

ASSURANCE SECTION

REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION VISIT

TO

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY
SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI 63103

April 23-25, 2012

FOR

The Higher Learning Commission
A Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

EVALUATION TEAM

**Elizabeth E. Stevens, Ph.D. (Team
Chair)**

Special Consultant to the University
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66502-6014

Dr. Margaret L. Bloom

Professor, Education/Counseling Psychology
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI 53201-1881

Dr. David V. Curtis

Professor of Management, Emeritus
Governors State University
Frankfort, IL 60423

Ms. Ingrid Gould

Associate Provost for Faculty and Student Affairs
University of Chicago
Chicago, IL 60637

Dr. Eleanor V Howell

Dean - School of Nursing
Creighton University

Omaha, NE 68178

Dr. Rubén Martínez

Director
Michigan State University
Julian Samora Research Institute, Michigan State
East Lansing, MI 48823

Dr. Mark S. Paller

Senior Associate Dean, Medical School
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Carol Simpson Stern

Department of Performance Studies
Northwestern University
Evanston, IL 60208

Dr. George E. Stevens

Dean Emeritus, College of Business Administration
& Grad. Sch. of Mgt.
Kent State University
Kent, OH 44242

Contents

I. Context and Nature of Visit.....	4
II. Commitment to Peer Review	10
III. Compliance with Federal Requirements	11
IV. Fulfillment of the Criteria.....	12
a. Criterion One.....	12
b. Criterion Two.....	16
c. Criterion Three	19
d. Criterion Four	24
e. Criterion Five.....	30
V. Affiliation Status.....	33
VI. Additional Comments and Explanations.....	36
Appendix A--Worksheet for Credits and Program Length.....	37
Appendix B--Clock Hour Worksheet.....	41
Appendix C--Worksheet on Federal Compliance Requirements.....	43

I. CONTEXT AND NATURE OF VISIT

A. Purpose of Visit

The team evaluated the institution for the purposes of continued accreditation and Federal compliance.

B. Institutional Context

Saint Louis University was the first university to be established west of the Mississippi River and is the second oldest Jesuit University in the United States. It will celebrate its 200th year in 2018. It is a private, not-for-profit university classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a Research University with High Research Activity, and with a medical school, a law school, a large number of allied health programs, and a substantial array of liberal arts and sciences, as well as several other strong colleges, schools, institutes, and centers. The main campus in St. Louis, Missouri, spans a large area of the midtown city, and over the years has been a major mover in the re-development and gentrification of its neighborhood. It also operates a full-service campus in Madrid, Spain, and students may go from either campus to the other for a study abroad experience with no break in their program of study, depending of course on their specific program and their year of study. The Madrid campus has over 600 students including “study abroad” students. The University operates several other course and degree locations throughout the State of Missouri.

The University has been regionally accredited since 1916. The most recent comprehensive visit for continuing accreditation was in the 2001-2002 academic year. After that visit, Commission follow-up was required with a Progress Report on Assessment to be submitted in 2005. The Commission accepted that report.

This is a growing and changing organization, with new programs and new mixes of programs almost annually. The current University President has been in that position for twenty-five years, and largely through his own *ethos* and commitment has been a major change agent for the University and the city. The Board of Trustees is forward-thinking, strongly supportive of the President, and includes members with strong backgrounds and successes in business, government, education, and religious activities.

C. Unique Aspects or Additions to the Visit

No additional evaluations were conducted as part of this visit. The University has a campus in Madrid, Spain, and a visit to that campus was not included as part of this visit; however, the team visited in person and at length with the Academic Dean and Interim Director of the Madrid campus, who was in St. Louis at the time of the visit, and held a live, synchronous video-conference with several members of the faculty and staff at Madrid.

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

1. No additional locations were visited.

E. Distance Delivery Reviewed

1. This visit did not include a focus on Distance Delivery. However, courses and programs that are delivered through any sort of asynchronous or synchronous online or other distance format were specifically examined and evaluated along with other courses and programs.

F. Interactions with Constituencies

The team met with the following individuals and groups.

1. University President
2. Trustees (6)
3. Vice Presidents:
 - a. Academic Affairs
 - b. Advancement
 - c. Business and Finance/Controller
 - d. Enrollment and Retention Management
 - e. Facilities Service Management
 - f. General Counsel
 - g. Human Resources
 - h. Information Technology Services
 - i. Medical Affairs
 - j. Mission and Ministry
 - k. Research
 - l. Student Development
4. Associate Vice Presidents:
 - a. International and Academic Affairs
 - b. Graduate Education
 - c. Undergraduate Education
5. Associate General Counsel (3)
6. Assistant Vice Presidents:
 - a. Academic Affairs
 - b. Financial and Academic Affairs
 - c. Human Resources
 - d. Student Development (3)
 - e. University Libraries
7. Deans:
 - a. Arts and Sciences; Philosophy and Letters
 - b. Business

- c. Education and Public Service
 - d. Engineering, Aviation, and Technology
 - e. Health Sciences
 - f. Law
 - g. Madrid Campus
 - h. Medicine
 - i. Nursing
 - j. Public Health
 - k. School for Professional Studies
 - l. Students
8. Directors:
- a. 1818 Advanced College Credit
 - b. Academic Advising Support
 - c. Academic Support
 - d. Accounting and Financial Reporting (Business and Finance)
 - e. CADE (Center for Advanced Dental Education)
 - f. Campus Recreation
 - g. Career Services
 - h. Center for Service and Community Engagement
 - i. Center for Sustainability
 - j. CHCE (Center for Health Care Ethics)
 - k. Cross Cultural Center
 - l. Customer Services-ITS
 - m. Housing and Residence Life
 - n. Museum of Contemporary Religious Art
 - o. Office of University Compliance
 - p. Pius Library
 - q. Planning and Budget
 - r. Real Estate (Business and Finance)
 - s. Reinert Center for Teaching Excellence
 - t. Research Development and Services
 - u. Social Work
 - v. SLUCOR (Center for Outcomes Research)
 - w. Student Conduct
 - x. Student Educational Services
 - y. Student Financial Services
 - z. Student Health and Counseling
 - aa. Student Involvement Center
 - bb. Student Support and Parent Services

_9. Academic Department Chairs (approximately 46)

10. Associate Dean-College of Arts and Sciences
11. Associate Director-Academic Technologies (ITS)
12. Faculty Fellows-Center for Teaching Excellence (4)
13. Faculty in open meeting (approximately 24)
14. Instructional Designer (Reinert Center for Teaching Excellence)
15. Members of Faculty Senate Executive Committee (7)
16. Members of staff (non-union) advisory committee executive board (5)
17. Members of Student Government Association Executive Board (7)
18. Members of the Criterion #1 Subcommittee (10)
19. Members of the Criterion #2 Subcommittee (14)
20. Members of the Criterion #3 Subcommittee (14)
21. Members of the Criterion #4 Subcommittee (8)
22. Members of the Criterion #5 Subcommittee (11)
23. Non-union staff in open meeting (48)
24. Other faculty in prescheduled meetings (approximately 24)
25. Reference Librarian/Information Literacy Coordinator (Pius Library)
26. Risk Management Administrator
27. Senior Human Resources Consultant-Labor Relations
28. Students in open meeting (11)
29. Students visited informally around campus (approximately 25)
30. Unionized staff open meeting (65+)
31. University Treasurer and Chief Investment Officer (Business and Finance)

G. Principal Documents, Materials, and Web Pages Reviewed

(Note: Some URLs are for a temporary online resource room that was provided for the use of the HLC visiting team and may not be permanent or accessible by others.)

1. *Casa de Salud*. <http://casadesaludstl.org/>
2. *In Perspective* publication.
<http://www.slu.edu/Documents/provost/InPerspective.pdf>
3. 1818 ACC Program Liaison's classroom visit summary.
http://www.slu.edu/colleges/AS/1818acc/docs/Liaison_Classroom_Visit_Summary.2010-2011.doc
4. *Academic Affairs Strategic Planning* document
5. Accreditation Log for 2012
6. Alumni Survey, 2002-4, 2006, 2008-9.
7. *Assessment as Proactive Pedagogy* Project, Department of Theological Studies
8. School of Public Health Accreditation Report
9. Assessment Plan 2002

10. Assessment questionnaire for 1818 ACC dual enrollment (high school) program.
http://www.slu.edu/colleges/AS/1818acc/docs/Assessment_Questionnaire_%20and_template_2010-2011.doc
11. Assessment Summary Report, Oct. 22, 2003
12. *Beyond the Classroom: Men and Women for Others, A Celebration of SLU Service and Outreach for Year 2009*
13. CAAP report 2007.
<https://myfiles.slu.edu/oneNet/NetStorage/DriveT%40DEP/Provost-Frost%20Division/HLC%20Site%20Team%20Electronic%20Resource%20Room/Academic%20Affairs-Office%20of/Assessment%20Reports/2009%20Assessment%20Reports/CAAP-Collegiate%20Assessment%20of%20Acad%20Prof-Guide%202009.pdf>
14. *Components of the Core Curriculum* (College of Arts and Sciences web page)
15. *Comprehensive Globalization Plan for Saint Louis University Academic Affairs*
16. Concurrent Enrollment Guidelines.
<https://myfiles.slu.edu/oneNet/NetStorage/DriveT%40DEP/Provost-Frost%20Division/HLC%20Site%20Team%20Electronic%20Resource%20Room/Academic%20Affairs-Office%20of/Assessment%20Reports/2009%20Assessment%20Reports/1818%20Adv-College%20Credit%20Prgm%20Dept%20Assessment%20Plan%20Rpt%202009-2010.pdf>
17. Deans' assessment reports including:
<https://myfiles.slu.edu/oneNet/NetStorage/DriveT%40DEP/Provost-Frost%20Division/HLC%20Site%20Team%20Electronic%20Resource%20Room/Academic%20Affairs-Office%20of/Assessment%20Reports/Deans%20Assessment%20Reports/Curricular%20Changes%20Highlights%20Sept%202004.pdf>
18. Diversity at SLU. <http://www.slu.edu/x47276.xml>
19. Diversity Defined. <http://www.slu.edu/diversity-at-slu-home/about-diversity-at-slu/diversity-defined>
20. Division of Student Development Strategic Success Indicators 2011-2012 Academic Year
21. EEO and Affirmative Action policy. <http://www.slu.edu/x40826.xml>
22. *Fact Book 2010-2011*, Office of Institutional Research, Saint Louis University
23. Fall 2011 Counts of 1818 Faculty by High School
24. *Features Characteristic of Graduates of Saint Louis University* (2011)
25. Freshmen Retention and Graduation Rates (series of charts & figures)
26. Graduating Senior Survey
<https://myfiles.slu.edu/oneNet/NetStorage/DriveT%40DEP/Provost-Frost%20Division/HLC%20Site%20Team%20Electronic%20Resource%20Room/>

[Academic%20Affairs-Office%20of/Assessment%20Reports/Deans%20Assessment%20Reports/Curricular%20Changes%20Highlights%20Oct%202003.pdf](#)

27. *IFCLA* – The St. Louis Inter-Faith Committee on Latin America – Pamphlet focuses on needs and challenges faced by Latinos.
28. Incumbency v. Estimated Availability, Comparison Test, 2011, Saint Louis University
29. *Learning Outcome Assessment Matrix* (Internal document of the Criterion 3 subcommittee)
30. Library: Strategic Plan Environmental Scan and Assessment Plan
31. *Magis: Higher Learning Commission Self-Study 2012 – Advancing Mission Into Saint Louis University’s Third Century*, Saint Louis University, 2012.
32. *Magis: Higher Learning Commission Self-Study 2012 Appendix A*, Saint Louis University
33. *Magis: Higher Learning Commission Self-Study 2012 Appendix B*, Saint Louis University
34. *NASPAA Accreditation Review*, July 2009
35. NSSE 2008 Benchmark Comparisons and 2008 Multi-Year Benchmark Report
36. *OMB Circular A-133 Single Audit Report* (2011), Saint Louis University
37. *Profile 2012*, Saint Louis University
38. Program Review Policy
39. *Progress Report on Assessment* (for HLC), August 1, 2005
40. Recruiting video. http://beabilliken.com/archive_video.html
41. *Report of a Visit for Continued Accreditation, St. Louis University, 2002*
42. *Report on Assessment Activity...* John Cook School of Business, July 1, 2005
43. Reports Provided by Asst. VPAA Steve Sanchez
 - a. College of Arts and Sciences 2010-2011 Departmental Assessment Audit
 - b. College of Arts and Sciences FY 09 and FY 10 Annual Reports
 - c. College of Education and Public Service FY 10 Annual Report
 - d. School for Professional Studies, FY10 Annual Report
 - e. Doisy College of Health Sciences, FY 09 Annual Report
 - f. Parks College of Engineering, Aviation, and Technology July 2010- June 2011 Annual Report
 - g. Physics BA and BS Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report, May 31, 2011
 - h. Dept. of Communication, Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report, May 31, 2011
 - i. American Studies, Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report, May 31, 2011
 - j. Student complaint cases (6)
44. *Saint Louis University 2012 Senior Legacy Symposium* (program guide).
45. *Saint Louis University Academic Affairs Strategic Plan*, 21 pp.
46. *Saint Louis University Campus Map*
47. *Saint Louis University Catalog, 2011 – 2012 Undergraduate Catalog*

48. *Saint Louis University Catalog, Graduate Education 2011-2012*
49. *Saint Louis University Financial Report, Years 2010 and 2009*
50. *Saint Louis University Financial Report, Years 2011 and 2010*
51. *Saint Louis University Libraries Benchmark Analysis, 2012*
52. *Saint Louis University Libraries Strategic Plan, 2007-2012*
53. *Saint Louis University Madrid, Academic Catalog 2011 – 2014*
54. *Saint Louis University School for Professional Studies*, 5 pp.
55. *Saint Louis University School of Nursing Strategic Plan*, 6 pp.
56. Saint Louis University's Critical Success Factors, Power-Point Slides on the SLU Strategic Plan provided by Manoj Patankar, VPAA
57. SLU "Profile" (viewbook) 2011. http://www.slu.edu/Documents/2011_Profile.pdf
58. *SLU School for Professional Studies Catalog and Student Handbook 2011 - 2012*
59. St. Louis University Self Study, 2002
60. State report on SLU's charter schools.
http://www.publiccharters.org/data/files/Publication_docs/2011_Final_Missouri_Report.pdf 20110330T164833.pdf
61. *Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings, 2011, Saint Louis University*
62. Survey of the Core Experience, 2009
63. *The Catholic and Jesuit Identity of Saint Louis University – 2011 – 2012.*
64. *The Jesuit Mission of Saint Louis University* (Pamphlet).
65. *The University News*, Saint Louis University, (April 19, 2012)
66. Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee and Graduate Academic Affairs Committee:
67. Undergraduate and Graduate Alumni Survey
68. *Universitas: Saint Louis University*, (Spring 2012), 33 pp .
69. *University Libraries Materials Budget Summary*
70. *University-Wide Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)*; April 20, 2012 draft
71. Various: Electronic Resource Center – all documents/references made available

II. COMMITMENT TO PEER REVIEW

A. Comprehensiveness of the Self-Study Process

The University officially initiated its self study in September 2008 with the appointment of a Self Study Planning Team. After that, various subcommittees were created, involving significant numbers of administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The University selected a theme for the process, which would become the title of the self study report: *Magis: Advancing Mission into Saint Louis University's Third Century*. "Magis" literally means "more" or "the more." The theme was chosen to reflect on the long and successful history of this University, and to anticipate an even more promising future through study, strategic

planning, and a full cycling of assessment and quality improvement practices, as well as a recognition of changes occurring in the processes of accreditation in the Higher Learning Commission.

The Visiting Team found evidence that the self study process itself was thorough and dealt with details as well as general trends. Individuals throughout the institution were aware of the self study process and were familiar with the principles of accreditation and seemed to have an accurate self-awareness of the strengths and challenges that were identified in the study. The Self-Study Report revealed a broad view of the University and also was able to focus on specific evidence for the Criteria and other accreditation requirements.

B. Integrity of the Self-Study Report

After spending time with the Self-Study Report, the electronic “resource room” documents, the University’s many-faceted websites, and other evidence, the Visiting Team determined that the Report was honest and covered the facts well. It is evident that the University understands itself, its mission and values, and its well-deserved reputation as a leading institution of higher education, service, and research. In reflecting on some of the challenges that the institution identified in the Report, the Team found that very often the University missed opportunities to propose specific steps that might be needed to raise its level of achievement in some of the Criteria and their Core Components. Challenges and opportunities were often listed as items to be added to the Strategic Plan’s goals and objectives, but without much analysis of the possible reasons for the current status of particular features, or of the types of actions that might be taken to reach the desired levels of quality.

C. Adequacy of Progress in Addressing Previously Identified Challenges

The Team considers the response of the institution to previously identified challenges to be adequate.

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

Requirements were fulfilled.

III. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

The Team reviewed the required Title IV compliance areas and the student complaint information. See appendices for compliance worksheets.

IV. FULFILLMENT OF THE CRITERIA

CRITERION ONE: MISSION AND INTEGRITY. The organization operates with integrity to

ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.

1. Evidence that Core Components are met

- a. The organization's mission documents are clear and articulate publicly the organization's commitments.
 - i. The University's mission statement is direct, understandable, and applicable to the day-to-day work of the University. SLU's mission statement is backed by hundreds of years of Jesuit tradition and almost two hundred years of University history. It is clear as to the University's objectives and to its broad priorities of teaching, research, health care and service to the community.
 - ii. Saint Louis University's student recruitment materials draw on the deeply service-minded mission to convey the institutional ethos and attract individuals already drawn to working for the good of humanity. Staff and faculty we met with consider it their job to nurture these values and to guide students in living these values daily.
- b. In its mission documents, the organization recognizes the diversity of its learners, other constituencies, and the greater society it serves.
 - i. The University is clear about embracing diversity. Its documents that discuss the Jesuit tradition are unequivocal in expressing an acceptance of non-believers as well as believers in other faiths and traditions. In 2011 the President's Diversity Council created a diversity and inclusion vision statement which states that the University is "committed to fostering an inclusive environment that welcomes and celebrates all expressions of diversity and identity that advance the Jesuit mission of forming women and men for and with others." In 2011, students developed the "Oath of Inclusion."
 - ii. In addition to accepting followers of other faiths as well as agnostics and atheists, SLU's mission documents direct the University to welcome and learn from and about each other. SLU documents recognize that engagement can engender better understanding of oneself, one's beliefs, and those of others. SLU does not content itself to let people study and work adjacent and disconnected on campus; its mission documents urge intertwining and contact.
 - iii. The University provides a full website to its vision for diversity, a definition of diversity, and several applications of how diversity is valued and celebrated at SLU (<http://www.slu.edu/diversity>). The Team found that these applications and examples are realistic and generally representative of the atmosphere and social culture at the University.

- c. Understanding of and support for the mission pervade the organization.
 - i. The University's mission is pervasive throughout the University's documents, organizational structure, and activities. For example, it is easy to find on the University website, in multiple public documents (even in Spanish), in materials given to prospective and new students and staff. The Human Resource department recommends that all prospective employees be asked how they would contribute to the Catholic, Jesuit tradition of SLU. New employees participate in a mission orientation program, and Team sampling among various employees indicates that this is the case. A senior leadership position in the University is the Vice President for Mission and Ministry.
 - ii. The University's mission is specifically integrated into the curriculum. It is discussed in University 101, the new student orientation program, which is required of every undergraduate student and includes participation in group discussions and meetings with the student's mentor. The University has a "value-centered curriculum," as stated in the President's Vision Statement, which is exemplified by content and course offerings such as the foundational course, THEO 100, Theological Foundations, which is required of every undergraduate student. The University also has strong departments of Theological Studies and Philosophy. Students in the liberal arts and sciences programs take at least foundational ethics courses while those in professional programs take foundational and/or applied professional ethics course(s).
- d. The organization's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the organization to fulfill its mission.
 - i. Ample ruling bodies and administrative apparatuses exist and are codified to promote effective leadership and collaborative processes in furtherance of the University's mission. Members of the Board of Trustees, Executive Staff Committee, President's Coordinating Council, Council of Academic Deans and Directors, and the Staff Advisory Committee understand their respective roles and dedicate themselves to fulfilling them responsibly. The team heard from several faculty members that they air their disagreements with the Administration directly with administrators, maintaining as unified, professional, and as bright a public face as possible with students.
 - ii. In interviews with all members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee the Team heard evidence that the Faculty Senate has an active and

appropriate role in University governance. The faculty is able to contribute ideas, opinions, and discussions on major decisions such as budget allocations, policy and procedures, and other university-wide issues. The faculty also has appropriate authority over academic and instructional matters. The Faculty Senate representatives stated that they understand their advisory role and that the University President (or the Board, in some cases) ultimately has decision-making authority on university governance issues. They also expressed a desire to receive more feedback and discussion when their strongly held opinions have not been adopted in some cases.

- iii. The Vice President for Academic Affairs identified department chairs as essential to the smooth functioning of the University and to faculty morale. He has instituted a series of lunch meetings/workshops to help strengthen this key group of academic leaders and develop in them a more nuanced understanding of their multi-faceted duties, the resources at their disposal, and strategies that might enhance their success. The Vice President for Academic Affairs invests significant time to these sessions, and to working with chairs individually, seemingly at all hours of the day and night, according to chairs' reports.
 - iv. In order to evaluate the management, administration, and academic qualities of the campus in Madrid, Spain, the Team found that the necessary documentary evidence was provided along with all the other documents in the electronic resource room. In reviewing the documents, such as the academic catalog and assessment materials from Madrid, and after interviewing the Academic Dean and Interim Director of the Madrid Campus and a group of faculty and staff at Madrid (via video hookup), the Team found that indeed the programs, courses, and other features of the Madrid Campus are closely coordinated with the St. Louis campus. Faculty and staff at Madrid converse regularly with their counterparts in St. Louis. Policies and procedures regarding academic content, quality of teaching and learning, assessment, student services and other factors are identical whenever possible. Local Spanish laws require some differences, such as differences in the employment status of the faculty.
- e. The organization upholds and protects its integrity.
- i. The University has well developed faculty, staff, and student manuals, which contain policies for ethical conduct and the processes for responding to failures of integrity in the intellectual enterprise, clinical medical setting, social arena, and the like. Further, conversation with senior administrators, student development staff, faculty, the Vice President for Mission and Ministry, and students themselves reveal that SLU applies those policies conscientiously and compassionately,

taking into account the offending individual, the aggrieved person, and the community as a whole.

- ii. The University has a very good reputation nationally and locally. The President and the Board are very conscientious about maintaining this reputation both as an institution of higher learning and also as a good citizen. Over the 25 years of the current President's Administration, many changes have been made to the campus and through partnerships the University has made a very significant impact on what was becoming a run-down midtown area. The President and the Board have worked closely with the City and other local groups, such as those people involved in the historical preservation of buildings, in order to renovate and revive buildings and neighborhoods. The University is recognized as a valuable partner in redevelopment efforts, especially in providing better and more convenient health and social services in the area. Evidence indicates that despite some serious disagreements with local groups at times about the status of specific buildings or spaces, the integrity of the University is intact and it has been officially and frequently recognized for its contributions to the city.

2. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need institutional attention

None

3. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up.

None

4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up.

None

Recommendation of the Team

Criterion is met; no Commission follow-up recommended.

CRITERION TWO: PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE. The organization's allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and

opportunities.

1. Evidence that Core Components are met

- a. The organization realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.
 - i. Systematic strategic planning is mandated from the SLU President and it is an integral part of the regular activities at all levels. Although these plans are carefully prepared and taken seriously, the University is open to revision of the plan as new opportunities arise or sometimes as hard realities occur. Most significant is the fact that the SLU Strategic Plan is reviewed at virtually all levels of the University. Not only is feedback provided for, but a systematic and orderly process for feedback is integrated into the design of the plan. Further, the various units from the department level, through Schools and Colleges engage in their own efforts to define their strategic directions based upon their own SWOT analyses and other strategic methods. As a part of the effort to define SLU's future there is Presidential Vision and a Saint Louis University Mission Statement that the University community embraces.
 - ii. The current university-level Strategic Plan builds upon and goes beyond the extensive strategic planning work done in 2001. That effort led to the creation of four strategic directions and three university-wide goals. These strategic directions and goals formed the platform for institutional focus, were responsive to the economic and social environment, and provided guidance to SLU units in the development of their own strategic directions.
 - iii. In 2009 an Executive Staff Committee discussed the future of planning at SLU. Rather than "re-invent the existing University Strategic Plan" the University would retain its best elements and updating other components to be aligned with "current social, global, and economic necessities." The VPAA, utilizing a document entitled "*Shaping the Strategy*," focused on refining the existing Strategic Plan but met with mixed reviews. A faculty "think tank" was formed to draft a Strategic Planning Framing Document to provide a context for the new institutional strategic planning initiative. The "think tank" worked throughout fall 2010. The work of the faculty "think tank" was endorsed by President's Coordinating Council.
 - iv. The Strategic Planning Framing Document that was developed was put in place in Spring 2011. The Academic Strategic Planning Group has been tasked to use this document to develop specific goals, operational plans and evaluation metrics. Accomplishing the Plan will require the implementation of planning and management tools such as: benchmarking; goal setting; accountability, evaluation and reward systems; innovation, and communication. For some units within the University, this sort of data-driven evaluation, project management, and planning will be a new experience and

likely will require some training and development of personnel. Nevertheless, the Team detected support among all constituencies and virtually no opposition to the Plan. In addition to the VPAA commencing discussions across the Saint Louis campus, Academic Deans and Vice Presidents have adopted a special process to both begin strategic planning for their units and form the basis for institution-wide discussion and planning.

- v. A first complete draft of the FY 2013-2017 University Level Strategic Plan has been endorsed by the Executive Staff Committee (October 2011) and an edited version was approved by the President's Coordinating Council (December 2011). The SLU Board of Trustees gave its approval in December 2011. The University-Level Plan is comprehensive and explicit in its coverage of its Strategic Intention and Strategic Directions, Operating Principles and Performance Standards, and processes for Periodic Review. Further, a noteworthy component of the Plan, endorsed by the Executive Staff Committee, is a "Top 50" aspirational goal. To assure the University completes its plan, SLU has developed and is carrying out its Iterative Strategic Planning Implementation Process.
- b. The organization's resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.
 - i. These are difficult times for virtually all institutions of higher learning. However, the real test of a university is determined by how that institution functions in difficult times. SLU, despite a volatile financial market, is financially secure. The University is entrepreneurial and quite adept at efficiently utilizing the resources obtained from a variety of sources. Noteworthy is the ability of SLU to judge accurately the appropriate price point at which to balance tuition costs and fees balanced against the determination of discounting levels. At this point, the resource base is adequate to support the multiple and varied missions of two campuses via a combination of tuition, Federal and non-Federal research grants, funds from entrepreneurial efforts, advancement efforts, increased revenue (e.g. more program completions and new programs) from the Madrid campus and from the management of its endowment. In sum, they know very well how to balance their revenues and expenses and manage the SLU funds, and have done so effectively.
 - ii. This University has extensive programs in medicine, nursing, and allied health. Although it sold its hospital to a private corporation some time ago, the St. Louis University Hospital retains its virtually exclusive relationship with St. Louis University for medical staffing. The University has taken ordinary and extraordinary steps to reduce its financial risks that are associated with such an endeavor. The team interviewed key administrators and viewed documents, charts, and

contracts that provide strong evidence of effective risk management and annual reports that show continuing annual improvements in risk reduction.

c. The organization's ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.

- i. There are many units that are engaged in evaluation and assessment processes across the SLU campus. These activities are occurring at the department, center, school, and college level. Assessment processes and related evaluation activities have been decentralized. A conscious effort has been made to permit units to create their own assessment processes. Throughout the 2011-2012 year, the VPAA has been working with deans and directors on the development of new academic plans as part of new, institution wide strategic planning efforts. These activities are leading to discussions on many topics including the creation of a common University-wide "core educational experience and strong support of new assessment and evaluation protocols." The University does continuously monitor the progression rate of undergraduate students as measures of success, retention and graduation. In sum, people are engaged across the University in doing assessment but the assessment efforts are not comprehensive or guided by a university-level leader or group. SLU acknowledges the fact of its decentralized approach but has not fully addressed this concern.

d. All levels of planning align with the organization's mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

- i. The Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the expanded operations of the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) both strengthen the evaluation and research efforts to inform recruitment, retention, and new program development efforts. The OIR has expanded its overall scope from a strong emphasis on institutional reporting (for state/federal compliance) to additional emphasis on primary and secondary research to inform academic and enrollment management decision making.
- ii. The recent preparations for, and Board approval of a new "University-Level Strategic Plan" initiative, has depended on participation by all facets of the University. The Strategic Plan that the Board approved is the all-university level of vision, mission, strategies, and goals. Implementation of the Plan relies on each administrative and academic unit to develop its own goals and objectives through which it will accomplish its part of the University's strategic goals. The Team found that all units understand and support this approach and are engaged in various stages of developing

their own strategies and objectives, ranging from full operation of the plan in some units to other units that are still completing the first iteration of their part of the plan.

2. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need institutional attention

None

3. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up.

None

4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be warranted.)

None

Recommendation of the Team

Criterion is met; no Commission follow-up recommended.

CRITERION THREE: STUDENT LEARNING AND EFFECTIVE TEACHING. The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

1. Evidence that Core Components are met

a. The organization's goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.

- i. The undergraduate and graduate curriculum committees use newly adopted (2011) protocols for new program requests that require any new program proposal to have identified program student learning outcomes and an assessment plan.
- ii. Co-curricular programs in the Division of Student Development have student learning objectives, assessment data are obtained and these data are used regularly to make changes and improvements.
- iii. During Team interviews, Deans, Department Chairs and other

individuals responsible for program assessment in the various Schools stated the programs in their units had program learning outcomes and particularly the programs that held external accreditations, the Law School being an exception, were engaged in assessment. For example, the Parks College of Engineering, Aviation and Technology, John Cook School of Business, and the School of Medicine all have student learning outcomes or goals and collect assessment data.

- iv. A review of the learning outcome assessment matrix, and interviews with assessment coordinators in various colleges and schools, and with student services professionals affirmed the commitment of the institution to assessment of student learning, retention, success, and life-balance.
- b. The organization values and supports effective teaching.
- i. All annual faculty reviews, notwithstanding that procedures and reviews vary considerably by School, College and often Departments within a School, include one or more measures of teaching effectiveness. All use some summary of student course evaluations and many use multiple methods such as peer and/or administrator teaching reviews and teaching portfolios.
 - ii. Significant funds are provided by departments and/or Schools for faculty development such as professional travel, registration fees for meetings and workshops, and mentoring programs for new faculty.
 - iii. The Center for Teaching Excellence, which provides support for faculty teaching development and the production of hybrid and (distance education) online courses, is uniformly praised by faculty and administrators for its work. The VPAA approved the doubling of the Center's staff (from three to six staff members) in academic year 2010-2011.
 - iv. It is clear that through existing policies and discussions with members of the academic support representatives that SLU's faculty who teach through distance education technology receive support and consultation in the design and implementation of online and other distance education courses but it is the instructors who decide what should be taught.
 - v. Distance education courses are held to the identical standards for faculty development, faculty evaluation, student outcomes, and assessment as on-campus courses. The Team found no evidence that such courses are treated any differently or less thoroughly than any other courses, and faculty and staff were familiar with the processes and quality improvement resources that are available for distance education.

- vi. Through its 1818 (named for the year of the University's founding) Advanced College Credit Program, Saint Louis University is a national leader in providing high quality college-level educational experiences to qualified high school students at 90 schools in the Greater Saint Louis Metropolitan Area, east central Missouri, and southwestern Illinois. The program introduces participating high school students to college-level expectations and provides them with opportunities to earn college-level credit for selected academic courses while earning high school credit as well. The self-funded program employs high school teachers with masters-level and higher degrees to teach the courses and meets the requirements of the Dual Credit Policy of the Missouri Department of Higher Education. Moreover, SLU was a founding member of the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP), which promotes standards of excellence by accrediting concurrent enrollment programs, and its 1818 Program is seeking accreditation by NACEP.
- c. The organization creates effective learning environments.
 - i. The University has a comprehensive approach to supporting the learning of first year students. Freshmen are engaged in learning communities, First Year Interest Groups (FIGS), and University 101, a course that focuses on the transition to college. Freshmen receive academic and personal guidance from student development staff in orientation programs and via *MAP-Works*, an academic risk identification software, academic advisors, and assigned faculty mentors. Based on *MAP-Works*, at-risk students receive support and individualized interventions from a "direct connect" staff member. A learning evaluation center, which opened in fall 2011, is available to conduct psycho-educational/ neuropsychological evaluations and diagnose the nature of students' learning or academic difficulties.
 - ii. Over the past five NSSE survey administrations, senior level students reported levels of supportive campus environments similar to other Jesuit and research-extensive peer institutions.
 - iii. Over the past 5 years, there has been a large increase in undergraduate students from China; approximately 700 Chinese undergraduate students currently are enrolled in the institution. The Office of International Student Services ascertained that the Chinese students felt affinity for SLU while participating in the recruitment process in China, but there was limited support during the admissions process and upon arrival on campus. In response, about two years ago, SLU combined international recruitment and admissions services into one office, and international advisors/counselors now help with

new student orientation, the acquisition of visas, transcript assessment, academic advising and course planning, and cross-cultural student success services.

- iv. The number of courses delivered distantly or through media varies throughout the University by program, major and college. However, the number of internet/mediated courses is continually increasing. The Center for Teaching Excellence provides individual, small group, and special workshops in both technology and pedagogy. The Center staff members are well prepared and faculty universally spoke very highly of their services. The services provided to the individual faculty are very confidential and are not disclosed to any other University personnel. Center staff believe that this confidentiality creates a climate in which faculty are more likely to take advantage of the services and will not be “judged” for attempting to increase their understanding of technology or improving their teaching quality and methods. The teamwork of the Center staff and the faculty members allows the faculty to do what they like best – customize their classes through the best use of the technology and pedagogy placed at their disposal.
 - v. It is clear that through existing policies and discussions with members of the Academic Support areas’ representatives that SLU’s distance education users receive support and consultation in the design and implementation of online and other distance education courses but it is the instructors who decide what should be taught.
- d. The organization’s learning resources support student learning and effective teaching.
- i. Students, faculty, staff, and administrators were involved in planning for the extensive Library renovation that is now under construction. The renovated library is designed to better match contemporary student and faculty needs for collaborative library research space and electronic resources.
 - ii. Libraries, instructional technology, and other learning support systems work together to ensure that students have access to books, journals, online resources of many kinds, and that access is available in person or virtually no matter where the students might be, as long as they have access to the internet or the campus.
- 2. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need institutional attention**

- a. While most of the undergraduate majors and graduate programs have some form of student learning outcomes, few programs publish student learning outcomes (such as in program recruitment materials, College Catalogs, or program web pages) and provide them on a routine basis to faculty, staff and students. Likewise, very few programs share assessment results with students and all their faculty.
 - b. Deans, Department Chairs, and other unit administrators reported to the Team that program outcomes assessment data is collected on a regular basis and conveyed in the Department and/or School Annual Report. The Team made multiple requests for annual reports, program reviews, and assessment documents prior to and during the visit. A review by the Team of the limited number of school/college and department annual reports provided by SLU during the visit, found little assessment data or descriptions of how assessment results had been used to improve student learning.
 - c. The VPAA and other administrators indicated that due to administrative changes and work on strategic planning, they did not require annual reports in Academic Year 2010-2011 and so far this academic year.
 - d. The University lacks the framework to gather and aggregate data and information about the quality of student learning and the ability of faculty members to provide effective teaching. SLU does not have a designated university-wide administrative unit for assessment or continuous quality improvement. There are no identified central administrators and university committees to gather, review, summarize and/or archive student learning assessment data and reports, student course evaluations, and faculty teaching evaluations. Each unit designs its own course evaluation and faculty evaluation surveys/tools so there is no way to compare or calibrate these data across the University. The lack of any central guidance or clearinghouse for assessment appears to be a major factor in the lack of follow-up to the results of assessment activities. Units do not generally share these results with any other unit of the University, and often do not even use the information within the unit to track improvements or the effects of changes in content or pedagogy.
- 3. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up.**
- a. There are no clearly identified student learning outcomes or assessment of student outcomes at the institutional level for undergraduate and graduate students.
 - b. Measureable student learning outcomes have not been developed for the

core curricula (general education).

- c. The University lacks documentation of assessment across the Schools, Departments, majors and degrees. Lists of all programs' student learning outcomes, program assessment plans, actual assessment data reports and lists or reports of other assessment activities since the 2005 progress report to the Higher Learning Commission were not available for team review. Such documents were requested prior to and during the team visit.

- 4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be warranted.)**

None

Recommendation of the Team

Criterion is met; Commission follow-up recommended. A Progress Report on Assessment of Student Learning will be required with a due date of August 31, 2016.

CRITERION FOUR: ACQUISITION, DISCOVERY, AND APPLICATION OF KNOWLEDGE.

The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

- 1. Evidence that Core Components are met**
 - a. The organization demonstrates, through the actions of its board, administrators, students, faculty, and staff, that it values a life of learning.
 - i. Full-time faculty and staff are offered up to 18 hours of tuition remission per academic year to attend classes at SLU, reinforcing the institution's commitment to a life of learning.
 - ii. In further support of ongoing faculty development and intellectual revitalization, SLU offers three types of professional and educational leave to full-time tenured faculty and two types of professional development leave to non-tenure track faculty. Faculty members are encouraged to present at and attend professional conferences, and departments provide varying levels of funding to assist such travel.

- iii. For distance education at this University, the following are evidence that the institution values students on and off campus, and provides for learning among non-traditional adults as well as traditional age students who choose to take all or part of their classes in electronically mediated form:
 - a) Evaluation Processes – SLU requires units to provide evidence that the pedagogy employed (including employment of varying amounts of distance technology) is appropriate to the academic content and facilitates student learning toward educational outcomes.
 - b) Feedback to Faculty Members – Faculty members get feedback directly from students throughout their academic terms if problems occur. Students are also asked for feedback on course/faculty evaluations.
 - c) State-by-State Approval – At this time SLU has decided to seek state-by-state approval for Distance Education in all states, despite the costs. The approval process is slow in addition to being expensive. The University may later decide to exclude some states.
 - d) Learning modes – As the Self Study lists, there are a variety of instructional modes identified and being applied for the benefit of learners. These range from Internships/Practical courses, self-paced and instructor-guided independent study courses, mixed face-to-face courses, hybrid courses, and distance courses. An Institutional Update provided on April 13, 2012 shows distance education activity at the Certificate, Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral levels. There appears to be significant potential to capture revenue and engage students in more distance learning courses if this is approached systematically. Currently, (assuming a 15-week course or equivalent) the three-credit course module is the most popular – leading the way with 127 distance education courses. There are 13 four-credit distance learning courses. There are 11 two-credit distance courses. At the other end of the spectrum were 6 distance courses at the one-credit level and 3 five-credit distance courses. Student time on task was shown to be consistent with the number of contact hours required per credit hour.
 - e) Course Length – The pattern regarding distance learning consumption is similar in the eight-week summer session with 44 three-hour distance education courses, 7 two-credit hour distance education courses, 6 one-credit hour DE courses, and 4 four-credit hour courses.
- b. The organization demonstrates that acquisition of a breadth of knowledge

and skills and the exercise of intellectual inquiry are integral to its educational programs.

- i. The annual Senior Legacy Symposium invites graduating seniors to present their individual capstone projects to an audience of professors, family and friends, outside visitors, and fellow students. Individual and groups of students may also produce a poster—and sometimes elaborate additional materials—to discuss with those who attend the 2-hour poster session. Student participants integrated information from various sources, developed a thoughtful argument or designed a complex experiment, and harnessed various technologies to bring their project and presentation to fruition. Donning professional attire and forcing themselves to speak and field questions, not just write, about their work adds a special dimension to the acquisition and application of knowledge. This impressive Symposium was held during the time of the visit, and some of the visiting team were able to attend and talk with the student presenters.
 - ii. The “Five Dimensions of the Saint Louis University Experience” are widely published, expanded, and discussed. Students are exposed to these components throughout their SLU experience. As displayed on the website, the Five Dimensions are:
 - a. Scholarship and Knowledge
 - b. Intellectual Inquiry and Communication
 - c. Community Building
 - d. Leadership and Service
 - e. Spirituality and Values
 - iii. Although there is no university-wide core curriculum, units use the Five Dimensions as a guide to structure their respective core requirements. In order to better define common learning outcomes, a quadrant model is being developed and a Committee is now formally incorporating the Five Dimensions into an assessment framework to ensure more reliably consistent skills acquisitions among students across programs. To further guide the students in shaping an intellectually coherent set of core courses, each is assigned both an advisor and a faculty mentor in their freshman year, or later if they are transfer students. A number of students mentioned how valuable they had found this system, in one case, changing majors five times, but ending with a major ideally suited to the student's evolving intellectual interests.
- c. The organization assesses the usefulness of its curricula to students who will live and work in a global, diverse, and technological society.

- i. Not only may SLU students spend a semester or a year abroad at SLU's Madrid campus or at another school courtesy of an exchange program or a growing number of articulation agreements, students in certain majors may actually complete the first half of their programs in Madrid. One-third of SLU students spend at least a semester abroad. Immersing themselves in another culture, they gain perspective on their own culture and on themselves. Students report that these experiences are illuminating and often transformative, refining and refocusing career and life choices.
 - ii. Springing from the centuries-old Jesuit roots, SLU's robust service ethic flourishes in today's modern world. SLU seeks to attract students, faculty, and staff who embrace the Jesuit value of serving others whether that embrace is motivated by religious commitment or agnostic social justice. The University provides retreats, immersion trips, and innumerable opportunities to make a positive difference in the lives of disadvantaged, vulnerable, or injured others nearby and far away. Faculty and staff members alike spoke passionately about working one-on-one with students to help them import the lessons into their everyday lives and daily interactions. Students touchingly referred to these professors and deans as "mentors." Such one-on-one faculty/student relationships are one of the most important factors by which the University gauges the progress of its students and the effectiveness of its various programs.
 - iii. Administrators, faculty, and trustees all mentioned the importance of expanding the University's reach and impact to more places around the world as well as for a more geographically and culturally diverse student body and faculty. Several new course or program locations are being considered for specific sites in Africa, Europe, and Asia. In addition, there is a renewed emphasis on admitting and retaining a globally diverse student body at the St. Louis campus. Already, the student body of the Madrid campus is notably diverse, including significant numbers of students not only from European nations but from the Middle East and Africa.
- d. The organization provides support to ensure that faculty, staff, and students acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.
- i. Social justice echoes from the institutional mission, literature, and rhetoric and reverberates in the ears of faculty, students, and staff members, who offer multiple examples of SLU's encouraging them to seek, obtain, and use knowledge responsibly. Student Development staff and faculty members speak about mentoring

young people and helping them air, examine, and learn from their mistakes, even (in at least one case) a drunken incident of racial bias resulting in suspension, counseling, and community service. Recognizing the burgeoning need for primary care physicians, a less lucrative career than the increasingly popular specialties, SLU established a new family practice residency at a federally qualified health center, where 40% of the patient population is uninsured. SLU proudly reports that the majority of their Physician Assistant graduates accept jobs in primary care and family practice settings.

- ii. Since 2005, the University has taken measured steps to increase its research productivity and administration and reduce or eliminate redundancies. To this end, in 2010, the University elevated the position of Associate Vice President for Research to a full Vice President for Research. At the same time, it initiated a series of structural changes that moved away from a centralized model of graduate education to a decentralized one. The movement away from a centralized organization of research and graduate programs to a decentralized one is a pattern widely practiced in higher education. In this case, matters of personnel; a perceived need to handle graduate admission and funding more opportunistically and strategically; and a need and desire to make the institution more competitive in the area of research and graduate student recruitment contributed to the decision to vest considerable authority in the respective academic deans and center directors.
- iii. In 2008-2010 the University embarked on a process of program review that was recently interrupted in order to allow the Vice President for Academic Affairs to suggest a number of changes to better align the institutional structures with the goals elaborated in the upcoming strategic plan. This year, the Vice President for Academic Affairs is examining the system of program review that had been initiated several years ago, with an eye to streamlining the process, involving external reviewers where appropriate, and participating in a recent initiative to collaborate with other institutions and higher education organizations to benchmark the performance of many of the programs.
- iv. Also taking its origins in 2005, the University has embarked on a program to consolidate existing research administration offices into one centralized expanded Office of Research Service Administration (ORSA) with its auxiliary offices designed to improve the handling of the pre- and post award stages of sponsored research. Personnel in the Office of Research Service Administration report to the Vice President for Research.

- v. In addition, a nuanced system of rewards to better incentivize faculty to seek external funding and launch new research initiatives has also been introduced. The ORSA office and the Office of Sponsored Programs are steadily meeting the increasing research needs of faculty; encouraging more multi-disciplinary, collaborative projects, drawing on teams of faculty from across schools; and stimulating a higher level of faculty research productivity. A Presidential Research Fund of one million dollars (\$1M) was established in 2009 to support faculty research projects likely to attract external funding, offering grants of up to \$25,000 per faculty, principal investigators, and other faculty members to stimulate cross-disciplinary, multi-faceted research and encourage and support greater faculty research productivity. Among the research funded is an award to the Center for Health Care Ethics for a study of "The Problem of Pain," and another to the department of Theological Studies for work "Creating an Interface between Digital Archives and the Editor's Task." The results of these measures are tangible: grant applications are increasing, more institutional staff support is available, new monies are being won, and new synergies between researchers in both the science and non-science areas are being forged. The richer array of services provided by the Office of Research Services and its auxiliary units addressing issues of intellectual property and research compliance, among others, are additional evidence of commitment to and enhancement of research endeavors at the University.
- vi. Several of the research projects that have been awarded outside fellowship grants, such as the digitization project to enable transcription of 15th century manuscripts, and the work of faculty in the areas of pain management and aging, involve the kind of research work that resonates powerfully with the Jesuit mission and the Five Dimensions.

2. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need institutional attention

None

3. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up.

None

4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be

warranted.)

None

Recommendation of the Team

Criterion is met; no Commission follow-up recommended

CRITERION FIVE: ENGAGEMENT AND SERVICE. As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

1. Evidence that Core Components are met

- a. The organization learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations.
 - i. The University gathers information from its constituents to learn about their needs and aspirations through surveys and advisory committees, including the annual survey of community agencies, the 2010 Health Literacy Demonstration Project, and other mechanisms. It also garners information through its faculty, staff, students and Alumni members. It then uses the departments and centers providing services to the community to assess capacity to meet community needs and to determine how to respond. The multiple sources of input often lead to new initiatives, which demonstrate the University's capacity and commitment to respond to community needs and interests. The University has underway a University Economic Impact Study and intends to use the results to inform and modify community service/support initiatives and to establish new goals for community impact.
- b. The organization has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities.
 - i. The University is cognizant of the importance of community engagement to its students. In 2009 it combined offices for student volunteerism and for service-learning into the Center for Service and Community Engagement. Importantly, the combined office reports to the Vice President for Student Development. More than 160 service-learning courses are available to its undergraduate students, mostly in the 3rd or 4th year of study. The 2009 NSSE showed that SLU students were more engaged than their peers at other Jesuit and other research institutions.

- ii. The University has numerous centers and programs delivering services to the public in the Greater St. Louis Metropolitan area, including the following: Casa de Salud, Integrative Interprofessional Practicum Experience, Beacon of Health Program, Health Resource Center, University Professional Development School Partnership, Math Club with Early Childhood and Elementary Education, 1818 Advanced College Credit Program, Campus Kitchen, Breakfast with Santa, SLU Law PLUS (Practicing Lawyers Unified in Service) Program, and sponsorship of three charters schools (City Garden Montessori Charter School, Shearwater High School, and Grand Center Arts Academy), to name a few. In Madrid it operates the SLU Community ESL program.

- c. The organization demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service.
 - i. In the Self Study and other documents there is evidence that SLU is committed to providing services to constituents in the greater St. Louis Metropolitan area and in Madrid, Spain. In its strategic plan it emphasizes programs that contribute to improving the quality of life for all persons in local, national and international communities. SLU recognizes services are resources and it demonstrates this through a number of collaborative relationships in the areas of education, medical care, business and the arts.
 - ii. The University's physical location in the Midtown area of St. Louis serves as the focus for its community engagement. The University has opened a hotel, supports the nearby arts district, and has been a major force in revitalizing the Midtown area of Saint Louis.
 - iii. The University has several units engaged in providing key services to members of the community, including promoting educational opportunities through its three charter schools, and providing health care services through a health and wellness center for local Hispanic and other underserved residents and through its Beacon for Health program.
 - iv. The University has demonstrated responsiveness to community needs. The most striking recent example is the opening of Casa de Salud, a health and wellness center for Spanish speaking residents of the nearby neighborhood. It was planned and opened within a very short span after the closing of two neighborhood clinics and the community requesting help from the University, a matter taken up by one of the Trustees and embraced by the President.

- d. Internal and external constituencies value the services the organization provides.
 - i. The community values the services provided by SLU. This was reported in the 2011 Annual Community Organization Survey and is demonstrated through the many letters of thanks and awards received by the University and its programs. For example, the Saint Louis University Relay for Life, which has raised more than \$1.25 million to fight cancer, was recently awarded the “Thanks a Million” award by the American Cancer Society. Additionally, the Corporation for National & Community Service, a federal agency, has recognized SLU for four consecutive years with a place on the President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll, among other awards and recognitions.

2. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need institutional attention

None

3. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up.

None

4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be warranted.)

None

Recommendation of the Team

Criterion is met; no Commission follow-up recommended

V. STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS

A. Affiliation Status

Recommendation:

No change.

Rationale for recommendation:

B. Nature of Institution**1. Legal status**

No change

2. Degrees awarded

No change

C. Conditions of Affiliation**1. Stipulation on affiliation**

No change

2. Approval of additional locations

None

3. Approval of distance delivery

None

4. Reports required

Progress Report on Assessment of Student Learning due August 31, 2016.

The required report will serve two purposes. First, it will provide faculty and administrative personnel access to what is now a missing university-wide stratum of comparative data about student learning and effective teaching. Second, it will prepare the institution for the new and detailed reporting requirements of the “Pathways” accreditation system that is now being employed by the Higher Learning Commission. One of the expected results of this new management of information will be a stronger “learning organization,” in which the faculty and administration will have better tools for analysis, evaluation, and improvement of their educational mission.

The report will include verification that the following practices have been adopted and are available for electronic access by internal users and at least the Higher Learning Commission as an external user. The verification will include an explanatory report and direct access (for the HLC) to certain types of online documents, to be viewed as a sort of “virtual visit” to the University.

1. Publish Student Learning Outcomes (“SLOs”) for each degree program and major. Any university-wide learning outcomes that are developed should be published on the University Website and in the Catalogs. Program SLOs should

be shown on the main website for each program and major, and should also be included in the official Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs. Any published student learning outcomes should be expressed in measureable (either quantitative or qualitative) terms that could be used internally for comparisons among and between students and programs. Training for some of the faculty on the subject of writing learning objectives might be needed to accomplish this.

2. Create a centralized electronic “accreditation and assessment” file of documents related to evaluation, program review, program accreditation self studies and reports, and assessment of student academic achievement. Among other things, this centralized resource should include, for each degree program and/or major, copies of assessment tools, summaries of findings, aggregated data that indicate changes in student learning over time, and similar documents that would create an assessment data base and library. This file should be available at least to certain internal users (faculty and administrators, at least) and to qualified users with expressed permission such as the Higher Learning Commission. Parts of the file could also be available online to the general public.
3. Provide evidence in the “accreditation and assessment file” that assessment of student academic achievement includes, for each program, a significant number of elements that are attained through direct assessment of learning and performance, along with indirect assessments such as opinion surveys. When including evidence particularly from outside sources, such as national licensing pass rates, the reports and analysis should provide notes that explain the significance of the data. For example, if a program has an 85% pass rate for licensing, a note should explain how many students were tested compared with how many students were in the class and how many students entered and completed the program. Comparative data from prior years should also be included. Also included would be annual program reports that include any changes that have been made as a result of specified information gained from the assessment process.

These files and resources should be developed and accessible online by qualified persons from the Higher Learning Commission at the time the required report is filed so the HLC might conduct a sort of “virtual visit” to confirm that adequate progress is being made.

Because the new Strategic Plan will depend on data, benchmarking, and continuous measurements, the University will be better prepared to implement the Strategic Plan as well as the Pathways accreditation procedures. Managing assessment data centrally and through continuous sharing of such data within the University will facilitate the recognition by faculty and administrators of desirable improvements in teaching and learning and will serve as documented evidence that improvements have been made as a result of the assessment of student learning and other comparative data.

5. Other visits scheduled

None

6. Other embedded change request

None

7. Campus Evaluation Visit

None

D. Commission Sanction or Adverse Action

None

E. Summary of Commission Review

Timing for next comprehensive visit

Academic year 2021-2022.

Rationale for recommendation:

The organization meets all the requirements for accreditation, fulfills all the Criteria for Accreditation with the Higher Learning Commission, and is in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. The University is a long-standing and highly respected institution of higher education with an excellent record of teaching, research, and service. As one of the leading Jesuit higher education institutions in the nation, it is a well-managed organization that is guided by clarity of vision and a mission statement that emphasizes ethical as well as educational dimensions. It has demonstrated competence in long-range planning, fiscal responsibility, community and humanitarian service, and student academic achievement. The institution has been able to respond successfully to various types of challenges with strong and mature leadership that is characterized by a commitment to Jesuit values and ideals. As with any institution of higher education, this organization has many areas where it can challenge itself to higher standards, and over the years it has demonstrated both a desire and an ability to make adjustments for the good of students and the future of the university.

VI. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND EXPLANATIONS

(This section is optional.)



230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7-500 | Chicago, IL 60604-1411
 312-263-0456 | 800-621-7440 | Fax: 312-263-7462 | ncahlc.org

WORKSHEET FOR USE BY EVALUATION TEAMS

Review the “Protocol for Peer Reviewers Reviewing Credit Hours Under the Commission’s New Policies” before completing this Worksheet.

APPENDIX A: CREDITS AND PROGRAM LENGTH

A: Answer the Following Questions

Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

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

Yes No

Comments: Institution has multiple policies and there is variability across and the amount of time required for credit.

- Does that policy relate the amount of instructional or contact time provided and homework typically expected of a student to the credit hours awarded for the classes offered in the delivery formats offered by the institution?

Yes No

Comments: The policy states that two hours of out-of-class work is expected of students for each credit hour.

- For institutions with non-traditional courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the timeframe and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

Yes No

Comments:

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

Yes No

Comments: Policies meet and/or exceed the federal definition.

Application of Policies

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

Yes No

Comments: Course descriptions are appropriate. However, some of the syllabi reviewed did not indicate the number of credit hours for the course.

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

Yes No

Comments: Learning outcomes are not readily available for some departments.

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

Yes No

Comments:

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

Yes No

Comments:

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

Yes No

Comments:

B: Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team. For the programs the team sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several of the courses in the program, identify the contact hours for each course, and expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.

Accounting

ACCT 220-03 Accounting, MGT 606-02 Strategy & Practice

Aviation Science

PP 210 Intermediate Flight I

Biology

CLS 352 Medical Microbiology Lecture

Business Administration

MBA-621 Information Technology in Organizations

Communications

CMM 100-4 Human Communication and Culture

CMM-330 Intercultural Communication

CMM 512 Contemporary Issues in Media

Education

CFT 532 Group Counseling Theory and Practice

English

ENGL 270-02/FSTD 270-02 Introduction to Film

ENGL-501-01 The Teaching of Writing (Madrid)

Engineering

AENG/MENG-536 Multidisciplinary Structural Optimization

Freshman Program

UNIV 101 -1 Enhancing First Year Success Fall 2003 Sample Syllabus

UNIV 101-1 Enhancing First Year Success Fall 2010 Sample Syllabus

Geography

EAS-501 Introduction to GIS

Nursing

NURS 250 Clinical Concepts in Nursing Practice

NURS 380-20B Conceptual Framework for Practice

NURS 508-20 Advanced Pharmacology

Nutrition

DIET 510-01 Human Nutrition in Physiology

Politic Science

AAM 293-01/POLS 215-01H Black Politics/Honors Black Politics

POLS 100-1 Introduction to Politics

POLS 100-2 Introduction to Politics

POLS 250-1 Asian Miracles

POLS 215-1 Black Politics

Public Health

PUBH 201.02 Introduction to Global Health

PUBH 201.02H Honors Introduction to Global Health

Physician Assistant

PAED-536 Essentials of Pediatrics

Social Work

SWRK 100.01 Introduction to Social Work

SWRK 700-02 Values and Ethics in Social Work Practice

Spanish

SPAN 505 Spanish Phonology and its Place in the Classroom

C: Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

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

Yes

No

Rationale: No critical issues were identified, but it is important that all syllabi include course credit hours.

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

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

WORKSHEET FOR USE BY EVALUATION TEAMS

APPENDIX B: CLOCK HOUR WORKSHEET

Instructions: Complete the following worksheet only if the institution offers any programs in clock hours OR that must be reported to the U.S. Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs. Such programs typically include those that must be identified in clock hours for state licensure of the program or where completing clock hours is a requirement for graduates to apply for licensure or authorization to practice the occupation. Such programs might include teacher education, nursing, or other programs in licensed fields.

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

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

1 quarter hour must include at least 25 clock hours of instruction

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

A: Answer the Following Questions

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

Yes

No

Comments:

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

- Did the team determine in reviewing the institution's credit hour policies that they reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education?

Yes

No

Comments:

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

Yes

No

Comments:

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

Yes

No

Comments: There were no variations that were less than the federal formula.

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

C: Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

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

Yes

No

Rationale: Institutions credit and contact hours meet or exceed the federal requirements. Students confirmed awareness and understanding of credit hours and expectations and validated that information on the syllabi and course descriptions matched course requirements.

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

APPENDIX C

WORKSHEET FOR THE EVALUATION TEAM ON FEDERAL COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS

This worksheet becomes an appendix to the team report.

INSTITUTIONAL MATERIALS RELATED TO FEDERAL COMPLIANCE REVIEWED BY THE TEAM:

(list)

1. *Higher Learning Commission Self-Study 2012*, Saint Louis University
2. *Higher Learning Commission Self-Study 2012 Appendix A*, Saint Louis University
3. *Higher Learning Commission Self-Study 2012 Appendix B*, Saint Louis University
4. *HLC Course Section List – AY 2012 – Credit Hour Calculations*
5. List of consortial relationships 2012
6. *NASPAA Accreditation Review*, July 2009
7. *OMB Circular A-133 Single Audit Report (2011)*, Saint Louis University
8. *Program Review Policy*
9. *Saint Louis University Catalog, Graduate Education 2011-2012*
10. *Saint Louis University Catalog, 2011 – 2012 Undergraduate Catalog*
11. *Saint Louis University Madrid, Academic Catalog 2011 – 2014*
12. *School of Public Health Accreditation Report*
13. *SLU College of Arts and Sciences, Procedures for Use in Appealing Allegedly Capricious Semester Grades of Undergraduate Students*
14. *SLU School for Professional Studies Catalog and Student Handbook 2011 – 2012*
15. *SLU University-wide Credit Hour Definition*
16. *SLU 2011 Annual Security and Fire Report*
17. *SLU 2011-2012 Code of Student Conduct*
18. *Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings, 2011*, Saint Louis University
19. *Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee and Graduate Academic Affairs Committee: Protocols for Submitting New Program Requests*
 - a. *Survey of Students' Perceptions of the Core Experience*
 - b. *Graduating Senior Survey*
 - c. *Undergraduate and Graduate Alumni Survey*
 - d. *Features Characteristic of Graduates of Saint Louis University (2011)*
 - e. *Assessment as Proactive Pedagogy Project, Department of Theological Studies*
 - f. *Results of College of Arts and Sciences 2010-2011 Departmental Assessment Audit*
20. *Year 4 curriculum requirements for the MD Degree Program*

EVALUATION OF FEDERAL COMPLIANCE PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The team reviews each item identified in the Federal Compliance Guide and documents its findings in the appropriate spaces below. Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution's ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in appropriate sections of the Assurance Section of the Team Report or highlighted as such in the appropriate AQIP Quality Checkup Report.

1. Credits, Program Length, and Tuition: *The institution has documented that it has credit hour assignments and degree program lengths within the range of good practice in higher education and that tuition is consistent across degree programs (or that there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition). New for 2012: The Commission has a new policy on the Credit Hour. Complete the Worksheet in Appendix A and then complete the following responses. Attach the Worksheet to this form.*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM'S CONCLUSIONS:

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

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

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

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

Comments:

Additional Monitoring, if any:

2. Student Complaints: *The institution has documented a process in place for addressing student complaints and appears to be systematically processing such complaints as evidenced by the data on student complaints for the three years prior to the visit.*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM'S CONCLUSIONS:

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

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

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

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

Comments:

Additional Monitoring, if any:

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

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM’S CONCLUSIONS:

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

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

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

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

Comments:

Additional Monitoring, if any:

4. Verification of Student Identity: *The institution has demonstrated that it verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided to the student through distance or correspondence education and has appropriate protocols to disclose additional fees related to verification to students and to protect their privacy.*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM’S CONCLUSIONS:

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

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

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

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

Comments:

Additional Monitoring, if any:

5. Title IV Program and Related Responsibilities: *The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program.*

- **General Program Requirements:** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area.*
- **Financial Responsibility Requirements:** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion Two if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)*
- **Default Rates.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about three years of default rates. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area.*
- **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures:** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.*

- ***Student Right to Know.*** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion One if the team determines that disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)*
- ***Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance.*** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students.*
- ***Contractual Relationships:*** *The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships (The institution should review the Contractual Change Application on the Commission's Web site for more information. If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require Commission approval and has not completed the appropriate Commission Contractual Change Application the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible.)*
- ***Consortial Relationships:*** *The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships (The institution should review the Consortial Change Application on the Commission's Web site for more information. If the team learns that the institution has such a consortial relationship that may require Commission approval and has not completed the appropriate Commission Consortial Change Application the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible.)*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM'S CONCLUSIONS:

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

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

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

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

Comments:

Additional Monitoring, if any:

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

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM'S CONCLUSIONS:

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

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

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

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

Comments:

Additional Monitoring, if any:

7. Relationship with Other Accrediting Agencies and with State Regulatory Boards: *The institution has documented that it discloses accurately to the public and the Commission its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditor and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence. Note that if the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is currently under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor in the past five years, the team must explain the action in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report and provide its rationale for recommending Commission status in light of this action. In addition, the team must contact the staff liaison immediately if it learns that the institution is at risk of losing its degree authorization or lacks such authorization in any state in which the institution meets state presence requirements.*

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM'S CONCLUSIONS:

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

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

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

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

Comments:

Additional Monitoring, if any:

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

CHECK THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE THAT REFLECTS THE TEAM'S CONCLUSIONS:

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

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

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

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

Comments:

Additional Monitoring, if any:

ADVANCEMENT SECTION

REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION VISIT

TO

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY
Saint Louis, Missouri 63103

April 23-25, 2012

FOR

The Higher Learning Commission

A Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

EVALUATION TEAM

**Elizabeth E. Stevens, Ph.D. (Team
Chair)**

Special Consultant to the University
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66502-6014

Dr. Margaret L. Bloom

Professor, Education/Counseling Psychology
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI 53201-1881

Dr. David V. Curtis

Professor of Management, Emeritus
Governors State University
Frankfort, IL 60423

Ms. Ingrid Gould

Associate Provost for Faculty and Student Affairs

University of Chicago
Chicago, IL 60637

Dr. Eleanor V. Howell
Dean - School of Nursing
Creighton University
Omaha, NE 68178

Dr. Rubén Martínez
Director
Michigan State University
Julian Samora Research Institute, Michigan State
East Lansing, MI 48823

Dr. Mark S. Paller
Senior Associate Dean, Medical School
University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Carol Simpson Stern
Department of Performance Studies
Northwestern University
Evanston, IL 60208

Dr. George E. Stevens
Dean Emeritus, College of Business Administration
& Grad. Sch. of Mgt.
Kent State University
Kent, OH 44242

Contents

I. Overall Observations about the Organization.....4

II. Consultations of the Team.....4

 A. Topic One: Assessment.....4

 B. Topic Two: Diversity.....6

 C. Topic Three: Distance Education, Technology, and Teaching
 Excellence.....8

 D. Topic Four: Campus Climate.....9

III. Recognition of Significant Accomplishments, Progress, and/or Practices..11

I. OVERALL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION

Saint Louis University is an excellent higher education institution with a long history of distinction in teaching, research, and service. It adapts to changing circumstances with mature and productive decisions. Its governance and management structures are effective. The faculty, staff, and students are dedicated to the vision, mission, and values that the University espouses broadly and visibly. This University prides itself on an unusual amount of decentralization of responsibilities to the College, Department, and program levels. This decentralization becomes apparent in any examination of how this institution operates, and it is valued by the faculty, who have a high degree of academic freedom. In some instances, however, too much decentralization can be a barrier to needed change, or may cause inordinate delays and unnecessary expenditures of time and effort in trying to establish desirable university-wide practices.

The visiting team recognizes the overall values that the University holds, and offers the following advice and suggestions. These comments are based on the limited observations that were made in the course of evaluating the University for accreditation, and may be considered solely as consultations, with no requirement for follow-up to the points made in this section of the team's report. The team hopes that these comments will be especially helpful as the University responds to the items that are covered in the Assurance Section of this report.

II. CONSULTATIONS OF THE TEAM

A. Topic One: Assessment

Based on evidence that was available to the Visiting Team, the University has not yet fully developed an assessment program that is an overall, university-wide, managed system of quality improvement, despite concerns raised by previous HLC teams and the filing of a report on assessment with the HLC in 2005. While Colleges and programs are doing assessment, and, based on oral reports and some available documents, are using the information from assessment to make improvements in student learning, the Team found very little documentation of these activities dated after 2005. The Team believes that a contributing reason for this scarcity of documentation is that many processes and activities are decentralized, so if there were documents within colleges or programs, those have not been retained centrally and in some cases were not even shared within a department. Another contributing reason is probably that faculty, Departments, programs, and Colleges have not been evaluated or measured on the basis of improvements in student learning. There is a saying that "what gets measured is what gets done." In a number of areas—not just in the case of assessment—the Team observed that two factors caused an increase in self-measurement within the last two years: the creation of a new Strategic Planning Initiative within the University and the conduct of the Self Study that was undertaken in anticipation of this HLC comprehensive review. Both of these initiatives were driven from the central

administration, and they also depended heavily on the participation of all parts of the institution. In the case of quality improvement processes, and in particular the conduct of the assessment of student academic achievement, it appears to the Team that more centralization of these activities is necessary.

The experience of these Team members in other institutions leads to the recommendation that successful implementation of continuous quality improvement and a productive assessment program require (1) strong leadership support, (2) commitment of adequate resources, (3) a realistic plan and timetable, (4) effective and frequent communication, (5) professional development and training, and (6) reward structures. This means that a successful program of quality improvement and assessment must start with strong support from the very top levels of the institution. To be truly a “learning organization” these activities must be a clear priority of the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, faculty, staff, students, and the Board of Trustees. It must be clear to everyone in the University that improvements in student learning will be expected, measured, and rewarded. This means that indicators of student learning need to be documented within a strong central repository of data and information that are based on a variety of valid and reliable measurements, and that the data will be analyzed by professionals and shared with the necessary internal constituencies—especially the faculty of each academic unit. Within each academic unit, the faculty will need this type of analysis, comparison, and information in order to make desirable changes and adjustments in curriculum, student learning outcomes, teaching techniques, etc., that will lead to higher and higher levels of student achievement.

The team offers some specific suggestions to Saint Louis University for a stronger university-level program of assessment of student academic achievement.

1. Assign the responsibility for this university-wide activity to a senior level administrator (probably the Vice President for Academic Affairs), while expecting certain enhanced support activities from the Office of Institutional Research, the Center for Teaching Excellence, and other existing support services.
2. Within the office of the senior administrator, designate a person to be the Director of Assessment, since this is at least a full time responsibility for one qualified person. This person should be able to work closely and productively with the faculty and with the central support systems such as OIR.
3. Identify several individuals within the University who can help the faculty define, implement, and document what is meant by “valid and reliable” assessment instruments. Currently the faculty in some areas rely on a broad collection of surveys, accreditation reports, perhaps some program reviews, anecdotal reports from students, external tests and placement information from professional organizations, etc., with a relatively small amount of “direct” assessment of student learning, as compared to similar universities. Also, one cannot assume that all program accreditations cover the assessment of student learning in

sufficient depth to provide good planning information for the faculty.

4. Consider joining the Higher Learning Commission's "Assessment Academy," or other professional organizations that will provide the faculty with a valuable source of information, training, and support that will be useful not only for meeting the University's need for better information but will also prepare the University for its reporting requirements under the new "Pathways" system of accreditation.
5. Create a timetable and schedule of interim objectives and achievements so the needed documentation can be collected, filed, and made available for use by the faculty and available for HLC inspection at the end of the 2015-2016 academic year.
6. Create some type of incentive or reward for those programs and faculty who can show significant progress in responding to this renewed university-wide emphasis on accountability for student learning. Some institutions conduct an annual "showcase" event, in which various departments explain their assessment program to anyone who wants to attend the "showcase." Being selected for the "showcase" is a reward to those who are making notable progress and an incentive for others who might be unsure about how to proceed.
7. Allocate needed resources based on need, commitment, and progress. Sometimes resources such as a temporary reduced teaching load, or a subscription to a testing service, or scheduling of faculty seminars, workshops, webinars, etc., can be effective without being very expensive.
8. Consider course and program assessment of student learning as an integral part of faculty teaching, not as something extra that has to receive special compensation. How faculty would be rewarded for assessment is the same as how faculty members are rewarded for effective teaching, although participating in assessment and achieving effective teaching are two different but related things. Participation in assessment activities should be incorporated into annual faculty activity reporting, merit, and promotion and tenure guidelines.
9. Communicate often and widely. The University's approach to outcome assessment and its role in improving student learning and advancing the vision of the University should become part of the daily conversation with regular coverage on webpages, in newsletters, in college and department meetings, and other forums. Stakeholders who should receive various levels of reports should be clearly identified, including students and Trustees.

The point of all this is to raise the assessment process to the university-wide level, thus giving the activity more visibility, more quality control, and more effectiveness in achieving the vision and mission of Saint Louis University.

Topic Two: Diversity

This University has achieved a high level of diversity in a number of ways. The student body includes about 1,000 students from at least 69 foreign countries, and students are encouraged to learn about each others' culture, values, and beliefs. The University encourages the admission of students who represent a broad range of faiths and philosophical perspectives, and uses these differences as the basis of academic inquiry at the personal and institutional levels. The University has established a full campus in Madrid, Spain, where students come from countries in Europe, the Middle East, and Africa, and where students from the St. Louis campus can go to study abroad without interrupting their own program of study. The University is examining additional international sites for degree or program offerings, with an eye to enhancing the global awareness and involvement of all S.L.U. students. These are laudable activities that will yield important learning experiences for all the students.

On two fronts, however, the University is still working toward some challenging goals. These areas are in the makeup of the faculty at St. Louis and in the proportion of Hispanic/Latino students. The previous comprehensive report identified a narrow use of the term diversity by the University and suggested that it be broadened to include ethnic minorities beyond African Americans. Although the University has emphasized diversity in its strategic plan and has increased the number of Asian students, particularly foreign students from China, it has not significantly increased the number of Latino students over the years. As such, while Latinos are the largest minority ethnic group in the country (as determined by the 2010 U.S. Census), this group is greatly underrepresented at Saint Louis University at student, staff, and faculty levels. While the University emphasizes the Midwest as an important geographical unit for student recruitment purposes, it also takes pride in having students from more than 40 states and aspires to having its student body represent all 50 states. Given the University's aspirations for geographic representation, it makes sense to build capacity to recruit Latino students from throughout the country. Additionally, the NASPAA Accreditation review found that plans to diversify the faculty were "still under development" and requested an annual report to confirm implementation of the plan. It appears that S.L.U. continues to have a diversity plan under development.

Some ideas to consider as possible responses to these remaining challenges would include some local partnerships with community colleges in areas with significant Latino populations. These partnerships might identify potential transfer students even as they enter the local community college by assigning admissions personnel to establish personal and family contact with these students and provide advice and support as they complete their two-year degrees. Another tactic might be to identify Jesuit high schools in areas of high minority populations to identify potential students, even if those Latino students are not attending the Jesuit school. Some universities recruit Latino students through local churches, where students and their families may be open to conversation about the students' future. Information about available scholarships is almost always very intriguing to families who have had no prior college students. Information can be

very persuasive in these instances. Sometimes a university can gain the assistance of experts in “information campaigns” to find ways to target information more efficiently to the intended audience.

At the same time, the University should use its emerging ability to measure and track student achievement in order to learn what factors most affect the retention of distinct sub-groups of minority students. Centralized data gathering and analysis with careful longitudinal benchmarks might provide information that would enhance not only retention but also recruiting of a more ethnically diverse student body.

The University Trustees seem to have a view of diversity that is mostly limited to the mix of student demographics on campus, and the Trustees are very supportive of such diversity. On the other hand, the University has some partnerships and relationships established that might result in course or program locations in the Middle East and the Pacific Rim. Students whom the Team met with in the Busch Student Center saw the potential of going abroad, learning languages, and having a better understanding of themselves and cultures abroad. The Team is impressed with the caliber of leadership the University has in place to drive these efforts and the methodical approach that is reflected in their planning documents. These efforts will go far to combine the concepts of “diversity” and “global education” to the benefit of all the students.

Diversification of the faculty and staff presents more difficult challenges, as all universities in the United States will attest. Some have started programs to “grow their own” diverse faculty from among their students in underrepresented groups. Some have used personal contacts in other universities to identify promising recent PhDs or young faculty who might be open to offers from an institution with the character and reputation of Saint Louis University. The University has already begun to target its employment recruiting to publications and sources that might reach minority populations, with mixed results.

Topic three: Distance Education, Technology, and Teaching Excellence

The team believes there is growth potential in Distance Education. With an enrollment of over 13,000 students including over 7,000 undergraduates, more activity can be generated in distance learning but attention to many market factors and details concerning topics, discipline, and convenience as well as other factors must be carefully considered. Additional efforts are already evident across campus; the Medical School, for example, has two Distance Education courses that account for 120 meetings. The Team supports the University’s efforts to adapt the teaching and the technology to each course and program, depending on the characteristics of the instructor, the desired learning outcomes, and the students’ abilities and readiness.

In the context of Distance Education, but pertaining more broadly to all teaching, the Team recognizes that the Reinert Center for Teaching Excellence is a valuable resource for the faculty. The Center’s staff members are well prepared and exhibit a high level of expertise in helping the faculty find more effective ways of teaching with or

without the use of technology, and adapting the teaching methods and style to the student learning goals and outcomes and the instructor's strengths. The Team would encourage the faculty to make more use of this fine resource.

Topic four: Campus Climate

The visiting Team found Saint Louis University to be an institution that values excellence in teaching, research, and service, and that lives up to its vision and mission in those areas. Administrators, staff, faculty, and students are excited about the opportunity to make a real difference in the world. The distinct mission of this Jesuit institution is evident at every level, providing energy, direction, and commitment among those who work and learn there.

Over the past years, much progress and change have been apparent in this University. Under the leadership of a strong and dedicated Board of Trustees, and with the strong and persuasive leadership of its President, the University has made an indelible mark of excellence not only on its students and graduates, but on the community it serves. The City of St. Louis has benefitted visibly and culturally by the physical improvement that the University has promoted, and the people of the City benefit from the health and social services that the University provides.

The Team confirmed that shared governance at the University is well understood and is effective in making informed decisions at all levels. Faculty confirmed that they have appropriate opportunities for leadership in academic areas and advisory capacity in other administrative areas. Non-administrative staff displayed an eagerness to serve the students and to have an important role in the success of every student, even if that role is to keep the learning environment clean and neat.

In the midst of this dedication and commitment, nevertheless, the Team found some frustration with interpersonal communications. Unionized staff, and to some extent the non-unionized staff shared their disappointment that they seldom receive even as much as a "thank you" for their services. Some described their supervisors as uncaring. Some told of how they stepped up to fill in for absent co-workers, or to take on additional work left when a job was left unfilled, and even in these instances their efforts were never acknowledged. The Team considered that while the City of St. Louis, the State of Missouri, and the United States have been experiencing an historic recession, with massive job losses and unemployment, it is reasonable that employees would be fearful of any change that might affect their jobs. The Team suggests that more effort be directed to attending to these feelings, and perhaps that supervisors could be provided with some training in how to acknowledge good work and personal commitments.

In visiting with the faculty and even some of the administrators, the Team also identified some frustration that faculty members feel when their advice and opinions seem not to have been considered when a major decision has been made. In a few recent, high-impact decisions, faculty leadership believes that it was not included in the decision-

making process but informed of the already-made decisions and invited to participate in the implementation. Some of the factors that might contribute to such feelings would be that the faculty lacks all the information that was used in making the decision, that the administration feels there are times when privileged and sensitive facts should not be shared, or that the administration assumes incorrectly that the faculty knows the reasons for these sometimes contentious decisions. Like the staff, the faculty might feel that when one of their own has been negatively affected by a decision, anyone might be the next “victim,” especially if they do not understand the reasons for the decision. This is another example of fear that is partly driven by the national angst related to unemployment, but that would be natural in any circumstances. The team believes that some of this frustration might be ameliorated by more frequent interpersonal, informal contact with the President particularly, but also with senior administrators.

Based on these observations the Team suggests that a focused effort be made for more frequent interpersonal communications, even in very casual settings. The President and the Vice Presidents might set aside some specific times in their busy schedules to do some “management by walking around,” and listening more than speaking. The new plan for informal lunch discussions including faculty and administrators is certainly a step in the right direction. In addition, after significant administrative decisions are made, the President should make a point to review with the Faculty representatives the types of information that were used in making the decision. University faculty members often do not understand the dynamics of a large university budget, and most of the time are unaware of the advance planning and information gathering that are involved in budgeting. It is one thing to “present” budget information to the faculty; it is quite a different thing to sit down and talk with the faculty about all the decision points that lead up to each fiscal year.

Department Chairs might benefit from some professional development in leadership and management of people. Perhaps an annual one-day Chair retreat with some key “speakers” or knowledgeable colleagues on topics such as “conflict management,” group dynamics, interpersonal communication, and other such subjects would open the discussion on how to keep the faculty informed of events that might impact their departments.

In the case of the non-exempt staff, the Team suggests that the supervisors be alerted to ways in which they can motivate and reward workers just by their attitude toward the work. Some training in supervisory skills and interpersonal dynamics might go a long way in keeping the workers happy. In particular, the supervisors, who might also be fearful of losing their jobs, should be assured that being nice to the workers will not be taken as a weakness, but that the quality and quantity of the work being done will be the measure of success. Some workers complained that they are forbidden from having a conversation with students or other university employees in the course of their daily work; others complained about the price of parking and the time allotted for lunch. Some of these matters are negotiable conditions of work, but if the supervisors make a point to explain the reasons for these rules and conditions, the workers might be more receptive. Beyond the supervisors, all the faculty and administrative staff might be

reminded that it is nice to compliment anyone on their work. “Thank you for picking up that trash,” or “Wow, that floor is really gleaming!” don’t take much time or effort, but can make the day for a worker who feels her work is never appreciated.

III. RECOGNITION OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS, PROGRESS, AND/OR PRACTICES

The Team recognizes that one of the distinctive characteristics of the University is its beneficial and visible presence in the downtown area of St. Louis, Missouri, which is unusual among large, not-for-profit universities. The University provides not only a large array of much needed services, but has a visible leadership role in the physical improvement of the midtown area of the city. The services that are provided also involve students, who, according to the mission of the University, will provide “service to humanity.” The Team suggests that the University consider applying for the optional “Community Engagement Classification” from the Carnegie Foundation.

*Team Recommendations for the
STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS*

INSTITUTION and STATE: Saint Louis University, MO

TYPE OF REVIEW (from ESS): Continued Accreditation

DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW (from ESS):

DATES OF REVIEW: 4/23/12 - 4/25/12

Nature of Organization

LEGAL STATUS: Private NFP

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

DEGREES AWARDED: B, M, S, D

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

Conditions of Affiliation

STIPULATIONS ON AFFILIATION STATUS: International program offerings are limited to existing (2009) undergraduate and graduate courses and programs in Madrid, Spain; and existing graduate courses and programs at sites in Limassol, Cyprus, and Louiaze, Lebanon. Commission notification is required if additions are made. Off-campus course and program offerings in the U.S. are limited to those offered by the School for Professional Studies and the College of Education and Public Service.

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

APPROVAL OF NEW ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS: Prior Commission approval required to offer degrees and programs at off-campus locations other than at Lees Summit, MO (at Metropolitan Community College); to deliver bachelor's degree programs (except for the Bachelor of Arts in Renaissance Education) at the BJC Health Center for Lifelong Learning in St. Louis, MO; and to deliver courses at the BJC Centers in St. Louis and St. Peters, MO; and at the St. Elizabeth's Medical Center in Belleville, IL; and to deliver the Master of Social Work degree program in Cape Girardeau, MO.

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

APPROVAL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION DEGREES: The institution has been approved under Commission policy to offer up to 5% of its total degree programs through distance education. The processes for expanding distance education are defined in other Commission documents.

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

REPORTS REQUIRED: None

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: By August 31, 2016; Progress Report on Assessment of Student Learning

OTHER VISITS SCHEDULED: None

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

*Team Recommendations for the
STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS*

Summary of Commission Review

YEAR OF LAST COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION: 2001 - 2002

YEAR FOR NEXT COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION: 2011 - 2012

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: 2021-2022

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE

INSTITUTION and STATE: Saint Louis University, MO

TYPE OF REVIEW (from ESS): Continued Accreditation

No change to Organization Profile

Educational Programs

	Program Distribution	Recommended Change (+ or -)
Programs leading to Undergraduate		
Associate	0	
Bachelors	80	
Programs leading to Graduate		
Masters	57	
Specialist	2	
First Professional		
Doctoral	36	

Off-Campus Activities

<p>In-State:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Campuses: Additional Locations:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Course Locations:</p>	<p>Present Activity:</p> <p>None Bonne Terre (Eastern Reception, Diagnostic & Correctional Center) ; Cape Girardeau (Cape Girardeau Career and Technology Center) ; St. Louis (BJC Center for Life Long Learning)</p> <p>None</p>	<p>Recommended Change: (+ or -)</p>
<p>Out-of-State:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Campuses: Additional Locations: Course Locations:</p>	<p>Present Wording:</p> <p>None Belleville, IL (Mecical Arts Building)</p> <p>None</p>	<p>Recommended Change: (+ or -)</p>
<p>Out-of-USA:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Campuses: Additional Locations: Course</p>	<p>Present Wording:</p> <p>Madrid, Spain Limassol, Cyprus; Louiaze, Lebanon</p> <p>None</p>	<p>Recommended Change: (+ or -)</p>

Locations:

Distance Education Programs:

Present Offerings:

Bachelor - 24.0102 General Studies (Bachelor of Arts in General Studies) offered via Internet; Bachelor - 51.3801 Registered Nursing/Registered Nurse (Bachelor - Nursing/Registered Nurse (RN, ASN, BSN, MSN) (Bachelor of Science in Nursing)) offered via Internet; Certificate - 51.2211 Health Services Administration (Certificate in Biosecurity) offered via Internet; Doctor - 51.3801 Registered Nursing/Registered Nurse (Ph.D. in Nursing) offered via Internet; Master - 51.2211 Health Services Administration (MS in Biosecurity Disaster Preparedness) offered via Internet; Master - 51.3801 Registered Nursing/Registered Nurse (Nursing/Registered Nurse (RN, ASN, BSN, MSN) (MS in Nursing)) offered via Internet

Recommended Change:

(+ or -)

Correspondence Education Programs:

Present Offerings:

None