *Create a comprehensive First Year Experience program to facilitate the transition to college and create a foundation for student success.* During the 2016-17 academic year, faculty and staff from across the university conducted a [self-study](#) to assess the effectiveness of programs, policies, and procedures on retention and the experience of new students. Among other things, the self-study indicated an opportunity to improve first-year advising and the connections students make with faculty and each other during their first year in college -- particularly for first-generation and historically underrepresented students. The study recommends creating a first-year lab experience that addresses equity.
- *Eliminate retention and completion gaps between majority and under-represented students.* Though [retention](#) and [completion](#) rates for all students at SJU are significantly higher than national averages, gaps remain between majority students and students of color. Between fall 2014 and fall 2017, first-to-second year retention averaged 82 percent for American students of color and 89 percent for white students. The six-year completion rate for the entering class of 2011 totaled 66 percent for American students of color, compared to 77 percent for white students.

In support of the college's student diversity and inclusion objectives, the CSB/SJU Office of Intercultural and International Student Services advocates for, educates, and serves the campus community through programs and workshops that advance self-identity development, diversity, inclusion, and social justice. It seeks to strengthen the intercultural, international, and social justice education and development of all students; to advocate for, serve, and guide the campus community to increased and improved intercultural competence; and to assist international and underrepresented students in their transitions to, retention at, and graduation from CSB/SJU.

We provide a number of other services directed toward student retention and success:

- Student Accessibility Services collaborates with both academic and student development departments to provide community-wide access for persons with disabilities.
- College Navigator, a new position created in 2017, works in both admission and student development roles to assist historically underrepresented students and their families first through the admission process and then through successful completion of their first year in college.
- We host three College Possible "coaches," who work with historically underrepresented students throughout their four years here, helping them to navigate their academic and co-curricular experience, and providing them with counseling assistance on issues like financial aid, student accounts, and academic advising. College Possible is a national non-profit organization headquartered in the Twin Cities that connects underrepresented students to college opportunities.

In addition to administrative support, the university also offers a number of academic and student development programs and activities designed to support underrepresented students or advance multi-cultural understanding and inclusion, including:

- The Intercultural Leadership, Education and Development Program (Intercultural-LEAD) program, which provides support for talented first-generation students to build on the leadership

skills they demonstrated within their high schools and home communities.

- The SJU FirstGen Scholars program provides recipients with a scholarship, an annual travel allowance for learning or internship opportunities, and faculty and staff mentors.
- Festival of Cultures. An annual event drawing over a thousand people from the campus and surrounding community, Festival of Cultures is a festival of music, entertainment, food, and culture. It celebrates and recognizes the diversity at CSB/SJU through student performances, cultural food sampling, and a fashion show. Principally hosted by international students, the festival also includes students from the United States who have strong affinity to other countries, as well as varying cultures within the United States.
- Reflection Action Dialogue (RAD), a student organization that hosts interactive theater events on campus as an opportunity to promote inclusivity and shed light on various forms of exclusion that occur on and off campus.

The university has made significant progress in recent years extending the reach of its mission to historically underrepresented students. The number of [undergraduate students of color](#) enrolled at SJU has increased by 85 percent since fall 2010, and their proportion of the entire student body has risen from eight percent to nearly 18 percent. We also have experienced a significant increase in first-generation students, who comprised 21 percent of new entering students in fall 2010 and 26 percent in fall 2017.

In part a reflection of local demography, we have been less successful attracting faculty and staff of color. In fall 2016, nine percent [of all faculty were non-white](#). People of color represented 2.9 percent of all administrative and support staff. To better support our commitment to building and retaining a diverse workforce, the CSB/SJU Human Resources Department created a Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Committee in fall 2016. Comprised of both staff and faculty, the Advisory Committee aspires to serve our students and community with a commitment to diversity and inclusion in three focus areas: recruitment and retention, professional development and infrastructure, and community outreach and engagement. The committee has begun training of faculty and staff to serve as [search advocates](#) to ensure that searches are inclusive.

Sources

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Common Curriculum Intercultural Learning
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Mellon Grants2015
- CSB-SJU Search Advocate Executive Introduction Material
- CSBSJU_Diversity, Civility, and the Liberal Arts Institute
- IR_Cohort Grad Rates 2009-2012.pdf
- IR_Fac Staff by RaceEthnicity 2016-17
- IR_First-to-Second Year Persistence, 2013 to 2016 Cohorts
- IR_Race-Ethnicity Profile 2012-2017
- PRES CSBSJU_BECOMING Community 2017
- PRES CSBSJU_Inclusion Statement_2018.pdf
- STD DEV_FoE Final Report 2017
- STD DEV_Intercultural Directions Council Purpose

1.D - Core Component 1.D

The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

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

Argument

Service and commitment to community are core values at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University. The terms "service," "community," "justice" and "stewardship" each have a long tradition in Benedictine monasticism and Catholic social teaching. Together they provide the context for engagement, service and learning here.

Since its founding, Saint John's University has framed learning with powerful values rooted in its centuries-old Benedictine tradition. We approach inquiry and discovery in the context of community and the connections that bind us as people, families, and cultures. Our commitment extends to the generative uses of knowledge for practical, ethical, and moral purposes. We teach and mentor young men through the lens of community. Our mission directs to prepare our students to reach their full potential and instilling in them the values and aspiration to lead lives of significance and principled achievement.

[Promoting the common good](#) through active community engagement and serving others is an integral part of the SJU and CSB student experience. A portion of that work is expressed through Experience and Professional Development (XPD) Office, which combines the former offices of Career Services and Experiential Learning and Community Engagement. XPD "empowers students to connect their aspirations with opportunities and translate their liberal arts education to achieve meaningful personal and professional lives" It supports professional and career development as well as programs empowering students to apply knowledge and theory gained in the classroom to a hands-on learning environment. The office brings together students, faculty, businesses, non-profit organizations and government partners to promote access to experiential learning and pre- and post-graduation professional opportunities. The experiential learning programs managed by XPD include:

- The Bonner Leader Program, which seeks to improve the lives of individuals and communities by helping meet the basic needs of nutrition and educational opportunity. Today, 39 CSB and SJU students fulfill their Bonner work study at over 15 different locations and complete more than 1,000 hours of service every year.
- The Marie and Robert Jackson Fellows Program, which seeks to empower students with opportunities to serve the common good through community engagement, collective learning, and leadership and professional development. Each year, 10-12 CSB and SJU students are selected through an application and interview process to be part of a cohort of Jackson Fellows. Each Fellow serves at a community site for the summer. All fellowships involve civic engagement and work devoted to improving community life.

- The Service-Learning Program works with SJU and CSB students and faculty and organizations in the surrounding community to foster successful service-learning opportunities that are relevant to what is taught in the classroom. The program provides students with opportunities to participate in service-learning opportunities that incorporates ideas, theories, practices, and methods taught in the classroom and to accept, support, and appreciate diversity in all its forms.

The [CSB/SJU 2016 Senior Survey](#) reflects our students' strong commitment to service. Nearly three-quarters (73 percent) of SJU seniors indicated that they participated in a community service or volunteer activity during their time here. Half indicated that they spent at least one hour every week participating in community service activities. More than 8 in 10 said that "helping others in need" was a very important or essential life objective. Seventy-eight percent described "being active in my community" similarly.

The School of Theology and Seminary is also integral to the understanding and implementation of the Catholic, Benedictine character of the university. Its outreach contributes to the vitality of the College of Arts and Sciences through Youth in Theology and Ministry, National Catholic Youth Choir, and the Initiative on Community-Building.

Additionally, the [Hill Museum and Manuscript Library](#), a division of the university, serves the world through digital preservation of cultural resources, focusing on manuscripts in endangered or remote locations. HMML today is a world leader in photographic preservation of manuscripts. It makes both manuscript images and its catalogue available through online tools for teaching and research.

These examples provide only a small sample of the scope of our engagement with the broader public and the ways we serve a common good. Individual students, class sections and student clubs and organizations often organize and deliver service projects that serve communities.

Sources

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Campus Compact Civic Action Plan
- IR_2016 Senior Survey Report
- PRES SJU_HMML Global Work

1.S - Criterion 1 - Summary

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Summary

Saint John's University, together with its partner, the College and Saint Benedict, fulfills Criterion One through clearly defined mission and vision statements. Our strategic plan articulates a set of core commitments and aspirations to fulfill both. We lead and operate through the lens of mission. Consistency in the mission over many years has enabled us to nurture a strong sense of identity and purpose, and allowed us to direct our focus to goals, experiences, and activities that clearly move us toward the achievement of the mission. The liberal arts, residential and Catholic and Benedictine values expressed in our mission provide us with tremendous opportunities to create a true community of active and committed scholars and learners.

Sources

There are no sources.

2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

2.A - Core Component 2.A

The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

Argument

Saint John's University promotes and exhibits integrity through policies and practices that call board, faculty, staff and administration to fair, ethical and professional behavior.

The Board of Trustees fulfills its governance duties as outlined in governing documents and prescribed by law. The [Articles of Incorporation](#) articulate the university's purpose "to provide undergraduate and graduate education within the Catholic university tradition." The [SJU Bylaws](#) articulate the responsibilities of the Board and processes by which the board governs the university; the [Statement of Commitment and Responsibilities](#) describes the expectations of trustees to support and uphold the mission of the university. Trustees are required to disclose potential or perceived [conflicts of interest](#) and refrain from participating in board actions when there is a conflict of interest.

In May 2017, the SJU and CSB boards each reviewed their respective by-laws. Trustees approved changes to the bylaws regarding voting board membership to clarify fiduciary responsibility, improve independence, and reduce conflicts of interest related to faculty and students serving as voting members on the boards (additional details are provided in 2.C.2).

Through the actions of the board and its committees, the SJU board exercises its responsibilities for: (a) selection and review of the president, (b) approval of the budget, (c) review of educational programs, (d) quality of the faculty, (e) strategic planning, (f) risk management policies and practices, (g) compliance with state and federal laws and regulations, and (h) the condition of the physical plant. [Committee charters](#) and other [board policies](#) guide board and committee deliberations and decisions.

The [Finance Committee](#) has the principal duty for review of the annual operating budget, as well as costs for all renovations and construction projects. The [Audit Committee](#) reviews the university's financial statements and recommends the auditor. In addition, the Committee reviews insurance coverage and ensures that appropriate risk management policies and practices are being followed. The [Investment Committee](#) oversees the endowment, recommends draw policies, and monitors investment allocations and investment managers.

The Business Office employs generally accepted accounting principles to ensure transparent and consistent financial processes. It provides monthly and quarterly budget-to-actual reports to the Finance Committee, for review on behalf of the board. [SJU's financial statements](#) are audited annually

by an independent public accounting firm to ensure compliance with state and federal law. The institution consistently receives an unmodified audit opinion, reflecting conformity with the generally accepted accounting principles and indicating that financial statements are presented fairly.

SJU is an [Equal Employment Opportunity](#) employer and strives for fairness and transparency in employment practices. Human Resources is involved in all steps of recruitment and hiring to ensure a diverse applicant pool. In spring 2017, an HR Inclusion Advisory Committee was created to address issues of diversity and inclusion in hiring. HR also provides orientation for new employees, annual workshops on best recruitment and hiring practices, and a variety of ongoing informational, educational, and professional offerings. A [Joint Benefits Committee](#), comprised of faculty and staff, and a [Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee](#) regularly review benefits and provide input from stakeholders.

Employees are expected to conduct their work with professionalism and integrity and in accord with the institution's Catholic and Benedictine mission. The [Benedictine Institute](#) and [Koch Chair in Catholic Thought and Culture](#) provide mission-focused activities and lectures. Standards of conduct, institutional policies and employee policies are compiled in [faculty](#) and [staff](#) handbooks, which are available electronically to all employees. [EthicsPoint](#), an on-line reporting system, provides an anonymous and confidential way to report suspected improper conduct. We annually email a [reminder](#) about EthicsPoint to all employees. HR tracks the reports it receives and initiates appropriate follow-up.

Faculty members adhere to the highest levels of scholarly and research practice, supported by the [Faculty Code of Ethics](#). Academic and administrative departments model "best practices" and ethical codes of their various professions (e.g., Financial Accounting Standards Board, Society of Human Resources Management, Association of Student Affairs in Catholic Colleges and Universities).

The university has a tradition of shared governance that strives to include administrators, faculty, and staff in policy-making and decision-making. Standing committees such as the Joint Benefits Committee, Faculty Handbook Committee, Strategic Directions Council, Faculty Senate, and Student Senate provide employees and students opportunities for discussion, input and feedback. The President's Cabinet meets regularly to discuss and address institutional needs, issues, and concerns. Coordinate Cabinet, which is comprised of both the CSB Cabinet and the SJU Cabinet along with faculty and student leaders, meets twice a semester. An annual campus-wide workshop, twice-a-year state of the college forums with the Presidents, and strategic planning sessions bolster an already-strong culture of community.

Institutional processes are regularly reviewed for efficiency, effectiveness, and efficacy. For example, the [presidents' charge](#) for the Strategic Directions Council was revised in fall 2016 to refocus their work on implementing *Strategic Directions 2020*.

The SJU Board of Trustees meets with the CSB Board of Trustees twice annually to discuss shared academic and student service programs and issues of relevance to both institutions. Additionally, committees of the Boards of Trustees meet together regularly for the same purpose. A [Memorandum of Understanding](#), which is currently being updated, and a variety of supporting documents guide the work of the coordinate relationship at the board and administrative levels.

Sources

- FHB January 2018
- PRES CSBSJU_Benedictine Institute Website_20171117
- PRES CSBSJU_EthicPoint email_20170912
- PRES CSBSJU_EthicsPoint Website_20171117
- PRES CSBSJU_Fac Comp and Benefits Comm_2017
- PRES CSBSJU_Faculty Code of Ethics_2017
- PRES CSBSJU_Human Resources Website_20171025
- PRES CSBSJU_Ingram Report_Jan 2017
- PRES CSBSJU_Ingram Report_Jan 2017 (page number 2)
- PRES CSBSJU_Joint Benefits Committee Overview_2016
- PRES CSBSJU_Koch Chair in Catholic Thought_20171117
- PRES CSBSJU_MOU_20071130TBR
- PRES CSBSJU_Updated_Charge_to_SDC_20160725
- PRES SJU_Articles of Incorporation_101211
- PRES SJU_Audited Financials 2016
- PRES SJU_Board Committee Charters_2016
- PRES SJU_Board Committee Charters_2016 (page number 4)
- PRES SJU_Board Committee Charters_2016 (page number 12)
- PRES SJU_Board Committee Charters_2016 (page number 14)
- PRES SJU_Bylaws_20170529
- PRES SJU_Conflict of Interest Policy_20130520
- PRES SJU_Primary Board Documents_2017
- PRES SJU_Stmt of Trustee Commitment_07-01-12
- SJU Admin-Support Handbook (FINAL COPY 2.2018).pdf

2.B - Core Component 2.B

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.

Argument

Saint John's University strives for clear and accurate communication with its audiences throughout its public statements and organizational documents. The University uses a variety of tools and documents to communicate its mission, governance, control, academic programs, graduation requirements, costs to students, accreditation, and student programs. These include the CSB/SJU website, social media, academic catalog, J-Book, admission and marketing materials, the alumni magazine, and the CSB/SJU Institutional Profile. Each of these has been developed with mission in mind and is reviewed regularly to ensure accuracy and clarity.

In addition, the University provides information and data to the public through a number of mandatory and optional reporting systems. Examples include required state reporting to the Minnesota Office of Higher Education, the Annual Campus Safety Report (Cleary Act), and the federal Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, as well as participating in and providing data for many surveys from outside organizations.

Website

The [CSB/SJU website](#) is widely used by internal and external audiences to access information about Saint John's University. The website is managed by the Office of Marketing and Communications, which provides creative and content development support to academic and administrative departments, and has primary responsibility to keep the website updated. Websites for academic departments contain biographical and contact information for faculty, as well as information about majors, minors, student services and career opportunities. Other sites in the CSB/SJU domain provide current and historic information from A-Z for students, employees, alumni and alumnae and the public.

Academic Catalog

The [Academic Catalog](#) is the primary tool for communicating to current and prospective students about academic departments and offerings, policies and regulations, as well as campus support services to current and prospective students. The catalog provides links to specific departments and faculty listings. The Office of the Registrar updates the catalog annually.

Tuition and Fees

[Tuition and fees](#) are reported in the catalog, on the website and in admission materials. Students and their family have access to a [Net Price Calculator](#) to help them determine the cost of attending and types of financial aid for which they may be eligible. Each spring, families of returning students receive a letter from the president announcing costs of attendance for the next year.

Student Handbook

The [J-Book](#) is the handbook for Saint John's University students. It is the primary source for communicating policies, community standards, expectations, and information related to residential life, human rights, sexual misconduct, student activities, and student conduct. The J-Book is updated regularly by the Office of Student Development. The J-Book is published online, and all students receive a website link to it at the beginning of each school year.

Admission Materials

The [Office of Admission](#) produces print and on-line materials for prospective students and their families. These materials are designed to accurately reflect the mission and values of Saint John's University and College of Saint Benedict, to describe the broad range of curricular and co-curricular opportunities at the colleges, and to clearly articulate the quality and rigor of the academic programs offered.

Social Media

CSB/SJU maintain a number of social media accounts, including [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), [YouTube](#), [Pinterest](#), and [Instagram](#). We use these tools to communicate and engage with internal and external audiences. Staff from the OMC monitor all accounts to convey information clearly and accurately and to respond to questions in a timely manner.

Institutional Research Fact Book

The [Institutional Profile](#) is the official fact book for Saint John's University and College of Saint Benedict. It provides a multi-year snapshot and briefing of key data and trends related to admission and enrollment, academic activity and productivity, and human and financial resources. The profile is intended to address questions frequently asked about SJU and CSB and provide, in one compendium, macro-level data for planning, decision-making, fundraising and communication. The profile is updated annually by the Office of Institutional Planning and Research.

Accreditation

Accreditation status is listed on our [website](#) and in the [Academic Catalog](#). Departmental accreditation information is posted on the website and within the department-specific information in the catalog.

Sources

- IR_InstitutionalProfile-2017
- PRES CSBSJU_Accreditation_2017
- PRES CSBSJU_Admission_20171025
- PRES CSBSJU_Facebook_20171025
- PRES CSBSJU_Fact Book_2014TBR
- PRES CSBSJU_Instagram_20171025
- PRES CSBSJU_Magazine_2017Spring
- PRES CSBSJU_Net Price Calculator_20171025
- PRES CSBSJU_Pinterest_20171025
- PRES CSBSJU_Twitter_20171025
- PRES CSBSJU_Webpage_20170614_TBR

- PRES CSBSJU_YouTube_20171025
- PRES SJU_Tuition and Fees_20171025

2.C - Core Component 2.C

The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
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.
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.
4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Argument

The Saint John's University Board of Trustees operates in relation to the responsibilities outlined in the university's bylaws. Trustees take seriously their responsibility to define and sustain the mission, set strategic direction and secure the financial future of the university. Comprised of up to 44 members, the board meets four times each year.

Deliberations Reflect Priorities

Over the past years, in addition to its regular annual work reviewing the mission, approving the budget, acting on academic program review, and authorizing capital projects, the board has deliberated and acted on numerous other significant matters, recently including the [strategic plan](#) (*Strategic Directions 2020*), [Human Rights](#) and [Sexual Misconduct](#) policies, enterprise risk management, capital campaign and hiring a [President](#) (in 2012).

One of the most significant deliberations in the last decade was when the University was created as a separate civil non-profit corporation on July 1, 2012. This was a noteworthy task undertaken by the board, specifically to preserve and enhance the institution. Prior to 2012 Saint John's University was an operating division of its founder/sponsor, the Order of Saint Benedict, a structure accreditors expressed some concerns about during a previous accreditation. Over a number of years, under the guidance of SJU's governing board, a task force developed a legal framework and the necessary [legal documents](#) to make this transition possible.

Deliberation Includes Constituent Interests

Much of the work of the board is accomplished through its [standing committees](#). Faculty and students serve as voting representatives on the Academic Affairs, Enrollment and Marketing, Student Development, Resource Development and Building and Grounds committees. A non-voting faculty representative serves on the Finance Committee. This [model](#) helps ensure faculty and students have a voice in important deliberations. Faculty, staff and students often present directly to the board and to board committees. Broad input on the strategic plan, capital campaign and the presidential search was solicited from faculty, staff, students, former board members and alumni.

Board Preserves Independence

As noted in the [membership booklet](#), trustees are expected to serve the entire university and not to represent the interests of any particular constituency. This helps ensure that actions of the board benefit all of SJU, not particular individuals or groups. Annually Trustees are required to sign a [Conflict of Interest statement](#) disclosing any relationships or affiliations that are or could be perceived as a conflict of interest, and to refrain from participating in discussions where a conflict exists.

In spring 2016, Dr. Richard Cook, leader of the Council of Independent Colleges' Presidents Governance Academy recommended to the Joint Presidential Advisory Committee (JPAC) that the CSB and SJU bylaws be reviewed and revised to conform to best practices. In September 2016 the JPAC recommended review of the CSB and SJU bylaws to the CSB and SJU Boards of Trustees. Together, the SJU and CSB boards engaged Dr. Richard T. Ingram, former Association of Governing Boards president, to examine the two sets of bylaws. Dr. Ingram submitted his [report](#) in January 2017. The report included a number a number recommendations about board size, term limits, and clarification of trustee responsibilities. The recommendation that received the greatest scrutiny was related to faculty and students serving as voting trustees. The report indicated that, while not uncommon among colleges and universities, [faculty](#) and [students](#) as voting trustees did not represent *best* practice, noting that potential or real conflicts of interest inhibit these groups from fulfilling their fiduciary responsibility. Faculty and students opposed the recommendation. After [considerable deliberation](#) and advice from [legal counsel](#), in May 2017, the trustees of both the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University voted to remove faculty and students as voting members of their respective boards. The change went into effect in fall 2017. Though no longer voting trustees, [faculty and students continue to attend board meetings](#) and serve on most board committees, as noted above.

Delegation of Management

[A Policy Statement of Governance](#) enacted by the Board of Trustees describes the authority and responsibilities of the president (p.4), including organization, administration and leadership of the institution in accord with the mission, institutional priorities and goals authorized by the board. Specific duties of the president include appointment of vice presidents and other administrative officers; ensuring compliance with accrediting agencies, federal and state law; primary responsibility for the financial well-being of the university; and preparation of the budget and strategic plan.

Faculty Oversight of Academics

The faculty is responsible for curriculum planning and review, the core curriculum, majors and minors, and admission and graduation requirements. In addition, they set and maintain faculty standards related to tenure, promotions, sabbaticals and faculty development funds. Also within the faculty purview are creation and implementation of faculty salary schedules. These responsibilities are described more broadly in [Section 1.4.2](#) of the Faculty Handbook.

Subordinate Governing Bodies

The Board of Trustees delegates governance of the Hill Museum & Manuscript Library (HMML) and the School of Theology and Seminary (SOT) to the HMML Board of Overseers and the SOT Board of Regents, respectively. As described in the [Policy on Subordinate Governing Bodies](#), the Board of Trustees may establish such bodies for entities within the university that have a mission distinct from undergraduate education, a sizable budget, a significant revenue stream and which would "benefit from more intentional and extensive governance and oversight than a standing committee or Board of

Trustees as a whole can provide." These bodies serve as extensions of the Board of Trustees. These governance relationships are described in the [HMML Statutes](#), the [SOT Statutes](#).

Sources

- PRES CSBSJU_Board Governance Discussions
- PRES CSBSJU_Faculty Letters regarding Governance_2017 May
- PRES CSBSJU_Faculty Role in Governance_2017
- PRES CSBSJU_Governance Pathways May 2017
- PRES CSBSJU_Human Rights Policy_20171025
- PRES CSBSJU_Ingram Report_Jan 2017
- PRES CSBSJU_Legal Counsel Governance May 2017
- PRES CSBSJU_SD 2020 Bd Approved_20150518
- PRES CSBSJU_Sexual Misconduct Policy_20171025
- PRES CSBSJU_Shared Governance Proposal and Background_2017 May
- PRES CSBSJU_SJU Student Response Governance 2017
- PRES SJU_Board Committee Charters_2016
- PRES SJU_Conflict of Interest Policy_20130520
- PRES SJU_Conflict of Interest Policy_20130520 (page number 6)
- PRES SJU_HMML Statues_20120701
- PRES SJU_Presidential Profile_20111205
- PRES SJU_Primary Board Documents_2017
- PRES SJU_Primary Board Documents_2017 (page number 4)
- PRES SJU_SOT Statutes_20170303
- PRES SJU_Subordinate Gov Bodies Policy 07-01-12
- PRES SJU_Trustees Membership Booklet_2017
- PRES_SJU Corporate Legal and Transactional Document List

2.D - Core Component 2.D

The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

Argument

[Academic freedom](#) is a respected and protected value at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University. Faculty rights and obligations related to academic freedom, outlined in the Faculty Handbook, are based on the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) "Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom." The university recognizes the value of tenure as promoting not only academic freedom but also the stability of the university as a community of teachers and scholars. [Promotion and tenure policies](#) are carefully structured to assist faculty in their professional development and to allow for thorough evaluation of every candidate, creating positive long-term educational outcomes of tenure and promotion decisions.

Students, too, are ensured freedom of speech and artistic expression via the university's student life policies. The CSB/SJU student newspaper, *The Record*, provides a venue for free expression, as do social media, and the student senates. The colleges frequently host outside speakers who represent a rich variety of viewpoints on contemporary issues. Through our [Policy Statement for Freedom of Speech and Artistic Expression](#), we welcome the presentation of diverse views, understanding that the expression of those views may cause discomfort for some members of our community. We retain the right to limit speakers/groups inconsistent with the Catholic mission and character of the colleges.

As Catholic Benedictine institutions, CSB and SJU remain inspired by the [Catholic intellectual tradition](#). Our academic community is dedicated to the intellectual, spiritual and ethical formation of students and to academic excellence in the search for truth. The intellectual life of these campuses embodies and affirms the harmony of faith and reason in addition to the dignity of each person, each central to the Catholic intellectual tradition. We are committed to exploring how faith and reason mutually enrich and challenge our understanding of the human condition and the development of the human person. As Catholic and Benedictine institutions, we support and actively encourage freedom to explore the truths of faith, for intellectual and scientific inquiry of all types and for active dialogue about the interactions among these.

The Catholic intellectual tradition has long held that truth is too vast for any one tradition to fully encompass. Thus, those who stand in other faith traditions are no strangers here and are invited to witness to the truth as they see it. There is a place here also for those who do not consider themselves a part of any religious tradition, but who devote themselves with passion and integrity to their disciplines, learning, teaching and to the search for truth. The Catholic identity of CSB and SJU evokes the practices of Benedictine hospitality and an ecumenical welcome extended to all who enter the intellectual community as persons of principle and seekers of truth.

Sources

- PRES CSBSJU_Academic Freedom_201701
- PRES CSBSJU_Catholic Identity_20171117
- PRES CSBSJU_Tenure and Promotion_201701TBR
- PRES SJU_Freedom of Speech and Expression_201608TBR

2.E - Core Component 2.E

The institution's policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students and staff.

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.
2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.
3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Argument

Oversight and Support of Research and Scholarship

Saint John's University requires that all research activities involving human subjects comply with the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46). CSB/SJU have an [Institutional Review Board \(IRB\)](#) and accompanying policies to protect the dignity and rights of participants in research conducted on or by members of our two communities. The IRB ensures that risks are minimized and reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits, informed consent is obtained from subjects and appropriately documented; and the privacy and safety of subjects is maintained. Faculty and staff pursuing human subject research must submit an application to the IRB and receive written approval before they can begin recruiting subjects.

IRB members as well as undergraduate students pursuing human subject research are [required](#) to complete ethical training. Students as well as faculty who receive federal funding (e.g. NSF) must complete an on-line ethical training course before commencing data collection. The Office of Experience and Professional Development supports [undergraduate research](#) and contributes to the integrity of student research practices through grant funding, workshops and trainings, and by supporting of faculty-student collaboration.

Ethical Use of Resources

Library staff members are committed to educating students on the ethical use of information, as demonstrated through the [Information Literacy Learning Outcomes](#). Information on [copyright policy](#), [plagiarism](#), and [accurate citations](#), as well as overall [academic honesty](#) and academic misconduct, are shared on-line and in library training sessions conducted for each student's First Year Seminar course.

Academic Honesty and Integrity

Academic integrity is central to the mission, character and reputation of Saint John's University and the College of Saint Benedict. The colleges enforce copyright policy and [academic misconduct](#) policies. [Academic honesty](#) and [academic misconduct](#) are also clearly addressed within the Academic Catalog.

As liberal arts colleges in the Catholic and Benedictine tradition, we uphold ethical standards of conduct that demand integrity in all aspects of life, including the scholarly work of students. Academic dishonesty impedes faculty members' ability to impartially evaluate the aptitudes and achievements of their students. The reputation of SJU and CSB students, alumni/alumnae,

faculty, staff and benefactors depends on devotion to the highest of academic standards.

Sources

- PRES CSBSJU_Academic Honesty_2018.pdf
- PRES CSBSJU_Academic Misconduct Policy JFA approved_20120125
- PRES CSBSJU_Academic Misconduct_2018.pdf
- PRES CSBSJU_Citation Resources_20151019
- PRES CSBSJU_Copyright Policy_20110601
- PRES CSBSJU_Institutional Review Board_20171025
- PRES CSBSJU_IRB form_2017
- PRES CSBSJU_Library Learning Outcomes_20170615
- PRES CSBSJU_Plagiarism_20171025
- PRES CSBSJU_Undergraduate Research_20171025

2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Summary

Saint John's University strives to act with integrity and conduct all operations ethically and responsibly. Policies and processes have been developed to ensure financial, academic, personnel and fiscal responsibility and accountability befitting an organization founded in the Catholic and Benedictine traditions.

Staff members are encouraged to follow professional association standards and best practices. Students are taught about the importance of academic integrity. The SJU mission, bylaws and board committee charters inform board and committee practice; and trustees and key employees are asked to disclose known conflicts of interest.

Faculty are encouraged and expected to work according to the principles established by their respective disciplines. Controls are in place to ensure research is conducted in an ethical and responsible manner.

The Board of Trustees is committed to preserving and enhancing Saint John's University while allowing the administration to oversee daily management and the faculty to oversee academic matters.

As a Catholic and Benedictine institution, Saint John's supports and actively encourages freedom to explore the truths of faith, to pursue intellectual and scientific inquiry of all types, and to engage in active dialogue about the interactions between these.

Sources

There are no sources.

3 - Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

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

3.A - Core Component 3.A

The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
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).

Argument

3.A.1 Courses and Programs

The College of Saint Benedict (CSB) and Saint John's University (SJU) offer [35 majors and 41 minors](#) leading to the baccalaureate degree. [Credit requirements](#) meet commonly accepted practices in baccalaureate higher education: students must complete 124 credits, of which 40 must be earned in upper-division courses.

The School of Theology at Saint John's University offers graduate degrees (see below) and one certificate program. The College of Saint Benedict does not offer graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate or certificate programs.

To ensure that courses and programs are current and appropriately rigorous, each department completes a comprehensive program review [every 10 years](#) or more frequently (if required by external specialized accreditation). As a result, [100 percent of programs](#) have undergone program review within the previous 10 years and are able to demonstrate currency and appropriate rigor due to undergoing intensive self-study, including comparisons to peer and aspirant colleges, and an external expert evaluation.

The program review process is guided by the Programmatic Assessment of Student Success ([PASS](#)) document. Further details on the program review process are described in 4.A.1. In each self-study, faculty members examine course offerings, learning goals, and program design in the context of peer and aspirant colleges as well as the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University missions. The expected intensity and depth of review is demonstrated by the [Environmental Studies](#) program. An external evaluator reviews the self-study, visits campus, and submits a [detailed report](#) to the department and provost. The department [reflects on the evaluator's report](#) and meets with the provost to [create an action plan](#). This action plan is the focus of [annual reports](#) submitted by the department to the provost. All program reviews and subsequent annual reports are accessible to faculty, administrators, and staff via an intranet (SharePoint) site.

The appropriate level of academic performance required for baccalaureate students is further evidenced by student and alumni perception of quality and rigor. The [Senior Survey](#), administered each year to graduating seniors, asks multiple questions that indicate our students are academically challenged and satisfied with the quality and rigor of academic programs. For example, in 2016, 90.2 percent of CSB students and 73.2 percent of SJU students indicated they worked as hard as they could all or most of the time (see p. 2) and the quality of instruction was rated "excellent" or "good" by 92.5 percent of students (p. 3). The level of intellectual engagement on campus was rated as "excellent" or "good" by 89.7 percent and the level of academic challenge was rated as "excellent" or "good" by 90.6 percent of graduating seniors (p. 4). In addition, 90.7 percent of CSB students and 81.3 percent of SJU students who graduated in 2016 strongly agreed or agreed with the statement, "My experiences at CSB/SJU prepared me well for my career" (p. 9).

The most recent [alumnae/i survey](#) indicated that graduates rated their experience at CSB/SJU highly and indicated that their experience developed leadership skills and significantly contributed to their personal and professional development. Over 90 percent described a high level of academic challenge, commitment to academic excellence and achievement, and overall quality of instruction they received (p. 2).

Students have also demonstrated that the level of rigor required at CSB/SJU compares favorably nationally with performance on the [Collegiate Learning Assessment \(CLA\)](#). CSB and SJU administered the CLA most recently in 2014; entering students and graduating students performed above the 80th percentile in total score. This indicated that students were performing well with regard to analysis, problem solving, and writing mechanics as compared to a national sample of college graduates.

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

The Saint John's University School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem) offers the following graduate degrees:

- Master of Theological Studies;
- Master of Arts in Liturgical Music;
- Master of Arts in Ministry;
- Master of Theology; and
- Master of Divinity.

To ensure that courses and programs are current and rigorous, each SOT/Sem program undergoes a [review every 10 years](#). In the review, faculty examine the degree and program as a whole, course offerings, learning goals, and program design for alignment with the SOT/Sem mission. In addition, the SOT/Sem is accredited by the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) with the last comprehensive visit occurring in fall 2017. The report of a [comprehensive evaluation by ATS](#) indicated that courses are current and appropriately rigorous. Credit requirements for the degree programs meet current ATS requirements.

3.A.2 Learning Goals

Academic learning goals and related outcomes are articulated for [undergraduate students](#), the [general education program](#) (referred to as the Common Curriculum), academic [programs](#), and courses. The Academic Learning Goals were approved by the Joint Faculty Assembly on November 30, 1994. These learning goals are as follows:

Graduates will:

1. Analyze the influence of the Catholic and Benedictine traditions on the human condition.
2. Integrate knowledge from the liberal arts and sciences as they explore the human condition.
3. Integrate the liberal arts and sciences with the skills, values and depth of knowledge specific to a major field of study in preparation for further professional development.
4. Apply clear thinking and communication skills to the exploration of fundamental questions of the human condition.
5. Establish patterns of life-long learning to seek and integrate knowledge of self and the world.
6. Provide leadership and service in community to improve the human condition.
7. Communicate sensitivity to and understanding of gender and cultural differences in order to improve the human condition.

These are publicly accessible on the colleges' website. This year, parallel to the work on revising the Common Curriculum, we began a series of steps to create an updated set of institutional learning goals. The revision, pending approval, will integrate curricular and co-curricular learning and intends to more holistically represent the CSB/SJU graduate. The revisions, which are anticipated to occur prior to the HLC site visit, are further discussed in 4.B.1.

Oversight of learning goals at the institutional level, in the Common Curriculum, and for academic programs, is the responsibility of [faculty governance committees](#). Approvals of academic programs, courses in majors and minors, and related learning outcomes begin with the Academic Curriculum Committee. Approvals of Common Curriculum courses and learning outcomes begins with the Common Curriculum Committee. Both committees send major revisions to the Joint Faculty Senate for final approval. The most recent approved learning outcome changes in the Common Curriculum are found in the [minutes](#) of the Joint Faculty Senate dated 5-15-15. Since then, current learning outcomes have remained stable as larger Common Curriculum changes are being proposed.

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

The [graduate learning goals](#) in the School of Theology at Saint John's University are differentiated from the undergraduate programs; students enrolled in these degree programs intend to minister within the Roman Catholic Church as ordained priests (MDiv program for priests), permanent deacons or in some aspect of lay ecclesial ministry (MDiv for lay ecclesial ministers, MA in ministry, MA in liturgical music, and the MTS) or pursue doctoral studies toward research and teaching (ThM). In all degree programs students integrate theological reflection, spirituality, growth in moral sensibility and character, and the acquisition of skills requisite to the exercise of ministry not only within Roman Catholicism, but also within other Christian traditions. The SOT/Sem also offers a 22-credit graduate certificate in spiritual direction, as well as a more generic 18-credit graduate certificate, with at least nine credits in a focused area of study. ATS evaluators affirmed the appropriateness of graduate learning goals and certificate programs in their [2017 report](#).

3.A.3 Program Quality and Consistency

The undergraduate colleges do not provide distance delivery, do not participate in contractual or consortial arrangements, and do not maintain any additional locations. CSB/SJU holds one dual credit option: CSB/SJU students can complete a bachelor's of arts and either a master's of arts in ministry or master of theological studies degree through the St. John's University School of Theology in five years.

As residential colleges, consistency in program quality and learning goals for courses is monitored by

the Academic Curriculum Committee and Common Curriculum Committee through a course and curriculum approval process. For students who study abroad during the undergraduate experience, the colleges offer courses abroad (see, for example, the [Galway Program](#)), which are equivalent to those offered on campus. The colleges also offer several short-term programs abroad. For example, the [Nursing department](#) (NRSG 303) offers public health clinical experiences in Belize, Dominican Republic and South Africa as well as local equivalents. The course outcomes and expectations are identical for all students. Additional examples include BIOL 373-Ecology of the Galapagos Islands, EDUC 280-Children's Literature in the United Kingdom, which is based on the on-campus course EDUC 215, and HISP 211-Intermediate Spanish Language and Culture in Valladolid. To assure consistency, these courses are designed by our faculty, taught by our faculty, and approved by the Academic Curriculum Committee and/or Common Curriculum Committee consistent with all other courses. See 4.A.4. for more detail on oversight and rigor.

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

The SOT/Sem has offered two to three [distance learning](#) courses per semester since the early 1990s. The development in educational technology and the shift in the market for theological education has moved the SOT/Sem to work toward expanding its distance learning offerings. A [substantive change petition](#) was submitted to HLC in April 2017 complete with rationale and supporting documentation. We requested review by the site visit team as an embedded change alongside the comprehensive visit.

Sources

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_2016 Senior Survey Report 20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Academic Majors and Minors
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Alum Survey Class 2010-2014 20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CLA Report 2014
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CLA Report 2014 (page number 5)
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_ENVR 15-16 AR
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_ENVR PR Evaluators Report 2014
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_ENVR Studies PR response to reviewer 2014
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_FHB-Respective sections in part 5_20171004
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Institutional LG DRAFT_20171020_TBR
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_NRSG 303 Clinical Nursing IV syllabus
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_OAAE Department LGs and CMs_20171020_TBR
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_PASS
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Program Review Schedule 7-19-2017_20171020
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Study Abroad_GalwayCourses 2018-2019
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Approved_JFS_Minutes_5-4-15_2015
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Common_Curriculum_Learning_Goals_20170922.pdf
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Environmental_Studies_MOU_2015
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Environmental_Studies_Self-Study_2014
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Graduation_Requirements_20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Program_Review-Annual_Report_Dashboard_20170923
- Learning Outcomes for SOT Degrees
- Program Review SOT
- SOT_2017-2018 SJU SOT-SEM ATS Self-Study Report
- SOT_2017-2018 SJU SOT-SEM ATS Self-Study Report (page number 109)
- SOT_2017-ATS_FA CV report - STJOHNSUNIV

- SOT_2017-ATS_FA CV report - STJOHNSUNIV (page number 6)
- SOT_2017-ATS_FA CV report - STJOHNSUNIV (page number 16)
- SOT_Substantive Change on Distance Learning

3.B - Core Component 3.B

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.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
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.
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.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
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.

Argument

3.B.1 General Education

The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University faculty approved the requirements for its baccalaureate general education program, the Common Curriculum, in a series of meetings during 2006-07 (see example meeting minutes from [12-5-06](#) and [3-7-07](#)) with the most recent refinements in [2015](#).

The framework of the [Common Curriculum](#) has three layers, which are consistent with the mission and breadth of knowledge expected of the liberal arts and sciences. First, mission-driven, cross-disciplinary goals, which are reading, writing, discussion and research-intensive, are met through a two-semester First-Year Seminar, an Ethics Common Seminar, a course in Gender, Intercultural Learning and Experiential Learning. These courses share common learning outcomes and are structured around themes selected by the faculty. Second, disciplinary goals and exposure to "ways of knowing" are met through courses in the Natural Sciences, Humanities, Social Sciences and Fine Arts, including a Fine Arts Experience. Third, departmental goals are achieved through courses in Mathematics, a Global Language, and a Capstone course in the major. A total of up to 19 courses may be needed for students to fulfill the robust requirements of the Common Curriculum. A full description of the Common Curriculum is found on the website and is integrated into all students' four-year plans. Students must satisfactorily complete all requirements of the Common Curriculum for graduation. Advisors have access to student [DegreeWorks](#) to assure that requirements are met.

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

Not applicable. While all degree programs share some common classes, each program reflects a design that will enable it to match the particular educational goals of the specific degree.

3.B.2 Learning Outcomes

The Common Curriculum was developed by the faculty and encompasses the mission-driven cross-disciplinary, disciplinary, and departmental goals described above. [Learning outcomes](#) were articulated for each requirement and courses fulfilling those requirements are expected to adhere to those approved outcomes. To assure consistency and quality, faculty must apply for a Common Curriculum course designation (see, for example, the [gender designation](#) application and a [completed application](#)). In addition, faculty must explain how students will achieve the learning outcomes. [Application forms](#) are readily accessible on the website. All courses fulfilling a Common Curriculum requirement are reviewed and approved by the Common Curriculum Committee and documented within the committee's minutes (see, for example, minutes of [9-30-15](#)). In addition, faculty teaching courses with Common Curriculum designations submit samples of student work for assessment to determine the extent to which students are meeting the learning outcomes. Teams of faculty members read samples of student work; using a [faculty-designed rubric](#), they rate the student work. That process generates discussion about improving prompts for assignments and refining outcomes and pedagogy. Detail on assessment of the Common Curriculum is found in Criterion 4.B.2.

The Common Curriculum, as a whole, imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess. This assertion is based on the alignment of the Common Curriculum with the work done by [Association of American Colleges & Universities \(AAC&U\)](#), which has endorsed six "high-impact practices" for higher education. Specifically, CSB/SJU adheres to these practices through:

- A year-long First-Year Seminar that is "writing intensive;"
- "Common intellectual experiences" including First-Year Seminar and Ethics Common Seminar;
- "Diversity/global learning" through an intercultural course requirement;
- "Field-based experiential learning" through an Experiential Learning requirement; and
- "Capstone Courses and Projects" in every major.

In the [2016 Senior Survey](#), graduates agreed that the Common Curriculum does impart "broad knowledge across a number of fields" (86.3 percent very much or quite a bit). In addition, other indicators on the Senior Survey imply that students believe that the education provided at CSB/SJU has contributed to their knowledge, skills and personal development in the areas of:

Indicator	"Very Much or Quite a Bit"
Acquiring and applying information to solve a problem	89.2%
Thinking critically about complex issues	90.0%
Working effectively as a team member	87.8%
Leadership skill development	87.3%
Working with others who hold differing viewpoints	84.8%
Communicating well	83.7%

Writing effectively	82.4%
Developing ethical or moral principles	79.7%
Understanding race, culture and ethnicity	71.8%
Understanding issues related to gender	68.1%

The Senior Survey also asks students to indicate the degree to which the Common Curriculum requirements have contributed to their growth in adapting and succeeding in a changing world. The most impactful requirement, as reported by 2016 graduates (as "very much"), was experiential learning, followed by intercultural, gender, theology, and ethics common seminar courses.

Faculty have noted that these high impact practices do not include distributional requirements traditionally maintained by many higher education institutions. Similarly, students have indicated that the distributional requirements have a lower impact on their success as a well-rounded graduate. As a result, a task force was created by the Faculty Senate in 2013-14 to review the Common Curriculum and envision a path toward further improving the general education program. This task force, the Common Curriculum Visioning Committee, completed a comprehensive analysis of current best-practices in general education and created its final report titled "[Making Connections](#)."

In this report, the Common Curriculum Visioning Committee points out that the distribution model is not the ideal means of developing the knowledge, skills and values central to our mission and our programs (see p. 38). The executive summary recommends "moving from a general education program where learning goals are delivered in separate, individual courses to a program where courses are scaffolded in a developmentally appropriate sequence, assuring that students encounter, practice and refine key proficiencies and capabilities in multiple settings and in progressively challenging ways." In [September 2015](#), the Joint Faculty Senate approved the design principles for the new general education program. The plan is for a model to come to the Joint Faculty Assembly this spring for a vote. Detail regarding this process is also discussed Criterion 4.B.1.

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

Not applicable.

3.B.3 Program Content

The baccalaureate degree program engages students in collecting, analyzing and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments from the first day of First-Year Seminar through the culminating Capstone presentation. The two-semester First-Year Seminar focuses on the critical thinking, writing, discussion and oral presentation skills that all careers demand; the capstone course in the major requires that seniors demonstrate their mastery of these skills as they present and discuss a project they have developed independently. Likewise, the steps in between are designed to promote breadth and depth of learning expected of the liberal arts and sciences baccalaureate education.

Starting in First-Year Seminar, students identify and evaluate sources of information; analyze and synthesize information; and construct extended arguments that cite sources appropriately. This expectation is evidenced by the [FYS rubric](#) used to evaluate student research and a summary of

process and [results](#). These results suggest that most students, even after that first year, are in the beginner to intermediate stages of writing well. Other Common Curriculum courses build students' skills in data collection, analysis, and communication including the Capstone course in the major, which requires that students:

1. Demonstrate appropriate ability to work independently in their major discipline;
2. Demonstrate appropriate ability to integrate a variety of resources and learning from their major and, when appropriate, from across their undergraduate studies; and
3. Demonstrate appropriate ability to present and discuss their work.

Many students present their work publicly at the colleges' annual Scholarship and Creativity Day. The attached [program](#) demonstrates the breadth of projects undertaken across the campuses every year.

Mastering modes of inquiry and creative work are goals in the disciplinary courses. For example, courses with a Natural Science designation “introduce students to a systematic, empirical study of our world, while enhancing analytic skills and precise communication” by requiring that students:

1. Conduct a scientific investigation as part of a lab or field work to answer a given question
2. Solve or analyze challenging problems using qualitative and/or quantitative sources of information
3. Communicate clearly and concisely the methods, results and conclusions of a scientific investigation
4. Evaluate information, ideas and scientific claims using appropriate criteria.

The Fine Arts requirement helps students deepen their understanding of an area of the arts, and develop the ability to apply analytic skills to aesthetic judgment. In fine arts courses, students:

1. Demonstrate a basic understanding of the historical, theoretical or applied aspect of one of the fine arts;
2. Identify and describe a range of contrasting styles within one of the fine arts;
3. Experience the creative process through performance/artistic production and or through observation of demonstrations, workshops, live performances, etc;
4. Apply analytical skills in exercising artistic discrimination and aesthetic judgment; and
5. Describe how the arts reflect and influence the individual and society.

The [Senior Survey](#) affirms that students are indeed challenged to develop skills adaptable to changing environments. In addition to indicators identified in 3.B.2, students reportedly acquired broad knowledge across a number of fields, embraced challenges and took risks (83.4 percent), acquired and applied information to solve a problem (89.2 percent) and learned how to learn effectively on their own (89.5 percent).

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

Graduate programs engage students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments. In the [self-study](#) submitted to ATS, the SOT/Sem articulated expectations for each degree with regard to these skills. For example, the master of theological studies degree culminates with students completing a graduate research paper and comprehensive oral examination. The master of theology (Th.M.) requires students to publicly defend both a thesis proposal and the thesis itself before a panel of faculty members. Students completing the master of arts in ministry and the master of divinity program participate in field education and clinical pastoral education, which foster the

integration of their theoretical work in the classroom with the requirements of various ministries in the field. Students in the master of divinity program complete an integration (capstone) project, which aims to foster integration of course work by focusing upon a particular pastoral question. Students in the master of arts in ministry program maintain a portfolio to document their efforts to apply their coursework to pastoral situations.

3.B.4 Diversity

The commitment to diversity stems from the missions and strategic directions ("...engage diverse perspectives and peoples...") and is further articulated in the [Institutional Statement on Diversity](#), which asserts, "we commit ourselves to cultivate an inclusiveness and a respect that neither denies nor exaggerates differences. Recognizing our Catholic and liberal arts tradition of respect for human dignity, the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University affirm our mission to teach and foster respect for diversity, to embrace the marginalized and break down the privileges that would exclude those who are different or disadvantaged. Embracing the transcendent dignity of the human person, we accept our common call to build a community and contribute to a larger social world that reflects and celebrates the splendor of human diversity."

Curricular and co-curricular programs emphasize the growing diversity of our community. The [Common Curriculum](#) learning goals in language, gender and culture promote understanding of diverse viewpoints and experiences. For example, the learning goals associated with the intercultural designation highlight the ways in which social, political, economic and other forces continually shape "culture." The learning goals also emphasize the framework within which students perceive "difference": courses with intercultural designation require reflection on the ways in which students' experiences, beliefs and values inform their perspectives.

CSB and SJU have also demonstrated a significant commitment to intercultural learning through our study abroad programs. Our 19 faculty-led semester-long programs include a required course with a Common Curriculum intercultural designation. The majority of our students study abroad. This number peaked in 2012-13 when the colleges ranked third among undergraduate programs in the nation sending 563 students abroad according to the [Open Doors report](#) of the Institution of International Education. The [2017 report](#) (based on percentages) places CSB/SJU at 27th with 73.7 percent studying abroad. In 2012, CSB/SJU received the [Senator Paul Simon Award](#), an honor given to "colleges and universities that are making significant, well-planned, well-executed, and well-documented progress toward comprehensive internationalization—especially those using innovative and creative approaches."

As a college for women and a college for men founded by women's and men's Benedictine monastic communities, CSB and SJU are particularly attentive to gender in our curriculum and programming. By requiring a course with a gender designation, the colleges ensure that all students have an experience in which gender is "a primary lens of analysis for examining course content." The learning goals stipulate that students will "identify at least two gendered perspectives from across the gender spectrum (feminine, masculine, trans, queer, etc.)" and "[a]rticulate how gender intersects with at least one of the following: race, class, ethnicity, nationality or sexuality," and "[d]emonstrate ability to analyze individual or local experiences of gender in light of relevant broader structural and/or theoretical contexts."

Notably, gender-related initiatives are also the focus of our [HLC Quality Improvement Initiative](#). From this report, "Research within our campuses has . . . demonstrated the effectiveness of specific gendered interventions. For example, we know that our Mathematics, Physics, Computer Science Research Scholars ([MapCores](#)) program encouraged CSB students to persist in these traditionally

male-dominated fields. The program (2009-2016) enrolled a cohort of women annually and included scholarships, curricular enhancements, one-on-one advising and support activities designed to attract and graduate more women in specific STEM fields. The program had considerable success in increasing the number of CSB women graduating with majors in mathematics, physics and computer science.

However, there is still much work to be done. Student perceptions of our success at diversity and inclusion are evidenced through the [Senior Survey](#). In 2016, 57.1 percent of students were "very satisfied" or "generally satisfied" with the overall diversity of the colleges with respect to background and social identities. Over 70 percent believed the colleges contributed to their understanding of race, culture and ethnicity and 68 percent for that of gender.

The colleges continue to explore ways to attend to diversity initiatives and to support underserved student populations. For example, both CSB and SJU applied for and were awarded [Mellon grants](#) for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017; these grants provided support for inclusive pedagogy and course design that meets the needs of our U.S. students of color (15 percent). The [outcomes](#) of these grants are extensive. For example, the work on creating a more inclusive campus climate led to an increase (from 12 percent to 51 percent) in faculty who believed diversity in the classroom allowed for a broader variety of experiences. In addition, 100 percent of students of color reporting having someone to reach out to for support on campus. Students also perceive faculty are capable of addressing issues of diversity in the classroom; the number of students of color who believe that faculty were more open to diverse points of view in class increased by 25 percent.

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

Diversity is evident at the SOT/Sem through its student body, field education, and Holy Land Program. The composition of the graduate student body fosters awareness and conversation about diversity in the classroom. The SOT/Sem hosts a contingent of international students primarily from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. They study together creating a rich classroom experience about the reception and application of common ecclesial documents and theological positions studied. Field education and clinical pastoral experience requirements foster students' learning about the human and cultural diversity in which they live and work. Students are placed in hospitals, prisons, multi-lingual classrooms, rural and urban parishes and a variety of other settings in which they interact with people from a wide variety of backgrounds. In addition, every May the School offers a Holy Land Program where students study the biblical sources of our faith within the unique combination of study, pilgrimage, and prayer. Students venture to biblical and early Christian holy sites in Turkey, Israel, and Palestine, places frequented by Christian pilgrims for over 1,700 years.

3.B.5 Discovery of Knowledge

The mission of the [Undergraduate Research Program](#) at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University is to provide our students with the opportunity to engage in intensive scholarship, research or creative work within the students' chosen field of study. The goal of the program is to support student work in a manner which allows for the work to be presented in some form to a larger external audience (e.g., publication, exhibition, scholarly presentation, or public performance). The Undergraduate Research Program provides [resources](#) and support to both the students and their faculty mentors that will facilitate the students' scholarly and creative efforts.

The most significant evidence of students engaging in and contributing to mentored scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge is during Celebrating Scholarship and Creativity Day, held in April of each year. Typically, over 900 students present posters or provide oral presentations

of their scholarly and creative work as demonstrated by the abstract collections from [2016](#) and [2017](#). No classes meet on Celebrating Scholarship and Creativity Day, and both campuses host a full schedule of student presentations.

Expectations for student scholarship, creative work and discovery of knowledge are supported through coursework in the Common Curriculum and in the major. Students conduct a research project in First-Year Seminar, and this experience serves as the foundation for research projects in more advanced courses. Students have the option of meeting the Capstone requirement for the major through the completion of an [All College Thesis](#). This project is often an extended research project or a creative project. Music students present junior and senior recitals; art majors exhibit their work in the senior exhibits at the Gorecki Gallery at the CSB Benedicta Arts Center and at the Alice R. Rogers and Target Gallery at the SJU Art Center.

Faculty are also expected to contribute to scholarship, creative work and discovery of knowledge. The Faculty Handbook ([Section 2.5.2](#)) outlines expectations for tenure-track and tenured faculty scholarship and creative work at third-year review, tenure, and promotion to full professor. Faculty scholarship is supported by the institution through grants and [sabbaticals](#). Student-faculty collaborative research is also part of the culture at CSB/SJU. For example, a faculty member in Computer Science has included collaborative research with students on his [CV](#) (see underlined names). When hiring tenure track and full-time term faculty, the colleges specify a commitment to undergraduate research is expected and [award](#) one faculty member per year who has demonstrated excellence in mentored undergraduate research.

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

Graduate faculty adhere to the scholarship guidelines in the Faculty Handbook ([Section 2.5](#)) which outlines expectations for tenure-track and tenured faculty scholarship and creative work at third-year review, tenure, and promotion to full professor. Specific attention is given to the expectations of graduate faculty. Faculty engage in disseminating the results of their scholarly research. Faculty scholarship is supported by the institution through grants and [sabbaticals](#). Updated faculty CV's are kept on file in the dean's office.

All graduate student theses are accessible through the CSB/SJU Libraries' Digital Commons database. Additionally, students have [published](#) in their peer-reviewed journal *Obsculta* and in other journals ([summary list](#) of recent publications) and have presented papers at external conferences.

Sources

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_2007-03-07 JFA Approved Minutes_TH
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_2016 FYS Research Assessment Summary 20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_2016 Senior Survey Report 20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_AACU High Impact Practices 20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_All college thesis fellowships webpage
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_All College Thesis Program_2018
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC Assessment Cross Disciplinary LG_20180103
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC Assessment Cross Disciplinary LG_20180103 (page number 3)
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC online forms screenshot
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC requirements screenshot

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC_GEND360E and JAPN321A – Gender proposal
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CSC_Day 2016 Abstract Summary With Cover
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_DegreeWorks screenshot
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_FHB 2.5.1 Scholarship and Creative Work
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_FYS Research Essay Rubric 20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Institutional Statement on Diversity 20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_JFA Minutes 2006-12-05_CC approvals NS
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Linda Mealey Award 20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_MapCores NSF Assessment Report 2016 FINAL
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Mellon final narrative report 082817
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Open Doors 2017
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Undergraduate Research 20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Undergraduate Research Summer 20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Undergraduate Research_2018CV_ImadRahal
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_5_Year_Comparison_Alum_Survey_2009-2012
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Approved_Common_Curriculum_Committee_Minutes_9-30-15_2015
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Approved_JFS_Minutes_5-4-15_2015
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Approved_JFS_Minutes_9-8-15_2015
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Common_Curriculum_Learning_Goals_20170922.pdf
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Common_Curriculum_Proposal_Gender_2015
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_CSC_Day_Abstract_Booklet
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Gender_Learning_Goal_3_Rubric_2015
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Making_Connections_2015
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Mellon_Grants_2015
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Open_Doors_Study_Abroad_Page_2015
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_QI_Proposal_5-15-15_2015
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Quality_Initiative_2015
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Senator_Paul_Simon_Award_2015
- Sabbatical Policy
- SOT_2017-2018 SJU SOT-SEM ATS Self-Study Report
- SOT_2017-ATS_FA CV report - STJOHNSUNIV
- SOT_Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
- SOT_Curriculum Reviewed for ATS in 2017
- SOT_Degrees Reviewed for ATS Self-Study in 2017
- SOT_Faculty Scholarship Reviewed for ATS Self-Study 2017
- SOT_Student Publishable Research
- SOT_Student Scholarship

3.C - Core Component 3.C

The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

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.
2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.
3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.
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.
5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.
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.

Argument

3.C.1 Faculty

With 300 full-time and 52 part-time faculty, the colleges have [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 assessment of student learning, teaching, advising and service. The [Faculty Handbook](#) Section 2.10.3 states: “A faculty member’s overall responsibilities include: effective teaching, which is paramount; scholarship and creative work as appropriate to their field; academic advising; service; and the development of professional identity.” The institutions are committed to providing stability in programs: Using AAUP data, [80 percent of full-time faculty](#) are tenured or on a tenure-track. The [student-to-faculty ratio](#) has remained around 12:1 for the past five years. The median [class size](#) is 19, and the largest classes are 35 students. The small class sizes offer opportunities for students to work closely with faculty and for faculty to provide mentoring to all students. Involvement in faculty governance, as evidenced by the committee composition in the Faculty Handbook, is extensive: 81 faculty are required to serve on standing committees. Faculty are highly involved in oversight of the curriculum and other governance duties.

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

As with 3A and 3B, the recent ATS accreditation visit provided evidence that the SOT/Sem has sufficient faculty and staff needed for high quality programs and student services. The [report](#) states: "The composition of the faculty services the mission of the seminary well." All SOT/Sem faculty are held to the same Faculty Handbook as the undergraduate faculty with expectations for curriculum development, teaching, research, service, and assessment of student learning.

3.C.2 Instructor Qualifications

Faculty qualification is determined at the time of hire. Faculty are expected to hold a graduate degree in a relevant field. Transcripts are reviewed and references are checked by [department \(or search committee\) chairs](#) to ensure that applicants meet the [credentialing requirements](#) set out in the Faculty Handbook section 2.1. Through this process, 100 percent of faculty are academically and experientially qualified to fulfill the faculty role with 90 percent of faculty currently holding the terminal degree in their fields and the remaining with the appropriate graduate degree. A complete listing of faculty and corresponding qualifications are found in the Appendices of the [Academic Catalog](#). The Academic Affairs office maintains curriculum vitae, submitted initially at the time of hire and updated during program review or more frequently as needed.

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

All [SOT/Sem faculty](#) hold doctoral degrees appropriate to their field of study and teaching assignment. The Director of the Certificate Program holds a master's degree in Christian Spirituality.

3.C.3 Instructor Evaluation

Department chairs or program directors evaluate faculty on a schedule set forth by the Faculty Handbook. This includes a comprehensive evaluation through direct observation, review of syllabi, and a review of student course surveys for [term faculty](#), tenure track faculty [prior to third-year review](#), tenure track faculty [prior to tenure review](#), and tenured faculty. The frequency of chair access to student course surveys is directed by the Faculty Handbook ([section 4.3.5.1](#)). Completed evaluations are submitted to the Provost office annually. In addition, the Faculty Handbook (sections [2.8](#) and [4.2](#)) outlines procedures for a post-tenure review of faculty ten years after tenure or promotion.

Evaluation also occurs through the tenure and promotion processes. These processes are directed by the [Faculty Handbook](#) (section 2: Contractual Policies and Procedures). Both CSB and SJU elect faculty peers to Rank and Tenure Committees; these committee members evaluate tenure-track faculty in the third and sixth years and for applications for promotion. Departments and Rank and Tenure Committees draw on student course surveys and on the faculty member's reflections on course surveys as criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness. Other criteria include class observations by the chair and department colleagues as well as review of syllabi and other course materials. The Handbook also outlines criteria for evaluating advising, scholarship and creative work, service to the colleges and to the larger community, and professional identity at third year, tenure and promotion (see Sections 2.5, 2.6, 2.7).

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

Faculty of the SOT/Sem follow the same Faculty Handbook and review process as the undergraduate faculty. The Dean of the SOT/Sem evaluates faculty (as opposed to a Department Chair).

3.C.4 Professional Development

Faculty are expected to maintain a current [Program for Professional Development](#) (PPD). This document outlines the faculty's teaching, scholarship, advising, service, and professional goals and action plans over a three to five year time period. Faculty members share these plans with their department chair and use the plan to guide participation in professional development opportunities.

Faculty have a number of resources to stay current in their fields and to advance professionally. Each full-time faculty member is granted \$750 through the department budget each year for attendance at professional conferences or for presenting scholarship. In addition, funds can be secured through an

application process for professional development needs that goes beyond the \$750 as well as for curriculum development. These applications go to the [Faculty Development and Research Committee](#) for review and approval. The provost, academic dean, and dean of the faculty also hold budgetary authority to grant [supplemental](#) professional development funding as the need arises. Sabbaticals are another professional development opportunity available to tenured faculty. After tenure, faculty are eligible to apply for a semester-long sabbatical at full pay or a full-year sabbatical at half pay every seven years, beginning in the year following tenure (see Faculty Handbook, [section 2.9.2](#)). For the past 10 years, the colleges have funded sabbaticals for every faculty member whose sabbatical application met the criteria of the Faculty Development and Research Committee. The [financial investment](#) in faculty development has been significant. In FY 2016, over \$1 million was allocated to sabbaticals, \$182,418 granted toward faculty travel, \$83,130 in faculty development funding disbursed by FDRC, and \$67,488 for supplemental travel.

The colleges have also been successful in [securing external funding](#) for faculty development as well. For example, [CSB](#) received a \$100,000 Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grant for humanities faculty to address teaching and advising our increasingly racially diverse student body, and [SJU](#) received a \$100,000 Mellon grant to enhance our First-Year Seminar (FYS). With around 20 percent of the faculty participating, gains were reported in the perceived effectiveness of teaching and advising American students of color. In addition, the Fruth Family Foundation provided funding to explore [blended learning initiatives](#). In this project, 20 faculty participated in advancing teaching effectiveness through blended learning also with positive results.

Faculty have numerous opportunities on campus to improve their teaching effectiveness, ranging from class observations by departmental and other colleagues to assistance offered by the [Learning Enhancement Service](#) (LES). LES provides a range of services to support faculty teaching and student learning. These include teaching seminars, celebrated teacher sessions (teaching award winners invite faculty into their classes), reading groups, and faculty interest groups. Faculty can request individual sessions, assistance with interpreting and acting upon student course surveys, and mid-course corrections. New faculty are supported by LES through an orientation to the teaching culture, a mentorship program, and community-building activities. Also the Learning Enhancement Service disburses funding up to \$750 for faculty who are seeking professional development to improve teaching. In September 2015, the university received a grant from the [Andrew W. Mellon Foundation](#) to focus on professional development for first-year seminar (FYS) faculty to address successfully teaching, advising and engaging an increasingly diverse student body. The multi-pronged approach included an extensive review of current practices, multiple and dynamic faculty development opportunities and a "crossover evaluation" conducted in partnership with the College of Saint Benedict. In December 2017, CSB and SJU received an additional \$600,000 grant from the Mellon Foundation to support initiatives focused on inclusive pedagogy and community building. Additionally, the Council of Independent Colleges selected CSB and SJU to participate in the [Diversity, Civility, and the Liberal Arts Institute](#). CSB/SJU will send a team of faculty and administrators to participate in this program to develop realistic plans to enable their institutions to strengthen diversity and civility on campus, both inside and outside the classroom.

The colleges' annual [Technology Day](#) provides a forum for technology integration and effective use. In addition, IT Services hosts a full range of workshops throughout the academic year focusing on various applications used across the campuses, such as Canvas and SharePoint.

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

SOT/Sem faculty processes are aligned with those teaching in the undergraduate programs. In the [ATS report](#), evaluators note: "the [graduate] faculty is concerned that the amount of funds they

receive for participating in national and international academy meetings no longer adequately covers travel...". As a result, the "onsite visitation committee encourages attention be given to faculty scholarship that is supported and sustained...sufficient time for research and writing, in addition to the focus on teaching and mentoring students." Specific mandates were not provided by the visitation team and the SOT/Sem will continue to problem-solve this issue within budgetary constraints.

3.C.5 Access to Students

The [Faculty Handbook](#) (section 2.10.3.2 "Other Faculty Responsibilities") indicates "faculty members are expected to hold office hours for consultation on course work and the advising of students". In addition, faculty are in frequent communication with students via email or through Canvas. Given the small class sizes and culture of faculty accessibility, over 90 percent of [seniors surveyed in 2016](#) reported that they would describe their relationships with faculty as "excellent" or "good" and over 92 percent of students reportedly discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class. In addition, faculty utilize IA Systems student course surveys. The aggregate results from [Forms A and B](#) (designed for lecture/discussion courses) indicate that students are satisfied with faculty availability for help outside of class ([survey question 15](#), n=11,921, mean=3.99 "good").

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

SOT/Sem faculty adhere to the same Faculty Handbook responsibilities listed above.

3.C.6 Support Services

Staff are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development as evidenced by adherence to [hiring policies and procedures](#), resumes on file, and a formal program of administrative and support staff development. All [employment ads](#) specify the credentials required for each position and job descriptions outline the necessary skills and qualifications. Likewise, those jobs related to student support services detail the necessary education and training to effectively administer these programs, such as those in [academic advising](#), [counseling and health promotion](#), [financial aid](#), [education abroad](#) and [accessibility services](#).

Section 4 of the [Performance Appraisal Form](#) provides a forum for employees and supervisors to discuss professional/career aspirations and professional development planning. In addition to a wide range of on campus training in areas such as Title IX, conflict resolution, campus safety, etc., staff may apply for professional development funds to meet their development needs. One of four committees ([CSB administrative staff](#), [SJU administrative staff](#), [CSB support staff](#), and [SJU support staff](#)) review and approve these [applications](#) depending upon the locus of appointment and job classification for the applicant. For example, the Paul Lawson Professional Development fund, a dedicated endowment for SJU administrative employees, funds \$16,000-\$18,000 in staff professional development per year. Typically, there are 22-28 applicants with 16-20 proposals funded. The most common funding is allocated to work-related conferences. Less commonly, the committee approves staff participation in a relevant graduate course. The Saint John's support staff budget allocation is \$7,000 with an average of six applicants per year. In general, across the four committees, around \$1,000 is available per applicant for professional development.

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

SOT/Sem staff adhere to the same expectations listed above.

Sources

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_2016 Senior Survey Report 20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_At A Glance Webpage 2018
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Blended Learning Report_2017
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Class Size_Fact Book_Table 23
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Faculty Development_supplemental funding
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Faculty Tenure_Fact Book_Table 27
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_FD DATA_2016_Trimmed-2018.01.10
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_FHB 5.3_FDRC
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_FHB-2.1 Faculty Rank_20180102
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Hiring Process and Guidelines_20171031
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_HR Job Posting Sample
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_IT_Faculty Technology Day 2017
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Job Description_Academic Advisor
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Job Description_Counselor-Psychologist
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Job Description_Financial Aid and Admission Counselor
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Job Description_Manager of Short-Term Education Abroad Programs
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Job Description_Student Accessibility Specialist
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_LES webpage
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Mellon final narrative report 082817
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Mellon Saint Johns University Report 083017
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_PPD-template 2017-2018
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Staff Dev_CSB Admin and Support Professional Development Policy 20120727[1]
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Staff Dev_CSB Support
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Staff Dev_SJU Admin
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Staff Dev_SJU Support
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Staff Performance Appraisal
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Student Course Surveys_Aggregate
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Student Course Surveys_FormA
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Student Faculty Ratio_Fact Book_Table 24
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Annual Eval_of Faculty_Post_Third_Year_Review_2015
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Annual Eval_of Faculty_Pre_Third_Year_Review_2015
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CSB_Staff_Professional_Development_2015
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Faculty_evaluation_for_Term_20170831
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Faculty_Recruitment_Checklist_2015
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Mellon_Grants_2015
- CSBSJU_Diversity, Civility, and the Liberal Arts Institute
- FHB January 2018
- FHB January 2018 (page number 60)
- FHB January 2018 (page number 256)
- FHB January 2018 (page number 261)
- Sabbatical Policy
- SOT_2017-ATS_FA CV report - STJOHNSUNIV
- SOT_2017-ATS_FA CV report - STJOHNSUNIV (page number 7)
- SOT_2017-ATS_FA CV report - STJOHNSUNIV (page number 8)
- SOT_Faculty roster from website

3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
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.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
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).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Argument

3.D.1 Support Services

CSB and SJU provide a full array of student support services suited to the learning needs of students. These services include:

- [Academic Advising](#)
- [Libraries](#) and [IT Services](#)
- [English as a Second Language](#) and English for Bilingual Students
- [Student Accessibility Services](#)
- [Counseling and Health Promotion](#)
- [Writing](#) and [Math Skills](#)
- [Peer Tutors](#)
- [Experience and Professional Development](#)
- [Global Education](#)
- [College Possible](#)

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

Students attending the SOT/Sem have access to the same student services as the undergraduate programs.

3.D.2 Learning Support

The student support environments at CSB and SJU are "high touch." In the 2016 National Survey of Student Engagement ([NSSE](#)), perception of quality interactions and support were significantly higher than our peers (Carnegie Bac/A&S). Academic Advising and Student Accessibility Services staff begin working with students well before they arrive on campus. Using an online interactive survey, the Academic Advising Office is able to review students' academic profiles, aspirations, experience with college-level coursework and a series of questions designed to provide a holistic picture of that student. This allows the Academic Advisors to create first-semester schedules crafted specifically for

each student and to assure students are placed appropriately into the correct courses. In addition, global language proficiency is determined using online placement exams. If the student tests at the highest level of proficiency, another exam is administered on campus to assure that the student truly met the global language requirement. Math placement is based on the math subscores from the ACT and SAT to assure the student is "math ready." Students who test below 21 ACT/530 SAT must pass the Quantitative Skills Inventory (QSI) on campus to move into a math course. If they don't pass the QSI, then they are offered math readiness courses on campus and re-take the QSI until they are math ready.

The demand for support services is also evidenced by the growth of Student Accessibility Services (SAS) on campus. In 2010, 131 students reportedly required accommodations, compared to 350 students in 2016. SAS conducts intake interviews with students needing accommodations prior to the start of the school year. This allows staff to create and distribute academic accommodation letters and facilitate the provision of accommodations. The demand for services provided by SAS rose steadily and sharply between 2010 and 2016, from 131 to 350 students.

Once on campus, four major areas of academic support continue to provide for the needs of students and these services are heavily utilized. The Math Center is identified above. Peer tutors are available in most departments and support students in mastering course content and improve study skills. For diverse students, we have noticed a growing need for academic language services to promote effective learning in the college setting. Although English proficiency is assured at acceptance, English as a Second Language (ESL, serving international students) and English for Bilingual Students (EBL, serving bilingual and multilingual U.S. students) programs offer language advancement courses to strengthen communication and comprehension skills. Enrollment in ESL rose from 32 students in 2015-16 to 47 students this year. EBL student enrollments increased from 45 students in 2015-16 to 60 students this year.

The [Writing Center](#) is also an important service provided to students. Over 2,000 students attended writing appointments in 2016-17 with the majority (737) of these students being first-years. These usage statistics are well above average, as measured by The [National Census of Writing](#). For example, the median number of face-to-face visits to four year colleges with similar enrollments in the most recent survey (March 2013-October 2014) was 796, whereas our Writing Center had 1736. Every appointment is recorded on WOnline, our online appointment software and comments are consistently positive. In the [2016 NSSE](#), the importance of the Writing Center was affirmed as 93 percent of students agreed to strongly agreed that writing clearly and effectively was a direct result of their college experience. We incorporate the practices of the Writing Center into our facilities planning for the physical space of the center in the libraries.

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

The [ATS evaluation report](#) states, "The SOT/Sem offers a wide range of student services in conjunction with the resources available in the wider university. The school offers introductory level courses to students with diverse backgrounds to prepare them for more focused courses in liturgy, scripture, spirituality, systematics and other disciplines."

3.D.3 Academic Advising

Academic advising is a strength of the colleges and occurs in three phases. First, staff from the Office of Academic Advising provide the initial support and placement into the appropriate course sequence. Staff from this office are available to students throughout their four years at the colleges. In addition, the First-Year Seminar professor becomes the student's faculty advisor in the first year. This creates a

situation where students see their faculty advisor at least twice a week during the entire first year. At the end of the first year, students are assigned an advisor in their major. This model appears to work well based on student perception. A high percentage of [graduating seniors in 2016](#) (p. 4) rated the quality of academic advising as “Excellent” or “Good” (80.5 percent).

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

The SOT/Sem faculty provide graduate student advising. In an SOT/Sem Student Life Survey, conducted in March 2017, over 84 percent of students indicated faculty advising was almost always or usually helpful.

3.D.4 Infrastructure and Resources

CSB and SJU maintain resources and facilities that support effective teaching and learning as evidenced by [Strategic Directions 2020](#), which calls for the colleges to "create learning and academic support spaces that provide opportunities for best pedagogical practices and student success." The resources allocated to the educational enterprise are fully described in 5.A.

Full access to a quality technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, and museum collections are available to all students, faculty, and staff. The [virtual tour feature](#) on the colleges' website allows the visitor to fully explore these spaces using virtual technology.

Technology infrastructure

The campuses are fully wired with computer facilities consisting of 95 presentation-ready classrooms and 29 laboratory/studio classrooms (98 percent of classrooms; 31 percent of laboratories; overall 88 percent of formal learning spaces are presentation-ready), 15 computer lab facilities, and 44 residence hall computer clusters. All classrooms are equipped with digital TV screens or projectors, in-classroom computers, and laptop computer connections. In addition, some classrooms are equipped with Apple TVs or Kramer VIAs to facilitate wireless presentation. These implementations are growing across the campus in an effort to improve the ease of access to present in classrooms.

The colleges have 941 computers available for student use (computer labs, residence halls and other areas). All areas have modern computers offering the latest versions of software for email, web browsing, office productivity (word processing, spreadsheet, database and presentation), graphics and discipline-specific needs. Both campuses offer 3D modeling and printing at no cost for academic use. Computer facilities are available weekdays, evenings and weekends. Students are not required to own a computer, though over 98 percent of students bring one to campus. Students have access to printers in designated computer lab spaces and can print from both campus computers and their own personal devices.

All faculty are provided a personal computer, either desktop or laptop, as well as access to printers and scanners. IT Services provides technical support to students and faculty Monday through Friday, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., as well as some evening and weekend hours while classes are in session. In addition, training and workshops are offered through IT Services on a variety of software programs and systems available to all faculty, staff and students (e.g., PowerPoint, Excel, Canvas, building web-based course resources, security best practices, 3D printing, etc.). IT Services staff are also available to assist faculty on an individual basis. In addition, the IT Services department meets regularly with faculty to solicit input to determine future information technology needs for the campuses.

The many strengths of the technology infrastructure and support services are evident in the [Kaludis Consulting Report](#) of May 2017.

Scientific laboratories

Students have access to excellent laboratory facilities and equipment to support their learning in the Natural Sciences and other fields. These spaces are developed in coordination with faculty in order to ensure that they meet the specific needs for learning outcomes. One example of these spaces is the [Nursing Simulation lab](#), which includes state-of-the-art simulation rooms, a full video recording system, pan-tilt-zoom cameras, and digital screens, all designed with the specific purpose of enhancing the student experience and better preparing students in the nursing major.

Other scientific laboratories include those located in [Ardolf Science Center](#) (CSB) and [Peter Engel/New Science Center](#) (SJU). These spaces are dedicated to biology, chemistry, nutrition, physics and computer science. Ardolf houses labs for general chemistry as well as organic chemistry, analytical chemistry, physical/inorganic chemistry and biochemistry. The Chemistry department continually updates and modernizes its equipment; the department currently has more than \$1 million in modern instrumentation. The Bailey Herbarium at SJU is the largest private college herbarium in Minnesota with nearly 32,000 specimens of vascular and nonvascular plants, representing both local and global collections ranging in age from modern to over 150 years.

The colleges are surrounded by diverse natural habitats, which serve as a focus for study in both classes and independent research. The 2,900-plus-acre Saint John's campus features a large oak forest with stands of maples, pine and spruce, a restored oak savanna and tall grass prairie, both natural and restored wetlands and a diversity of large and small lakes known as the [Arboretum](#) and [Outdoor U](#). The College of Saint Benedict also owns about 300 acres of natural habitats, including prairie and wetland restorations and 100 acres of relatively undisturbed "big woods" deciduous forest on the campus.

Libraries

Clemens Library (CSB), built in 1986, comprises 55,000 square feet, has a shelving capacity of 200,000 volumes, includes five group study rooms, and maintains a seating capacity of 372. Student use of the building is heavy, with all study areas well populated in the afternoon and evenings, particularly the group study rooms. In our first year of collecting group study room usage data, the five rooms were reserved 4,723 times during the academic year.

Alcuin Library (SJU) was designed by modernist architect Marcel Breuer and built in 1964. While architecturally-distinguished, the building became insufficient to support best practices in contemporary teaching and learning. The 90,000-square foot building was completely remodeled in 2016, reopening in January 2017 with a student-centered design. In August 2017, the connected Learning Commons opened, providing an additional 20,000 square feet of learning spaces. Library staff rehoused the nearly 500,000-volume collection in high-density shelving, freeing up space for new functions while retaining the significant legacy collection on site. The renovated library and addition have over 600 seats and include new collaborative rooms, classrooms, IT Services training and assistance, the Writing Center, a World Languages Center, and expanded Media Services and Archives. The new Learning Commons supports constantly evolving modes of digital scholarship by providing equitable access to resources, especially equipment and software, for everyone on campus; making space available for experimentation and collaboration; and housing technology experts who can provide assistance, training and consultation.

[Both libraries](#) are responsible for providing collections and services that meet the curricular and

research needs of our community. While the role of academic libraries has been rapidly progressing beyond collections, we continue to add value to the educational experience of students through the quality of our information resources. While our print book circulation has declined consistent with national library trends, use of ebooks, electronic journals and other online resources has increased. Continual changes in access and delivery platforms for digital resources make it challenging to track usage over time. However, with one representative scholarly publisher, *JSTOR*, we saw an increase in ejournal use of nine percent, and a nearly 300 percent increase in ebook use from 2016 to 2017. We continue to buy resources in the formats best suited for use, meeting both our commitment to local curricular support and our national collecting responsibility.

Performance venues

The colleges maintain venues for rehearsal and performance of concerts, plays, and other fine arts and community events. The [Escher Auditorium](#) at CSB seats over 1,000 and the [Stephen B. Humphrey Theater](#) at SJU seats 500. Smaller venues at CSB include the [Gorecki Family Theater](#), the [Colman Black Box Theater](#), the outdoor [Darnall Amphitheater](#), and the [Helgeson Dance Studio](#). The colleges hold lectures and readings in many of these spaces as well as in [SJU's Pellegrine Auditorium](#).

Museum collections

The [Hill Museum & Manuscript Library](#) (HMML) at SJU holds the world's largest archive of manuscript photographs in both microfilm and digital format. HMML identifies manuscript collections around the world that need photographic preservation. HMML's archives now contain more than 200,000 complete manuscripts.

Practice sites

The Nursing department holds over 300 clinical contracts with clinical practice sites including hospitals, schools, community health sites, public health agencies, clinics, and nursing homes. These sites are sufficient for meeting the clinical hours needed in the major as demonstrated by the [CCNE program approval](#).

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

The resources identified above are also available to the SOT/Sem students and faculty.

3.D.5 Student Guidance

The baccalaureate degree program engages students in collecting, analyzing and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments from the first day of First-Year Seminar through the culminating Capstone presentation (see elaboration in 3.B.3).

Faculty and library staff are responsible for providing guidance to students in the effective use of research and information resources. CSB and SJU hire well-qualified staff in the libraries; all librarians hold an ALA-accredited degree in Library and Information Studies. Beginning with First-Year Seminar, librarians assist students with research projects focusing on [information literacy](#).

Reference librarians meet with classes at all levels to provide direction as students search for, evaluate and document sources of information. An online form allows students to make individual appointments with reference librarians, and a "chat" feature of the library page allows librarians to address questions immediately. At both libraries, reference librarians are available to answer students'

questions and to help them use databases and other tools. Students and other patrons can request research help from a librarian by online chat, text, email or a scheduled appointment as well as drop-in assistance.

The Libraries have implemented various assessments to measure student learning progress toward information literacy goals. In [spring 2017](#), for example, librarians tested students' ability to match research needs and search strategies to research tools; and to design and refine search strategies based on search results. Librarians also tested a [flipped classroom method](#) to improve student learning in media and library-related information literacy activities with considerable success. [Metrics from Media Services](#) have affirmed attention to skills adaptable to a changing environment. In fall 2017 alone, Media Services worked with 22 faculty in 31 courses with 613 students to teach video creation and editing, 3D design, Sketch Up, and Lightboard in support of teaching and learning.

School of Theology and Seminary (SOT/Sem)

The resources identified above are also available to the SOT/Sem students and faculty.

Sources

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_2016 Senior Survey Report 20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Facilities_Virtual Tour of Campus
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_HMML website
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_IT Services and Media Services Metrics HLC2017
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Libraries_Flipped Classroom in Video Production Classes
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Libraries_Searching as Strategic Exploration Results1
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_NRSG CCNE Accreditation approval November 2017
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_NRSG sim lab photos
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_NSSE16 Snapshot (CSB and SJU) p1
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_NSSE16 Snapshot (CSB and SJU) p2
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_NSSE16 Snapshot (CSB and SJU) p3
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_NSSE16 Snapshot (CSB and SJU) p4
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Writing Center_Swarthmore Report website
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Library_Data_2018.pdf
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Library_Learning_Goals_20170925
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Writing_Center_16-17_Client_Demographic_Information_2017
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Writing_Centers_20170826
- CSB_Ardolf Science Center
- CSBSJU_2016-17 College Possible Report 20171207
- CSBSJU_Academic Advising
- CSBSJU_Biology Laboratories
- CSBSJU_Colman Black Box
- CSBSJU_Counseling and Health Promotions
- CSBSJU_Darnall Amphitheater
- CSBSJU_Escher
- CSBSJU_ESL
- CSBSJU_Global Education
- CSBSJU_Gorecki Family Theater
- CSBSJU_Helgeson Dance Studio
- CSBSJU_Humphrey Theater

- CSBSJU_IT Services
- CSBSJU_Libraries
- CSBSJU_Math Skills Center
- CSBSJU_SJU Auditorium
- CSBSJU_Student Assessibility Services
- CSBSJU_Tutors SPRING 2018
- CSBSJU_Writing Center
- CSBSJU_XPD
- Finance_IT_ServicesExternalReviewerReport-2017
- Library Resources for SOT
- SJU_Arboretum
- SJU_Finance_Academic Planning Classroom Development
- SJU_Outdoor U
- SOT_2017-ATS_FA CV report - STJOHNSUNIV
- SOT_2017-ATS_FA CV report - STJOHNSUNIV (page number 10)
- SOT_Student Life Survey

3.E - Core Component 3.E

The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

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

Argument

3.E.1 Co-curricular Programs

CSB and SJU host a range of co-curricular programs, which contribute to the educational experience of students. Community is an especially important part of the CSB/SJU campus culture. Most students live on campus and participate in one or more campus clubs and organizations. The emphases for co-curricular programs are leadership and service, living in community and holistic development, all directly connected to the missions. Together [CSB and SJU Student Development departments](#) share common goals for students:

- Initiate, organize and be responsible for their own ongoing learning.
- Develop the skills necessary to succeed in the world of work.
- Practice inclusive dialogue, problem solving and written and verbal communication skills.
- Integrate physical, emotional, social, spiritual, intellectual and occupational aspects of their development.
- Develop a capacity for shared ethical leadership and become agents of social change.
- Develop the capacity for life-long service to community.
- Create true partnerships between men and women which are based on equity, integrity and respect.
- Seek and value diversity in every aspect of their lives.
- Develop the capacity to create global community.
- Develop the capacity to reflect on the nature of one's purpose for existence through the process of spiritual reflection.

While committed to providing a unified educational experience for all students, each college retains its own campus, residence halls, athletic programs and traditions. CSB Student Development activities focus on the development of women and SJU Student Development activities focus on the development of men. Through unique programming, each college is committed to serving the needs of the gender it represents. Each campus hosts:

- Residential Life programming
- Athletics (varsity, club and intramural)
- Campus Ministry
- Career Development programming
- 90-plus shared clubs and organizations
- Health Promotion programming
- International and Intercultural Student Services and Programs

- Recreation programming
- Student Activities and Leadership Development (SALD)
 - CSB — Sister Nancy Hynes Institute for Women's Leadership
 - SJU — Men's Development Institute

CSB Residential Life has designed a four-year residential living experience focused on women's development as leaders and citizens of the world. This is achieved through a cohort model for housing, grounded in Catholic and Benedictine traditions, which supports women's holistic development through the experience of community living.

Similarly, through its Residential Life program, Saint John's University promotes the development of men within the context of living and learning in community. Saint John's creates a supportive learning environment that encourages respect for others, good stewardship and tolerance, while assisting students in their vocational discernment.

[Student Activities and Leadership Development](#) (SALD) sustains a vibrant campus life through social programming and leadership development. SALD oversees clubs, advises the Joint Events Council, and coordinates the Student Orientation program. Among the [clubs](#) and organizations are pre-professional clubs, including the Pre-Law Society and the Pre-Dentistry Club; clubs affiliated with majors, including the French Club, Math Society and the Drama Club; and special-interest clubs, including the student newspaper staff, *The Record*, the editorial board of the literary journal, *Studio One*, and KNJB Radio.

As a result, the vast majority of students in the [2016 Senior Survey](#) indicated that the sense of campus community is excellent or good (86.1 percent). Other indicators of satisfaction with the residential experience are equally positive: 77 percent were satisfied with the co-curricular opportunities, 80 percent were satisfied with the social experience, 70 percent are satisfied with recreational facilities, and 84 percent spent at least one hour per week on co-curricular club activities with over one in five participating 6-10 hours per week.

3.E.2 Mission-based Claims

Our mission-based claims include an excellent residential, liberal arts educational experience in the Catholic and Benedictine traditions with an emphasis on serving others, leadership and global engagement. (See also 3.B). The accuracy of these claims are evident in exiting senior and alumnae/i surveys and student participation and satisfaction rates with various activities.

Excellent educational experience

Results from our most recent [surveys of alumnae/i](#) indicate that over 90 percent of our alums described the level of academic challenge, our commitment to academic excellence and our level of instruction as excellent or good. Additionally, alumnae/i indicated that their education contributed to their acquiring broad knowledge (81 percent), communicating well (83 percent), and writing effectively (86 percent). [Graduating seniors](#) indicated their education at CSB/SJU contributed to thinking critically about complex issues (90 percent), communicating effectively (83 percent), writing persuasively (82 percent), using quantitative reasoning (76 percent), and effective learning on their own (90 percent).

In addition, 90 percent of [alumnae/i](#) believed that the liberal arts education at CSB/SJU significantly contributed to their personal and professional development; over 86 percent indicated that CSB/SJU prepared them well for their careers and over 95 percent of those attending graduate or professional

school credited CSB/SJU with preparing them well; 90 percent of respondents credited CSB/SJU with giving them the ability to work well in teams; 83 percent with embracing challenge and accepting risks.

Spiritual purpose

The most recent [surveys](#) indicated that nearly nine in 10 of alumnae/i respondents credit CSB/SJU with developing them to perform their work ethically and with integrity; over 80 percent credited CSB/SJU with contributing to their own understanding of themselves and their spirituality, as well as developing a meaningful life purpose. The majority reportedly integrate Catholic (60 percent) and Benedictine (80 percent) values into their daily lives.

Service, leadership, global engagement

The most recent [surveys](#) indicated 69 percent (SJU) to 79 percent (CSB) of alumnae/i respondents participated in community service or volunteer activities while at the colleges. Over 70 percent credit the colleges with developing their leadership skills. [Graduating seniors](#) reported participating in community service or volunteer activities one to five hours (50 percent) or six to 10 hours (five percent) per week. Experiences at CSB and SJU contributed to [graduates'](#) working effectively as a team member (88 percent), leadership skills (87 percent), building a professional network (75 percent) and taking initiative (85 percent).

Alumnae/i and student surveys indicated that they attribute to CSB/SJU their ability to understand social, civic, or political issues and to be engaged. *Washington Monthly* listed both CSB and SJU among the top 50 liberal arts colleges in the nation in 2017. Schools are rated based on their contributions to the public good. CSB and SJU are leaders in the production of Fulbright Scholars (CSB ranked 26th among all baccalaureate colleges nationally), as well as ranked 20th nationally in Peace Corps Top Colleges. A CSB alum was awarded a Rhodes Scholarship in 2016. These and many other successes are identified on the [Admissions and Financial Aid webpage](#).

Saint John's University SOT/Sem

The SOT/Sem brand of theology emphasizes the residential learning in which the “pursuit of wisdom” occurs in the context of a praying community. Our students are encouraged by faculty and staff to bring together the activities of classroom, dining room and chapel and so to be educated and formed holistically.

As a result, the [2016 SOT Alumni Survey](#) indicated that the sense of community among students was strong (86.4 percent agreed or strongly agreed). Students agreed that this education provided a foundation for parish/diocese leadership (70.1 percent), instilled the desire for ongoing study in theology, scripture and ministry (88.8 percent), and exuded the Benedictine character claimed in the mission (97.5 percent).

Sources

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_2016 Senior Survey Report 20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Bragging Rights webpage
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Alum_Survey_Class_2010-2014_20170826
- CSBSJU_SALD Clubs List
- CSBSJU_SALD mission

- SOT_Alum Survey of 2016
- SOT_Alum Survey of 2016 (page number 10)
- SOT_Student Life Survey
- STD DEV_learning goals

3.S - Criterion 3 - Summary

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

Summary

Our shared mission is to create an excellent residential, liberal arts educational experience in the Catholic and Benedictine traditions with an emphasis on serving others, leadership and global engagement. The student academic experience is one of small class sizes, a rigorous curriculum, and extensive support services.

The quality of education is supported by a highly qualified and engaged faculty whose primary role is to teach and mentor students. Faculty are principally full-time and tenured. The financial and opportunity investment in faculty development is significant. Faculty have access to funding and numerous opportunities to improve their teaching effectiveness.

The quality of education is evidenced by student learning through the Common Curriculum and in our 35 academic majors and 41 minors. The Common Curriculum promotes the breadth and depth of learning expected of a liberal arts education. Departments and programs undergo a comprehensive program review every 10 years, which promotes currency and appropriate rigor. Students are academically challenged and satisfied with the quality and rigor of the academic programs. Faculty are highly engaged in the development, implementation and assessment of the curricula.

The quality of education is enhanced by a "high touch" supportive environment and learning facilities. From enrollment through graduation and beyond, students have access to academic advising, accessibility services, libraries, technology support, a writing center, a math center, tutoring, health promotion and counseling services, academic language services, experience and professional development services.

The residential, co-curricular experience is also a strength of the colleges and contributes to a high-quality education. CSB and SJU host a range of co-curricular programs, which contribute to the educational experience of students.

Sources

There are no sources.

4 - 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.

4.A - Core Component 4.A

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
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.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
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).

Argument

4.A.1 Program Reviews

Since Academic Year (AY) 2001, the College of Saint Benedict (CSB) and Saint John's University (SJU) have followed a Program Review Process that examines all majors, minors, academic programs and academic offices (including the Registrar, Office of Experience and Professional Development, and Center for Global Education) [every eight to 10 years](#). The Student Development Offices on each campus follow a similar [review process](#). All program reviews are housed within an intranet (SharePoint) site, accessible to all faculty, administration, and staff.

The academic [Program Review Process](#) includes a number of important steps:

- 1) An extensive self-study reflecting on mission, learning goals, assessment data (including alumnae/i surveys), and resources for the program. It also includes a list of questions to guide the external review process. Academic Affairs, the Office of Academic Assessment and Effectiveness (OAAE), and the assessment subcommittee overseen by the faculty committee, Academic Policies,

Standards, and Assessment Committee (APSAC) review self-study drafts.

- 2) Review by an external evaluator, who also conducts a two-day site visit and responds with an independent evaluation and recommendations.
- 3) A departmental action plan shaped to guide the program for the next five to ten years. Academic Affairs, OAAE, and APSAC review all departmental action plans, which ultimately are presented first to the provost for approval and then to the Academic Affairs Committee of the boards and to the CSB and SJU Boards of Trustees for final endorsement. Academic departments and programs annually provide progress or change reports related to their action plan to Academic Affairs, OAAE and APSAC. Midpoint-Program Reviews are completed should the action plan require major reform or has been completed. The Program Review Process records, sustains and supports improvement of academic excellence at CSB and SJU. A [dashboard](#) highlights historic department/program participation in program as well as annual reviews.

Examples of actions resulting from program review include:

1. Restructuring of the SJU School of Theology (graduate study) and the undergraduate CSB/SJU Theology department have created greater autonomy for both as well as improved coordination for staffing purposes. Their program review also resulted in revised learning outcomes for the THEO 111 and upper-division theology courses required of all students, a faculty hire in comparative religion, and advising and community-building initiatives designed to increase the number of majors and minors.
2. Renaming and reconfiguration of the Natural Science major to an Integrated Science major better meets our student's interests in interdisciplinary interactions in STEM as well as future interdisciplinary demands in science and health.
3. Renaming and reconfiguration of the former Modern & Classical Languages & Literatures department to Languages & Cultures has allowed the department to successfully incorporate the former Humanities major (now named European Studies) and to update the French Studies major to better align students' needs and staffing on campus.
4. Development of courses in the technology of music production and delivery in the Music department has increased their offerings in contemporary musical genres and modes of performance.
5. Responding to student survey data, the counsel of an external evaluator, and their own self-assessment, Environmental Studies program is building the social science element of their offerings with a new faculty member hired in AY 2018, specializing in the intersection of energy extraction, climate justice and grassroots organizing.
6. Having met the curricular revision goals arising from program review in AY 2011, the Political Science department conducted CSB/SJU's pilot Midpoint Program review in 2015-2016, sending their revised curriculum to the same external evaluator, who confirmed the wisdom of their revisions and urged increased hiring in the International Relations area. As a result, the Political Science department hired a tenure-track faculty member for AY 2019 with expertise in Latin American politics.

The Program Review Process and the annual reports that are part of that process, allows Academic Affairs to identify priorities among departments and programs as we allocate faculty lines and resources. For example, Nutrition's program review in AY 2017 verified a need for a faculty member who has both a RDN (Registered Dietitian) and PhD in a relevant field to meet their developing curricular needs. As a result, Academic Affairs approved the conversion of a full-time term position to a tenure-track position which belonged to an excellent RDN/PhD faculty member.

School of Theology

Similar to the undergraduate programs, the SOT/Sem conducts regular program reviews. [Comprehensive assessment](#) consists of five major components: (1) program level assessment, (2) course level assessment, (3) mid-program assessment for ministry students, (4) comprehensive exam and thesis defense for academic-track students, and (5) the curriculum conference.

[Program reviews](#) address student learning outcomes in light of the overall structure of a degree program or program devoted to a particular form of ministry (e.g., youth ministry, spiritual direction). Program reviews for the degree programs and the specialized programs linked with them have been conducted on a five-year cycle since 2001. In the Spring of 2016, the Graduate Theological Studies (GTS) committee revised this cycle so that these [programs](#) are reviewed on a more manageable ten-year cycle. The adjustment of this schedule reflects our effort to carry the process from data gathering and analysis to attention to adjustments in programs.

4.A.2 and 4.A.3 Evaluation and Quality of Credit

Three faculty committees authorize the CSB/SJU academic program policies governing the transcription of credits: the Academic Curriculum Committee (ACC), responsible for department and program credits; the Common Curriculum Committee (CCC), responsible for general education credits; and, the Academic Policies, Standards, and Assessment Committee (APSAC), responsible for academic policies. Each is described in the [Faculty Handbook](#). The [policies](#) and guidelines approved by the committees are strictly adhered to by the Registrar's Office and Academic Advising when they work with students who seek credit for coursework completed outside of CSB/SJU. The online Academic Catalog as well as the Registrar's Office homepage clearly articulate policies that regulate approved coursework.

Credits earned outside CSB/SJU

These policies apply to transfer, readmitted and new first-year students or any current students who plan to take summer courses and/or transfer credits to complete their degree requirements. The policies are clearly articulated in our online course catalog and the Registrar's Office homepage. All [transfer course work](#) is evaluated on an individual basis, but our general guidelines state: "CSB/SJU will accept credits from another college that meet the following criteria: 1) The transfer institution must be regionally accredited (i.e. Higher Learning Commission); 2) A grade of C or higher is required in order for the course work to transfer; 3) The course level must be equivalent to college level course work (normally 100 level or higher) and credit bearing; 4) The course content must be similar to courses offered at CSB/SJU." Transfer course work is evaluated for its applicability for elective credits, general education requirements and, if approved by the respective department chair, major or minor degree requirements. Grades earned for transferred coursework are not calculated into the student's cumulative GPA.

Students who matriculated at CSB/SJU prior to fall 2017 must earn at least 45 of the 124 from CSB/SJU. Those students must earn at least half of the credits required for their academic major, excluding supporting courses, from CSB/SJU. Beginning with new students who enrolled in fall 2017, at least 76 of the 124 credits required for a degree must be residential credits earned from CSB/SJU. Residential credits include credits earned at CSB/SJU or in one of its sponsored or approved study abroad programs. At least half of the credits required for a major, excluding supporting courses, must be earned from CSB/SJU. For transfer students, at least 45 of the 124 credits required for a degree must be residential credits earned from CSB/SJU.

International student transfer credits

Incoming international transfer students who attended a college or university outside of the United States are required to have an official World Evaluation Services (WES) evaluation completed and submitted to the Registrar's Office.

Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB) and College-Level Examination Program (CLEP)

CSB/SJU revise and publish annual [policies](#) on score requirements for each AP, IB and CLEP test. The Registrar's Office coordinates that work for each academic area. To receive credit, the student must have the official test results mailed directly to the CSB/SJU Registrar's Office.

Study abroad credits

Students earn CSB/SJU credit through approved off-campus programs. The Academic Curriculum Committee (as well as the Common Curriculum Committee when courses include designations towards general education requirements) approves international study courses, irrespective of whether those courses are instructed by CSB/SJU faculty or designated faculty at off-site accredited institutions. Courses considered as elective that have not been pre-approved through the above process but are taught regularly are evaluated similarly to transfer credits.

Students choosing abroad programs not offered through CSB/SJU must submit a study abroad application. The program must be approved by the Center for Global Education with appropriate, [designated guidelines](#). Credits must be approved using the transfer policies described above. Courses counting towards a major, minor or the Common Curriculum must also follow the appropriate policies for approval (see section 4.A.3).

Internships and independent research

Experiential learning opportunities require CSB/SJU faculty supervision. The most common form of credit-bearing opportunities are internships, independent research, and All-College Thesis opportunities. The Office of Experience and Professional Development oversees a [policy](#) on the credit allowance and facilitation of academic internships. Independent student research requires faculty supervision and may be conducted for credit or not for credit. Policies offering credit to independent research opportunities are facilitated through [Independent Learning Projects](#). Students can also gain independent research credits through the [All-College Thesis](#).

Military

Credit for programs completed through the military are evaluated by the Registrar's Office and Academic Advising per guidelines established by the American Council on Education.

Evaluation for credit that counts towards a Major, Minor or Common Curriculum requirement

Transfer course work is evaluated for its applicability of elective credits, Common Curriculum requirements and, if approved by the respective department chair, major or minor degree requirements. CSB/SJU has [standards and policies](#) to ensure the quality of the transfer credit we accept. In addition to the general guidelines noted above, the Academic Curriculum Committee, the Common Curriculum Committee and the academic dean have granted the Registrar's Office the authority to review course descriptions of transfer credits to be applied as elective credits or towards

Common Curriculum requirements. The Registrar's Office follows guidelines authorized by these committees. When courses do not meet our guidelines, students are directed to the Academic Advising Office for further evaluation for elective credits or Common Curriculum requirements.

Grades earned for transferred coursework are not calculated into the student's cumulative GPA. A preliminary transcript evaluation is completed once an unofficial or official transcript is received. The Registrar's Office must receive an official transcript directly from the college at which the courses were taken to complete a final transcript evaluation and for application of credits the student's CSB or SJU record. Grades from designated, approved courses as part of a study abroad program and approved internship and independent research credits are calculated into the student's cumulative GPA.

Graduate School of Theology

The SOT/Sem evaluates all the credits it [transcripts](#). Credits accepted from other ATS accredited programs are granted according to a standard policy for transfer credits stated in the Academic Catalog.

4.A.4 Authority over Courses

Institutional authority is authorized at various levels to maintain rigor, student expectations, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all programs offered at CSB/SJU. The Board of Trustees provides oversight of student learning at multiple levels. For example, the board and its Academic Affairs Committee endorse all program reviews, institutional policies bearing on faculty appointment, promotion, tenure and dismissal. The committee receives regular updates on curricular matters.

The Academic Affairs Office has direct oversight of curricular matters at all levels. Representatives of the office act as *ex-officio* members of faculty governance committees and are responsible for hiring and maintaining excellent faculty and providing oversight on learning facilities. The [Joint Faculty Assembly](#), the governing body of the CSB/SJU faculty, is responsible for the educational goals of CSB/SJU as defined in the Faculty Handbook. This responsibility includes admission and graduation requirements as well as curricular oversight. In addition, a faculty-elected and constructed [Joint Faculty Senate](#) (JFS) "deliberate[s] and make[s] decisions on matters related to the academic policies and programs, faculty rights and responsibilities, and the general academic environment of the institutions. The JFS communicates and consults with faculty, administration staff and the boards in formulating, developing and implementing the CSB/SJU educational mission." [Faculty committees](#), including the Academic Curriculum Committee, Common Curriculum Committee, and Academic Policies, Standards and Assessment Committee, maintain oversight and approval of different aspects of the curricula.

Course prerequisites

All prerequisites for a given course must be specified in the initial [course proposal](#), which requires evaluation and approval by the Academic Curriculum Committee. The Academic Catalog specifies all prerequisites in each course description. The Registrar's Office maintains [course descriptions, titles and prerequisites](#). In addition, prerequisites for each course are highlighted during the registration process. Students who have not completed course prerequisites must seek approval from the instructor or department chair prior to enrollment. Prerequisites for courses proposing a designation in the Common Curriculum must also be listed in the proposal and evaluated by the Common Curriculum Committee.

Rigor

Rigor is the responsibility of Academic Affairs and the faculty. Faculty, with oversight from Academic Affairs, is responsible for the implementation of academic programs, policies, and admission and graduation requirements. Faculty work to maintain high academic standards for student learning across the curricula. [Rigor of a course](#) is evaluated using several criteria: 1) Credit hours demand an expectation of student learning time. As defined in the [Academic Catalog](#), “one credit ordinarily represents three hours of work each week, including private study and research as well as scheduled class meetings.” The expected hours of student work increases as the number of credits increases. 2) Course level: courses are designated as 100, 200 (both lower-division undergraduate courses), 300 (upper-division undergraduate courses), or 400 level courses (graduate courses). The [rigor](#) expected of each level has recently been defined and will be added to the Academic Catalog in AY 2019. 3) Grades faculty are responsible for applying a grade to student work. Expectations for specific letter grades are delineated in the [Academic Catalog](#). 4) Finally, as defined in the [Faculty Handbook](#), faculty are evaluated on their “teaching effectiveness.” Part of this measurement includes the “ability to identify course-appropriate student learning goals.” Inherent in this measurement is a faculty’s understanding and commitment to appropriate rigor in each of his/her courses.

As described earlier, rigor of transfer credits is regulated by [policies](#) that ensure coursework is similar to those taken at CSB/SJU.

Access to academic resources

Support for student learning requires an effective structure. Academic Affairs, including the provost, academic dean, and dean of the faculty maintain institutional authority over student learning. Department and program chairs facilitate and oversee learning within each individual program. This includes oversight over the curricula, facilities and budget. We recently appointed a director of the general education curriculum to oversee the learning experience within the general education program. Academic Affairs will oversee the [Academic Success Center](#), currently under development. When complete, the Academic Success Center will include Academic Advising, Student Accessibility Services, the Office of Experience and Professional Development, the Libraries, the Writing Center, and the Math Skills Center. In its mission to “empower students to learn and connect,” the center will provide comprehensive and integrated support to student learning and experiential opportunities. Student Accessibility Services (SAS) provides ongoing support to our student community. SAS recommends individualized accommodations for students with documented disabilities. Needs are communicated to relevant faculty for implementation. The office seeks to ensure that all students with disabilities have an equal opportunity to participate in both academic and non-academic campus activities.

The library, an important academic support service, has a large and growing investment in information literacy services. The library staff of 31 professionals seeks to incorporate national trends and local needs for enhanced learning opportunities for students encountering the complex array of information types and formats. The libraries connect to students via the common curriculum through the First Year First-Year Seminar and the developing [First-Year Experience](#). The library also supports the All-College Thesis Program.

The registrar is responsible for student course enrollment and regulates access to course resources. The director of environmental health and safety regulates access to laboratory settings and ensures that faculty, staff and students are properly trained to work in these conditions.

Faculty qualifications

As defined in Chapter 7 of the [Department Chair's Handbook](#), the Provost's Office evaluates all requests for tenure track positions and presents final recommendations to the presidents of CSB and SJU. If approved, the department chair of the respective program establishes a hiring committee that works closely with the dean of the faculty and the Human Resources department to follow appropriate [procedures](#) during the hiring process.

Ranks are established as defined in [section 2.1](#) of the Faculty Handbook. Section 2.1.3 states that, "at the time of initial appointment of a full-time or reduced-load faculty member, the provost, in consultation with the dean of the faculty (including the dean of the School of Theology when appropriate), the academic dean, the senior budget analyst, and the department chair, makes a judgment about rank for the initial contract using the criteria." This includes an earned degree of an appropriate nature depending on the rank.

When students study abroad as a part of our approved programs, they have access to qualified faculty. On 15 of our 17 programs, a CSB/SJU faculty member travels and teaches at least one course. In addition, at some locations the Center for Global Education will work with partner sites to hire faculty with qualifications similar to those specified in the [Faculty Handbook](#). In other cases, the Center will arrange with a partner school to hire appropriate faculty to teach designated courses.

Dual credit

CSB/SJU holds a dual credit option with the SJU School of Theology. CSB and SJU students can complete a bachelor's of arts and either a master's of arts in ministry or master of theological studies degree in five years. Undergraduate students must earn a minimum of a 3.2 grade point average in theological coursework to enroll in the five-year program.

Graduate School of Theology

The SOT/Sem has clear [requirements](#) for admission to its degree programs. For a particular course, upper-division undergraduates may petition the Dean to enroll. For undergraduate students who choose to pursue a master's degree from the SOT/Sem in conjunction with their work toward a bachelor's degree, they are able to count credits earned in graduate level courses toward a masters degree as long as the credits are not counted toward the bachelor's degree. Courses cross-listed for BA and MA students must clearly differentiate the learning outcomes and requirements for BA and MA students [[BA/MA Program](#)]. Students with considerable life-experience that qualifies them to pursue an MA without having completed a BA may apply and be considered for admissions according to the [policy](#) outlined in the Student Handbook. In light of the [standards](#) of the Association of Theological Schools, only 15% of the students enrolled in the MA in Ministry (MAM) degree and only 15% enrolled in the Master of Divinity (MDiv) may be without a bachelor's degree.

4.A.5 Specialized Accreditation

The following CSB/SJU programs are accredited by specialized accrediting agencies:

- The Nursing department is accredited by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE). The department was last [reaccredited by CCNE](#) in AY 2017. The next reaccreditation visit is scheduled for AY 2027. Additionally, the department is approved by the Minnesota

Board of Nursing (MBON). Continuing program approval is received annually from the MBON through demonstration of national accreditation and compliance with MBON rules through completion of the annual compliance survey.

- The Didactic Program in Dietetics, an area of concentration within the Nutrition department, is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (ACEND) of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics. The department had their last [positive reaccreditation](#) in April 2016. Reaccreditation is required every seven years.
- The CSB/SJU Chemistry department is [approved](#) by the American Chemical Society (ACS) and in this capacity is authorized to confer ACS-certified degrees. In 2008, the ACS Committee on Professional Development (ACS-CPT) made significant changes to its program guidelines and approval process. The ACS-CPT changes allowed the Chemistry department to pursue nationally recognized curriculum reform while maintaining ACS approval. Curricular innovations at CSB/SJU were funded in part by a grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF) to the CSB/SJU Chemistry department (Chris Schaller, PI). Dissemination of this reform has been accomplished through publications in peer-reviewed journals focused on chemical education, numerous presentations and workshops at national meetings on chemistry and chemical education, as well as media coverage from Chemical and Engineering News and the Wall Street Journal. The Chemistry department's ACS membership was most recently approved in [2013](#). The department is currently engaged in the renewal process with continued approval expected in Spring 2018.
- The Education Department adheres to all state and national accreditation requirements programs and were approved by [NCATE](#) (CAEP — Council for Accreditation of Education Programs) and the [Minnesota Board of Teaching](#) in 2012. State accreditation must be renewed every two years. The program was approved by EPPAS (Educator Preparation Program Application System) in Fall 2014. The next NCATE (now CAEP) accreditation occurs in 2019.
- The Music department is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and successfully completed its latest [reaccreditation](#) in July 2014. The next reaccreditation visit by NASM occurs in AY 2023.

Graduate School of Theology

The Association of Theological (ATS) site visit for re-accreditation occurred on October 23-26, 2017. The review team recommended [continued accreditation](#) for another ten years, pending final approval by the ATS Board of Commissioners in February, 2018.

4.A.6 Success of our Graduates

CSB/SJU annually collect and disseminate information about the success of our graduates, primarily through a “First Destination Survey” of the graduating class and an annual survey of alumnae and alumni three years after graduation.

The [First Destination Survey](#) collects data on employment, service and education outcomes of students immediately following their graduation from CSB or SJU. Administered by the Office of Experience and Professional Development, the survey collects information over a 12-month period from the point of graduation. The number of contacts varies from one to six, depending on the graduates' status at the time of contact. The commitment to repeated contact over an extended period of time has resulted in very high participation rates. Among 2016 graduates, 97 percent of CSB graduates and 94 percent of SJU graduates provided information about their employment, service or education status. The class of 2015 reported a situated rate of greater than 99 percent, confirming that

they were able to find opportunities upon leaving CSB/SJU. In total, 81 percent of CSB graduates and 90 percent of SJU graduates in 2016 reported full-time employment, inclusive of paid employment, military service, and full-time volunteer service. Approximately 18 percent of CSB graduates and ten percent of SJU graduates indicated that they were continuing their education. Less than one percent indicated that they remained unemployed and still seeking opportunities 12 months after having graduated.

We widely disseminate results of the First Destination Survey on campus and on our institutional website. The [full report](#) on recent graduates is available on the Office of Experience and Professional Development webpage under the heading "Graduate Outcomes" after opening "Career Planning and Resources." In addition, we post a multiyear searchable database on the "Consumer Information" webpage under the heading "Graduate Outcomes." The site allows anyone to search graduate outcomes by major, location, name of business and continuing education degree, among other choices. The site currently includes results for six graduating classes. CSB and SJU are two of only three colleges in Minnesota that make a searchable database of recent graduates available on their website.

The annual alumnae and alumni survey provides evidence of what graduates are doing three years after earning their degree at CSB/SJU. The survey also provides an opportunity to gather information about our graduates' assessment of the quality of their experiences at CSB/SJU as well as their perceptions of how their experiences here have contributed to their personal and professional development. The [Class of 2014](#) survey was fielded in summer 2017. In total, 41 percent of 2014 CSB alumnae and 31 percent of 2014 SJU alumni completed the survey. The results point to important outcomes. More than 90 percent described the level of academic challenge, our commitment to academic excellence and achievement, and the overall quality of instruction they received as excellent or good. Eighty percent also rated the quality of the academic advice they received at CSB/SJU as excellent or good. Nearly three-quarters rated the quality of career and professional advice they received similarly. Nearly eight in 10 CSB and SJU graduates described their work as meaningful. Three-quarters said their current work used skills they developed as students at CSB/SJU. The vast majority of 2014 graduates who completed the survey described their primary activity as employed (75 percent). Most of the rest (19 percent) indicated that they were enrolled in graduate or professional school. One in 10 graduates had already completed graduate or professional degrees (most of them master's degrees). An additional 25 percent indicated that they are pursuing a master's degree, 11 percent a professional degree, and five percent a doctoral degree. Survey results are available to the campus community in SharePoint on the [Institutional Planning and Research](#) website under the header "Reports."

CSB/SJU also reports data about its graduates gathered by external sources. The success indicators reported on the [Bragging Rights](#) page of our Admission website include:

- CSB ranked 26th among all baccalaureate colleges nationally in the production of [Fulbright scholars](#) in 2016-17. In 2016, CSB 2014 graduate Rachel Mullin was awarded a Rhodes Scholarship.
- In 2015, CSB ranked 20th nationally in the Peace Corps Top Colleges 2015 rankings of small colleges and universities. Since its establishment in 1961, 145 CSB graduates have served in the Peace Corps.
- The *Wall Street Journal* ranked SJU 13th nationally for best returns on investment (ROI) for liberal arts majors. The story, headlined "Are Prestigious Private Colleges Worth the Cost?" showed SJU tied with Yale University and Colgate University with an annual ROI of 6.5 percent.

Graduate School of Theology

SOT/Sem [evaluates](#) the success of its programs through its employment rates, its admission rates to advanced degrees, and by alum surveys that report their use of their degree in their current work or in accord with their expectations for earning the degree. Each degree program needs to develop a process by which it brings together its assessment of student learning to provide an annual report on its educational effectiveness.

Sources

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_2016 SJU First Destination Report_20171030
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_2017 11 13 Student Success Center Learning Outcomes_20180102
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_2017_11_NURS_BAL_B_CSBSJU_MN_20180105
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Academic Internship_20171020
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_ACC Course proposal_20171020
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_All College Thesis Program_20170826
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CGE-External Study Abroad Program Process_20171020(2)
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CHEM-ACS Accreditation Letter 2013_20180105
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Course Numbers and Academic Rigor_20170831
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Credit definition_20180103
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Department Chair Handbook Ch. 7_20171005
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_ELED12-13MBT ER_20180105
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_ELED12-13NCATE ER_20180105
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_FHB_5.4.2.1 and 5.4.4.1 JFS_20180102
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_FHB-2.1 Faculty Rank_20180102
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_FHB-2.5.1 Teaching Effectiveness_20171005
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_FHB-5.0.1 Faculty Governance_20171003
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_FHB-5.4.4.1 Duties and Responsibilities of Joint Faculty Senate
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_FHB-Respective sections in part 5_20171004
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Graduate Outcomes Database_20180103
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Hiring Process and Guidelines_20171031
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Independent Learning Project_20171020
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Institutional Planning and Research survey data_20171031
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_JFA responsibilities_20180214
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Link-Bragging Rights_20171006
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Link-Fulbright Scholars_20171006
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_MUSC-nasm - commission action report 8-2014_20180105
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_NRSG CCNE Accreditation approval November 2017
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_NUTR-Dietetics ACEND letter_20180105
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Program Review Schedule_20180102
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Programs and Courses of Study_20171020
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Registrar_Credits-Grades policies_20170103
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Registrar_Transfer and Transcript Credit Policies_20170103(2)
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Rigor definition with course number_20180102
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_ACS_Listing-2018.02.01
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Foundations_of_Excellence_Comprehensive_Report_20170922
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Guiding_Documents_for_Annual_Reports_and_Program_Review_20170922
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Program_Review-Annual_Report_Dashboard_20170923
- Admissions Requirements in SOT

- ATS Letter Accepting Assessment of Distance Ed Courses
- ATS Letter Accepting Implementation of Assessment 2014
- ATS Letter Accepting MA LitStudies MA Theology
- ATS Letter Accepting Progress on Assessment Plan 2012
- ATS Letter Accepting Recruiting Admissions Plan
- ATS Reaccreditation of SOT in 2008
- ATS_degree-program-standards
- IR_Class of 2014 Alum Survey
- Program Review SOT
- SDDEV_2013 Executive Summary of Alcohol and Drug Survey
- SDDEV_2017 Sexual Assault Survey Executive Summary
- SDDEV_CSBSJU Comparison 2015 with Non-White Data1
- SDDEV_Program Review Criteria (Dec2015)
- SDDEV_SJU 2015 Health Survey Summary1
- SOT_2017-ATS_FA CV report - STJOHNSUNIV
- SOT_Assessment Plan of Student Learning Outcomes
- SOT_BA Equivalency
- SOT_BA MA Program
- SOT_Comprehensive Assessment Plan report
- SOT_Educational Effectiveness Statement 1
- SOT_Revision of Program Review Schedule
- SOT_Transfer Credits Policy
- Student Development Learning Goals Final

4.B - Core Component 4.B

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
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.

Argument

This accreditation review occurs at a point when CSB/SJU are undertaking several simultaneous efforts to improve and integrate student learning in the curricular and co-curricular spheres. Additionally, we are in the final stages of reforming our general education curriculum. The argument in 4.B, therefore, indicates developing efforts where appropriate but also necessarily emphasizes the learning goals and their assessment in the current curricular and co-curricular programs. With these significant changes occurring as we complete this assurance argument, we look forward to reporting on our progress, improvements, and initial assessment of outcomes at our HLC Assurance Review in year 4.

4.B.1 Learning Goals and Assessment

CSB/SJU have clear learning goals for their undergraduate curriculum (Common Curriculum and degree programs) and their co-curricular programs. We are working to improve these goals by developing unified institutional goals.

Previous to 2017, CSB/SJU had separate Academic and Student Development learning goals for undergraduates. The Academic Learning Goals were approved by the Joint Faculty Assembly on November 30, 1994. The Student Development Learning Outcomes were initially developed in 2006, adopted in 2007, reviewed and revised in 2009, and most recently again in [2017](#). We have discovered that having separate learning goals is not best practice. In spring 2017, Academic Affairs and Student Development representatives collaborated to construct an integrated and holistic set of institutional learning goals. The goals encompass curricular and co-curricular learning and currently are being vetted by faculty, staff, students and the Academic Affairs Committee of the CSB and SJU Boards of Trustees.

First-Year Experience Program Learning Outcomes

In AY 2017, CSB/SJU collaborated with the John Gardner Institute to conduct a thorough [self-study](#) of the student first-year experience. As a result of the self-study, a team of representatives from the faculty, Academic Affairs and Student Development offices are working to develop [learning outcomes](#) that integrate academics and student development goals in our first-year programming. The team will also develop an assessment plan.

Curricular Learning Goals — Common Curriculum

The Common Curriculum (CC) is our general education program at CSB/SJU, replacing the previous Core Curriculum, adopted in AY 2008. The [CC learning goals](#) and their respective requirements have been revised incrementally over the years. Most of the goals were approved in [September 2006](#) and [April 2007](#), with the later addition of Experiential Learning in [January 2009](#) and Intercultural Learning in [May 2009](#). All learning goals were approved by the Joint Faculty Assembly (JFA) and more recently by the Joint Faculty Senate (JFS). As a result of ongoing assessment and program review, three sets of learning goals — theology, mathematics and gender — have been modified via proposals endorsed by the Common Curriculum Committee and approval by the Joint Faculty Senate in [AY 2015 and 2016](#). The CC learning goals in their current formulations are available on the CC website. Assessment of the CC learning goals is discussed in sections 4.B.2 and 4.B.3.

As we teach and assess the Common Curriculum, we seek to improve general education at CSB/SJU. Following [Program Review](#) of the CC in AY 2010, the JFS began an effort to design a new general education curriculum. The faculty senate authorized the creation of first the Common Curriculum Program Review Committee (CCPR) and then the Common Curriculum Visioning Committee (CCVC). These committees began a three-year evaluation process which included an evaluation of the program review, extensive discussions with faculty and staff, and a literature review on general education. The CCVC's report and recommendations, "[Making Connections: Transforming the General Education at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University](#)," was presented to and endorsed by the JFS in [September 2015](#). The JFS reauthorized the CCVC to develop a mission, learning goals and curriculum model in keeping with the "Making Connections" report over the next two years. In [March 2017](#), the JFS endorsed a new set of [learning outcomes](#). In [April 2017](#), the JFS voted on and endorsed a curriculum model that incorporated these learning outcomes, but the JFA narrowly defeated the proposal in a vote in [May](#). After an external review of the curriculum reform process in [September 2017](#), the JFS established a new *ad hoc* committee to continue model development still maintaining the "Making Connections" principles and learning outcomes endorsed in March 2017. We expect to vote on a curriculum package at the end of AY 2018. The efforts of many members of the CCVC, the JFS, the faculty, and staff represent a tremendous commitment on the part of CSB/SJU to improve its curriculum and provide a stronger, more coherent general education program that reflects best practices.

Curricular Learning Goals — Academic Departments and Programs

All departments and programs have their own [learning outcomes](#), each individually designed but ultimately approved by the Academic Curriculum Committee. Curricular learning goals are available on departmental websites as well as the Office of Academic Assessment and Effectiveness website.

Additional programs that support the curriculum or high-impact practices have learning goals, including the study abroad programs, facilitated through the [Center for Global Education](#), and the [Libraries](#). We are currently vetting a set of learning outcomes for an [Academic Student Success Center](#) that encompass the goals of many of our service departments and programs, including the Writing Center, Math Skills Center, Undergraduate Research and Experience and Professional Development, among others. Upon approval, we will assess these outcomes.

Honors Program

The [Honors Program](#) underwent program review in AY 2016. As a result of the review, the director is now working with faculty to redefine the mission and goals for the program and to create an

assessment plan for these specific goals in tandem.

The Honors curriculum is now embedded within the Common Curriculum, with the additional expectation that active teaching pedagogies and rigor increases within Honors-designated courses. These courses undergo assessment as part of specific departments or programs and also as part of the Common Curriculum. Student and alumni surveys have been used to measure whether active pedagogies and rigor are embedded in Honors courses. Surveys in the [self study](#) (p.54) indicate this does occur.

Co-Curricular Learning Goals — Student Development

The Student Development vice presidents at CSB and [SJU](#) lead collegial efforts to develop learning goals that foster the full and holistic development of young women and young men, to implement programs in pursuit of those learning goals, to assess the success of those programs, and to redesign them on an ongoing basis in light of assessment results.

Student Development at CSB and SJU have a shared set of [learning outcomes](#) with a gender-specific focus. The outcomes were developed in 2007 as part of an initiative to create a “culture of assessment” within the divisions. We engaged [Keeling and Associates](#) to provide initial training on the value and process of assessment. This led to a small committee of program directors who developed a draft of divisional learning outcomes. The outcomes were further refined in a series of meetings with all program directors and finally with feedback from CSB and SJU Student Development division employees. The outcomes ultimately were reviewed and adopted by both Student Development committees of the boards of trustees and serve as the foundation of our assessment plan. Each program director is responsible for creating learning outcomes for their department using the divisional outcomes that pertain most to their area. [Yearly surveys](#) measure those defined outcomes.

Effective Processes for Assessment

CSB/SJU continuously strive to improve our processes for assessment.

The evidence presented for sections 4.B.2 and 4.B.3 strongly demonstrate that assessment is conducted with reasonable regularity and effectiveness. Departments actively assess their program goals as well as the disciplinary goals of the Common Curriculum (CC) when relevant. We have learned that assessment of the cross-disciplinary components of the CC (not owned by specific divisions or departments) requires a faculty leader in each area to ensure that systematic assessment occurs. This [system](#) is in place.

[Assessment processes](#) at CSB/SJU allow for informed and data-driven decisions that positively impact student learning. The Office of Academic Assessment and Effectiveness (OAAE) collects, maintains and supports program review and yearly assessment of departmental and program goals. We have had decentralized assessment activities. However, our assessment practices and outcomes, along with investigations of best practices, have led us to begin a process toward greater coordination. The Office of Academic Assessment and Effectiveness has been restructured and new staff hired. We are beginning to use Taskstream to better coordinate and document assessment. In addition, the office provides resources and support for faculty as it relates to effective assessment practices. OAAE reports directly to the provost and works closely with the academic dean in matters of assessment processes and impact on curriculum and with the dean of the faculty insofar as data-driven decisions impact faculty development. The academic dean is an *ex-officio* member of the faculty Academic Policies, Standards, and Assessment Committee (APSAC) and its assessment subcommittee. The

Director of OAAE is a consultant to the assessment subcommittee. APSAC and the Assessment Subcommittee are responsible for reviewing annual departmental and program assessment reports as well as their self-study documents during program review. OAAE, the academic dean, and APSAC work together to monitor and provide feedback on annual assessment reports for departments and programs. OAAE will collect and manage assessment of the institutional and first-year experience learning goals. The assistant director of OAAE also works with Institutional Planning and Research to manage and analyze retention, persistence, graduation and graduate success.

To ensure data collection, discussion and integration, we have learned that a leader is vital for regular and effective assessment of the Common Curriculum. Therefore, we have provided faculty reassignment for a director of the Common Curriculum to oversee assessment of the Common Curriculum. With the help and support of OAAE and Academic Affairs, the director ensures that assessment is completed within a defined [timeline](#) and is connected and used effectively and comprehensively where appropriate. To further support assessment of the cross-disciplinary learning goals within the Common Curriculum, a single faculty member for each of the cross-disciplinary components leads this process. The director of the First-Year Seminar conducts assessment for these courses. Disciplinary goals are assessed by their appropriate divisions and departments. While assessment has been completed regularly by departments within each division, the data have been decentralized, which we are currently correcting through changes in the assessment office and the development of a new curriculum which will have more integrated and coordinated learning goals.

Each department and program is responsible for assessment of its own learning goals. [Departments](#) must create a curriculum map identifying a timeline for assessment of each goal. Departments and programs submit assessment results annually to Academic Affairs, APSAC and the OAAE. As discussed in 4.B.3, different structures exist within a department/program to facilitate assessment.

Graduate School of Theology

The SOT/Sem has [learning outcomes](#) for each of its five degree programs. Given recent curricular changes (the Master of Theological Studies replaced the MA in Theology and the MA in Liturgical Studies, and the Master of Arts in Ministry replaced the MA in Pastoral Ministry in 2016), the [learning outcomes](#) for the terminated degrees are also provided as these guided the assessment activities from 2008 until 2016.

4.B.2 Assessment of Learning Outcomes

Common Curriculum: Cross-disciplinary Learning Goals

A leadership structure described in 4.B.1 has provided an effective assessment process for the [cross-disciplinary goals](#) (First-Year Seminar, Ethics Seminar, Gender, Experiential Learning, and Intercultural Learning) of the Common Curriculum. Academic Affairs worked with APSAC to construct a comprehensive assessment plan for the cross-disciplinary goals. The First-Year Seminar director (previously the Common Curriculum director) has actively led assessment of the First-Year Seminar learning goals (a two-semester sequence) since its onset in 2008. Assessment of ethics, gender, experiential learning, and intercultural learning is coordinated each by an assessment coordinator. Teams of faculty who teach these courses conduct assessment of the respective learning goals. Reports are submitted to Academic Affairs and APSAC and are available on our SharePoint site. Results and next steps are discussed in workshops throughout the year as described in 4.B.3 and 4.B.4.

Common Curriculum: Disciplinary Learning Goals

Disciplinary-divisional:

The four academic divisions (Fine Arts, Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences) conduct [assessment of their respective divisional learning goals](#). Departments teach and assess the Common Curriculum learning goals corresponding to their respective divisions. For example, in AY 2016:

- Theater assessed Fine Arts goal 1 in THEA 105
- English assessed Humanities goal 1
- History assessed the Humanities' goals 1 and 2 in all 100-level courses
- Chemistry assessed Natural Science goals 1, 2, and 3 in CHEM 201
- Nutrition assessed Natural Science goals 1, 2, 3, and 4 in NUTR 110 and NUTR 125
- Political Science assessed Social Science goals 1, 2, and 3 in POLS 111, POLS 121, POLS 399, and the MFT for Political Science
- Psychology assessed Social Science goal 3 in PSYC 111 Lab

Because assessment methods were built within departments, tools and timelines were decentralized, leading to a lack of collaboration and integration of summative assessment of divisional learning goals. This has led to the a new approach in the development of learning goals for the new general education model. More integrated, the assessment practices and reporting will be more integrated and coordinated.

[Reporting](#) of disciplinary divisional goals has increased dramatically since requested by departments in AY 2013. For example, in AY 2016, all [annual reports](#), where appropriate, contained assessment data for the Natural Science, Humanities, Social Science and Fine Arts divisional goals.

Disciplinary-departmental:

Departmental Common Curriculum (CC) goals were designed for [mathematics and theology](#). Assessment plans were developed by these individual departments and can be found in the departments' annual reports. These goals have been assessed since their onset, and as a result, both math and theology learning goals have changed within the past five years. In addition:

- Members of the Mathematics department have adopted alternative pedagogies and changed textbooks as a result of assessment data.
- Theology, during their discussions of assessment data, shared assignments, prompts and different pedagogical approaches to help reach specific goals.

Departmental goals also were designed for the departments of [Languages & Cultures and Hispanic Studies](#). Assessment plans were developed by these individual departments and can be found in the departments' annual reports. Numerous changes have resulted from assessment to enhance student learning. For example, changes in software to enhance language learning, alternative pedagogies to support learning, and changes in syllabi have been adopted. Additional examples include:

- French created its Talk Abroad program to enhance listening and speaking skills.
- An English for Bilingual Students (EBS 210-211) course was created in fall 2010 to better serve bilingual U.S. students and address the global language proficiency requirements.

Department and Program Learning Goals (Majors)

Departments and programs submit their assessment data annually. A [compliance dashboard](#) suggests a substantial increase in submission and participation in assessment since 2009. Accountability for

completion of departmental and Common Curriculum assessment is monitored by APSAC. Annual reports are evaluated for the inclusion of assessment data. Over the last five years, an average of 85 percent of departments and programs that submitted annual reports included an assessment report. This data further supports the participation of most departments and programs in their own assessment.

Each [department](#) develops its own assessment plan to assess student learning for disciplinary goals. For example:

- Exercise Science and Sport Studies uses several direct and indirect methods to assess its five learning goals over several courses; it completed its five-year assessment plan in AY 2017.
- Computer Science assesses its five learning goals annually using direct measures via lab exams and the Major Field Test in Computer Science.
- Art has assessed all seven of its learning goals for Art majors annually since program review in 2011-2012.
- History assesses two of its six learning goals each year, one for general students and one for majors, and will complete its second round of assessment in AY 2019.
- Economics collects evidence regularly for its three learning goals and eight objectives for analysis on a three-year rotation; for example, in AY 2016, it evaluated three semesters worth of senior research papers to assess learning goals for student writing.

Departments use both direct and indirect methods of assessment for their programs. Typically, they field senior surveys (and alumni surveys during program reviews) along with direct assessment using student assignments, writings, exams and class activities. Rubrics are common to evaluate student writings.

Assessment in Accredited Programs

Chemistry, Education, Music, Nursing and Nutrition all conduct assessment in conjunction with their respective accrediting bodies (discussed in 4.A.5). For example, the [Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education](#) (CCNE) determined that the Nursing department fulfills its mission and goals and uses "data on program effectiveness [...] to foster ongoing program development."

Assessment in the Center for Global Education

The Center for Global Education currently offers 17 semester-long abroad programs and 10 to 12 short-term programs each year. Fifteen of the semester-long programs are led by faculty, meaning a faculty member from CSB/SJU directs the program and teaches one class while abroad. The coursework must be approved by the Academic Curriculum Committee (ACC) and, if appropriate, the Common Curriculum Committee (CCC). Both committees include faculty members and ex-officio members from Academic Affairs. If the course is part of the Common Curriculum, faculty are expected to participate in the assessment process as for the Common Curriculum.

The Center for Global Education has a set of common [learning goals](#) for all abroad programs. [Assessment](#) is conducted indirectly through student surveys and end-of-semester reports by faculty directors. CGE conducted a [program review](#) in 2016 and a leadership change occurred in 2017.

Student Development

Metrics for student learning trends are assessed through a variety of surveys administered by

Institutional Planning and Research, including the New Entering Student Survey, Enrolled Student Survey, Senior Survey and the Graduate Survey. In addition, CSB/SJU Health Promotion administers one of the following self-designed surveys over a three-year rotation: [General Health Survey](#), [Alcohol and Other Drug survey](#), and the [Sexual Violence Campus Climate survey](#), the latter of which complies with Title IX requirements. These surveys have guided an ongoing assessment process which has resulted in a variety of revisions highlighted in section 4.B.3.

Graduate Program in the School of Theology

The SOT/Sem has been developing and implementing a [comprehensive program](#) of regular, ongoing assessment since the last visit of the accreditation team from the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) in 2008. As noted in the [ATS site visitor report](#): "The on-site visitation committee saw evidence of the assessment of student learning outcomes. In fact, the 'culture of assessment' is very evident and alive within the institution and the professors."

The SOT/Sem utilizes direct and indirect assessment of student learning. Our [direct assessments](#) have been in place for several years. Expectations for participation in direct assessment are outlined in the [Student Handbook](#). Specific assignments used for direct assessment include public presentations, portfolios, [integration writings](#), defense of a thesis, and comprehensive examinations. A practice of [embedded assessment](#) was implemented in 2011 and, using this [embedded assessments](#) worksheet, that type of assessment has developed into standard practice.

A number of indirect assessments are also regularly implemented: (1) [student course evaluations](#); (2) program review [surveys](#); (3) an annual [student life survey](#) (started in Spring of 2017); and (4) [exit surveys](#).

4.B.3 Assessment Improves Student Learning

Assessment of Student Learning Has Led to Strategic Institutional Goals for CSB/SJU

Assessment data has been a growing and important piece of CSB/SJU's institutional decisions. [Strategic Directions 2020](#) (SD2020) has goals driven by assessment data. Two examples make this clear. The goal to "create a leading and innovative liberal arts curriculum emphasizing preparation for life" was shaped not only by the Common Curriculum Program Review but also by a three-year [study](#) led by CSB/SJU to evaluate the impact of our current Common Curriculum on student learning. Assessment data influenced this decision and has led us to undergo curricular reform described in 4.B.1.

The SD2020 goals to "meet the needs and aspirations and exceed the expectations of a 21st century student body" resulted from an assessment that included retention data and an extensive self-study of CSB/SJU's overall [first-year experience](#). As a result of this data and assessment, we have identified needs and taken steps to create a more inclusive campus and to enhance the first-year student experience from an academic and co-curricular level.

Assessment of Student Learning Has Led to Changes in the Curriculum

Institutional Changes in Student Learning: The alignment of both curricular and co-curricular learning goals in the development of institutional learning goals, described in 4.B.1, will facilitate assessment of these goals and help us better understand how well our institutions approach the holistic development of our students.

Improvement in the Common Curriculum: Many positive changes have occurred as a result of assessment. For example, several student [learning goals](#) were revised to improve student learning, including the goals for mathematics (2015), theology (2015/2016), and gender (2015). We also have created a lengthy description of the learning goals for ethics (2013). In addition, assessment led to modifications in rubrics that better clarify student expectations (e.g. include experiential learning, gender, and ethics). In addition to rubrics and learning goals, assessment also has resulted in changes in pedagogy as well as assignments and learning tools used to help students meet these goals (see evidence highlighted above in 4.B.2).

Program review and an extensive additional assessment of our current Common Curriculum have led to a multiyear process in the development of a new general education curriculum as described in 4.B.1. We are in year seven of curricular reform with continued discussion of a model to best achieve the newly developed learning outcomes.

Improvement in Programs and Departments: [Programs and departments](#) have made a wide variety of changes as a result of assessment data. A sample of the changes include:

- Art used assessment results to ensure consistency of the evaluation process
- Theater used assessment as a teaching tool for instructors and a learning tool for students
- English used assessment to translate Common Curriculum learning goals into English-specific goals and improve data collection
- History used assessment to improve Humanities-History rubrics and improve the data collection process
- Chemistry used assessment to improve a large-enrollment, multi-section, foundational laboratory course (CHEM 201)
- Nutrition used assessment to monitor and improve student learning in courses with different audiences (NUTR 110 for general students, NUTR 125 for science majors)
- Political Science employed a multi-instrument approach to measure student learning at the introductory and senior levels to facilitate discussions of pedagogy
- Psychology used assessment to improve a multi-section introductory course (PSYC 111 Lab) by improving assessment instruments, sharing results and fostering collaboration within the department.

Our study abroad programs also have changed as a result of [assessment](#). For example, we have modified faculty training to support teaching towards the desired outcomes, and modified programming to help students better reach the program's specified goals.

Assessment of Student Learning Has Led to Improvement in Student Development

Student Development has a formal process of program review. Each program in the division is now on a five- to seven-year review cycle similar to the cycle and practice for academic programs. Guidelines were established for program review linking assessment to student learning outcomes. All departments in Student Development have been through at least one cycle of program review, and we are now well into our second cycle. While each program review has its particular nuances, it typically occurs in three major phases: a self-study based on program review guidelines; an external evaluation to review the self-study and identify the program's strengths and opportunities for improvement; and a response from the director that becomes the departmental strategic plan. The vice presidents for Student Development work with each director to make fiscal, human resource or programmatic changes as needed to improve student learning and enhance the student experience. Examples of improvements that have resulted from program review include: moving Career Services from Student Development to Academic Affairs and restructuring it into the [Office of Experience and Professional](#)

[Development \(XPD\)](#), re-organization transitions within SJU Athletics, and increased staffing for Life Safety Services.

Graduate Program in the School of Theology

The SOT/Sem's annual day-long curriculum conference draws upon data from student and alum surveys, faculty self-assessment, data from syllabi, etc. in order to inform faculty about needed improvements. Rubrics have guided the effective evaluation of graduate papers and written comprehensive exams and have informed change. An annual curriculum [conference](#) and subsequent portions of [faculty meetings](#) in the academic year devoted to assessment exercises have aimed not only to adjust curricular structures and pedagogical processes but also to shape a “common mind” of the faculty that better aligns our teaching with our mission and the needs of students.

4.B.4 Process of Assessment

Stakeholders Participate in Assessment

As described in 4.B.1, we have created a structure to ensure assessment is conducted at an institutional, general education and departmental/programmatic level. The academic dean and OAAE manage and oversee assessment for Academic Affairs and also serve as a support and assistance network for faculty. [Systems](#) are in place for departments and programs to submit their assessment and follow-up with progress reports on student learning

As noted in 4.B.1, all programs and departments must establish an assessment plan and create structures to conduct effective assessment. Assessment by programs and departments has increased dramatically, and we have evidence of strong, broad-based faculty participation in department-level assessment. Of the 32 academic departments and programs, 20 have an assessment coordinator. In other cases, the chair, a committee, or individual faculty coordinate assessment work. Sixteen departments report that 100 percent of their faculty participate in annual assessment work. Overwhelmingly, [department and program chairs](#) report that they discuss assessment to improve curriculum, pedagogy and/or the assessment process itself. Since AY 2012, over 75 percent of departments routinely "close the assessment loop" by discussing assessment results in their annual reports (this number has risen to more than 80 percent since AY 2015).

Participation in assessment of the Common Curriculum has increased as well. As described in 4.B.2, when asked to submit assessment results for the Common Curriculum, 100 percent of those departments and programs with courses with divisional learning outcomes submit results. Participation in Common Curriculum assessment of cross-disciplinary learning goals is increasing. For example, in AY 2016 approximately 20 percent of courses submitted artifacts for assessment of the ethics learning goals. By AY 2017, the participation had risen to 84 percent.

The [assessment of the gender designation](#) of the Common Curriculum provides a good example of faculty participation. In May 2017, a team of nine faculty from eight departments met for a two-day workshop to assess artifacts from Gender courses taught in AY 2017. They assessed goal 3: "Articulate how gender intersects with at least one of the following: race, class, ethnicity, nationality, or sexuality." Their report served as the subject of a brown bag discussion in late August, where 17 faculty from 12 departments discussed the need for further training to teach intersectionality and subsequently laid initial plans for follow-up work in AY 2018. In total, 23 faculty from 14 different departments participated in this one assessment cycle of the gender designation.

Training and Support for Assessment is in Place

CSB/SJU faculty and staff receive assessment training both on campus and off campus. From 2008 to 2012, 39 faculty (12 percent of faculty FTE) and 14 administrative and staff members participated in the [Assessment 101](#) training on campus supported by the Teagle Foundation and administered by CSB/SJU staff. In addition, faculty from a wide variety of departments have received training in many off-campus workshops and conferences including assessment workshops through AAC&U and HLC. We send a team annually to the HLC conference. An [internal survey](#) conducted in April 2017 revealed that faculty from 22 departments and First-Year Seminar, as well as administrative and staff members from the SJU School of Theology, Academic Advising, Counseling, the library, Campus Life and other offices, received Teagle or other off-campus assessment training. Respondents indicated that they used training in the assessment of Common Curriculum and department learning goals, Student Development and other institutional goals, as well as service on APSAC or curriculum development efforts.

The institution provides [funding](#) for departments and individuals to support assessment training for both faculty and staff. For example, departments have annual assessment budgets. Furthermore, between 2012 and 2017, the institution supported attendance at a variety of assessment conferences, including the American Association of Colleges & Universities' Institute on General Education and Assessment, the Peace Studies Assessment conference, and the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages conference.

Additionally, as described in 4.B.1, we have structured OAAE to provide individual and systematic training in assessment.

As a result of training and the continued development of a culture of assessment, CSB/SJU is demonstrating an increasing and more pervasive use of assessment to make decisions regarding student learning. CSB/SJU are beginning to use Taskstream to coordinate assessment. The institutions are moving away from decentralized assessment practices.

Graduate School of Theology

The SOT/Sem also has access to the assessment and evaluation resources described above. As a result, the SOT/Sem also demonstrates processes and methodologies that reflect good practice (see also 4.B.2 and 4.B.3) with substantial participation of the faculty. As noted in 4.B.2, the [ATS site team](#) commended the SOT/Sem faculty for their commitment to a "culture of assessment" and that assessment is "alive within the professors".

Sources

- 2006-09-20 JFA Approved Minutes-FYS
- 2007-04-03 JFA Approved Minutes-ethics-gender
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS _ Department LG assessment_20180103
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS _ Department LG assessment_20180202
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS _2009 01 22 JFS Approved Minutes_20180209
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS _2009 1 May Approved JFS Minutes_20180209
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS _2015-16 JFS minutes approved for CC LG changes_20180211
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS _2017 03 14 JFS APPROVED_20180211
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS _2017 04 11 JFS Approved Minutes_20180211

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_2017 05 04 vote results on Connections_20180211
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_2017 11 13 Student Success Center Learning Outcomes_20180102
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Approved 2015 09 08 JFS Minutes_20180211
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Assessment organization chart 20171020
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_AY2017 CGE program review_20170211
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC Assessment Cross Disciplinary LG_20180103
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC Assessment Cross Disciplinary LG_20180202
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC Assessment Disciplinary-Departmental LG_20180210
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC Assessment Disciplinary-Divisional LG_20180103
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC Assessment Disciplinary-Divisional LG_20180209
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC Assessment structure_20171020
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC Assessment Timeline_20171020
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC Disciplinary-Departmental LGs Assessment_20171020
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC Fine Arts Experience_20170907.pdf
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CC Program Review WabashTeamReport2011_20180211
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CGE Assessment_20171013
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_CGE-External Study Abroad Program Process_20171020(2)
- Academic Affairs_Common Curriculum Learning Goals 20170215
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Faculty Training in Assessment 20180216
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_GE Learning Outcomes 3.14.17_20171020
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Honor's program review 2015-16_20180211
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_NRSG CCNE Accreditation approval November 2017
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_OAAE Department and Program Learning Goals and Curriculum Maps_20180211
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_OAAE Department LGs and CMs_20171020_TBR
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Rhodes Report_20180211
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Support for Assessment Training_20171030
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Teagle Final Report_20171030
- Academic_Affairs Fac-staff assment training survey 20171101
- Academic_Affairs chair survey assmnt 20171030
- Academic_Affairs GE assess AY17 summ 20171030
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_CGE learning goals_20170922.pdf
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Common_Curriculum_Learning_Goals_20170922.pdf
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Department-Program Learning Goals_20170824.pdf
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Foundations_of_Excellence_Comprehensive_Report_20170922
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Guiding_Documents_for_Annual_Reports_and_Program_Review_20170922
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Library Learning Goals_20170925.pdf
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Library_Learning_Goals_20170925
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Program_Review-Annual_Report_Dashboard_20170923
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_Senator_Paul_Simon_Award_2015
- Annual Assessment of Seminarians
- Assessment of Graduate Paper for Comprehensives
- Assessment of Ministry Students
- ASSESSMENT_Making Connections_2015
- ATS Graduating Student Questionnaire
- CSBSJU_XPD
- Former Learning Outcomes in 2008-16 SOT
- Learning Outcomes for SOT Degrees
- PRES CSBSJU_SD 2020 Bd Approved_20150518
- SD_keeling and associates

- SDDEV_2013 Executive Summary of Alcohol and Drug Survey
- SDDEV_2017 Sexual Assault Survey Executive Summary
- SDDEV_CSBSJU Comparison 2015 with Non-White Data1
- SDDEV_Program Review Criteria (Dec2015)
- SDDEV_SJU 2015 Health Survey Summary1
- SDDEV_VP Student Development (D. Mullin) updated Dec 2016
- SDDEV_VP Student Development (D. Mullin) updated Dec 2016 (003)
- SDLG Assessment SJU
- SOT_2017-ATS_FA CV report - STJOHNSUNIV
- SOT_2017-ATS_FA CV report - STJOHNSUNIV (page number 15)
- SOT_Assessment Plan of Student Learning Outcomes
- SOT_Comprehensive Assessment Plan report
- SOT_Curriculum Conference
- SOT_Embedded Assessment Examples
- SOT_Embedded Assessment Exercise
- SOT_Evaluation of Ministry Integration Papers
- SOT_Faculty Meetings 2008 to 2016
- SOT_Student Course Evaluations are facilitated with IA Systems
- SOT_Student Life Survey
- SOT_student_handbook_0708_web
- SOT_student_handbook_0708_web (page number 13)
- SOT_Surveys of Alums Students
- SOT_Turpin Report
- STD DEV_FoE Final Report 2017
- Student Development Learning Goals Final
- Student Development Learning Goals Final
- Summary of SOT Assessment Exercises 2008-16
- Thesis Writing in SOT

4.C - Core Component 4.C

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

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.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
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.)

Argument

4.C.1 Goals for retention, persistence, and completion

CSB/SJU closely monitors retention, persistence and completion and works to achieve excellent outcomes overall. [Strategic Directions 2020](#) identifies clear retention and completion goals. Specifically, we aim to achieve and sustain a first-to-second year retention rate of 90 percent (our first-to-second year retention average rate for the past four years is 87 percent). We aim to achieve and sustain a four-year completion rate of 75 percent (our average for three cohorts that entered between fall 2011 and fall 2013 was 68 percent). In addition, we are working to eliminate retention and completion gaps between majority and under-represented students. Between fall 2013 and fall 2017, first-to-second year retention averaged 82 percent for American students of color and 89 percent for white students. The six-year completion rate for the entering class of 2011 totaled 66 percent for American students of color, compared to 77 percent for white students. To begin this work, in summer 2016 we joined the John Gardner Institute for an intensive self-reflective study of our students' first-year experience. With the development of a First-Year Experience, we anticipate results will increase our retention rate for both majority and under-represented students.

Even as our student population has changed, becoming more academically, socioeconomically, and racially and ethnically diverse, our retention and completion rates have remained above national averages and are consistent with averages at [peer liberal arts colleges](#).

Graduate School of Theology

Prior to 2016-17, the SOT addressed retention from purely an enrollment management perspective. A more systematic way of addressing retention issues in the Fall of 2016 resulted in the implementation of a more comprehensive [retention plan](#).

4.C.2/4 Collection and Analysis

The College of Saint Benedict calculates retention, persistence and graduation rates using the IPEDS methodology, which tracks entering cohorts of full-time, first-time degree-seeking students. Retention and completion information is available on the [Institutional and Planning Research website](#).

While most students who enroll at CSB and SJU stay to [completion](#), between 18 percent and 20 percent of each entering cohort since 2007 left without having earned their undergraduate degree here. The largest number and percentage leave during their first year or between the first and second year.

We work closely with students in a number of ways, principally through Academic Advising, Residential Life and Counseling, to address issues before departure becomes the clearest or only choice. The Student Support Team (comprised of the deans of students and representatives of Residential Life, Counseling, Academic Advising and Campus Security) meets regularly during the academic year to review students who might be at-risk academically and/or behaviorally and to develop a plan to assist those students as needed. In addition, the Retention Committee monitors student enrollment throughout the year, integrating the work of the business offices, Academic Affairs, the Office of the Registrar, Student Development, and Financial Aid to insure a coordinated approach to addressing the needs of individual students and to maximize the number of students who register each term.

CSB/SJU have developed a number of program strategies and partnerships to support retention, persistence and graduation. For example, we recently created a College Navigator staff position to provide support for first-generation students. That position connects first-generation students to support provided in various offices on campus, helping them to successfully transition into the college environment and culture.

The [Fact Book](#) provides "a multiyear snapshot and briefing of key data and trends related to admission and enrollment, academic activity and productivity, and human and financial resources [for CSB/SJU] ... Information includes: admission and new entering student data, undergraduate student data, academic and instructional data, alumni data, financial and human resource data, and private college comparison data."

Graduate School of Theology

[Data on retention](#) from 2008-16 was gathered in the following categories from the Banner system of the University and from the SOT Admissions database: (1) Admits to Degrees and Degrees Awarded; (2) Degree Completion Periods; (3) Summary of Enrollment; (4) Enrollment by Degree.

The [global](#) retention rate (ratio of total admits to total graduates) yielded a rate of 54.8%, which is slightly higher than the 53% retention rate in 2004-6. If the [retention numbers](#) are limited to full-time students, then the retention rate from the Fall of 2012 to Spring 2017 is 81%, which is slightly higher than the national average of 80% reported by ATS. The latter retention rate is more in line with the reality of our School. However, we need to study further the retention rate for part-time students.

In the second data-gathering study (Spring 2017) for the development of our 2016 [Retention Plan](#), we researched the SOT's retention of full time degree seeking students from Fall 2012 to Spring 2017. This research established a five-year baseline of an 81% retention rate for these students. The report also collected names of those students who dropped out of their degree programs. This allows us to do further qualitative data collection about the reasons for their departure from graduate theological study. The SOT will continue to refine this method of data collection to determine the extent of progress we are making in retaining full time degree seeking students. We also intend to develop a plan for attending to the retention of part-time students.

4.C.3 Use of information

Each year, the Retention Committee reviews persistence data to make improvements in our registration and student outreach processes. Significant changes in recent years include [earlier outreach](#) to students and parents to prepare for class registration and the requirement of completion of course registration as a condition for participation in the campus housing lottery (all CSB and SJU students are required to live on campus).

Retention, persistence and completion were driving factors for the self-study completed for the [first-year experience](#). As a result of the self-study, steps are being taken to collaborate on a set of learning outcomes that will drive a first-year program.

Graduate School of Theology

Formation, student life, and academics converge in the assessment of our degree programs. A more systematic method of attending to retention data will influence our practices in selecting students for admission and for attending to their needs holistically (i.e., the integration of the intellectual, human, spiritual, and pastoral dimensions).

Sources

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Digital Retention Messages_2017 08 25
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Fact Book_20170831
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Institutional Planning and Research_completion rates_20180102
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Peer Comparison_20170825
- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_Foundations_of_Excellence_Comprehensive_Report_20170922
- PRES CSBSJU_SD 2020 Bd Approved_20150518
- Retention Data in SOT
- SOT_Data in Implementation of Retention Plan
- SOT_Method of Maintaining Retention Data prior to 2016
- SOT_Recruiting Plan in 2010 - Report to ATS
- SOT_Retention Plan_2017

4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary

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.

Summary

The Graduate School of Theology and the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University have developed systematic approaches to undergo data-informed, ongoing reform to enhance student learning. Assessment timelines are established and used to assess learning goals at the institutional, student development, general education and departmental/program level. Data is reported and maintained and used to guide decisions as it relates to the assessment process, pedagogical change, as well as curricular change. Over the past decade, the culture of assessment has grown and with new structures and commitments now in place. We expect this culture to continue to expand in the future.

CSB/SJU are in the final stages of integrating academic and student development learning goals. We are also in the final stages of reforming the general education curriculum as a result of a program review of the current curriculum and the work of faculty committees to intentionally incorporate best practices into the general education curriculum. The Office of Academic Assessment and Effectiveness is incorporating practices to make assessment more integrated and coordinated.

Sources

There are no sources.

5 - 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.

5.A - Core Component 5.A

The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

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.
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.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Argument

Saint John's University (SJU) is committed to maintaining and strengthening the educational experience provided to our students. [Strategic Directions 2020](#) provides the foundation for improvements to the educational experience and the basis for making resource allocation decisions. As a residential, undergraduate and graduate institution, our resources are allocated in support of and consistent with our educational mission.

5.A.1/5.A.2/5.A.3 Mission-Appropriate Resource Allocation and Infrastructure

The university is comprised of four self-sustaining divisions: College of Arts and Sciences, School of Theology, Hill Museum and Manuscript Library, and Artist in Residence. Each division has a set of financial statements that are consolidated into the university statements within the annual audited financial report. SJU has consistently improved its financial base through increased gifts to the endowment and annual fund, prudent management of the budget, and transfers to reserves as summarized in the [fiscal year 2017 audited financial statements](#).

Over the last 10 years, net assets have increased by 39 percent, rising from \$247 million to \$344 million. Three sources of revenue provide the primary support for the educational and general budget: net tuition and fees (67 percent), endowment and private gifts and grants (21 percent) and auxiliary operations (five percent). The university consistently has produced operating budget surpluses at fiscal year-end through prudent budget management.

Between fall 2015 and fall 2017, SJU closed on a \$7.595 million bond refunding issue, a \$13.815 million bond refunding issue, and an \$18.275 million new bond issue. Those resources supported

renovation of the Alcuin Library and construction of a new Learning Commons (key objectives of SD2020). Through the careful use of debt restructure and savings realized through the refunded issues (outlined in [a document](#) shared with the Finance Committee of the board of trustees), the bond actions did not significantly impact our operating budget. In August 2017, the university transacted an advanced [refunding of Series 6U](#) that resulted in annual debt service savings and an overall reduction in outstanding debt. The university maintained its Moody's bond rating of A2 with a stable outlook with all three of these issues. The [Moody's report](#) noted that the assignment and affirmation of the A2 rating reflected the university's strong balance sheet coverage of debt, consistent operating surpluses, strong monthly liquidity, solid fund raising, and consistent solid operating surpluses through sound fiscal management and planning. Our strategic alignment with the College of Saint Benedict (CSB) also weighed positively on the A2 rating.

Our partnership with CSB provides both of us with added operating efficiencies, enables budget flexibility, and provides scale that would otherwise be difficult to achieve. The institutions share faculty and all academic departments, Admission, Information Technology (IT) Services, and Libraries, Registrar, Human Resources and many other administrative units. In addition to wholly sharing our faculty, 60 percent of our total administrative and support staff are shared by both institutions.

While our endowment market value is moderate, it is on an upward trajectory. Consistent fundraising and strong investment performance have supported continued growth in our investment pool. Between FY08 and FY17, the endowment grew by nearly 24 percent, rising from \$145 million to \$180 million. The university successfully completed its \$140 million campaign on June 30, 2017, raising \$158 million (summarized in [a presentation](#) to the campus communities in October 2017).

The SD2020 goal, *Shared Future, Sustainable Future*, called for the development of a long-range [economic model](#) that financially aligned the goals articulated in the plan. The accompanying [narrative](#) provides a historical context for the long-range plan. We update the economic model annually with a four-year look forward projection. We use the model to make resource allocation decisions that align our resources with the strategic plan while being realistic about our challenges and opportunities. We have allocated funding toward the goals in the plan, including funding in support of the First-Year Experience, support for the new common curriculum, new resources for classroom renovations, development of new athletic fields, and a new Learning Commons and renovation of Alcuin Library. SD2020 included clear [goals and targets](#) that we closely monitor and [report](#) to the Board of Trustees.

The School of Theology underwent a review by the American Theological Society fall 2017. As outlined in its [self-study](#), the School of Theology has engaged in considerable planning in recent years to ensure it has sufficient financial and human resources to support its operations in ways that are consistent with its mission. [Standard 8](#) of the ATS standards addresses institutional resources for the School of Theology.

Facilities

Property, plant and equipment are among the university's largest assets, totaling approximately \$152 million. We take stewardship of our physical assets very seriously. SJU's facility [master plan](#) was updated in 2009. The updated master plan continues to serve as a key planning document in the management of and expansion of campus facilities.

SJU recently completed construction of new and updated athletic fields that support the SD2020 goal, *Holistic and Transformational Development of Men*. In addition, the university has completed a major

renovation of Alcuin Library and a new 23,000 square-foot Learning Commons that opened fall 2017. Under the provost's direction, the university has completed a [classroom inventory](#) that will result in systematic renovation of all classroom spaces over a five-year time period. These classrooms are being updated following [classroom development standards](#) that were developed in conjunction with faculty and staff from departments across campus. Planning for a new student housing structure has begun with construction slated for summer of 2021.

In addition, the university also has a long-term [Facility Audit Plan](#) and allocates funding annually to address ongoing plant renewal, facility adaption and timely maintenance to ensure the sustainability and integrity of the campus infrastructure. The spending on these projects are tracked through a [facilities improvement plan](#).

Technology

The Information Technology Services (ITS) department provides a range of [services](#), including computer and network support, enterprise applications, web services, technical support and telephone support. The ITS strategic plan supports the [goals articulated in SD2020](#). [The plan](#) addresses learning space design, tools for teaching and learning, service and support, data for analytics, anytime/anywhere access, expanded partnerships across campus, process improvement, and system security. Working with academic areas, ITS will create new standards for classrooms, advancing the model for learning space design, which will plan to integrate into instructional space planning, technology planning, budgeting, staffing and management.

ITS completed a [program review](#) in 2016-17. The review noted several notable strengths, including staff talent and skill, creation of a plan closely aligned with the institutional strategic plan, a regular cycle of funding replacement computers for faculty and staff, maintenance of up-to-date technology infrastructure appropriate for our mission, modernized classrooms and our focus on access for students with an emphasis on mobile technologies. As a result of the review, Media Services (formerly included as part of the Libraries staff) was integrated into ITS in spring 2018 to provide better and more consistent classroom support

Human Resources

Faculty and staff are the university's greatest assets in delivering our mission. As part of the SD2020 goal, *Shared Future, Sustainable Future*, the university has developed a faculty and staff composition design to manage both the student-to-faculty ratio and the student-to-staff ratio in ways consistent with our mission, our educational commitments and our economic constraints. [The first faculty composition design](#) was presented to the CSB and SJU Boards of Trustees in November 2012. We continue to actively monitor the metrics included in that first design. We presented [the first iteration of the staff composition design](#) to the SJU Board of Trustees in May 2014. That document also is updated annually. The [2017-18 version](#) of the faculty and staff designs currently are in draft form and under review. Based on the fall 2016 IPEDS-reported data, the university employs 149 faculty FTE and 328 staff FTE for a total employee base of 477 FTE. Approximately 95 percent of faculty FTE is full-time; over 75 percent of those full-time appointments are tenured or on a tenure-track. Students [report](#) high levels of interaction and satisfaction with the support they receive from faculty.

5.A.4 Qualified Staff

SJU annually conducts an employee review process designed not only to evaluate employee job performance but also to promote dialogue between employees and supervisors and to reflect on the

employee's goals and professional development aspirations. In addition, the President's Cabinet has developed [goals](#) that align the current year with the goals in SD2020. The university supports the professional development of its staff and provides annual funding for professional development opportunities through departmental funding as well as institutional grants administered by the Administrative Professional Development and Support Staff Development Committees. We also provide a [professional development series](#) through the Human Resources Office that encompasses a range of topics, including supervisory training, diversity and inclusion, financial wellness, health and wellness, technology training and compliance.

The Human Resources Office has established an HR Inclusion Advisory Committee committed to building and retaining a diverse workforce. The committee began meeting in spring 2017 and established a [framework and action plan](#) that will be implemented in FY18. The committee aspires to serve our students and community with a commitment to diversity and inclusion in three focus areas: recruitment and retention, professional development and infrastructure and community outreach and engagement.

See also 3.C.6

5.A.5 Budget

SJU consistently has aligned its annual budget process for the College of Arts and Sciences with the long-term economic model. In fall 2017, we changed the timeline for making our comprehensive price decision from spring to fall in response to a change in the federal financial aid needs analysis process. Typically, we would have requested a final pricing decision at the March meeting of our board of trustees, when the entire budget is presented for approval. Through consistent use of the model, the board has had confidence in setting the price earlier.

While we closely follow the expense parameters specified in the economic model, it is not static. The college continually revisits the parameters in response to changes in the higher education marketplace and to issues identified in the annual [environmental scan](#). New budget requests must be aligned with the goals articulated in SD2020.

The president's cabinet and the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees monitor the budget and other key metrics throughout the year through a series of [dashboard reports](#). The Business Office has established strong internal controls to monitor and review all expenditures and to monitor budget activity. The Business Office sends monthly budget reports to all budget managers and vice presidents. The university undergoes an annual audit, which is approved by the Audit Committee of the board of trustees. We provide the entire audit to all trustees. SJU consistently has received unqualified opinions on its annual audit.

Sources

- AcademicAffairs-2012FacultyCompsitionDesign-2014.11.30
- FINANCE_CSB_SJU_DebtOutlook-2016.02.09
- Finance_EconomicModelUpdate-2017.02.08
- Finance_IT_ServicesExternalReviewerReport-2017
- Finance_ITS Strategic Plan 2015-2020 Alignment with SD2020
- Finance_ITS Strategic Plan 2015-2020 Snapshot
- Finance_SD 2020 Financial Plan Narrative UPDATE 2017.08
- Finance_ServiceCatalogITDetails

- Finance_SJU_StaffCompositionDesign_2014.05.19
- Finance_SJU_StaffCompositionDesignDRAFT_2018.01.05
- Human Resources_INCLUSION ADVISORY COMMITTEE Framework Action Plan
- HUMAN_RESOURCES_DevelopmentProgramming-Spring 2018
- IR_2016 Senior Survey Report
- IR_2016 Senior Survey Report (page number 10)
- PRES SJU_Audited Financials 2017
- SDC_Environmental Scan_2016
- SDC_SD2020_JointBoardPresentation_2015_May
- SDC_SD2020_ProcessProgressUpdate_2016 November
- SJU_Finance_Academic Planning Classroom Development
- SJU_FINANCE_Classroom Inventory
- SJU_FINANCE_FacilitiesAuditReport_2013
- SJU_FINANCE_FacilitiesImprovementPlan
- SJU_FINANCE_FacilitiesMasterPlan_2009
- SJU_FINANCE_Housing Master Plan 2011
- SJU_Finance_MoodysCreditOpinion_2017
- SJU_FINANCE_PlanningModel-2017.09.25
- SJU_FINANCE_Refunding Summary for Moody's (8-8-17)
- SJU_IA_Final Total Campaign Celebration - Oct 2017
- SJU_Pres and Cabinet Goals 2017-18
- SOT_2017-2018 SJU SOT-SEM ATS Self-Study Report
- SOT_2017-2018 SJU SOT-SEM ATS Self-Study Report (page number 72)
- Strategic Planning_SD 2020 Bd Approved 5-18-15

5.B - Core Component 5.B

The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.
2. 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.
3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Argument

Saint John's University governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and collaboratively engage the campus community and the College of Saint Benedict. Cross-divisional and campus representation on governance, faculty, and administrative committees exemplifies an inherent transparency within the organizational structure that drives operational performance in the fulfillment of our mission.

The American Theological Society [Standard 7](#) addresses this component specifically for the School of Theology.

5.B.1 Governing Board Oversight

Saint John's University Board of Trustees governance oversight required to meet its legal and fiduciary responsibilities was described in 2.A and 2.C. Some [board committees](#) are comprised of trustees from CSB and SJU and meet [jointly](#), while others include only SJU trustees and meet as independent committees of the SJU board of trustees. In their role as directors, trustees review and periodically revise the university mission, appoint and support the president of the university, assess board performance, monitor the university's educational and public service programs, ensure the adequate and appropriate allocation of resources, and preserve institutional independence. The board also participates in periodic [educational opportunities](#) to improve their effectiveness in providing crucial and generative leadership for the university.

The SJU Board evaluates meetings using a [simple form](#) available at each meeting. In October 2017, the Executive Committee discussed a full evaluation of the board and president together. Part of the Presidential Review planned by the Board in spring 2018 focuses on the effectiveness of the President/Board relationship. The Committee on Trustees and Governance leads an annual [review of individual board](#) members.

New trustees are required to participate in [trustee orientation](#). Orientation continues throughout their first year with divisional overviews occurring at each board meeting. In addition, reference materials available on the [Board's SharePoint site](#) will provide new trustees with resources that will enable them to understand the governance structure and responsibilities associated with trustee membership. We continue to populate this site.

5.B.2 Shared Governance

Saint John's University's unique relationship with the College of Saint Benedict and the Order of Saint Benedict requires a strong commitment and attention to shared governance throughout the organization. Due to the high level of overlap, joint operations in key areas involve collaboration and coordination between the organizations, trustees, faculty, administrators, staff and students. In 2017 a task force, which includes the presidents, trustees, administrators, faculty, and students, was formed to review shared governance principles and practices at CSB and SJU.

Trustee:

The SJU board of trustees meet four times a year, focusing on governance, strategy and operating performance. Administrators, faculty leadership and students attend these meetings and participate in presentations and discussions. For a more detailed description on shared governance at the trustee level please see 2.A. and 2.C.

Administrative:

The president and [his cabinet](#) represent administrative senior leadership on campus. The cabinet meets throughout the year focusing discussion on institutional priorities and challenges. Faculty, administrators, staff and students may be invited to cabinet meetings to provide input or feedback on a variety of issues, which may include policies and procedures, budgets, and curricular or co-curricular issues. The provost, vice president for Admissions and Financial Aid and the vice president for Planning and Strategy serve on both the CSB and SJU cabinets.

The cabinets from the two institutions meet several times a year as [Coordinate Cabinet](#) to discuss joint matters and strategic priorities. The chair and vice chair of the faculty participate in these meetings.

The presidents of CSB and SJU jointly established the Strategic Directions Council (SDC) over a decade ago. Made up of members of both cabinets as well as the faculty chair and vice chair, the SDC is responsible for oversight of the strategic plan and for monitoring the progress of the initiatives incorporated into the plan. In addition to cabinet and faculty representatives, SDC members include the director of Information Technology Services, the dean of Admission, the executive director of Financial Aid, the dean of the Faculty, the academic dean, and the senior budget analyst. The provost and vice president for Planning and Strategy lead the committee.

Other standing administrative committees that include faculty and/or student representatives were discussed in 2.A. Ad hoc committees are used for specific purposes such as capital projects and may include trustees, faculty, administration, staff and students. Examples of committees that engage constituents from across campus include the [Library Committee](#) (created to support the Library and Learning Commons project) and the ad hoc [Housing Committee](#) (currently working on planning for a new student resident hall on campus).

Faculty:

Faculty participate in institutional governance as outlined in [section 1.4.2 of the Faculty Handbook](#). Faculty participate and have representation at the board (non-voting) and on board committees. At the May 2017 Board meeting, the presidents outlined a [plan](#) for a healthy future around shared governance. The methods of engagement outlined in the plan provide a process to further explore shared governance to create opportunities for continuous improvement and enhance faculty input beyond board membership. Faculty also participate in many administrative, divisional, departmental

and ad hoc committees. Additional information describing the faculty role in institutional governance is included in 2.C.

Student:

The Saint John's Senate (SJS) represents the voice of students at Saint John's University. The SJS expresses views and makes recommendations to staff, faculty and administrators; provides support for academic, social and cultural experiences and activities; promotes students' rights; and assists the university in operating more effectively in the interest of students. The senate meets regularly and routinely invites administrators and faculty to discuss, provide input and receive feedback on institutional matters, which may include policies and procedures.

5.B.3 Structures for Contribution and Collaboration

Faculty have a key role and responsibility in setting academic requirements, policies and processes for the institution. The practices described below demonstrate a collaborative process that engages key stakeholders from within the institution.

- The [Faculty Handbook \(section 5.0.1\)](#) states that “the primary role of the faculty in governance is the implementation of the educational goals of the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John’s University. In this capacity, the faculty is responsible for curricular requirements including but not limited to: admissions and graduation requirements, the Common Curriculum, additions and deletions of majors, minors or programs.” These decisions require approval by the Joint Faculty Senate, the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and, where required, the full Board of Trustees.
- Faculty are responsible for academic policies and standards. The Academic Policies, Standards, and Assessment Committee (APSAC) “oversees the quality and functioning of the entire undergraduate academic program and formulates guidelines for achieving and maintaining integrity and excellence in academic programs.” APSAC reviews and revises academic policies and standards. This includes a responsibility to “establish, periodically review, and revise — in cooperation with the offices of Admission and Academic Advising — academic standards for admission, academic probation and dismissal and graduation.” APSAC reports policy changes to the Joint Faculty Senate. One example is a recent change in the Academic Honesty and Misconduct Policy that was brought to the committee by the academic dean. The committee reviewed and made changes to the policy that are now in effect. The Registrar’s Office maintains the policies in the Academic Catalog.
- Faculty are responsible for the curriculum.
 - All proposals to reform either the curriculum (e.g. requirements, number of requirements, course restructuring, etc.) or a single course (e.g.. name change, course description), must be submitted to the Academic Curriculum Committee (ACC). In addition to faculty, the committee membership also includes the academic dean, registrar, director of Academic Advising, and the Libraries as ex-officio members. The committee reviews curricular and course changes, in some instances working with the Academic Planning and Budget Committee (APBC) on the cost impact of selected changes. ACC has the authority to approve or reject proposals it considers. Additions and/or deletions of programs, majors, minors must go through the ACC and then to the JFS for approval prior to final board of trustee action.
 - Faculty seeking to teach general education courses must go through an approval process

led by the Common Curriculum Committee (CCC). The CCC may approve or reject a course proposal. Changes to academic learning outcomes or requirements for the Common Curriculum (CC) must be approved by the Joint Faculty Senate. A faculty member seeking a change to a learning outcome that is part of the CC must bring the modification to the CCC for review. The CCC, upon endorsement, would bring the change to the JFS for final review and approval.

Although led by the faculty, the process of setting academic requirements, policy and processes ultimately is a collaborative process involving faculty, administrators, staff, students and trustees.

Sources

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS_FHB-5.0.1 Faculty Governance_20171003
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_FacultyHandbookSectionV
- ACADEMIC_AFFAIRS_FacultyHandbookSectionV (page number 10)
- PRES CSBSJU_Faculty Role in Governance_2017
- PRES SJU_Board Committee Charters_2016
- PRES SJU_Comm Membership SJU, Coord, Staff 2017-2018 10-24-17
- PRES SJU_Stmt of Trustee Commitment_07-01-12
- PRES SJU_Trustee Orientation_2017
- PRES_SJU Board of Trustees Educ
- PRES_SJU Board Self-Review Form 2018
- PRES_SJU Trustee Meeting Evaluation
- PRES_SJU Trustees Resources Index
- President's Office_Coord Comm Membership + Staff 2017-2018 10-24-17
- SJU_FINANCE_LearningCommonsReport-2016.02.26
- SJU_PRESIDENT_CabinetDirectory-2018.01.22
- SJU_PRESIDENT_Coordinate Cabinet Agenda Schema 2017-2018
- SJU_PRESIDENT_HousingCommitteeCreation-2016.10.06
- SJU_President's Office_Governance Pathways May 2017
- SOT_2017-2018 SJU SOT-SEM ATS Self-Study Report
- SOT_2017-2018 SJU SOT-SEM ATS Self-Study Report (page number 59)
- Strategic Planning_SD 2020 Bd Approved 5-18-15

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
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.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Argument

5.C.1 Mission and Resource Alignment

The university uses *SD2020* to guide resource allocation decisions. The development of SD2020 included a conscious effort to link the plan to the institutional budget process. As part of the goal, *Shared Future, Sustainable Future*, CSB and SJU developed an economic model designed to balance long-run revenues and expenses. The model defines the primary financial "levers" we must consider when making decisions and clearly indicates how changes in individual levers or metric (enrollment, for example) impact both short-term and long-term financial outlook of the college. The economic model was built around a set of [guiding principles](#) that were reviewed by both the CSB and SJU boards of trustees in November 2015. The goals included a plan that could reduce expenses in mission-appropriate ways that would support the long-term sustainability of CSB and SJU. The metrics and the goals are reviewed regularly.

We produce a narrative guide each year to explicitly address the connection of the budget to the college's mission and priorities. The [Fiscal Year 2017](#) and [Fiscal Year 2018](#) versions specifically link the [budget decisions](#) to SD2020 priorities.

We also annually prepare a report describing progress toward the goals and objectives outlined in SD2020. We share the report with both the Strategic Directions Council and the Board of Trustees. The [May 2017](#) version clearly outlines the progress toward goals outlined in SD2020 and identifies resource allocation decisions that have been made in support of that work. Similarly, the [SD2015 Summary](#) document identified numerous instances of resource allocation decisions that were made as a result of the priorities and goals included in that plan (the predecessor plan to SD2020).

The practices cited above ensure the resource allocation process align with the mission and priorities of the university.

5.C.2 Linking Learning, Operations, Planning and Budgeting

The ongoing assessment and evaluation of SD2020 is directly linked to our planning and budgeting process. The [annual progress reports for the plan](#) identify instances where resources are required or

have been dedicated to achieve goals. The First-Year Experience (FYX) provides an example of how we have linked planning and budgeting. FYX was an important component in the SD2020 plan. The Gardner Institute [assessment](#) supporting development of a comprehensive First-Year Experience outlined next steps and resources needed to support this program. In FY18, we allocated \$50,000 to development of FYX. Similarly, there have been considerable investments in the general education revision. That work is ongoing and the institutions are committed to budgetary support for the curriculum revision.

As outlined in 4.A.1, departmental program reviews and annual reports are an essential part of the assessment and evaluation process. The program review process informs resource allocation within departments and are one source referenced by the provost as Academic Affairs makes faculty hiring decisions.

In addition, the institutions have a shared budget analyst who reports directly to the provost and to the chief financial officers at both institutions. The budget analyst works with the provost and the CFOs on all things budget related within the academic operation. The reporting structure of the position ensures a direct link between Academic Affairs and institutional budgeting and finances.

5.C.3 Planning Process

Strategic Directions 2020 resulted from a collaborative process incorporating perspectives of numerous constituent groups, including trustees, faculty, staff, students and alumnae. The Strategic Directions Council initiated the planning process with a broad [environmental scan white paper](#) articulating the key issues influencing the future of the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University. It shared the environmental scan with trustees, faculty and staff. We kept the campus community apprised of the plan as it developed through a dedicated web page for *Strategic Directions 2020*. The website served two broad purposes: it provided a digital space to post and share the input we gathered during the planning process and it offered a link to provide people with an opportunity to submit comments or questions about the plan or supporting materials. We ultimately received a great deal of input from both internal and external constituent groups:

- We hosted one all-campus forum and nine campus conversations. All faculty and staff were invited to participate in those activities. Approximately 550 faculty and staff (more than half our workforce) participated in one or more those events.
- Both student senates were engaged by the presidents and again by the Student Development divisions.
- All divisions conducted independent planning sessions throughout the fall and into the winter. Those typically were held as part of regularly scheduled divisional or departmental meetings.
- Both presidents engaged their respective monastic communities at Chapter meetings. Both the prioress and the abbot were invited to prepare an assessment of planning priorities on behalf of their communities — which both did (together) in spring 2015.
- We received 161 unique suggestions of planning priorities for consideration for inclusion in *Strategic Directions 2020* from faculty and staff, approximately half from faculty alone.

The Board of Trustees was actively involved in the development of the plan as well. Individual committees of the board, had an opportunity to provide input at various points during the process and presentations were made to the full board throughout the process. The board provided feedback on a [draft of the plan](#) in February 2015 that led to the construction of the final plan. [The plan was ultimately presented to and endorsed by the Board of Trustees in May 2015.](#)

5.C.4 Planning and Capacity

The economic model makes clear the impact of shifting revenue streams on our expense structure. In [fall 2015](#), we shared the key drivers of the institution's finances with campus leaders and the Board of Trustees. We subsequently updated those drivers and shared the results with the Finance Committee of the board in [September 2017](#). The economic model is a living document updated with each term's tenth-day enrollment and tuition discounting values. [Here is an example](#) of the update that was included in the November 2017 finance committee materials. This iteration also included a more detailed sensitivity analysis to provide stakeholders a better sense of the financial impact of specific changes in key revenue and expense drivers.

In addition to the long-range plan, the university has adopted a [budget revision plan](#) outlining the process by which we will address a budget shortfall or surplus during any given year.

5.C.5 Environmental Scanning

Each year, the Strategic Directions Council prepares an environmental scan identifying issues reshaping our operating landscape. Those scans encompass market, mission, and management/operating issues. Each year, the environmental scan seeks to identify key issues external or internal to CSB and SJU that influence the goals and objectives of *Strategic Directions 2020*. A [special version of the scan](#) was developed specifically to guide the SD2020 campus conversations. [The most recent version of the scan](#) was completed and shared with the Board of Trustees in November 2016. The 2016 environmental scan offers a lens through which the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University communities can continue to plan for a successful future that prepares our students for active participation and leadership in a modern world.

Sources

- Finance_FinancialModelUpdate-2017_November
- Finance_SD 2020 Financial Plan Narrative UPDATE 8-17
- FINANCE_SJU Budget Revision Plan_2017
- PRES CSBSJU_SD2020 Process Performance_May 2017
- SD 2020 Outcome Metrics.pdf
- SDC_BudgetNarrative_FiscalYear2017
- SDC_BudgetNarrative_FY18
- SDC_EconomicModelContext_2015Fall.pdf
- SDC_Environmental Scan_2016
- SDC_SD2015 Summary_2015 Spring
- SDC_SD2020_EnvironmentalScan_2014
- SDC_SD2020_JointBoardPresentation_2015_February
- SDC_SD2020_JointBoardPresentation_2015_May
- SDC_SD2020_ProcessProgressUpdate_2016 November
- SJU_Finance_Board FY18 Budget Presentation
- SJU_Finance_SD 2020 Process Performance May 2017
- STD DEV_FoE Final Report 2017

5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

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

Argument

5.D.1 Operational Performance

Saint John's University regularly produces and shares evidence of performance in its operations to both internal and external constituencies. Each year, the university undergoes an [annual audit](#) review that must be approved by the Audit Committee of the board of trustees and later reviewed by the full board of trustees. A summary of the audit, along with a copy of the financial statements, is posted to the Business Office website and is available to any interested party. In addition to these annual audits, the Finance Committee of the board also examines a [ratio review](#) comparing key financial indicators for SJU to other members of the Minnesota Private College Council. This review provides the Finance Committee and board with a high-level understanding of the university's financial strengths and weaknesses relative to peers. The cabinet and Strategic Directions Council also receive the financial results for the university.

The university had its most recent bond rating reviewed by Moody's in August 2017. In the [credit opinion](#), Moody's clearly documented performance in the university's operations, including favorable operating results that result from a culture of fiscal discipline.

Enrollment is the primary revenue driver for the university. We closely monitor new student enrollment and financial aid discount rates and values throughout the year. During the admission yield cycle (typically March through August) the Admission and Financial Aid division produces and distributes a [weekly report](#) tracking first-year and transfer applications, admissions and deposits. The report is widely shared across campus to make departments aware of progress toward the enrollment goal. We develop and monitor our financial aid strategy in conjunction with Applied Policy Research (APR), a national enrollment management firm with whom we have worked since the early 1990s. In addition to [tracking reports](#) developed regularly during the spring and summer, APR provides a [full report](#) each fall after tenth-day census. The Office of Institutional Planning and Research prepares an annual [fall enrollment summary](#) that is distributed to the senior leadership team and posted on SharePoint for the community. Strategies for subsequent years are informed by the findings of these reports.

Strategic Directions 2020 includes [measurable performance metrics](#) that are regularly monitored. The First-Year Experience provides an example of programmatic addition and improvements we have made that are intended to enhance student success and retention.

In addition to the operational performance indicators we track in the areas cited above, the Office of Institutional Planning and Research annually prepares and updates an *Institutional Profile*. The [Institutional Profile](#) is the official fact book for the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University. It was created to provide a multiyear snapshot and briefing of key data and trends related to admission

and enrollment, academic activity and productivity, and human and financial resources. The *Profile* addresses questions frequently asked about the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University and provides, in one compendium, macro-level data for planning, decision-making, fundraising and communication. Information in the *Institutional Profile* is presented in six chapters: admission and new entering student data, undergraduate student data, academic and instructional data, alumni data, financial and human resource data and private college comparison data.

5.D.2 The Institution Learns from its Operational Experience

The university regularly acts to improve based on the results of regular monitoring and tracking outlined in 5.D.1.

Regular monitoring of enrollment and discounting data has allowed us to feel confident in our ability to meet the goals outlined in the long-term financial plan. For example, in fall 2014 the university determined that its first-year student enrollment target of 475 new entering students was too high in relation to demand and yield. Market data and our own experience suggested that a lower goal would be more prudent for long-term budget purposes. After review, we lowered the entering student goal to 455, which has proved to be a wise choice. The financial model allowed us to measure and prepare for the financial impact of the new enrollment target.

Administrative units across campus go through program review processes similar to those in academic departments. Recent administrative program reviews that have resulted in significant operational change include the offices of Information Technology Services (ITS), Experiential Learning and Community Engagement (ELCE), Career Services and the Libraries.

An external review of ITS operations resulted in a renewed focus on the academic mission of the department. ITS regularly assesses the software and hardware systems at CSB/SJU, as well as the staffing required to support those tools and systems. The [assessment from the external consultant](#), included recommendations about staffing levels, organizational structure, and software systems that could be rearranged to create efficiencies and improve resource usage. ITS also utilizes SD2020 to influence their internal strategic planning and budget allocation. For example, as part of previous needs assessment work, we learned that faculty and students needed a more modernized Learning Management System (LMS). ITS subsequently re-aligned funds to enable the purchase of a new LMS (Canvas) better aligned with the needs of the CSB/SJU campuses.

Both ELCE and Career Services underwent program review in 2016. Those reviews provided opportunities for improved services. Both departments concluded that students would be better served if they combined their operations. For example, credit-bearing internships were overseen by ELCE while non-credit-bearing internships were overseen by Career Services. The two departments were combined in early 2017 and now operate under a newly defined department named Office of Experience and Professional Development (XPD). We believe the new configuration will provide students with a more seamless experience when interacting with these offices. It also represents the first step toward the goal of establishing a Student Success Center that would include XPD, Academic Advising and several other academic support departments.

The CSB/SJU Libraries regularly examines their operational experience and makes change to improve service based on those findings. Several examples illustrate their commitment to continuous improvement:

- A [2013 Library Service Analysis](#) indicated some patron dissatisfaction with the library website. The director of Libraries dedicated resources for a usability studies which

resulted in improvements and refinements in the website. The Libraries continue to allocate resources to improve this essential service.

- They routinely conduct usage analyses, including cost per use ratio, for all electronic resources at renewal. While this represents only one aspect of collections decision-making, they do not renew low-use, expensive subscriptions.
- Library staff survey faculty and students on a semi-regular basis to inquire about their preferences for print or electronic books. They allocate resources to print or electronic budgets based on what they learn from those surveys.
- Library staff conducted a survey of student social media use to determine how best to communicate with students, ultimately reallocating marketing resources based on those findings.

Sources

- AA_LibraryServiceAnalysisSurvey_2013
- Enrollment_FallEnrollmentSummary_2017
- Enrollment_SJU_APR_10thDayReports-2017.09.08
- Enrollment_SJU_APR_Discount & Yield Tracking-2017.06.12.pdf
- Enrollment_SJU_WeeklyAdmissionUpdate-2017.08.25.pdf
- Finance_IT_ServicesExternalReviewerReport-2017
- FINANCE_MPC Financial Ratios Report 2016
- IR_InstitutionalProfile-2017
- PRES SJU_Audited Financials 2017
- SD 2020 Outcome Metrics.pdf
- SJU_Finance_MoodysCreditOpinion_2017

5.S - Criterion 5 - Summary

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.

Summary

As indicated by the evidence for the individual core components, the university meets the expectations specified in Criteria 5. Saint John's University operates in a way that ensures the institution's resource base supports its educational program and mission. We have structures in place to promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes. Not only does the university operate effectively on an annual basis, we maintain an eye toward the future. A culture of systematic and integrated planning ensures that we consider emerging challenges and opportunities as we chart a course into the future. We use planning to improve performance and the quality of the student experience.

Sources

There are no sources.