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1. Assessment of Student Outcomes

**Introduction.** The primary purpose of student outcomes assessment at Saint Joseph’s University is to encourage continuous programmatic improvement by informing faculty, staff, and administrators about the extent to which curricular and co-curricular goals and objectives are being met. Outcomes assessment practices are in this way essential to the SJU mission of providing a rigorous, student-centered education rooted in the liberal arts and preparing students for personal excellence, professional success, and engaged citizenship. This mission calls for the realization of important student outcomes and the assessment process helps us to understand both our successes and challenges in this regard. For this reason, assessment projects should target all levels of the student curricular and co-curricular experience and they should be administered by a broad and inclusive set of faculty, staff, and administrators. Assessment should be programmatic, aiming to identify the development of essential skills and other outcomes by the graduation. Assessment results should be widely disseminated and discussed by all relevant stakeholders and they should directly inform efforts to improve teaching and other mechanisms for achieving programmatic goals.

1.1 **Basic Terminology.** Student outcomes are evaluated in light of intended goals and objectives. Following Mary J. Allen, we understand goals and outcomes as broad statements concerning the knowledge, skills, or values that students are expected to achieve or appreciate. Goals are specified in terms of discrete, measurable learning objectives. These more specific learning objectives describe what students are expected to learn, what skills they will develop, and what values they will have. Learning objectives should be formulated in student-centered terms and they should be measurable according to some direct measure of student learning. Direct measures of student learning are closely connected to demonstrable outcomes. Examples of direct measures include course embedded assignments, course examination questions, pre- and post-tests, proficiency exams, portfolios or performances. Other measures of student learning are less demonstrable and so indirect e.g., student or faculty surveys, exit interviews, course/program evaluation questions for students, or faculty/administrator reflections on teaching and learning. (See Appendix 5 MSCHE Direct and Indirect Evidence of Student Learning) It is the process of directly and indirectly measuring learning objectives that provides evidence about the extent to which learning goals are being met. Learning goals and objectives are also aligned to courses and/or other program-level requirements. The process of aligning goals and objectives to requirements is curricular (or co-curricular) mapping. A curricular map links learning objectives to program requirements and identifies when and how learning goals are to be achieved.

1.2 **General Organization.** Student outcomes assessment at Saint Joseph’s University is organized in terms of five principal committees and corresponding sites of institutional responsibility:
Student Outcome Assessment Committees

General Education Program Assessment Committee (responsible for General Education Program student learning assessment for Undergraduate Day, Professional and Liberal Studies, and Haub Degree Completion students)

Planning and Assessment Committee of the College of Art and Sciences (responsible for student learning assessment for all undergraduate and graduate programs in the College of Arts and Sciences)

Haub Assurance of Learning Committee (responsible for student learning assessment for all undergraduate and graduate programs in the Haub School of Business)

Institutional Effectiveness Committee (responsible for overseeing university-wide assessment systems, evaluating and improving those systems, and making sure that assessment results are made available for the strategic planning and budgeting process.

Each of the first three structures is responsible for overseeing a subset of student outcomes assessment processes and working with faculty, staff, and administrators in organizing ongoing assessment projects. Each committee is a kind of “hub” into which annual or semi-annual assessment plans and results flow for subsequent University-wide dissemination and out of which curricular (or co-curricular) maps, expectations, guidelines, and timelines are communicated. Each is also responsible for reporting regularly to the relevant Dean, Provost, or Vice President about the general successes and challenges identified through the assessment process. Specifically, GEP, PAC, and HSB committees must report assessment results by March 31. Reports are to be submitted to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the relevant administrator(s).

Each committee must have at least one member serving concurrently on the SJU Institutional Effectiveness Committee. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee should in turn evaluate the assessment process and provide feedback aimed at improving assessment procedures, measures, rubrics, and so on.
Variety in how outcomes assessment projects are organized and understood is a natural result of differences in program objectives and requirements. It is also an important corollary of encouraging broad participation in a culture of assessment in which as many stakeholders as possible are engaged in the design and administration of assessment projects and the evaluation of their results. For these reasons, there can be no “one size fits all” approach to meaningful outcomes assessment. Nevertheless, there are some general guidelines and procedures that apply to assessments across different academic divisions, departments, and programs. These guidelines and procedures are as follows:

1.2.1 All curricular program-level goals must be published in the SJU academic catalog. Changes to goals and objectives should be finalized only after consultation with the relevant assessment committee(s), and only according to the official timeline for catalog revisions.

1.2.2 In every relevant area, the full set of program-level goals must be assessed in due course. Minimally each goal should be assessed at least once every five years, though it is expected that many goals will be assessed more frequently than this.

1.2.3 Student learning assessment projects must always be based on an assessment plan that includes at least one direct measure of student learning for each objective being assessed.

1.2.4 Each department or program must be involved in an outcomes assessment process every academic year and their assessment plans and results should be sent to the relevant assessment committee(s) according to the published timeline(s) of those committee(s).

1.2.5 By March 31 of the academic year, each department or program must identify at least one person who will serve as a liaison to the relevant assessment committee(s) for the subsequent academic year and inform the relevant assessment committee(s) accordingly.

1.2.6 Assessment projects, both in their planning and evaluating phases, must always include opportunities for robust conversation among all participants and other main stakeholders. (E.g., department-administered student learning assessments should require conversations about assessment results by all faculty, or at least by all faculty who teach courses aligned with the relevant goal.) Such conversation is arguably the most essential element in “closing the loop,” i.e., using assessment results to devise action steps aimed at improving outcomes.
1.2.7 Periodic reviews of the appropriateness of goals and objectives, as well as of the assessment instruments and methods that have been used so far, must be a normal part of the assessment process.

1.2.8 Assessment results (consistent with anonymity [1.3]) must be made available to all members of the University community at the SJU Assessment website, which must be updated by the assessment committees at least once each semester.

1.2.9 Assessment projects must always target a sufficiently representative sample of students.

1.2.10 Assessment projects must employ common standards or rubrics in the evaluation of student outcomes.

1.2.11 Assessment plans must follow the SJU Assessment Template and always address at least the following questions:

   - What is the objective being assessed (and to which goal does that objective contribute)?
   - What is the instrument and/or process that will be used to carry out the assessment and how will results be evaluated?
   - Which student populations will be assessed?
   - What are the expected outcomes?
   - How/when will faculty or staff have an opportunity to discuss the results of the assessment?

1.2.12 Completed assessment reports must follow the SJU Assessment Template (see Appendix 1-4) and address the following questions, (i.e., questions in addition to those listed at 1.2.11):

   - What were the results of the assessment?
   - What steps might the department or program adopt to improve outcomes, based on these assessment results?
   - What if any changes might be made to improve the assessment process?
1.3 Assessment Reporting Lines and Timeframes. Completed reports on spring, summer, fall semester, and intersession assessment projects are due on March 31 of the following spring semester. This means that CAS-PAC, HSB-AOL, and GEPAC will report out to IEC on March 31. Those committees may arrange to receive data from assessment coordinators sufficiently earlier so that analysis may be completed for the March 31 reporting date. For example, both the CAS-PAC and GEPAC committees ask for completed spring and summer assessment projects by October 15 of the following fall semester.

Reports should be completed by the relevant person administering the project (e.g., the departmental assessment liaison or assessment subcommittee chair) and address all of the questions listed above at 1.2.11 and 1.2.12. Reports should be made according to the SJU Assessment and Annual Report Template. Reports should be based on conversations among faculty or staff about any potential changes or action-steps warranted by the assessment results.

Assessment plans for the current spring semester and subsequent summer, fall, and intersession are due on March 31 each year.

All CAS program-level assessment reports should be sent to the relevant department chair or program director and the CAS Planning and Assessment committee. The CAS Planning and Assessment committee is responsible for making all reports available at the SJU Assessment site. All HSB program-level assessment reports should be sent to the relevant department chair or program director and the HSB Assurance of Learning committee. All GEP assessment reports should be sent to the GEP Assessment committee and to the chairs/directors of contributing departments and programs. The GEP Assessment committee is responsible for making all reports available at the SJU Assessment site.

1.4 Using Assessment Information. Outcomes assessment results are to be used primarily by the faculty, staff, and administrators to improve outcomes in accordance with considered judgments about which student learning goals are worth pursuing. Student outcomes assessment results thus feed into review and assessment processes at a variety of different levels. For example, these results should inform individual faculty members as they consider ways of improving teaching or more effectively delivering course-level objectives. The results should also inform College-level or divisional annual reports, departmental program reviews, or more wholesale curricular reviews such as the periodic programmatic review of the General Education Program. Deans, Provosts, Vice-Presidents, and other
academic administrators will use the results of assessment projects in strategic planning and resource allocation decisions.

Assessment results are included in both June 15 Annual Reports of departments and programs and July 15 divisional reports.

Information obtained through student outcomes assessments will not be used to evaluate the performances of individual faculty or staff. Outcomes assessment results that are shared with the University community should not identify individual students or individual members of the faculty and staff. Results will be shared with external bodies as necessary to meet the various accrediting, certifying, and regulatory requirements to which the University is subject.

1.5 Feedback on Student Outcomes Assessment. The various assessment bodies will provide feedback on the assessments conducted to departments and programs. (timeline). The feedback will address: 1) the mechanics of the assessments used (i.e., are there better or more efficient ways to measure student attainment of learning objectives), 2) the proposed plan for programmatic improvement (e.g., does it seem likely to be successful?; do the proposed steps require additional resources or other institutional resources to address issues beyond the control of the program? ), and 3) opportunities for leveraging the information obtained to support other areas (e.g., can other programs benefit from seeing how this assessment was conducted?; are the opportunities for other programs to collaborate with this program to further enhance student attainment of the learning objectives?).

Direct feedback will be provided to each area from the relevant individual body overseeing that process (GEP Assessment Committee, HSB Assurance of Learning Committee, CAS Planning and Assessment Committee) and, where appropriate, the relevant associate dean. Feedback may also be provided by the IEC, the Provost, Vice Presidents and other "higher level" areas involved in the assessment process. It is likely that opportunities to leverage the findings for broader impact may be identified at these higher levels since they will have a broader view of the university assessment efforts relating to student learning. The overall process will be coordinated by the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and the IEC.
2. Saint Joseph's University Institutional Level

INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

1.6 Student Learning Outcomes

Introduction. In Spring 2016, the SJU Ad Hoc Committee on Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (hereafter “Committee”) reported on the work to the University Council. The Committee was established by then-Provost Reichard during the Fall 2015 semester and its charge was charged that was acknowledged by the University Council at the November 2015 Council meeting.

The Committee is expected to deliver has delivered four items to the General Education Oversight Committee, the University Council, and the Provost’s Council: (1) a list of undergraduate-level learning outcomes; (2) a matrix demonstrating how undergraduate students will achieve those outcomes through SJU undergraduate programs; (3) a list of graduate-level learning outcomes; and, (4) a matrix demonstrating how graduate students will achieve those outcomes through SJU graduate programs. Today we submit We submitted final drafts of the first three of the above items and a plan for completing the last item.

With respect to item two (2), the charge specifically recommends a matrix or other diagrammatic tool connecting the institutional learning outcomes to the particular learning objectives of undergraduate programs. What we submit today for item two organizes the institutional outcomes first in terms of undergraduate curricular requirements... The essential concern is to show how all students will in fact achieve the institutional outcomes and the matrix we submit addresses this concern by identifying the relevant requirements. We also list representative GEP learning objectives and/or Student Life learning objectives for all six outcomes. If a more complete map including more (or even all) undergraduate learning objectives is desired, it should be completed next year by particular programs and departments and by the General Education Program Oversight (GEPO) Committee. The GEPO needs to review and reduce the existing 85-90 course-level GEP learning objectives. Once a shorter list of course-level GEP learning objectives is finalized by the GEPO, that shorter list of objectives should be linked to the institutional learning outcomes, which may replace the existing overarching GEP “goals”. The General Education Program assessment map and schedule should be adjusted accordingly by the GEP Assessment Committee.
With respect to item four (4), our proposal is as follows: Committee co-Chairs Wenjun Chi and Jim Boettcher should work with graduate program directors next fall to finalize a matrix linking graduate-level institutional outcomes to more specific graduate-level learning objectives.

1.6.1 Student Learning Outcomes. SJU Ad Hoc Committee on Institutional Student Learning Outcomes Proposed Undergraduate (UG) and Graduate (GR) SLOs

1. Communication (UG and GR)

**UG:** Students will communicate effectively through written and oral modes of expression across academic, professional, and social contexts using appropriate technology.

**GR:** Students will communicate effectively using appropriate technology.

2. Critical Thinking and Inquiry (UG and GR)

*Students will think critically and construct reasoned arguments to support their positions using skills appropriate to the context, such as deductive reasoning, scientific inquiry, quantitative reasoning, aesthetic judgment, or critical examination of form, style, content and meaning.*

3. Ethics, Social Justice, and Ignatian Values (UG and GR)

**UG:** Students will assess and respond to ethical and social justice issues informed by Ignatian values and other theoretical frameworks.

**GR:** Students will assess and respond to ethical and social justice issues informed by Ignatian values.

4. Diversity (UG)

*Students will engage respectfully, in a local and global context, with diverse human beliefs, abilities, experiences, identities, or cultures.*
5. Discipline or Program Specific Competencies (UG and GR)

Students will acquire the essential knowledge and skills to succeed and make well-reasoned judgments personally, professionally, and in their chosen area(s) of study.

6. Jesuit Intellectual Tradition Cultural Legacies (UG)

Students will examine forces that have shaped the world they have inherited through instruction in the Ignatian educational pedagogical tradition which includes the study of the humanities, philosophy, theology, history, and the other humanities, mathematics, history, and the natural and social sciences.

GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

1.7 General Education Program. The General Education Program (GEP) is central to the University’s Jesuit mission, providing all students with the broad knowledge, essential skills, appreciation of diversity, and ethically informed perspective needed by those who would aspire to be “men and women for others.” A full statement of GEP goals and objectives, developed originally by an ad hoc task force comprising faculty and administrators, is included below. This statement is maintained and promulgated by the University-level GEP Oversight and Assessment Committees, which are responsible for any necessary revisions. The GEP Assessment Committee is also responsible for maintaining and promulgating GEP curricular maps and assessment schedules. GEP goals and objectives are a reflection of the stated purposes and course descriptions and rationales in the SJU Comprehensive Curriculum Review Final Report (2008). These goals and objectives are also fully consistent with – indeed, they directly undergird – the certification of courses for general education credit. Five different University-wide certification committees are responsible for certifying courses in various GEP areas. Each publicizes certification standards that are based on GEP goals and objectives:

http://www.sju.edu/int/academics/resources/gep/certification.html

Outside of these five certification areas, individual academic departments are responsible for the approval of all other GEP courses. In every case, departments must develop either certification criteria or formal departmental interpretations of their respective GEP areas, and these criteria and interpretations should also be based directly on the statement of GEP goals and objectives. This information is reviewed and recorded by the GEP Oversight Committee.
Ten overarching GEP learning goals apply to all undergraduate students, though in a few cases, Professional and Liberals Studies students and Haub Degree Completion students pursue somewhat different learning objectives under these same goals. These differences in learning objectives, noted below, reflect several differences in the curricular requirements of the Undergraduate Day GEP as compared to the PLS/HDC GEP.

**Statement of GEP Goals and Objectives before 2016-17:**

**Goal 1:** Demonstrate foundational knowledge of Western Civilization and its dynamic interactions with other cultures.

**Moral Foundations:**

- Students will understand the various ways in which agents, actions, and social practices are evaluated from the moral point of view, as this has been articulated in major Western ethical theories.

**Faith, Justice, and the Catholic Tradition / Introduction to New Testament (PLS/HDC only):**

- Students will acquire sufficient knowledge of the relevant social, cultural and intellectual contexts to be able to read primary texts, including authoritative texts such as the Bible, within their historical contexts.

**Texts and contexts:**

- Students will become familiar with the development of literary genres and conventions within the Western literary tradition.

**Forging the Modern World:**

- Students will gain substantive knowledge about complex human institutions and relationships, how these changed over time, and why.
- Students will learn about choices made by past societies and individuals and the implications of those choices for the present.
- Students will learn how to interpret texts and traditions in their historical, social, and cultural contexts.

**Non-native language course:**

- Students will demonstrate knowledge about the civilization whose language is under study.

**Goal 2:** Think critically, conduct inquiry, analyze problems qualitatively or quantitatively and formulate creative responses.

**Moral Foundations**
• Students will demonstrate an understanding of the complexity of terms typically used in moral discourse.
• Students will be able to identify, analyze, evaluate, and formulate arguments.

Faith, Justice, and the Catholic Tradition / Introduction to New Testament (PLS/HDC only):

• Students will be able to articulate and critically evaluate the ways in which basic Christian doctrines inform and regulate one another.

Texts & Contexts:

• Students will learn how to identify and examine the formal qualities of literary works in order to discern and formulate opinions about the meaning or significance of the work.

Forging the Modern World:

• Students will be able to distinguish among various sources of information and to identify sources of conflict arising from allocation of material resources or ideological differences.

First Year Seminar / Adult Learning Seminar (PLS/HDC):

• Students will engage in structured investigation of discipline-specific topics and be able to navigate the University library system and/or the Internet to accurately use and cite materials in written work.

Faith and Reason:

• Students will be able to use theoretical frameworks that enable them to analyze and evaluate challenges such as these: the nature of faith and its relationship to rationality; the origins and veracity of religious faith claims; the internal logical coherence of theism or of theological doctrines associated with a particular theistic religion; the compatibility of religious belief and various scientific methods of inquiry; the experience of religious diversity; the problem of evil.

Art/Lit/Music, Theatre, Film:

• Students will learn how to identify and examine the formal qualities of works of art or literature in order to discern and formulate opinions about the meaning or significance of the work.

Math Beauty:

• Students will be able to apply analytical reasoning and logical arguments to solve mathematical problems and prove mathematical statements.

Natural Science:

• Students will be able to evaluate scientific evidence within the context of at least one scientific discipline.
• Students will be able to evaluate scientific events relevant to the GEP science course they have taken.

Social-Behavioral Science:

• Students will be able to analyze explanations of human and/or animal behavior in one or more of its diverse manifestations in individuals, groups, societies, institutions, or systems.

Religious Difference:

• Students will apply the principles of critical reflection to the analysis of at least one non-
Christian religion.

**Goal 3: Communicate effectively.**

**Moral Foundations:**

- Students will express with precision and accuracy the dominant ethical theories in the Western tradition, as well as meet high standards of clarity in their use of moral terms and concepts.

**Forging the Modern World:**

- Students will use faculty and/or peer feedback to improve the quality of their written assignments, oral participation, and formal speaking.

**First Year Seminar / Adult Learning Seminar (PLS/HDC):**

- Students will contribute meaningfully to in-class oral discussion.
- Students will communicate effectively through individual/small group presentations or debates, enhanced by technology.
- Students will communicate effectively using a variety of written forms.

**Math Beauty:**

- Students will interpret and formulate precise mathematical or technical statements.

**Natural Science:**

- Students will correctly use basic scientific terminology in writing and speaking.

**Non-native Language:**

- Students will communicate at an appropriate level of proficiency and creativity in the target language in a variety of modes (interpersonal, presentational, and interpretive).
- Students will read and interpret authentic target-language documents.

**Linguistics (PLS/HDC) only):**

- Students will communicate effectively in oral presentations and class discussions of linguistics related topics.

**Craft of Language:**

- Students will develop an understanding of revision and practice editing skills by examining their own writing and the writing of their peers.
- Students will learn to recognize and use various methods of rhetorical development including (but not limited to) narrative, exposition, analysis, and argument.

**Writing Intensive:**

Students will understand and apply invention strategies, consider and apply diverse organizational options, and reflect on stylistic choices in developing a series of writing projects.
- Students will understand and apply the writing conventions of a discipline.
- Students will understand apply the techniques of effective revision.
Goal 4: Reflect critically on their own beliefs and values as well as those of others and to discuss respectfully religious, social, and cultural difference.

Faith, Justice & the Catholic Tradition:

- Students will understand the Roman Catholic doctrine of conscience and the levels of teaching authority within the Catholic Church
- Students will discuss implications of the doctrine conscience for Catholic belief and practice.
- Students will recognize and discuss examples of the ways in which Christianity is a tradition that developed over time, within specific contexts, and in response to particular social, cultural, and religious needs.

Forging the Modern World:

- Students will understand how various individuals and societies have striven to make sense of their worlds, to maximize their resources, and to wrestle with issues of their own identities.

Non-native Language:

- Students will be able to articulate and explain major similarities and differences between their native culture(s) and the target culture(s), including ideas and behaviors, cultural assumptions and sociolinguistic realities.

Social Behavioral Science:

- Students will be able to synthesize and integrate information and ideas within a social science framework so as to see how social forces, such as race, class, gender, and age, influence social interactions and behavior.

Religious Difference:

- Students will apply the principles of critical reflection to the analysis of at least one non-Christian religion
- Students will recognize and discuss examples of the impact of historical, political, and cultural contexts on the teachings, sacred texts, and various manifestations of at least one non-Christian religious tradition.
- Students will discuss the implications of living in a religiously diverse world for the other disciplines they study and the career choices they will consider.

Diversity:

- Students will scrutinize their assumptions about identity and difference.
- Students will examine issues of subordination and privilege in their own and others’ lives.
- Students will understand the complex, dynamic, and dialectical nature of culture and the political, historical, and economic conditions that shape it.
- Students will investigate patterns of oppression and resistance among particular cultural groups.
- Students will develop understandings about the experiences and contributions (political, social, economic, etc.) of particular cultural communities that have been systematically marginalized.
- Students will analyze the construction and maintenance of social categories and the material, political, economic, social, and ethical consequences of these identities.
Non-Western Area Studies:

- Students will be able to describe and discuss in depth the cultural content and distinctive features of one country or one region outside of North America and Europe from the perspective of its own people(s).

Goal 5: Demonstrate an understanding of the relationship of faith and reason from different theoretical perspectives.

Faith and Reason:

- Students will be able to discuss the complexity of defining concepts such as ‘reason,’ ‘rationality,’ ‘faith,’ ‘religious belief,’ and ‘science.’
- Students will be able to explain and juxtapose multiple understandings of ‘faith’ and ‘reason.’
- Students will be able to identify and explain some of the epistemological issues that arise in understanding religious belief and the nature of reason.
- Students will be able to use theoretical frameworks that enable them to analyze and evaluate challenges such as these: the nature of faith and its relationship to rationality; the origins and veracity of religious faith claims; the internal logical coherence of theism or of theological doctrines associated with a particular theistic religion; the compatibility of religious belief and various scientific methods of inquiry; the experience of religious diversity; the problem of evil.
- Students will be able to explain and evaluate at least one intellectual theory or tradition that demonstrates consistency or complementarity between human reason and religious belief.

Goal 6: Understand and employ a theoretically informed ethical perspective, which provides the foundation for a transforming commitment to social justice, animated by belief in the dignity and freedom of the human person.

Moral Foundations:

- Students will be able to recognize moral issues and the moral point of view as distinguished from prudential, legal, or economic points of view.
- Students will be able to identify and explain major concepts and theories used in moral reasoning.
- Students will be able to construct and critically evaluate moral arguments by employing major moral concepts and theories.
- Students will be prepared to participate intelligently in moral debate about current issues, and be prepared for more specialized ethics intensive courses.

Faith, Justice and the Catholic Tradition:

- Students will be able to articulate some of the implications of such doctrines as God, human person, Christ, salvation, sacraments and Church for social justice thought and practice.
• Students will understand central Catholic ethical concepts and be able to apply them to situations in the contemporary world.

**Philosophical Anthropology:**

• Students will be able to identify features of persons that make them agents, and thus beings with moral responsibilities and political liberties.
• Students will understand why the concept of personhood is foundational in the philosophical tradition that is distinctive of Jesuit Catholic higher education.

**Ethics Intensive:**

• Students will be able to critically examine the often unspoken and unarticulated moral assumptions and values that underlie subject content and/or disciplinary methods.
• Students will be able to draw explicit connections between moral principles and issues or cases in a particular discipline or field, and thus will be able to engage in explicit and critical evaluation of those issues or cases.
• Students will demonstrate the intellectual tools necessary to make well-grounded and informed decisions and to participate in advanced discussions about moral issues.

**Goal 7:** Analyze individual, institutional, and societal behavior.

**Social Behavioral Science:**

• Students will understand and be able to explain the techniques and methods used to gain knowledge of animal and/or human behavior in one or more of its diverse manifestations in individuals, groups, societies, institutions, or systems.
• Students will be able to apply social scientific knowledge of animal and/or human behavior to respond creatively to social issues and problems.

**Diversity:**

• Students will understand the complex, dynamic, and dialectical nature of culture and the political, historical, and economic conditions that shape it.
• Students will be able to recognize and examine the roles of subordination and privilege in their own and others’ lives.
• Students will investigate patterns of oppression and resistance among particular cultural groups.
• Students will describe and analyze issues of subordination and privilege, oppression and resistance in their own lives and the lives of other cultural groups.
• Students will be able to identify the contributions (political, social, economic, etc) of particular cultural communities that have been systematically marginalized.

**Globalization:**

• Students will critically analyze past and current theoretical debates over political and economic interdependence, democratization, and the evolution of capitalism, focusing upon the interaction and interdependence of contemporary global actors.
• Students will critically analyze contemporary ethical and policy debates over tensions between hegemonic power, global interdependence, trade, state autonomy, environmental concerns and the rights of individuals.
Goal 8: Understand and employ important concepts and methods in mathematics.

Math Beauty:
- Students will explain some important concepts and methods in mathematics, such as the difference between conjectures, theorems, examples and proofs, and understand how each is used in mathematics.
- Students will apply analytical reasoning and logical arguments to solve mathematical problems and prove mathematical statements.

Mathematics (PLS/HDC only):
- Students will develop computational proficiency.
- Students will identify appropriate models and techniques to solve problems.

Goal 9: Understand the scientific worldview and apply methods of scientific inquiry.

Natural Science:
- Students will be able to evaluate scientific events relevant to the GEP science course they have taken.
- Students will be able to interpret graphical data.
- Students will evaluate scientific evidence within the context of at least one scientific discipline.
- Students will understand how scientific knowledge is evaluated and communicated.
- Students will correctly use basic scientific terminology in writing and speaking.
- Students will demonstrate familiarity with basic laboratory skills and equipment.

Social Behavioral Science:
- Students will be able to apply scientific methodology to the study of animal and/or human behavior in one or more of its diverse manifestations in individuals, groups, societies, institutions, or systems.

Goal 10: Appreciate beauty and creativity in their various forms.

Art/Lit/Music, Theatre, Film:
- Students will demonstrate knowledge of particular artists, the qualities of their work, and lasting traditions in literature or the arts.
- Students will be able to identify and assess the formal qualities of works of art and/or express them creatively in their own work.

Natural Science:
- Students will identify and comprehend the aesthetic dimension of one or more contemporary scientific discoveries.
1.7.1 GEP Assessment Schedules. GEP student learning goals are assessed according to a four-year cycle, with more widely shared goals assessed each academic year and other goals assessed at least twice during each four-year cycle. Assessment projects target specific learning objectives under the relevant goals. Moreover, every GEP curricular area should be assessed at least once during the four-year cycle. Adjustment to the assessment schedules are made by the GEP Assessment Committee. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is responsible for minimizing redundancies in assessment efforts by coordinating GEP assessment projects with other program-level assessments whenever possible, recommending corresponding scheduling changes for a more efficient assessment process.

Undergraduate Day GEP Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1</td>
<td>HIS 154</td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td>HIS 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2</td>
<td>First Year Seminar</td>
<td>First Year Seminar</td>
<td>First Year Seminar</td>
<td>First Year Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3</td>
<td>Non-Native Language</td>
<td>Writing Intensive</td>
<td>ENG 101</td>
<td>First Year Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5</td>
<td>Faith and Reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faith and Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 6</td>
<td>PHL 154</td>
<td>PHL 154</td>
<td>Philosophical Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 7</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 8</td>
<td>Math Beauty</td>
<td>Math Beauty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 9</td>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PLS / HDC GEP Schedule

(Note: The three overlay requirements are being phased in for the PLS/HDC GEP.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1</td>
<td>HIS 154</td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td>HIS 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 102</td>
<td>THE 154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2</td>
<td>Adult Learning Seminar</td>
<td>Adult Learning Seminar</td>
<td>Adult Learning Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHL 154</td>
<td>PHL 154</td>
<td>Summative - Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seniors – Crit. Thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3</td>
<td>Non-Native Language</td>
<td>ENG 101</td>
<td>ENG 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Writing Intensive (phased)</em></td>
<td>Adult Learning Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Native Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Difference</td>
<td>Religious Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faith and Reason</td>
<td>Faith and Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 6</td>
<td>PHL 154</td>
<td>PHL 154</td>
<td>Philosophical Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE 154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 9</td>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.7.2 GEP Assessment Procedures. Particular GEP assessment projects are planned and administered by departments, programs, and certification committees – these are the various agents of GEP assessment. Assessment plans are due to IEC on March 31. Each assessment agent must appoint a faculty member responsible for the logistics of its assessment project. This faculty member corresponds with a member of the GEP Assessment Committee who acts as a liaison and resource person for the assessment project. Assessment agents must also identify the learning objectives to be assessed (consistent with the GEP Schedule), develop and communicate an assessment plan that includes at least one direct measure, administer the assessment, discuss and evaluate its results, formulate an action plan, and report all results to the GEP Assessment Committee liaison. Final assessment reports (March 31) are made using the SJU Assessment Report template.

The GEP Assessment Committee provides an annual report summarizing and evaluating all academic-year GEP assessment results. This report must be presented to the Provost and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee May 15 of each year. As part of this report, the GEP Assessment Committee should include an evaluation of assessment methods, instruments, and procedures, recommending changes as needed for improving the assessment process. Membership and replacement procedures for the GEP Assessment Committee are determined by the mandate establishing the permanent GEP committees, with modifications approved by University Council and/or the GEP Oversight Committee (Appendix X).

1.7.3 GEP Programmatic Review. GEP assessment results should directly inform periodic programmatic review of the GEP. Programmatic review includes but is not limited to the assessment of student learning outcomes. It is an evaluation of the curriculum as a whole and in its various parts. The GEP Oversight and Assessment Committees are jointly responsible for carrying out GEP programmatic review. The first programmatic review of the GEP, currently under way in the 2014-2015 academic year, follows the first four-year cycle of the GEP and is based on significant planning and agenda setting during the 2013-2014 academic year. Six working groups are studying and completing reports on the following issues: 1) curricular structure, goals, and student learning outcomes, 2) course certification procedures, 3) the PLS/HDC GEP, 4) the GEP Integrative Learning Component, 5) policy decisions made by the GEP Oversight Committee, and 6) data analysis of GEP costs, effects on departmental scheduling, and impact on student curricular choices (e.g., double majors and minors). A final GEP programmatic review report will be presented to the Provost and Faculty Senate by May 1, 2016.
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

1.8 CAS Assessment of Student Learning Overview. The College of Arts & Sciences LOA (learning outcome assessment) program is designed to inform faculty, chairs, program directors, administrators, and external audiences about the attainment of the student learning goals that have been developed for each academic program (majors, minors, certificates, associate degrees, masters and doctoral programs) in the college. This information is used internally for a) continuous program improvement by informing the faculty and staff involved in the program about the students' success in the various areas, b) for program evaluation and c) for resource allocation decisions made by the chairs, directors, the Dean of the College, the Provost of the University, and relevant budget and policy committees. It is also provided to external organizations involved in the accreditation of programs, government agencies involved in certification and other reviews, and to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education which serves as the accrediting body for the University.

Information obtained through the assessment process is not used as a direct evaluation of faculty performance, nor is it used in a punitive fashion in terms of resource allocation and other support decisions in cases where programs identify legitimate student learning issues and then take prompt and appropriate steps to address these issues. Programs that do not respond to issues identified through the LOA process will be asked to explain why they have not done so and, in such cases, this information may be used by the Dean and Provost in making subsequent decisions regarding resource allocation.

1.8.1 Methodology. Each major, minor, certificate, associate degree program, masters and doctoral program is required to articulate a set of learning goals and measurable outcomes (SLOs) which are published in the academic catalog. These statements of learning goals and outcomes are reviewed by the relevant associate dean who oversees each program, and by the CAS Planning and Assessment Committee (PAC). Each major, minor, certificate, associate degree program, masters and doctoral program is also required to set out a 3-5 year plan demonstrating that all program SLO’s can and will be assessed within this time frame. Major, minor and certificate programs sharing same or similar program learning outcomes can assess and submit report as one group.

The SLOs are to be treated as "living documents" and are to be reviewed by all of the faculty and staff involved in the program at the end of a complete cycle of assessment (every 3-5 years). Modifications to programmatic SLOs may also result from assessments as part of the action decisions. Any modifications are to be submitted to the relevant Associate Dean and are subject to the review process described above.

Program SLOs are to be mapped to identified priorities within the University strategic Plan as well as to the University educational outcomes appropriate to undergraduate or graduate programs. These latter reflect the minimum outcomes which all SJU graduates are expected to meet. This mapping indicates where and how major and minor programs contribute to enabling students to meet these goals.
Each major, minor, certificate, associate degree program, masters and doctoral program is also required to complete a curriculum map which specifies which courses in the program curriculum enable students to meet which measurable program outcomes. This mapping will be reviewed by the program at the end of each complete cycle of assessment (every 3-5 years).

Each program is required to submit a LOA Report and Plan twice each academic year. A report on the SLO assessments conducted during the prior Intersession, Spring, and Summer terms, and plans for the upcoming Intersession and Spring term program assessments are due October 15 of each year. A report on the SLO assessments conducted each Fall semester and plans for the upcoming Summer and Fall program assessments are due March 31 of each year.

These reports and plans are to be submitted to cas_assess@sju.edu and will be reviewed by the relevant associate deans, PAC, and the IEC. The associate deans will check the completeness of the report, take note of assessment results that are relevant to their work, and review the assessment plans to ensure that programs are on track with the timeline for completion of their 3-5 year assessment cycle. PAC will review the reported assessment results, collating information relevant to the planning cycle of the college and university, and will report out to the College Council and the Dean’s office. The IEC will assess the assessments with respect to methods, means, and quality of the assessments, and work to improve the overall assessment process of the college and university.

Programs are asked to conduct assessments in accord with best practices. Multiple means of assessment must be used in each course/section being assessed and at least one of the means used must be a direct measure of student outcome achievement. Most programs will be using at least two direct measures for each assessment being conducted. An appropriate set of courses or an appropriate and randomized subset of courses or students will be assessed. Course and assignment grades are not acceptable measures in and of themselves unless these grades clearly reflect only an assessment of student achievement of the singular outcome being assessed. Most grades do not disaggregate differing components of student achievement, and therefore do not speak directly to student strength and weakness on the particular outcome for which data is being sought. Rubrics used for grading student work may, however, be appropriate tools for collecting such data because these allow the disaggregation of various skills or content knowledge achievements which flow into a particular assignment grade.

Once assessment data is collected and collated, programs are asked to share this information with all relevant faculty and staff (including adjunct and visiting faculty members) and to engage in a broad conversation about the actions to be taken in light of the findings. Decisions made during these discussions are reported as Resource allocation/reallocation decisions on the standard report form.

1.8.2 Annual Timeline

- Revision and drafting of SLO statements
The timeline for revision of existing SLOs and the drafting of SLO statements for new or modified programs is primarily driven by the SJU academic catalog revision timeline. Revised or new SLO statements are to be submitted to the relevant associate dean well in advance of the catalog revision process (ideally at least one month prior to the start of the process) to allow time for review by PAC and the associate dean, feedback to the program and, if necessary revision of the SLOs in response to that feedback. In cases where there is an urgent need to revise the SLOs and the process is out of sequence with the catalog revision timeline, the final SLO statements will be posted on the SJU Assessment web site, on program web pages and in other appropriate areas to ensure that students have access to that information.

- **SLO Assessment Process**
  A report on the SLO assessments conducted during the prior Intersession, Spring, and Summer terms, and plans for the upcoming Intersession and Spring term program assessments are due October 15 of each year. A report on the SLO assessments conducted each Fall semester and plans for the upcoming Summer and Fall program assessments are due March 31 of each year. The timing of the report due dates reflects the need to allow for at least one regularly-scheduled department faculty meeting to be held after the semester in which the assessment was conducted so that the findings and action plans can be discussed. Interdisciplinary, graduate and PLS programs will follow the same dates but given the range of departments from which the relevant faculty may be drawn, they may conduct these conversations via email or in meetings scheduled outside of the normal department meeting time frames.

  PAC will review the reported assessment results, collating information relevant to the planning cycle of the college and university, and will report out to the College Council and the Dean’s office. PAC will report out on the assessment results and resource allocation decisions in the October 15 LOA reports by the February meeting of College Council. PAC will supply report out on assessment results and resource allocation decisions in the March 30 LOA reports by June 15 so that these results can be taken into account by the Dean in the College of Arts and Sciences Annual Report. A preliminary draft of this report is due July 15. These results will be reported out to the college at the first College Council meeting in the Fall semester.

**1.8.3 Uses of Assessment Information.** The primary function of the SLO Assessment process is to provide faculty and staff involved in the delivery of the program with information needed for continuous programmatic improvement. As such, the primary users of the information obtained will be the faculty and staff in the relevant program.

The information will also be used for planning, resource and other decision-making issues by the Dean of CAS and by the CAS PAC, which is charged with advising the Dean in planning issues for the college. The Dean of CAS will use the information in the development of the CAS Annual Report which is provided to the Provost and for updating and revising the CAS Strategic Plan.
Issues identified through the LOA process may reveal the need for additional support for particular programs. For example, if assessment results indicate that a program is lacking the personnel or other resources needed for students to attain specific learning objectives and these objectives are reasonable and appropriate to the program and comport with the CAS and University mission and strategic plan, then that program may be identified as a priority for additional resourcing. While the LOA process is not intended to be used in any punitive fashion, programs that fail to comply with the LOA requirements, or that fail to take reasonable and appropriate steps to address issues identified by the LOA process in a timely fashion, may be considered lower priority areas in terms of resource allocation. LOA information will also serve an important role in the assessment of the effectiveness of new or revised academic programs and will be used in their review as mandated by the University Council or other relevant governance bodies.

Information from the LOA process, including SLO statements, SLO assessment plans and reports, will be shared with faculty and other appropriate internal constituencies through the SJU Assessment web site located in Blackboard Learn. LOA information will also be used in the periodic program review process and will be shared with external reviewers. It will also be made available, as needed, to external accrediting and certification bodies, including the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, as well as any government bodies that have a legitimate need for access to this information, such as the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

1.8.4 LOA Administration. The primary responsibility for oversight of the LOA process will rest with the CAS Dean's Office. The Dean of CAS will appoint an individual or group to oversee the process, periodically review the mechanisms, obtain feedback from faculty and other constituencies regarding the effectiveness of the process and the relevant policies, and ensure compliance by academic programs with the LOA requirements and timelines. The relevant associate deans and the PAC are also charged with providing timely and appropriate feedback to academic programs on their assessment plans and reports.

The PAC will serve as an advisory and oversight body within the CAS for the LOA process. They will review new or revised SLO statements and provide feedback. PAC will review all SLO reports and collate resource reallocation decisions in summary form to the Dean and the College Council. They will note any repeating themes or issues with assessment projects or reports. PAC also has the authority to examine any and all assessment documents, reports, policies and procedures and make recommendations to the Dean. One member of the Dean's Office will serve as a member of PAC, ex officio, to provide a direct linkage between PAC and the Dean's Office. PAC may also request to meet directly with the Dean of CAS at any time.

The Dean of CAS will ensure that one of the members of the Dean's Office who is involved with the LOA process administration also reports to other bodies as appropriate (i.e. the Institutional Effectiveness Committee). Typically this will be done by ensuring that the relevant person or persons are appointed to those bodies.
The individual or group administering the LOA process in the CAS Dean’s Office will also work with the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Research, and other offices as necessary, to ensure that information is effectively shared and that communication occurs in both directions. As new or revised university-wide assessment policies and plans are developed by bodies such as the IEC, the individual/group administering the SLO ASSESSMENT process in CAS will work to ensure that all policies and practices are consistent with other university wide policies and processes.
HAUB SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

1.9 Haub School of Business (HSB) Assurance of Learning (AOL) Program

Overview. The HSB AOL program is anchored by the HSB core value of academic excellence, the commitment to the Jesuit ideal of the *Magis* or the more, always striving to become better, and the HSB mission statement: “We seek excellence in business education that offers *breadth* in terms of broad-based coverage of business concepts and skills, *depth* through focus on specific industries and professions, and *wholeness* via education of men and women in service with and for others in accordance with the Ignatian tradition.” Academic integrity is the cornerstone of our approach to teaching, an approach that emphasizes excellence in teaching and seeks rigor and student engagement. The HSB mission of providing educational programs with breadth, depth and wholeness components fits with the HSB and the University visions and is the blueprint for the HSB strategic plan.

The HSB delivers undergraduate, professional MBA, Executive MBA, and specialized graduate programs. Several of these are delivered in both the traditional classroom and online delivery methods. Additionally, the undergraduate program maintains 15 majors.

1.9.1 Involvement: The AOL process is integral in HSB. As such various entities are involved in assessments including departments, various committees, directors, course coordinators, alumni group, and industry boards.

1.9.1.1 AOL Committee: The Assurance of Learning (AOL) Committee serves as the central organization that directs and oversees the business school’s AOL methodology. The AOL Committee was established in 2003 and has evolved over time to become the driving force for assessment in the HSB, fostering a culture of assessment and continuous improvement.

The AOL Committee is composed of at least one faculty member from each department, and it is chaired by a faculty member who is provided with a one-course release per semester and a small stipend in recognition of the heavy time commitment expected of this position. Administrative assistant support is also provided by the Office of the Dean as required. The Chair is selected by the HSB Dean and is designated as the AOL Coordinator for HSB. The committee is responsible for (1) monitoring and facilitating the development of program objectives, rubrics, metrics, and methods for assessing student achievement for each learning objective, and (2) disseminating assessment results to all stakeholders and ensuring that these results are utilized for continuous improvement. In order to ensure that assessment results are disseminated to all appropriate stakeholders and that the continuous
improvement loop is closed, the AOL Committee developed and implemented a model for the AOL process.

The AOL Committee also serves as the central repository of all HSB assessment results. An on-line HSB AOL section has been created to store and disseminate accreditation standards, assessment information, forms, reports, and results. Housed in the SJU Assessment website on the university-wide Blackboard LMS, this section contains all the schedules and materials needed by faculty members to manage their AOL responsibilities. The committee provides an annual summary of HSB assessment results on March 31 of each year covering the prior calendar year. The content includes an evaluation of assessment methods, instruments, and procedures, as well as changes noted for improving the assessment process. This summary is then utilized by the Office of the Dean in the annual reporting process. Additionally, reports on AOL activities are provided by the AOL Committee, departments, or individual faculty members at each monthly HSB faculty meeting on department or program level AOL results. Lastly, the AOL Director is a member of the HSB Executive Committee and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee in order to insure coordination of the HSB AOL processes with the university-wide assessment process.

1.9.1.2 Graduate and Undergraduate Programs Committees: In addition to the AOL committee, HSB also has a committee for both undergraduate and graduate programs. These program committees are charged with reviewing and assisting with AOL process for the respective programs. As necessary, these program committees provide reports and information to the HSB Executive Committee and HSB college council.

1.9.1.3 Advisory Boards. The role of the advisory boards is to assist the program directors in identifying potential areas in the curriculum that are in need of innovation and change due to market trends. In addition to program-level advisory boards, each department has or is developing an advisory board. Consistent with the program advisory boards, the departmental advisory board’s major objective is to provide guidance and insight to improve the department. For example, the Department of Accounting has an established, structured outcome assessment process in place. An integral part of the assessment process includes consultation with the Accounting Advisory Board, the Sutula Chair Founders, annual alumni surveys, and broad-based stakeholder meetings. The Accounting Advisory Board is comprised predominately, but not totally, of SJU graduates from all areas of the accounting profession including large international/national industry/service firms, local/regional industry/service firms, and governmental non-for-profit units. The Accounting Department also reviews the surveys of undergraduate accounting graduates each year and the department reviews the annual employment survey published by the Career Development Center. Further, the Accounting Department conducts stakeholder meetings. These stakeholder meetings include participation by a diverse population of interested parties and are held to discuss topics relevant to the accounting program. Many of the
changes in the Accounting Department’s programs were initiated through the stakeholder meeting process. An additional element in stakeholder analysis and monitoring is the Haub School Dean’s Board of Visitors. The Board of Visitors provides another perspective when evaluating programming.

1.9.2 The AOL process Figure 1 illustrates the flow of assessment process in the HSB, starting with the development of learning objectives and culminating with continuous improvements. The faculty within the departments, the department chairs, the AOL Committee, the undergraduate and graduate programs committees, and the Dean all play key roles in ensuring the success of the process. Assessment is required of all learning objectives at least twice within a five-year period, although many programs have opted to measure key objectives on a yearly cycle.

Figure 1: Flow of the AOL Assessment Process
In HSB all objectives are measured by at least one direct measure. In addition, HSB recognizes the value of indirect measurements of learnings. Undergraduate indirect measures are provided by alumni and employer surveys conducted by the SJU Career Development Center. In the MBA program, an exit survey developed by a consortium of MBA programs serves as an indirect measure. National rankings surveys, student comments, and a variety of external input are also considered in curriculum management.
STUDENT LIFE

1.10 Transformative Learning Goals (Division of Student Life). Prior to the start of the 2009-2010 academic year, the Transformative Learning Goals (TLG) and respective objectives were identified.

http://www.sju.edu/int/studentlife/tlg/

These learning outcomes were formulated through referencing Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) and Frameworks for Assessment of Learning and Developmental Outcomes and focusing on the mission of the University. In addition, representatives from the University provided feedback (i.e., infused Jesuit ideals), and adjustments were made accordingly. At the heart of the TLGs are Ignatian values and the University’s Jesuit mission, reflected in the mission statement of Student Life:

Committed to our Catholic Jesuit tradition and guided by our Ignatian values, we empower our students to create a supportive and transformative educational experience. We provide challenging opportunities for the holistic development of students so that they may become servant leaders who discern goals, focus on social justice, appreciate diversity and lead lives of faith and purpose.

The Division of Student Life includes the following areas: Adult Student Life; Campus Recreation; Career Development; Center for International Programs; Community Standards; Counseling and Psychological Services; Educational Support Services for Student Athletes; Inclusion and Diversity; Information Systems for Student Life; Learning Resources; Public Safety and Security; Residence Life; Services for Students with Disabilities; Student Health; Student Leadership and Activities; Student Outreach and Support; Student Success and First Year Experience.

The five TLGs are a framework for what the Division of Student Life expects students to learn, develop, and experience during their time at the University; they offer outcomes-based co-curricular experiences to which multiple departments contribute. They also are a mechanism for implementing a collaborative, goal-centered approach to student and program development within extracurricular aspects of SJU.

Ultimately, the TLGs are relevant to all who engage students at the University, and for this reason they were adopted and incorporated as the “Transformative Student Experience” into the previous ten year institutional strategic plan, Plan 2020 as well as current institutional strategic plan, Achieving the Magis. Although TLG programming has primarily been a function of the Division of Student Life to date, the goal is to fully integrate them into all aspects of a student experience.
A summary of each goal is provided below and is accompanied by specific objectives, which will serve to complement and inform the division’s strategic planning, programming, service delivery and assessment initiatives.

1. **Develop Faith and Spiritual Awareness**

*Inspired by the example of Saint Ignatius of Loyola, we help students discern God’s presence in their lives and encourage them to become persons they feel called to be. As the first Jesuits did more than 450 years ago, we meet students where they are in their spiritual journeys and help them explore the role of faith and spirituality in their lives.*

Objectives:

a. Students will articulate what it means to be educated at a Jesuit institution.

b. Students will be men and women who experience a “faith that does justice.”

c. Students will engage in a critical exploration of their faith/spirituality.

d. Students will recognize the impact their behaviors and actions have on those around them in light of the moral imperative, “Love one another, as I have loved you.”

e. Students will develop the ability to express their faith/spirituality.

2. **Appreciate Diversity**

*Finding God in all things means recognizing we are all made in God’s image and likeness and are therefore inherently good people. To this end, our students must challenge racism, strive for justice and recognize their roles and responsibilities within a pluralistic and global society.*

Objectives:

a. Students will interact with people different than themselves in order to appreciate their own identity/culture and the identity/culture of others.

b. Students will develop an ability to acknowledge and confront barriers to equality and inclusiveness.

c. Students will seek out and develop an appreciation of art, music, and forms of expression by those different from themselves.

d. Students will understand the interconnectedness of societies worldwide.

e. Students will articulate the advantages and impact of a diverse society.

3. **Realize a Satisfying and Productive Lifestyle**

*Through our commitment to Cura Personalis, our students need the ability to find balance in all areas of their lives in order to reach their full potential. In developing a thoughtful approach to life, students can begin making wise decisions, learning from their successes and mistakes and making better future judgments.*

Objectives:

a. Students will develop meaningful, lasting relationships.

b. Students will learn strategies to achieve life balance.

c. Students will care for themselves in a healthy and holistic manner.

d. Students will develop proactive strategies in dealing with challenges.
e. Students will initiate a career search or seek advanced education.

4. **Practice Servant Leadership focused on Social Justice**

   *St. Luke said, “Of those to whom much is given, much is expected.” (Luke 12:48) In observance of this maxim, students can make a positive difference in the world through service focused on justice with a sense of responsibility for sharing their gifts and talents with and for others.*

   **Objectives:**
   a. Students will articulate their leadership strengths and skills.
   b. Students will mentor others toward engaging in and contributing to the quality of campus life.
   c. Students will collaborate with others in order to achieve goals.
   d. Students will demonstrate effective stewardship of human, economic and environmental resources.
   e. Students will articulate a vision for their organization and set challenging and attainable goals.

5. **Discern Personal, Educational and Professional Goals**

   *As part of the Spiritual Exercises, Saint Ignatius teaches the need for discernment. Informed by this truth, we challenge students to employ purposeful reflection and self-awareness resulting in informed action focused on the greater good.*

   **Objectives:**
   a. Students will employ self-reflection to gain personal insight.
   b. Students will identify personal strengths and weaknesses and take action accordingly.
   c. Students will take personal responsibility for their choices/actions.
   d. Students will act in congruence with personal identity, ethical, spiritual and moral values.
   e. Students will use self-knowledge to set challenging, yet realistic professional goals.

1.10.1 **Transformative Learning Goals Planning and Assessment Schedules.**

   Each year, members of the Division of Student Life complete the performance evaluation process by indicating their level of achievement of TLG-related goals for the previous year and include at least one TLG-related goal in their performance evaluation goals (February/March). Prior to the start of the academic year (April/May/June), the Division of Student Life then gathers for an annual planning retreat. The agenda typically includes time to:

   - celebrate achievements related to the TLG of focus for the previous year
   - learn more about the content related to the upcoming year’s TLG of focus from a subject matter expert (i.e., discernment)
   - brainstorm in a collaborative session with colleagues from the same department and from other Student Life departments about ways to achieve the upcoming year’s TLG
   - work within the Campus Labs Compliance Assist platform to input programs and initiatives for the annual report
1.9.2 Transformative Learning Goals Assessment Procedures. Particular TLG assessment projects are planned and administered by departments within the Division of Student Life. In addition to indirect assessment, some Student Life departmental programs and initiatives are assessed using quantitative and qualitative methodologies. From 2009-2011, the Division of Student Life mapped extant programs, initiatives, and survey questions to the TLGs. For programs and initiatives, this provided an opportunity to assess “gaps” and areas of collaboration amongst departments. For surveys, this provided an effective way to utilize already-existing assessment results in an indirect way. Specific survey questions from National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) The Freshman Survey (TFS), Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) College Senior Survey (CSS), Association of College and University Housing Officers International Educational Benchmarking Inventory for Resident Staff and Residents (ACUHO-I EBI), American College Health Association National College Health Assessment II (ACHA NCHA II), and other institution-specific and departmental-specific assessment were mapped. Most of these national surveys continue to be administered at the University on a triennial cycle.

The Division of Student Life utilizes Campus Labs Baseline tools for administration of surveys and rubrics.

The Assistant Vice President for Student Life serves on the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, and is a liaison and resource person to departments within the Division of Student Life regarding planning and assessment efforts.

In an effort to communicate and effectively utilize assessment results, the comprehensive annual report is shared with key stakeholders, and an additional summary report is developed and distributed with appropriate constituents. The Division of Student Life follows the requirements and timelines of the institutional annual report process.

1.9.3 Transformative Learning Goals Programmatic Review. A TLG programmatic review will occur every five years. TLG assessment results should directly inform the programmatic review of the TLGs. The programmatic review includes but is not limited to the assessment of student learning outcomes. It is an evaluation of the co-curriculum as a whole and in its various parts. The final TLG programmatic review report will be presented to the Vice President for Student Life.

1.20 Institutional Effectiveness section

Annual publication of the Benchmarks of Progress

Benchmarks of Progress is a publication shared with the University community each fall that highlights the achievements of goals found within the University’s strategic plan. Both qualitative and quantitative
data is compiled each year, with a report completed after the Annual Reports are received in July each year.

Student Persistence Report

In alignment with the goals established in the University’s strategic plan, each semester the Office of Student Success & First Year Experience will compile a “persistence to graduation” report for undergraduate day students. The report will be shared with the campus community to achieve a campus-wide understanding of the collaborative nature of all retention efforts and student outcomes.

Other on-going assessment activities

At the university level, SJU continues to participate in various nationally and locally benchmarked surveys including the following. From these surveys, SJU extracts information related to student learning and institutional effectiveness.

- College Senior Survey (CSS) - UCLA Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP)
  - Target Population: Graduating Senior students – UD
  - Content: Satisfaction with the college experience; student involvement; cognitive and affective development; student values, attitudes and goals; degree aspirations and career plans.

- The Freshman Survey (TFS) - UCLA Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP)
  - Target Population: Entering First Year students – UD
  - Content: Demographic characteristics; expectations of the college experience; secondary school experiences; degree goals and career plans; college finances; attitudes, values and life goals; and reasons for attending college.

- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) - Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research
  - Target Population: First Year and Senior students
• Content: Student behaviors in college; institutional actions; student reactions to college; student background information.

• National College Health Assessment (ACHA) – American College Health Association
  o Target Population: All UD students
  o Content: Health issues; alcohol and tobacco use; sexual behavior; body weight; mental health.

• Career Development Post-Graduation Survey
  o Target Population: All SJU graduates (1) UD, 2) PLS/HDC, 3) Graduate
  o Content: Post-graduation occupational status and details, including employers, industries, average salaries, and method(s) of securing employment; continuing education; demographic information; usage/satisfaction with the Career Development Center

• Career Development Internship Survey
  o Target Population: Sophomore, Junior, and Senior students – UD
  o Content: Whether/not internship completed; if so, satisfaction with internship, reason(s) for completing an internship; method(s) of securing internship; skills developed from internship; usefulness/applicability of classroom learning/experience to internship; usefulness/applicability of internship to classroom learning/experience

• iSJU Senior Survey using the Boston College Questionnaire on the Undergraduate Experience (BCQUE)
  o Target Population: Graduating Senior students – UD
  o Content: Naming and evaluating significant and formative experiences over the four years of the undergraduate experience in several areas, including, but not limited to, student activities in and out of the classroom and the significance of those activities; student-faculty interaction; religious/spiritual orientation and behaviors; personal development; and education in the Jesuit tradition.
CampusLabs Tools: Baseline and Compliance Assist

CampusLabs (formerly known as StudentVoice) is a company that specializes in providing tools to create a comprehensive, coordinated and centralized assessment approach for the whole campus. Saint Joseph’s University invests in two modules within the CampusLabs platform: Baseline and Compliance Assist.

Beginning in 2005-2006, Saint Joseph’s University began using the Baseline module of CampusLabs, which provides the technology, resources, and expert consultation required to create an integrated, coordinated, and comprehensive assessment. Beginning in 2012-2013, the Student Life Division at Saint Joseph’s began utilizing the Compliance Assist module of CampusLabs, which is a fully integrated and comprehensive online solution for managing institutional planning needs.
Annual Planning Process

Overview: The annual planning process is the yearly assessment of progress toward university, college/division and departmental goals and is completed by both academic and administrative units. The process is comprised of three components: the first is the Annual Report which is a summary of accomplishments of the prior year; the second component is the Annual Plan which defines goals, objectives and assessments for the upcoming year; and, the third component develops preliminary goals, objectives and assessments for the following year. These reports are due to the Dean and the divisional Vice President or Provost by June 15 and are used to demonstrate compliance with requirements of our accrediting body and to ensure department/program activities are aligned with institutional mission, goals and objectives. Additionally, academic program/major will complete the Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report which identifies the effectiveness of programs/activities in achieving desired student learning outcomes.

In greater detail, the components are as follows:

**Annual Report:** The Annual Report is a review of departmental progress made toward goals which were defined during the prior year. The report summarizes accomplishments in terms of the defined assessment measures and is the tool for informing senior leadership of progress toward current goals. Each objective defines the responsible unit, the measurement strategy for the objective, assessment result and action/reallocation plan which is based on the assessment result. Adjustments made to the original plan are noted in the report. The Annual Report is due to the Dean or Divisional Vice President by June 15th.

**Annual Plan:** The Annual Plan is the set of departmental goals and objectives for the upcoming fiscal year. The plan defines the top three goals for a department for the upcoming year with supporting objectives for each goal. Each objective includes the responsible unit and the measurement strategy for the objective. Like the Annual Report, the Plan is due to the Dean or Divisional Vice President by June 15th.

**Preliminary Plan for the Next Year:** The Preliminary Plan includes the top three to five resource reallocation priorities for the next fiscal year which require review and decision-making at the college or divisional level. The reallocation priorities are based on assessment results from the Annual Report. The Preliminary Plan includes the following elements: goal/objective, resource allocation action, funding source, assessment and the link to the University strategic plan and divisional plans.

3.1 Integrated Budget/Planning/Assessment Cycle

Detailed Timeline

**June 1:** Begin New Fiscal Year

**June 15:** Departmental and Administrative sub-units submit prior year Annual Reports
**Academic Units** submit to Appropriate Dean:

- Mission/Vision statement of department or program.
- Prior FY Annual Report including program assessment results and resource reallocation decisions and requests.
- Current-FY revised Plan with goals.
- Preliminary Plan for the following-FY: Include the top goals and objectives (normally not more than 5) along with any anticipated resource reallocations or new allocations needed to support it. (e.g. The change of human, financial, physical, technological, curricular, temporal and instructional resources etc.) estimated revenue, costs and link to college/division priorities.
- All goals need to be linked to the university strategic plan.

**Administrative Units** submit to appropriate Division Heads:

- Mission/Vision statement of department, program, or unit.
- Prior FY Annual Report including assessment results and resource reallocation decisions with goals.
- Current-FY revised Plan with goals.
- Preliminary Plan for the following-FY: Include the top two to five goals and objectives along with any anticipated resource reallocation needed to support it and college/division priorities *Insert as above*.
- All goals need to be linked to the university strategic plan.

**July 15: Deans and Division Heads Report Out to Provost, President and VPFA.**

Deans and Division Heads review unit annual reports and plans, and submit their college/division summary reports and next-FY preliminary college/division plans to the Provost, the President and VPFA.

- All program/unit annual reports, plans and resource reallocation priorities are also submitted to IEC and the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Research for evaluation.
- Division Heads and Deans meet with their department and/or programs to communicate unit/program resource reallocation priorities and give feedback to department and programs.

**October 15:**

- **CAS and GEPAC:** All academic assessment reports for current calendar year Intersession, Spring and Summer terms due to cas_assess@sju.edu. Plans for upcoming calendar year Intersession and Spring academic terms are also due.
October through March:

- **CAS PAC:** reviews all assessment reports from Intersession, Spring, and Summer Terms. Prepares preliminary summation of recommended planning and budget priorities based on these assessments.
- **CAS PAC:** provides feedback to all departments re. Intersession, Spring and Summer SLO assessment reports.

November through April

- **CAS Associate Deans:** Provide feedback to all departments re. Intersession and Spring Academic SLO Assessment plans.
- **PBC** requests summary report from Division Heads and Deans for next-FY Resource Allocation Requests to be integrated into budget planning process for entire university. Report includes goals/objectives, assessment results, resources needed (capital, salary and non-salary), revenue anticipated, external funding or source, and connection with Strategic Plan.
- **PBC:** sends resource allocation recommendations to the President/Provost.

- **IEC reviews** all of the next-FY preliminary plans and previous calendar year assessment reports and provides recommendations for report/assessment enhancement.
- **Assessment of Annual & Assessment Reports** submitted by IEC and Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Planning to Provost, Deans and Division Heads. Report to highlight progress towards the metrics identified under strategic plan goals. Benchmarks include quantitative and qualitative data drawn from departmental annual reports, outcomes reports and evaluation of annual reports and assessment reports.
- President submits budget plan for next-FY to the Board of Trustee for preliminary approval.

March 31:

**Haub School:** Academic programs submit all prior calendar year Student Learning Outcome assessment reports to Deans and IEC. These reports include assessment results collected during Intersession, Spring, Summer and Fall terms of the previous calendar year. Assessment plans for all current calendar year academic terms are also due.

**CAS and GE:** Prior calendar year Fall Assessment Reports and Assessment plans for Summer and Fall of current calendar year are due. Intersession, Spring and Summer term assessment reports have already been submitted and reviewed.
April:

**CAS Associate Deans:** provide feedback on assessment plans for Summer and Fall assessments.

**CAS PAC:** reviews prior Fall term assessment reports, combines these with prior reviews of intersession, Spring, and Summer Terms. Reports out to College Council. Provides CAS Deans with summation of recommended planning and budget priorities based on all prior calendar year classroom assessments.

**Haub School:** reviews prior calendar year AOL/SLO assessment reports. Reports out to College Council. Provides HAUB Deans with summation of recommended planning and budget priorities based on all prior calendar year classroom assessments.

May 15:

- **GEPPAC Annual Report on prior year assessment due**

May

- BOT approve the final budget plan for approaching FY. Results are shared with division, Department and programs. Financial Affairs builds out the budgets.
- Departments, programs and units review and revise their prior next-FY Plans (submitted previous June and revised in Marc) in line with budget approved by BOT.

June 1: **Beginning of New Fiscal Year**
3.2 Saint Joseph’s University Assessment Cycle Timeline

Academic Program Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report from previous calendar Year
Due March 31st

President & Board of Trustee make final resource allocation decisions based on Linkage to Strategic Plan, assessment results and PBC recommendations and share University Strategic Priorities

Department/Program Annual Report for previous fiscal year including Assessment Reports submitted on March 31st, current fiscal year revised plan, and preliminary plan for the next fiscal year
Due June 15th

Planning and Budget Committee synthesizes and prioritizes resource allocations based on assessment results and Strategic Plan

Deans and VPs submit Division Summary Reports with assessment results & recommendation, in alignment with Strategic Plan
Due July 15

Institutional Effectiveness Committee recommendations and evaluation of assessment
Assessment and Planning Process for Resource Allocation

- Annual Report from Administrative Units
- Academic SLO Assessment Reports
- PAC (CAS) AOL
- Academic Annual Reports
- VPs
- Deans
- President, Provost and CFO
- PBC
- President → BOT
APPENDIXES
(Insert Department/Program Name) Annual Report

Insert Office or Degree Offered

Insert Author Name
AY2016
Pick the date

Saint Joseph's University Mission and Vision
Mission Statement:
As Philadelphia’s Jesuit Catholic University, Saint Joseph’s provides a rigorous, student-centered education rooted in the liberal arts. We prepare students for personal excellence, professional success, and engaged citizenship. Striving to be an inclusive and diverse community that educates and cares for the whole person, we encourage and model lifelong commitment to thinking critically, making ethical decisions, pursuing social justice, and finding God in all things.

Vision Statement:
Saint Joseph's University will be recognized nationally for academic excellence, community engagement, and preparing graduates for lives that matter, with and for others.

Department/Program Mission and Vision

Mission
Click here to enter text.

Vision (if applicable)
Click here to enter text.

Goals and Objectives:

Goal 1 The department/Program will...

Supports: Choose an item.

Objective 1.1 Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy

Assessment Result

Action Plan/Cost Estimate/Resource Reallocation Plan

Objective 1.2 Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy
Assessment Result

Action Plan/Cost Estimate/Resource Reallocation Plan

Goal 2 The department/Program will...

Supports: Choose an item.

Objective 2.1 Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy

Assessment Result

Action Plan/Cost Estimate/Resource Reallocation Plan

Objective 2.2 Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy

Assessment Result

Action Plan/Cost Estimate/Resource Reallocation Plan

Goal 3 The department/Program will...

Supports: Choose an item.

Objective 3.1 Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy

Assessment Result
Action Plan/Cost Estimate/Resource Reallocation Plan

Objective 3.2 Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy

Assessment Result

Action Plan/Cost Estimate/Resource Reallocation Plan

Goal 4 The department/Program will...

Supports: Choose an item.

Objective 4.1 Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy

Assessment Result

Action Plan/Cost Estimate/Resource Reallocation Plan

Objective 4.2 Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy

Assessment Result

Action Plan/Cost Estimate/Resource Reallocation Plan
Department/Program Annual Plan

ACADEMIC YEAR (e.g. AY 2016-17):  Click here to enter text.

Goals and objectives

Goal 1 The department/Program will...

Supports: Choose an item.

Objective 1.1  Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy

Objective 1.2  Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy

Goal 2 The department/Program will...

Supports: Choose an item.

Objective 2.1  Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy

Objective 2.2  Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy
Goal 3 The department/Program will...

Supports: Choose an item.

Objective 3.1 Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy

Objective 3.2 Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy

Goal 4 The department/Program will...

Supports: Choose an item.

Objective 4.1 Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy

Objective 4.2 Click here to enter text.

Responsible Unit and/or Individual:

Measurement Strategy
## Preliminary Plan for the Next Fiscal Year (e.g. June 1st, 2017 – May 31st, 2018)
(To be completed by all academic and non-academic units for deans or division vice presidents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals and Objective</th>
<th>Assigned to</th>
<th>Resource Allocation Action</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Link to SP &amp; College/Division Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State relevant goals and objectives from your annual report or assessment report</td>
<td>Individual or Department Name</td>
<td>Resources Allocation (e.g. The change of human, financial, physical, technological, curricular, temporal and instructional resources etc.) One time request or multiple years needed? Close a project? Remove funding from one to another? Please explain in detail</td>
<td>Revenues Anticipated, External Funding and/or Reallocation Source (if any) and funding type (capital, incremental, reallocation)</td>
<td>State assessment results DIRECTLY related to the resource allocation action</td>
<td>State the strategic plan goals and college/division priorities (if any) your plan support. Include relevant compliances and influence if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports SP: Choose an item.</td>
<td>College/Division Priorities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports SP: Choose an item.</td>
<td>College/Division Priorities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports SP: Choose an item.</td>
<td>College/Division Priorities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports SP: Choose an item.</td>
<td>College/Division Priorities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports SP: Choose an item.</td>
<td>College/Division Priorities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annual Report Evaluation Table (To be completed by IEC for all units and programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Click here to enter a date.</th>
<th>Person preparing the evaluation:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Not Acceptable</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission/Vision Statement</strong></td>
<td>Describes clearly the mission of the departmental and demonstrate the connection with the SJU mission and vision</td>
<td>Describes clearly the mission (and vision) of the department; Connection with the SJU mission and vision is unclear</td>
<td>Mission (and vision) are not clear or does not support SJU mission and vision</td>
<td>No mission statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>Goals are well-expressed, support department mission and linked with Achieving Magis Goals (and SP objectives if applicable);</td>
<td>Some of the goals are listed but not well-expressed, connection with department mission and/or Achieving Magis Strategic Planning Goals (and SP objectives if applicable) is not clear or not appropriate;</td>
<td>Goals are not clearly stated and are not linked with SP goals.</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Objectives meet all five standards of SMART objectives: Specific, Measurable, Assignable, Realistic and Time-delineated</td>
<td>Objectives meet at least three of the standards</td>
<td>Objectives barely meet any standards</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement Strategy</strong></td>
<td>All expected outcomes in the objective are stated in measurable, quantifiable terms</td>
<td>Some of the outcomes in the objectives are stated in measurable, quantifiable terms</td>
<td>None of the outcomes are stated in measurable,</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Measures</strong></td>
<td>One or more direct assessment measures were used to assess each objective</td>
<td>Some direct measures and some indirect measures were used</td>
<td>Only indirect measures (e.g. surveys) were used</td>
<td>No measures were used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Results were described clearly for each objective assessed.</td>
<td>Results are described for most objectives</td>
<td>Results were not clear</td>
<td>Results were not described</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Plan</strong></td>
<td>All action plans are sustainable and are made based on the assessment result and support the department mission and SJU mission</td>
<td>Some of the action plans are clearly outlined and linked to the assessment results</td>
<td>Action plans are outlined but not based on assessment results</td>
<td>No plan or action steps described</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Estimation and Resource Allocation</strong></td>
<td>Clear cost estimation and resource allocation plan are listed and are supported with reasonable rationale</td>
<td>Clear cost estimation and resource allocation plan are listed and but are not supported with reasonable rationale</td>
<td>Cost estimation and resource allocation are listed but are not clear and not supported with reasonable rationale.</td>
<td>No cost estimation and resource allocation listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preliminary Plan</strong></td>
<td>Recommended resource allocation actions are listed with clear cost estimation (and revenues if applicable), supported by relevant assessment results and are linked with Strategic Planning Goals (and college/division priorities if applicable)</td>
<td>Recommended resource allocation actions are listed with cost estimation (and revenues if applicable), somewhat supported by relevant assessment results and are linked with Strategic Planning Goals (and college/division priorities if applicable)</td>
<td>Recommended resource allocation actions are listed without cost estimation revenues. The connection between the actions and the assessment results is not clear, and are not linked with Strategic Planning Goals (and college/division priorities if applicable)</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements Made Based on Implemented Changes (only for 2017 reports)</strong></td>
<td>Improvements outlined in prior action plans clearly demonstrated</td>
<td>Some improvements are demonstrated; not all are linked to prior action plan</td>
<td>Evidence of improvement is not clear</td>
<td>No improvements are demonstrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Follow-through with Proposed Activities (only for 2017 reports)</td>
<td>The department performed all of the proposed activities</td>
<td>The department performed most of the proposed activities</td>
<td>The department performed a limited number of the proposed activities</td>
<td>The department performed none of the proposed activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Add additional page if necessary
Annual Report & Plan

Instruction

Institutional Effectiveness
Committee  AY 2015-16

11/2/2015
Department/Program Annual Report Instruction

Reporting Overview

Each year, departments/programs are required to complete their Annual Report, Annual Plan. These reports are due to the Dean and the divisional Vice President or Provost by June 15.

These reports are used to demonstrate compliance with requirements of our accrediting body and to ensure department/program activities are aligned with institutional mission, goals and objectives. Additionally, academic program/major also needs to complete the Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report which identifies the effectiveness of programs/activities in achieving desired student learning outcomes. (See SJU Academic SLO Assessment Report Template Instruction for detail)

Annual Report/Annual Plan

The Annual Report (Template page 1-3) is the tool for informing senior leadership of progress toward current goals. The Annual Plan provides information on department/program goals and objectives for the coming years.

Instructions for each section of the Annual Report and Annual Plan are provided below.

Department/Program Annual Report should be completed by both academic programs and non-academic units following the instruction in Assessment Cycle Timeline and submitted to their deans, vice presidents and IEC.

To submit your report to IEC, please send the final report before June 15, 2015 to Wenjun Chi, the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Research by emailing wchi@sju.edu.

This report template is used to replace the previous annual reports and summary reports as identified in Request for Annual Report Memo and academic assessment reports completed by units and programs in AY 2014-15.

Reference: Kean University Residential Student Services 2013-14 Assessment Report

Department/Program Mission and Vision
Department/program mission (vision is optional) should support SJU mission and vision.

If a department doesn’t have a mission yet, please use the mission of the division or college for the current fiscal year 2016. All departments/programs are expected to have a mission statement for FY2017 reporting.

Reference: How to Write a Program Mission Statement (UCONN.EDU)
**Goals and objectives:**

Programs and units can use the same goals and objectives identified in 2015-16 annual plan submitted on June 15, 2015. It is recommended that programs and units list no more than four goals and two objectives under each goal.

Your goals may be the same over consecutive years while objectives might be different each year. Goals should be aligned with the university strategic planning goals *Achieving Magis*. Please also list the objectives listed under each strategic planning goal if applicable. (see below for example)

To link your goals with relevant strategic planning goals, please click the checkbox after each goal. If your goal support more than one strategic planning goals, simply copy and paste the drop-down list to add additional goals. (Manually type in the SP code if you are Mac users)

Example:

**Goal 1** The Residential Student Services will develop a residential atmosphere that supports university academic and retention initiatives by further expanding ACCESS tutoring services, identifying and supporting at-risk students, and creating intentional programs that incorporate both social and academic components.

**Supports:** SP1 Academic Excellence and Transformative Student Experience

Achieve and promote the distinctiveness of SJU’s curriculum through a focus on the General Education Program, Ignatian pedagogy, rigorous/engaged learning, and interdisciplinary teaching and learning.

Additionally, unit/program goals should be aligned with college or division strategic plan goals or priorities if applicable.

**Objective**

Reference: A good objective should be **Specific** (Target a specific area for improvement), **Measurable** (quantify or at least suggest an indicator of progress), **Assignable** (specify who will do it), **Realistic**
(state what results can realistically be achieved, given available resources), and **Time-related** (specify when the result(s) can be achieved).


**Saint Joseph's University** is required by Middle States Commission on Higher Education to provide **“clear and measurable outcomes”** in assessment process (Progress Report due Oct 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2016).
**Responsible Unit and/or Individual**

The unit or person ultimately responsible for meeting the objective and delivering results.

**Measurement Strategy**

Please explain the measurement strategies and the tools you used including models and the system/software such as Campus lab, Blackboard, Survey Monkey, Qualtrics etc.

**Assessment Result**

Indicate your assessment result including achievement and challenges. Include the connection with the assessment result from previous years if applicable.

**Action Plan/Cost Estimate/Resource Reallocation Plan:**

If there is action and resource reallocation to be taken based on the assessment result, please indicate the action plan in detail.

Your action should be made based on the assessment results and it should support the long term and short term direction of your department and the mission of the college.

- For academic units: action plan or resource reallocation may include changes on workshop, professional development, course assessment and evaluation, usage of physical facilities, academic advising, curriculum development etc. and it should be related with the departmental objectives.

- For administrative units, the planning and resource reallocation may include changes on labor, tools and equipment, technology, services and projects, and should be driven by strategic plan and division priorities.

If the action is cost related, please indicate the amount and the funding resource, timeline, plan and the influence on the unit, college/division or institution.

**Department/Program Annual Plan (Template page 4-5)**
Your goals can be the same over the years, depends on the measurement you choose and results you collected, and the priority of your college, division and the institution.
Preliminary Plan for the Next Fiscal Year

All academic and non-academic units should complete this table (Template page 6) and submit it to their deans or division vice presidents following the instruction in Assessment Cycle Timeline.

Review your annual report and identify the top three to five resource reallocation priorities for the next fiscal year (e.g. FY2018) that require decision making on college and institutional level and are based on assessment results. The decision should be made through group discussion on your unit/program priorities, the college/division priorities and the related strategic plan goals your plan support. Add additional page(s) or link(s) for more detail if needed. (e.g. a business plan, assessment result, etc.)

Here is an example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals and Objective (Division and/or Unit)</th>
<th>Assigned to</th>
<th>Resource Allocation Action</th>
<th>Potential Resources</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Link to SP &amp; College/Division Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State relevant goals and objectives from your annual report or assessment report</td>
<td>Individual or Department Name</td>
<td>Resources Allocation (e.g. The change of human, financial, physical, technological, curricular, temporal and instructional resources etc.) One time request or multiple years needed? Close a project, a course or a program? Remove funding from one to another? Please explain in detail</td>
<td>Revenues Anticipated, External Funding and/or Reallocation Source (if any) and funding type (capital, incremental, reallocation)</td>
<td>State assessment results DIRECTLY related to the resource allocation action</td>
<td>State the strategic plan goals and college/division priorities (if any) your plan support. Include relevant compliances and influence if applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals: Assist with efforts to increase the number of Chinese Graduate Students studying at Saint Joseph's University by 10% from the 2015-2016 (from 150 to 165) Increase scholarship pool for Chinese Programs by 10% (from $       to $  ). The total amount to be increased is $5,000

Revenue is anticipated based on increased number of international students from China. By increasing 10% which is 15 Chinese students, we anticipate revenue is approximately 15x $40,000=$600,000 by FY2018.

Trend analysis shows the number of Chinese graduate students has dropped in recent years from      to         This has been offset by an increase in students from Saudi Arabia. The Saudi government will be curtailing subsides so a renewed focus on China where we have connections is needed. Given the recent fall in the value of the RMB to the US dollar, scholarship funds are necessary

Supports SP:SP3 Campus Culture Strengthen efforts to develop a campus environment that is inclusive and diverse. SP4 Financial Strength: Continue the process of analyzing the university's cost structure and pursue identified opportunities to reduce expenses and increase revenue through efficiencies in organizational structures and processes.College/Division Priorities:
MSCHE Guidance for Institutional Planning and Resource Allocation


   An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

2. Example: “An institution might, for example, have a goal of providing modern educational facilities for its students, and it will achieve this goal through several objectives or strategies, including completing a capital campaign and updating its facilities master plan. Another institution might have a goal of graduating a high proportion of the students it admits, and it might plan to achieve this goal through a number of objectives or strategies, including developing a first-year experience program and making academic advising more responsive to student needs.”

3. Appropriate interrelationships among institutional, operational, and unit-level goals should be evident. Some goals may be shared across units, and some institutional goals may be syntheses of unit-level goals.

4. When developing goals and objectives at the institutional and unit-levels, quality is more important than quantity.

5. The planning process aims to promote coordination of resources, prioritization of goals based on resources available, and resolution of resource conflicts or insufficient resources.

6. Institutions often have a variety of plans, including not only an institutional (strategic) plan but also an academic plan, financial plan, enrollment plan, capital facilities master plan, and technology plan.

7. An effective planning process also includes assessment: a thorough review of relevant quantitative and qualitative information drawn from all segments of the institutional community.

8. Institutional support resources including financial, facilities, equipment and supplies, technology, research and instructional support and staffing, and other assets should be an integral and proportional part of all institutional planning, allocation, and assessment activities.
What is Resource Allocation and Who are the Stakeholders?

Resources

Unraveling the mystery-budgeting, planning and resource allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Meaning (“...in an environment of scarcity...”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>A process in which dollars are assigned to a project or initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>A process in which future plans are made and resources assigned to achieve such plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation</td>
<td>A process in which something “someone [an institution] has and can use when it is needed” is allocated in an environment of scarcity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of resources at an academic institution...

- Human
- Financial
- Physical
- Technological
- Curricular
- Temporal
- Instructional
- Etc.
### Stakeholders

#### Institutional Level
- Presidents, Provosts/VPAAs, Curriculum Committees, Faculty Senate Committees

#### College, Department or Program Level
- Deans, Faculty Councils
- Department Chairs, Program Directors

#### Professional [Individual] Level
- Instructional Professionals
- Student Affairs Professionals, Librarians
- Academic and Faculty Advisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Technological</th>
<th>Curricular</th>
<th>Temporal</th>
<th>Instructional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actions to be considered by administration, curriculum committees, etc., (Institutional level actions)</td>
<td>Faculty and instructional staff hiring</td>
<td>Budgeting for teaching and learning center, information technology, etc.,</td>
<td>Classroom space for instructional initiatives</td>
<td>Software; computer labs, etc.,</td>
<td>Curriculum reviews</td>
<td>Allocations of time to be spend on specific curriculum initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions to be considered by staff and faculty (Department, unit, and program actions)</td>
<td>Allocations of time to be spent on curriculum, teaching, and learning initiatives</td>
<td>Budgeting for specific unit initiatives</td>
<td>Learning and laboratory space used in teaching; library space</td>
<td>Classroom technological infrastructure decisions</td>
<td>Program and department curriculum changes</td>
<td>Time spent by committees to address findings; changes in instructional time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions to be taken by individuals (faculty, staff, etc.,)</td>
<td>Requests for presentations by library personnel</td>
<td>Special expenditures for classroom speakers/presenters</td>
<td>Requests for different instructional space</td>
<td>Use of technology in classroom facilitation</td>
<td>Proposals to change course objectives</td>
<td>Time spent on lesson modules; changes in lesson plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables are taken from MSCHE Annual Conference Workshop “Assessment and General Education: Empowering Stakeholders to Enhance the Management of Student Learning” by Sean McKitrick, Ph.D., Vice President of Middle States Commission on Higher Education.
Annual Report Evaluation

Table
This table (Template page 7) will be completed by the IEC for all academic and non-academic units. Programs and units should review this evaluation for self-improvement before submitting your report.

Definition

Strategic Planning Goals (Achieving Magis)

SP1: Academic Excellence and Transformative Student Experience

SP2: Community Engagement

SP3: Campus Culture

SP4: Financial Strength

Student Learning Outcomes

1. Communication (UG and GR)
UG: Students will communicate effectively through written and oral modes of expression across academic, professional, and social contexts using appropriate technology.
GR: Students will communicate effectively using appropriate technology.

2. Critical Thinking and Inquiry (UG and GR)
Students will think critically and construct reasoned arguments to support their positions using skills appropriate to the context, such as deductive reasoning, scientific inquiry, quantitative reasoning, aesthetic judgment, or critical examination of form, style, content and meaning.

3. Ethics, Social Justice, and Ignatian Values (UG and GR)
UG: Students will assess and respond to ethical and social justice issues informed by Ignatian values and other theoretical frameworks.
GR: Students will assess and respond to ethical and social justice issues informed by Ignatian values.

4. Diversity (UG)
Students will engage respectfully, in a local and global context, with diverse human beliefs, abilities, experiences, identities, or cultures.

5. Discipline or Program Specific Competencies (UG and GR)
Students will acquire the essential knowledge and skills to succeed and make well-reasoned judgments personally, professionally, and in their chosen area(s) of study.

6. Jesuit Intellectual TraditionCultural Legacies (UG)
Students will examine forces that have shaped the world they have inherited through instruction in the Ignatian educationalpedagogical tradition which includesand the study of the humanities, philosophy, theology, history, and the other humanities, mathematics, history, and the natural and social sciences.
Academic Program Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report

ACADEMIC YEAR:    SEMESTER:
COLLEGE:    PROGRAM (e.g. B.S. Chemistry):
REPORTER:    PHONE:    EMAIL:
COURSE(S):

PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO):

☐ SLO1:  Supports: SP: Choose an item.   SJU SLO: Choose an item.
☐ SLO2:  Supports: SP: Choose an item.   SJU SLO: Choose an item.
☐ SLO3:  Supports: SP: Choose an item.   SJU SLO: Choose an item.
☐ SLO4:  Supports: SP: Choose an item.   SJU SLO: Choose an item.
☐ SLO5:  Supports: SP: Choose an item.   SJU SLO: Choose an item.
☐ SLO6:  Supports: SP: Choose an item.   SJU SLO: Choose an item.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

1st PROGRAM SLO ASSESSED:

Supports: SP Link: Choose an item.   SJU SLO Link: Choose an item.

Direct Measure:

Assessment Result:

Indirect Measure:

Assessment Result:

Action Plan (Include Cost Estimate/Resource Reallocation Plan If Applicable):

2nd PROGRAM SLO ASSESSED:

Supports: SP Link: Choose an item.   SJU SLO Link: Choose an item.

Direct Measure:
Assessment Result:

Indirect Measure:

Assessment Result:

Action Plan (Include Cost Estimate/Resource Reallocation Plan If Applicable):

3rd PROGRAM SLO ASSESSED:
Supports: SP Link:  Choose an item.  SJU SLO Link:  Choose an item.

Direct Measure:

Assessment Result:

Indirect Measure:

Assessment Result:

Action Plan (Include Cost Estimate/Resource Reallocation Plan If Applicable):

4th PROGRAM SLO ASSESSED:
Supports: SP Link:  Choose an item.  SJU SLO Link:  Choose an item.

Direct Measure:

Assessment Result:

Indirect Measure:
Assessment Result:

Action Plan (Include Cost Estimate/Resource Reallocation Plan If Applicable):
Academic Program Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan

ACADEMIC YEAR: SEMESTER:
COLLEGE: PROGRAM (e.g. B.S. Chemistry):
REPORTER: PHONE: EMAIL:
COURSE:

PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO)
☐ SLO1: Supports: SP: Choose an item. SJU SLO: Choose an item.
☐ SLO2: Supports: SP: Choose an item. SJU SLO: Choose an item.
☐ SLO3: Supports: SP: Choose an item. SJU SLO: Choose an item.
☐ SLO4: Supports: SP: Choose an item. SJU SLO: Choose an item.
☐ SLO5: Supports: SP: Choose an item. SJU SLO: Choose an item.
☐ SLO6: Supports: SP: Choose an item. SJU SLO: Choose an item.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

1st PROGRAM SLO ASSESSED:
Supports: SP Link: Choose an item. SJU SLO Link: Choose an item.

Direct Measure:

Indirect Measure:

2nd PROGRAM SLO ASSESSED:
Supports: SP Link: Choose an item. GE SLO Link: Choose an item.

Direct Measure:

Indirect Measure:

3rd PROGRAM SLO ASSESSED:
Supports: SP Link: Choose an item. GE SLO Link: Choose an item.
Direct Measure:

Indirect Measure:

4th PROGRAM SLO ASSESSED:

Supports: SP Link: Choose an item. GE SLO Link: Choose an item.

Direct Measure:

Indirect Measure:
## Academic SLO Assessment Report Evaluation Form

(To be completed by IEC for all academic programs and the student life division)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Click here to enter a date.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person preparing the evaluation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Somewhat Meets</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Expectations</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Program Learning Outcomes
- Clear, well-expressed and focused; could serve as model for others; linked to the College's Strategic Planning Goals and GE Student Learning Outcomes
- Focused on specific skills or knowledge, link to College's Strategic Planning Goals and GE SLOs unclear
- Not clear and specific; No link to SP and GE SLOs.
- Not listed

#### Expected Learning Outcomes
- All learning outcomes are measurable
- Some outcomes are stated in measurable terms
- None of the outcomes are measurable
- Not listed

#### Assessment Measures
- More than one assessment measure was used for each learning outcome and at least one was a direct measure.
- Only one measure was used, but it was a direct measure.
- Only indirect measures were used
- No measures were used

#### Results
- Results were clearly described for each identified outcome assessed
- Results are described for most identified outcomes
- Results were not clearly linked to identified outcomes
- No results were provided

#### Plan of Action
- Specific action plan has been or will be implemented and there is a clear connection between the action and assessment results.
- Some actions step are outlined and linked to relevant assessment results
- Action steps based on results are not proposed, or the action plan is not related with assessment result
- No plan or action steps described

#### Improvements Made Based on the Implemented Changes (For 2017 Report Only)
- Improvements outlined in prior action plans clearly demonstrated
- Some improvements are demonstrated; not all are linked to prior action plan
- Evidence of improvement is not clear
- No improvements are demonstrated

#### Department Follow-through with Proposed Activities (For 2017 Report Only)
- The department performed all of the proposed activities
- The department performed most of the proposed activities
- The department performed a limited number of the proposed activities
- The department performed none of the proposed activities

#### Cost Estimation and Resource Allocation
- Clear cost estimation and resource allocation plan are listed and are supported with reasonable rationale
- Clear cost estimation and resource allocation plan are listed and but are not supported with reasonable rationale
- Cost estimation and resource allocation are listed but are not clear and not supported with reasonable rationale
- No cost estimation and resource allocation listed

### Comments:

_Evaluation tables are adapted from Emory & Henry Assessment Template_
Academic Program Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report Instruction

Reporting Overview

Academic programs and student life division are required to complete their student learning outcome assessment (SLO) report and plan. These reports are due to the Dean and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) by March 31st. If a program has multiple majors/concentrations with different student learning outcomes, each major/concentration will complete their own SLO assessment report. The department chair or deans will attach all submitted SLO Assessment reports as appendices in their Department/Program Annual Report.

To submit your report to IEC, please send the final report before March 31st, 2016 to Wenjun Chi, the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Research by emailing wchi@sju.edu.

This report template is used to replace the previous templates used by individual programs in AY 2014-15.

Program Student Learning Outcomes

Academic programs can use the same program learning outcomes identified in their annual assessment plan submitted in the previous year.

Reference: Program SLOs should be clearly articulated learning outcomes: the knowledge, skills, and competencies that students are expected to exhibit upon successful completion of academic program. (Middle States Assessing Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness 2007)

Please link all program SLOs with relevant strategic planning goals Achieving Magis (SP) and institutional level student learning outcomes. Program SLOs can be found on the AY 2015-16 Catalog.

General Education SLOs (GE SLO) are temporarily used as the institutional level student learning outcomes for Academic Year 2015-16. For the definition of SP and GE SLOs please check the last page of this document. New institutional level student learning outcomes will be identified in 2016 to cover undergraduate and graduate programs in CAS, HSB and GE.

Please provide all program learning outcomes of your major/program, but indicate which program SLOs were assessed in the past calendar year (spring, summer and fall) by clicking the checkbox in front of each program SLO. If your program SLO supports more than one strategic
planning goals and/or general education SLOs, simply copy and paste the drop-down list to add additional goals. (Manually type in the SP and GESLO code if you are Mac users)

Example: ☒ SLO1: Students will develop an awareness of, and an appreciation for, the professional responsibilities and ethical issues related to the field of accountancy.

Supports: SP: SP1 SJU SLO: GE SLO6

**Direct Measure**

Describe the courses and sections involved, how data was collected, sample size, the means of measurement (test, essay test question, writing samples, term paper, oral presentation, case analysis, class projects, class presentation etc.), performance expectation and timeline. Attach a copy if a rubric was used.

_Saint Joseph's University is required by Middle States Commission on Higher Education to provide “direct evidence of student learning, with evidence that results are used to improve teaching and learning” in assessment process_ (A progress report is due Oct 1st, 2016).

Example:

In fall 2014, SJU SAS Lesson Plan/Rubric was used in EDU 466 D01 –D15 to measure 100 students randomly selected from 15 sections using their final term paper.

The rubric consists of nine performances on a rating scale of 1-4 (4 being the exemplary level)

It is expected that at least 80% of the students, upon completion of the course, will achieve “proficient” or higher on each of the nine performance criteria in the SJU SAS Lesson Plan/Rubric.

**Assessment Result**

Provide assessment process, data summary (e.g. mean, medium, data range) in prose, table or graph and data analysis.

Mean scores overall (example):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Data Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Scores (example):

ED466 Standard Aligned System Lesson Plan Assessment Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Essential Questions</th>
<th>Learner Outcomes</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Materials/Resources</th>
<th>Instructional Procedures</th>
<th>Addressing Learners' Diverse Needs</th>
<th>Formative/Summative Assessments</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Basic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Proficient</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Exemplary</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ED 466 Standard Aligned System Lesson Plan Assessment Mean Distribution

Data Analysis (example):
80% or more of the students enrolled in ED466 scored proficient or above (3 points or higher) in all categories except Materials/Resources (51% scored 3 or 4). Students also scored relatively lower on “Data Analysis” (39% exemplary). The reasons, based on the data collected from survey/focus group/class discussion and observation, might be _________________________.

**Indirect Measure**

Describe the indirect measure, such as survey, focus group, interview, grades, employment or placement rates, course evaluation related to the overall course or curriculum quality, questionnaires, open-ended self-reports, honors, awards, etc)

Indirect measure is optional, but program and unit are encouraged to include this measurement.

**Assessment Result**

Provide assessment process, data summary (e.g. mean, medium, data range) in prose, table or graph and data analysis.

**Action Plan/Cost/Resource Reallocation Plan**

Describe the action (closing the loop) and the resource reallocation plan for your program/course based on the assessment results.

Example:

Action Plan: The current ED466 syllabus will be reviewed and __________ will be added into the content to improve students’ ability in _________________________.

Resource reallocation: Data collected from annual communication assessment through _____ suggest students are not completing required substantive revision as expected. A new annual workshop will be provided to faculty in spring 2016 to support student work in ways that encourage substantive revision. The first will focus on the scholarship on responding to the writing. The second will provide online tools for students to practice.

Cost: It was found in the assessment process that students enrolled in ED466 need to improve their ability in locating materials and resources online for research purpose. A new software ____________will be purchased in AY 2016-17 to provide training for students in EDU 466 to improve students’ ability in online information collection and evaluation. The price is $______ (one time purchase).
Academic Program Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan

1st PROGRAM SLO ASSESSED: Click here to enter text.

Direct Measure:

Describe the courses and section involved, how data will be collected, sample size, the means of measurement (test, essay test question, writing samples, term paper, oral presentation, case analysis, class projects, class presentation etc.), performance expectation and timeline. Attach a copy if a rubric will be used.

Example:

In fall 2014, SJU SAS Lesson Plan/Rubric will be used in EDU 466 D01 –D15 to measure 100 students randomly selected from 15 sections using their final term paper.

The rubric consists of nine performances on a rating scale of 1-4 (4 being the exemplary level)

It is expected that at least 80% of the students, upon completion of the course, will achieve “proficient” or higher on each of the nine performance criteria in the SJU SAS Lesson Plan/Rubric.

Academic Assessment Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report Evaluation form

This form (Template page 5) will be completed by Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) for all academic programs and the student life division.

Definition

Strategic Planning Goals (Achieving Magis)

SP1: Academic Excellence and Transformative Student Experience

SP2: Community Engagement

SP3: Campus Culture

SP4: Financial Strength
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Communication (UG and GR)
UG: Students will communicate effectively through written and oral modes of expression across academic, professional, and social contexts using appropriate technology.
GR: Students will communicate effectively using appropriate technology.

2. Critical Thinking and Inquiry (UG and GR)
Students will think critically and construct reasoned arguments to support their positions using skills appropriate to the context, such as deductive reasoning, scientific inquiry, quantitative reasoning, aesthetic judgment, or critical examination of form, style, content and meaning.

3. Ethics, Social Justice, and Ignatian Values (UG and GR)
UG: Students will assess and respond to ethical and social justice issues informed by Ignatian values and other theoretical frameworks.
GR: Students will assess and respond to ethical and social justice issues informed by Ignatian values.

4. Diversity (UG)
Students will engage respectfully, in a local and global context, with diverse human beliefs, abilities, experiences, identities, or cultures.

5. Discipline or Program Specific Competencies (UG and GR)
Students will acquire the essential knowledge and skills to succeed and make well- reasoned judgments personally, professionally, and in their chosen area(s) of study.

6. Jesuit Intellectual TraditionCultural Legacies (UG)
Students will examine forces that have shaped the world they have inherited through instruction in the Ignatian educationalpedagogical tradition which includesand the study of the humanities, philosophy, theology, history, and the other humanities, mathematics, history, and the natural and social sciences.
Appendix 5  MSCHE Examples of Direct and Indirect Evidence of Student Learning


EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

C = evidence suitable for course-level as well as program-level student learning

Direct (Clear and Compelling) Evidence of What Students Are Learning
- Ratings of student skills by field experience supervisors
- Scores and pass rates on appropriate licensure/certification exams (e.g., Praxis, NLN) or other published tests (e.g., Major Field Tests) that assess key learning outcomes
- “Capstone” experiences such as research projects, presentations, theses, dissertations, oral defenses, exhibitions, or performances, scored using a rubric
- Other written work, performances, or presentations, scored using a rubric (C)
- Portfolios of student work (C)
- Scores on locally-designed multiple choice and/or essay tests such as final examinations in key courses, qualifying examinations, and comprehensive examinations, accompanied by test “blueprints” describing what the tests assess (C)
- Score gains between entry and exit on published or local tests or writing samples (C)
- Employer ratings of employee skills
- Observations of student behavior (e.g., presentations, group discussions), undertaken systematically and with notes recorded systematically
- Summaries/analyses of electronic discussion threads (C)
- “Think-alouds” (C)
- Classroom response systems (clickers) (C)
- Knowledge maps (C)
- Feedback from computer simulated tasks (e.g., information on patterns of actions, decisions, branches) (C)
- Student reflections on their values, attitudes and beliefs, if developing those are intended outcomes of the course or program (C)

Indirect Evidence of Student Learning
(Signs that Students Are Probably Learning, But Exactly What or How Much They Are Learning is Less Clear)
- Course grades (C)
- Assignment grades, if not accompanied by a rubric or scoring guide (C)
- For four-year programs, admission rates into graduate programs and graduation rates from those programs
- For two-year programs, admission rates into four-year institutions and graduation rates from those institutions
- Quality/reputation of graduate and four-year programs into which alumni are accepted
- Placement rates of graduates into appropriate career positions and starting salaries
- Alumni perceptions of their career responsibilities and satisfaction
- Student ratings of their knowledge and skills and reflections on what they have learned in the course or program (C)
- Questions on end-of-course student evaluation forms that ask about the course rather than the instructor (C)
- Student/alumni satisfaction with their learning, collected through surveys, exit interviews, or focus groups
- Voluntary gifts from alumni and employers
- Student participation rates in faculty research, publications and conference presentations
- Honors, awards, and scholarships earned by students and alumni
Evidence of Learning Processes that Promote Student Learning (Insights into Why Students Are or Aren’t Learning)

- Transcripts, catalog descriptions, and course syllabi, analyzed for evidence of course or program coherence, opportunities for active and collaborative learning, etc. (C)
- Logs maintained by students documenting time spent on course work, interactions with faculty and other students, nature and frequency of library use, etc. (C)
- Interviews and focus groups with students, asking why they achieve some learning goals well and others less well (C)
- Many of Angelo and Cross’s Classroom Assessment Techniques (C)
- Counts of out-of-class interactions between faculty and students (C)
- Counts of programs that disseminate the program’s major learning goals to all students in the program
- Counts of courses whose syllabi list the course’s major learning goals
- Documentation of the match between course/program objectives and assessments (C)
- Counts of courses whose final grades are based at least in part on assessments of thinking skills as well as basic understanding
- Ratio of performance assessments to paper-and-pencil tests (C)
- Proportions of class time spent in active learning (C)
- Counts of courses with collaborative learning opportunities
- Counts of courses taught using culturally responsive teaching techniques
- Counts of courses with service learning opportunities, or counts of student hours spent in service learning activities
- Library activity in the program’s discipline(s) (e.g., number of books checked out; number of online database searches conducted; number of online journal articles accessed)
- Counts of student majors participating in relevant co-curricular activities (e.g., the percent of Biology majors participating in the Biology Club)
- Voluntary student attendance at disciplinary seminars and conferences and other intellectual/cultural events relevant to a course or program (C)


Appendix 6 Direct Assessment Techniques of SLO in Student Services

Publications on MSCHE.org by Michael C. Sachs in 2014 MSCHE Conference