

Assurance Argument

Saint Louis University - MO

3/1/2016

1 - Mission

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

1.A - Core Component 1.A

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

1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission.
(This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

Argument

1.A.1.

Initially created in 1991 and revised in 2008, the official [Mission Statement](#) of the University as approved by the Board of Trustees is:

...the pursuit of truth for the greater glory of God and for the service of humanity. The University seeks excellence in the fulfillment of its corporate purposes of teaching, research, health care and service to the community. It is dedicated to leadership in the continuing quest for understanding of God's creation and for the discovery, dissemination and integration of the values, knowledge and skills required to transform society in the spirit of the Gospels. As a Catholic, Jesuit university, this pursuit is motivated by the inspiration and values of the Judeo-Christian tradition and is guided by the spiritual and intellectual ideals of the Society of Jesus.

The mission guides the University's operations, permeating our academic programs and student support services; it has remain unchanged since the HLC's last review in 2012.

1.A.2.

Academic Programs

In 2012, SLU adopted four overarching University-Wide, [Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes](#) that define the essential educational expectations for all graduates, regardless of major. These outcomes include those that might be characterized as fairly standard academic expectations adopted at many excellent institutions of higher learning; but they also include

outcomes demonstrably specific both to Jesuit higher education and to SLU's distinct educational charism. Examples include the following:

- Graduates will discern the ethical consequences of decisions, actions, and inaction
- Graduates will demonstrate the ability to work within and across communities to promote social justice
- Graduates will articulate if and how faith and reason inform their understanding of and openness to God
- Graduates will demonstrate critical, informed, and creative theological inquiry that deepens their understanding of the transcendent and the human condition

Examples of mission principles manifesting in the curricula of various colleges/schools/ centers, include the following: the [College of Arts and Sciences](#), the [John Cook School of Business](#), and the [Center for Interprofessional Education and Research](#). Additionally, our [School of Medicine](#) has incorporated the Jesuit principle of "educating the whole person" into its curriculum, including the development of learning communities and an increased focus on the wellness of its students.

Service-learning is an important part of the University's curriculum as well. In 2014-2015, SLU offered [196 courses](#) that incorporated service-learning, with a total of 3,681 students enrolled in such courses.

Student Support Services

The University's Division of Student Development, which boasts 13 departments and nearly 200 employees [dedicated to providing support to students](#), "facilitates programs, services, and experiences that help students develop as leaders who are holistically formed, critically reflective, and socially and personally responsible." The division provides [resources](#) such as tutoring; writing services; health, counseling and wellness activities; housing support; involvement and engagement opportunities; and spiritual guidance.

The [Office of International Services](#) provides additional support to SLU's over 1,000 international students, with a mission "...to promote the globalization efforts and mission of SLU." As a Jesuit, Catholic institution, SLU is committed to intercultural communication and cross-cultural understanding. The Office of International Services challenges and supports the growth of all members of the University as leaders with a global perspective.

Enrollment Profile

Consistent with our mission, SLU values diversity and inclusiveness; our students represent [all 50 states](#) and [77 countries](#), and non-white students make up approximately one-third of our total enrollment. To support our mission-centric enrollment operations, the [Division of Enrollment](#)

[and Retention Management](#) commits itself to “collaborate with the SLU community in synthesizing research and services to support the fulfillment of the University’s mission, strategic enrollment vision and our students’ educational goals.”

In pursuit of the above mission and the mission of our University, by 2018 the division seeks to:

- Increase the academic profile of the freshman class
- Increase diversity of the student body
- Maintain a strong Catholic population
- Optimize University service capacities in order to limit tuition increases
- Increase student retention and graduation rates

1.A.3.

As noted in the *Introduction*, the SLU community engaged in a comprehensive [strategic planning process](#) over the course of 2014-2015, with our Catholic, Jesuit mission and values guiding the process and evidencing priority throughout the process. As President Pestello stated:

The strategic planning process that has led to the creation of this document has been carried out under the assurance that the process will be: mission-driven, faithful to, and congruent with, our Jesuit heritage and educational values; open to participation of all who have a stake in SLU’s future, and that this participation will be actively sought at every step in development of a strategy for the future; transparent, assuring that the community will have a clear understanding of the process and of how decisions are made and priorities set; inclusive, offering individuals and organizations invested in SLU’s success multiple opportunities to suggest, promote, and comment upon the strategies developed for the plan; aspirational, accommodating new ideas and new ways of doing things unconstrained by traditional thinking and entrenched policies and procedures while respecting identified needs and the resources available; dynamic, recognizing that strategy is constantly reviewed and renewed in the face of a rapidly changing environment, both in academia and the larger society; and responsive, balancing careful analysis with respectful consideration of the expressed needs and interests of stakeholders.

The strategic planning process and outcomes, detailed in 5.C., have included the creation of eight visions, each of which was assigned a work group of faculty, staff, and students representing a variety of disciplines, departments, and organizations. These “Topical Work Groups” then met regularly to gather information, draft topics to consider when planning, and create a set of goals and objectives to accomplish. These visions were ultimately combined to create the five Strategic Initiatives of the plan, each of which connects directly to our Mission:

Being a National Exemplar of Transformative Academic Excellence. *Our Jesuit heritage tells us that true academic excellence is best achieved when research-active faculty ensure that students experience transformational learning opportunities in the classroom, in the laboratory, in the community...*

Being a Market Leader in Health Promotion and the Highest Quality Medical Care. *No other Catholic, Jesuit university has the breadth of fully accredited academic health programs that exists on the St. Louis campus. No other provider of health care in St. Louis brings the Catholic and Jesuit values of competence, conscience, compassion, and commitment to its daily work.*

Being a Leading Catalyst for Groundbreaking Change in the Region, the Nation, and the World. *As the University approaches its third century in St. Louis, there are new opportunities for enriching the relationship between the University and the regional community in which it sits, instilling a new spirit of mutual cooperation and helping, through collaboration, to foster constructive resolutions to challenging issues within the region.*

Being an Innovator and Entrepreneur in All That We Do. *Although our primary modes of educational practice proceed from our being a residential Catholic, Jesuit research university, we embrace transformational changes that have the potential to facilitate the learning of current students and assist the University to extend high-quality, accessible higher education to future generations and into new educational markets.*

Fostering a Culture of Excellence, Effectiveness, and Efficiency Deeply Rooted in Our Institutional Mission and Catholic, Jesuit Values. *Perhaps the most consistent theme heard in the process that has led to this plan is the broad-based commitment to the SLU mission expressed by students, faculty, and staff. This commitment sets a high bar for institutional behavior in every aspect of its operations. It challenges us to become the campus community our mission calls us to be—open and participative in decision-making, fair and ethical in how we treat one another, respectful of the environment that surrounds us, and careful in our stewardship of the resources provided to do our work. Mission matters—in everything we do.*

University-wide budgeting priorities, detailed in 5.C.1., are also guided by our mission and values. It all begins with our students, nearly [89% of whom receive some form of financial aid from the University](#), with [\\$338 million awarded in FY2015 alone](#). Furthermore, in order to help our students learn, grow, and develop, the university committed [\\$422 million to salaries and benefits](#) of our faculty and staff in FY2015.

SLU also invests heavily in programs that contribute significantly to our community and evidence our commitment to truly live our mission:

- [The College in Prison Program](#)
- [SLU-Belize Project](#)
- [Billiken Teacher Corps](#)
- [Center for Service and Community Engagement](#)
- [Micah Program](#)
- [Campus Kitchen](#)

SLU also recognizes its responsibility to the public good in terms of caring for the environment. As a Catholic institution, we are called by Pope Francis to engage in activities and invest in programs that improve sustainability for the Earth. Pope Francis [decreed](#) that this focus

on the environment is at the very core of the mission of the Catholic Church. SLU is answering that call. In 2014, SLU's Facilities Services opened the [Office of Sustainability and Benchmarking](#) to provide leadership and guidance in improving environmental sustainability in its operations. This office has been critical in implementing such initiatives as campus-wide single-stream recycling, as well as setting a 20% goal reduction in energy and water use by 2020. The office also assisted SLU in obtaining a "[Silver](#)" STARS rating from the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education. These efforts have complimented the academic emphasis SLU placed on environmental sustainability when it opened the [Center for Sustainability](#) in Fall 2010.

Although SLU integrates its mission effectively into its operations and decision-making, all of our definitions related to mission and Jesuit, Catholic values may not be clear, explicit, current, and understood across our campuses. As we become an increasingly diverse community in terms of faith and non-faith traditions, we need to be intentional about ensuring we provide language regarding mission that can be shared and utilized consistently by all of our stakeholders.

Additionally, we need to continue to increase the number and impact of programs, events, and professional development opportunities devoted to mission education for our faculty and staff. Thankfully, our new leadership has already begun to devote more resources to assist faculty and staff in the integration of the mission into their work and daily lives.

Sources

- Billiken-Teacher-Corps_screenshot
- Campus-Kitchen
- CAS-Core-Curriculum_screenshot
- Center-for-Interprofessional-Education-and-Research-Mission_screenshot
- Center-for-Service-and-Community-Engagement-Home-Page_screenshot
- Center-for-Sustainability-Home-Page_screenshot
- Enrollment-and-Retention-Management_screenshot
- International-Services-Home_screenshot
- JCSB-Core-Curriculum_screenshot
- Micah-Program_screenshot
- Office-of-Sustainability-and-Benchmarking_screenshot
- Pope-Francis-Encyclical-On-Care-for-Our-Common-Home_5-24-15
- Prison-Program-Home-Page_screenshot
- Service-Learning-and-Diversity-Courses_2014-2015
- SLU-Belize-Project_screenshot
- SLU-FactBook_2014-2015
- SLU-Mission-Statement_screenshot

- SLU-Profile_2016
- SOM-Curriculum-Overview_screenshot
- STARS-Rating_screenshot
- Strategic-Planning-Process_screenshot
- Student-Development-Annual-Report_2013-2014
- Student-Development-Staff_screenshot
- Student-Educational-Services-Home_screenshot
- Undergraduate-Student-Learning-Outcomes_screenshot

1.B - Core Component 1.B

The mission is articulated publicly.

1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Argument

1.B.1.

[Saint Louis University's mission](#) is clearly and publicly articulated, and readily available on the main website. The University's recently-developed and publicly-available [strategic plan](#) definitively describes who we are as an institution, the challenges we face, and how each of us can live *magis*, an Ignatian term which calls people to reflect on how they can *be* more (not necessarily *do* more). SLU recently created a new position, the [Special Assistant to the President for Mission and Identity](#), to which Dr. Pestello appointed a Jesuit member of the theology faculty. An entire website of [resources related to our Jesuit values and identity](#) is readily available for faculty, staff, students and anyone who is interested in learning more about the mission-centric nature of our institution.

Recognizing that our operations take us beyond the traditional "borders" of campus, our Madrid campus does a thorough job of ensuring our mission is fully represented and understood:

- SLU's mission statement is online in both [English and Spanish](#).
- The mission statement is posted around campus, in handbooks, and is referenced in all of Madrid's planning documents.
- Orientations to the campus involve a section on mission, which also involves officials from the city of Madrid itself, such that the mission and values can be more readily shared.

Over time, the University has also developed a series of documents articulating our mission and further calling members of our community to engage with each other and the broader community in a spirit of compassion, love and respect:

- [Standards of Conduct for the Common Good](#): Standards of conduct in our personal and professional lives at SLU are lived in a variety of ways. By implementing these Standards

of Conduct for the Common Good, we celebrate the shared set of values that enable us to realize the mission of SLU.

- *Shared Values for the Common Good*: In our aspirations to realize the University's mission, we celebrate a shared set of values that support the common good. These values, referred to as the "5Cs"--competence, conscience, compassion, commitment, and community--also frame the annual performance evaluation tool for all University staff.
- *Oath of Inclusion*: Originated by the Student Government Association, students pledge to abide by this oath to respect each other's differences, embrace others, and to challenge their own worldview through diverse interactions and dialogue.

1.B.2. and 1.B.3.

SLU's mission also clearly communicates our purpose and operations, defining four major areas of focus: "The University seeks excellence in the fulfillment of its corporate purposes of teaching, research, health care and service to the community." In support of its mission, SLU

- Encourages and supports innovative scholarship and effective teaching in all fields of the arts; the humanities; the natural, health and medical sciences; the social sciences; the law; business; aviation; and technology.
- Creates an academic environment that values and promotes free, active and original intellectual inquiry among its faculty and students.
- Fosters programs that link University resources to local, national and international communities in collaborative efforts to alleviate ignorance, poverty, injustice and hunger; extend compassionate care to the ill and needy; and maintain and improve the quality of life for all persons.
- Strives continuously to seek means to build upon its Catholic, Jesuit identity and to promote activities that apply its intellectual and ethical heritage to work for the good of society as a whole.
- Welcomes students, faculty and staff from all racial, ethnic and religious backgrounds and beliefs and creates a sense of community that facilitates their development as men and women for others.
- Nurtures within its community an understanding of and commitment to the promotion of faith and justice in the spirit of the Gospels.
- Wisely allocates its resources to maintain efficiency and effectiveness in attaining its mission and goals.

It is clear that our mission is not just words on a website, or a set of documents or statements that defines who we are; rather, it is lived in our operations, carried out by the faculty, staff, students, and alumni through their *own* words and deeds. Examples of how they understand the mission appear in the *Mission in Motion* series, a set of videos highlighting SLU's mission in its diverse manifestations in the work of its students, faculty, and staff. Every week, the SLU e-newsletter *Newslink* publishes a [reflection on mission](#) written by an employee, student, board member, or community friend. Further, SLU has hosted the [Shared Vision program](#) for nearly two decades,

providing everyone a platform to discuss how our campus is (or is not) living its mission through the work, acts, and deeds of its members.

As articulated by President Dr. Pestello in his [inaugural address](#) on October 3, 2014:

In pursuit of our mission, we foster the sort of academic environment that bonds university resources with local, national, and international communities. Through collaborative efforts, we search for answers; transmit, integrate, and apply knowledge; address vexing problems; extend compassionate care; and improve the quality of life. In the Jesuit tradition, our work is directly linked to the world in which we live and learn. Thus, we who are SLU forge a path that serves a higher purpose by contributing to the greater good.

Sources

- Jesuit-Resources_screenshot
- Magis_Sept-2015
- Mission-in-Motion_screenshot
- Mission-Madrid-Campus_screenshot
- Mission-Matters_screenshot
- Oath-of-Inclusion_screenshot
- Pestello-Inaugural-Speech_screenshot
- Shared-Values-for-the-Common-Good_screenshot
- Shared-Vision_screenshot
- SLU-Mission-Statement_screenshot
- Special-Assistant-Diversity-Announcement_screenshot
- Special-Assistant-Mission-Announcement_screenshot
- Standards-of-Conduct-for-the-Common-Good_screenshot

1.C - Core Component 1.C

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

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

Argument

1.C.1.

SLU has remained both geographically and attitudinally at the very heart of St. Louis, a vibrant and culturally diverse metropolitan area. Embracing its urban setting and surrounding community, our campus recognizes the vital role it needs to play in an ever-changing multicultural society. It thus places a great emphasis on diversity, from recruiting incoming students to leading and reaching out to the local and global communities.

In 2013, SLU officially adopted a [diversity statement and definition](#) that expresses the following set of intentions:

- Building alliances across social identities to work together to eradicate all forms of individual and institutionalized discrimination and oppression, including, but not limited to, discrimination and oppression based on race, ethnicity, national origin, immigrant status, gender, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, physical ability, cognitive ability, mental illness, religious beliefs, physical appearance, income, military experience, geographic location, marital status, education, and parental status.
- Instilling in all members of the University community the values and tools necessary to empower them to combat all forms of discrimination and oppression that will prepare each individual to be a responsible local and global citizen and leader.
- Recognizing that personal, cultural, institutionalized, and organizational discrimination and stigmatization along social identities creates and sustains privileges for some while creating and sustaining oppression for others.
- Practicing mutual respect for our own identities, as well as identities different from our own.
- Exploring differences and similarities in a safe and nurturing environment.
- Moving beyond tolerance to embracing and celebrating the identities each individual possesses.

Adding to the emphasis the University places on diversity, in 2014 SLU hired its first chief diversity officer, a [Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Community Engagement](#). This position complements an already significant emphasis on diversity from our administration—especially regarding employees—including an [Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity](#).

1.C.2

SLU's enrollment efforts also reflect this commitment to diversity and multiculturalism, in line with our Jesuit mission:

- While overall enrollment decreased during the 2013-2014 academic year from 2012-2013, there was an increase in the number of Asian, multi-racial, and Muslim students.
- One-third of all students represent students of color or other minority populations.
- Nearly 1,000 students at SLU identify as international, representing 80 countries.
- In its 2018 unit strategic plan, the Division of Enrollment and Retention Management outlined increasing the diversity of the undergraduate student body as a major goal.
- In 2008, the University established the [Cross Cultural Center](#), which facilitates a variety of co-curricular programming dedicated to diversity, including the I AM series, SafeZone LGBTQ training, and dozens of events during Diversity Awareness Month each November. The Center also sponsors the [African-American Male Scholars initiative](#), and advises the 15 chartered student organizations on campus which represent the spectrum of diversity of race, religion and sexual orientation among our student body.
- The University has two dedicated [Interfaith Sacred Spaces](#) on campus which serve as non-denominational areas for individuals or groups of any faith background (or of none) to pray, reflect, meditate or dialogue. SLU's Madrid campus also has established such a space, and has founded the [Ignatian Community Council](#), which organizes round table discussions, visits, and other events related to interfaith issues.

SLU's academic areas include a significant emphasis on diversity and inclusion as well. In fact, during the 2014-2015 academic year, 127 courses were offered that were directly related to diversity and multiculturalism. The 1,649 students enrolled in such courses comprise over 20% of SLU's total undergraduate population. Other examples include:

- The [College of Arts and Sciences](#) includes a number of academic departments/programs that directly emphasize diversity, multiculturalism, and the importance of making local to global connections for our students:
 - o African American Studies
 - o English As A Second Language
 - o Global and Local Social Justice - Power, Society, Culture
 - o Ibero-American Studies
 - o Intercultural Studies, Center for
 - o International Studies Program

- o Languages, Literatures & Cultures
- o Sociology & Anthropology
- o Women's and Gender Studies
 - In 2012, the University opened the [Center for Global Citizenship](#), a 70,000 square foot facility that houses departments, programs, and events focused on the “promotion of collaboration across the University to educate and engage the SLU community for global awareness, responsibility, and participation.”
 - The University awards each year [Martin Luther King, Jr. scholarships](#), given to students who “participate in a structured program designed to deepen self-awareness, provide exposure to multicultural experiences, and develop advocacy competencies to foster positive social change.”

Events that occurred in Ferguson and the St. Louis community during Fall 2014 provided a chance for the campus to put its mission into action in our diverse community, led again by President Pestello. As noted earlier, the Occupy SLU demonstrations brought issues of racial and socio-economic injustice to our doorstep, and the campus’ response was covered by national and local media. For example:

- [CNN National Coverage](#)
- [International Society of Jesus](#)
- [NBC National Coverage](#)
- [Local Media Coverage](#)

Instead of turning away these students and community members, Dr. Pestello and University leadership, after first establishing the safety of our campus and students, invited the protestors to remain on campus. Keeping true to our mission of the “Pursuit of Truth,” Dr. Pestello saw it as a chance to engage in dialogue and discussion around sensitive topics very prevalent in the community:

“It was through the hard work, dialogue and collaboration of many people that we not only concluded the encampment at the clock tower, but also developed a true framework by which SLU can be even stronger in moving our campus forward to address some of the key social issues brought forward last week. ... I want to reiterate that while last week was unprecedented and challenging, it also provided the opportunity for a dialogue that many of us in the SLU community have never had before. And while there was concern about the demonstrations on campus, I did receive many supportive messages about the University’s efforts and the conversations that took place.”

SLU’s thoughtful and holistic approach to the protests garnered much public praise and gratitude from national, local and campus leaders:

- Letter of support from [Attorney General Eric Holder](#)
- Letter of support from [Jesuit Provincial Fr. Ron Mercier](#)

- Letter of support from [Interfaith Partnership of Greater St. Louis](#)
- Numerous letters of support from SLU leadership, including the [Faculty Senate](#), [Staff Advisory Committee](#), and the [Student Government Association](#)

All of the above individual and groups specifically recognized the University's response to events surrounding Ferguson and Occupy SLU as publicly and clearly living out our Jesuit mission. However, while SLU strives to be a place which embraces diversity, educates for multiculturalism, and forms its students into global citizens, we face many of the same challenges as do other institutions of higher education across the country. In times of financial hardship, colleges are struggling to maintain a balance between keeping costs low and increasing the diversity of its student body, allowing for greater access and affordability of a quality education. Challenges specific to SLU (although not unique in the landscape of higher education) include the following:

- Many diversity and multicultural initiatives have been under-funded to date, including both academic and co-curricular programming.
- Not all SLU colleges/schools include a diversity requirement as part of their core curricula.
- The university has seen a decrease in enrollment among specific minority populations, most notably African American and Hispanic/Latino students.

The University's Strategic Plan directly addresses these and other challenges, outlining our specific goals and objectives related to diversity, as in Goals 3 and 4 of [Initiative One](#):

3. We will enhance the array of support services that facilitate students' transitions in their programs of study and strengthen their rates of retention, graduation, and job placement.

4. We will increase access for those seeking the transformative power of a SLU education.

Beyond the strategic plan, the [Clocktower Accords](#) directly address our challenges – indeed, eight of the 12 accords deal directly with diversity as an outreach of our mission.

The future of higher education as it relates to building a spirit of diversity and multiculturalism where all students have access to an affordable college education is daunting. Saint Louis University faces those same challenges, particularly in terms of its focus on recruiting and retaining both a diverse student and employee community.

Sources

- African-American-Male-Scholar-Initiative_screenshot
- Casa-de-Salud_screenshot

- CAS-Departments-and-Programs_screenshot
- Center-for-Global-Citizenship-About_screenshot
- Clocktower-Accords-Update_1-27-15
- CNN-Occupy-SLU
- Cross-Cultural-Center-Initiatives_screenshot
- Cross-Cultural-Center-Student-Organizations_screenshot
- Diversity-Defined_screenshot
- Interfaith-Sacred-Space_screenshot
- Jesuits-Occupy-SLU
- KSDK-Occupy-SLU
- Madrid-Ignatian-Community-Council_screenshot
- Magis_Sept-2015
- Martin-Luther-King-Jr-Scholarship_screenshot
- NBC-Occupy-SLU
- Office-Institutional-Equity-Diversity_screenshot
- Pestello-Reflection_10-22-14
- Pestello-Support-Letter-Faculty-Senate
- Pestello-Support-Letter-Interfaith-Partnership
- Pestello-Support-Letter-Jesuit-Provincial
- Pestello-Support-Letter-Staff-Advisory-Committee
- Pestello-Support-Letter-Student-Government-Association
- Pestello-Support-Letter-US-Attorney-General
- Special-Assistant-Diversity-Announcement_screenshot

1.D - Core Component 1.D

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

1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Argument

1.D.1.

As part of its identity and operations, SLU is called to not only uphold its own mission of “the pursuit of truth for the greater glory of God and for the service of humanity,” but the overall Jesuit mission of inspiring “service of faith and the promotion of justice.” SLU asks that all of us—students, faculty, staff and alumni—respond to this call to serve others in our community, especially the most poor and marginalized. Through this service, we then can grow closer to each other in a spirit of solidarity to promote justice for all, “forming men and women for and with others.”

The facts and figures associated SLU's engagement with the community give a clear indication of our work to achieve this:

- Over 1.6 million hours of service are provided to the community each year by SLU students, faculty, and staff.
- [80% of SLU students are involved](#) with some form of community service each year—nearly three times the national average for college students nationwide.
- A [2012 economic impact study](#) showed that SLU is the largest single developer in the Midtown area, with more than \$850 million in campus improvements, enhancements and expansions during the past 25 years.
- [72% of community organizations with which the University works](#) said that SLU was “Very Effective” or “Effective” at meeting their needs.

These data, along with the efforts of multiple University departments and organizations heavily involved in the community, have earned SLU a number of national honors and recognitions, including:

- Ranked for five consecutive years by the *Washington Monthly* as the No. 4 school in the country for students' dedication to community service, as part of its "[2015 College Guide](#).”

- Named to the [President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll](#) for eight consecutive years. Placement on the honor roll is the highest federal recognition a school can achieve for its commitment to service-learning and community engagement.
- In 2015, SLU received the prestigious [Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement](#), an honor only given to 83 other institutions that year. The award is only given every five years.
- The [John Templeton Foundation](#) named SLU one of 325 colleges and universities nationwide that promotes character growth and development among the student body.

In support of the University's mission of "the service of humanity" as well as the Jesuit mission of the "promotion of justice," SLU established the Center for Service and Community Engagement (CSCE) in Fall 2009. The CSCE serves the entire campus community by offering a multitude of ways to serve, learn, and engage:

- **SERVE:** We connect students, faculty, staff, and alumni to volunteer opportunities in the community, both locally and globally.
- **LEARN:** We promote community-based scholarship by supporting campus-wide service-learning efforts and fostering university-community research partnerships.
- **ENGAGE:** We encourage personal and social responsibility by transforming volunteers into effective servant leaders and advocates of social justice.

The CSCE currently employs six full-time staff members and one graduate assistant, all dedicated to connecting the students, staff and faculty of SLU to engagement opportunities with over 500 community organizations in the St. Louis region.

1.D.2.

As noted in 5.A.2., SLU is a non-profit, private institution subordinate only to its volunteer Board of Trustees and the constituents it exists to serve, SLU commits its resources to its corporate purposes of teaching, research, service, and health care. SLU's educational purpose remains the foremost of those purposes, as each of the others contributes to the educational purpose. As noted in 5.C.1., SLU's expenditures are appropriately distributed.

1.D.3.

While the aforementioned statistics, honors, and rankings provide an overview of how Saint Louis University is committed to the community, they do not capture the breadth or depth of the day-to-day involvement of its students and employees. A number of campus positions and units exist primarily to connect with and serve our constituents in the community--and they exist because of demonstrable need expressed by our surrounding communities. Examples include the following:

- SLU currently has both an [Assistant Vice-President for Community Relations](#) and a [Director of Governmental Relations](#). These entities serve as liaisons among the various community organizations, businesses, elected officials and government agencies with which SLU regularly interacts.
- In 2013, the Schools of Public Health and Social Work combined for a more effective way to address societal issues, forming the [College for Public Health and Social Justice](#). This college is charged to “boldly lead in teaching, researching, and providing services to those most affected by the complex factors that undermine health and welfare.”
- The Medical Center Campus assists with the operations of [Casa de Salud](#), a clinic for immigrants and refugees living in St. Louis who have no access to healthcare. Each year, Casa serves thousands of patients with comprehensive medical care.
- The Medical Center Campus also operates the [Health Resource Center](#), which provides services to over 1,000 area citizens.
- The College of Arts and Sciences sponsors the [Micah Program](#), a learning community for hundreds of students dedicated to faith exploration, service in the community, and the pursuit of justice.
- The SLU [Campus Kitchen](#), the first of its kind in the nation, serves nearly 2,500 meals per month to elderly and disabled individuals living near campus, while reusing food that would otherwise be thrown away by dining services and local grocers. Campus Kitchen was founded in 2001 at SLU, and has since spread to over 50 schools around the country.

Responding to demonstrated community needs, and born out of the institutional, organizational and financial support of the University and funders, several unique programs and campus organizations have been developed in support of SLU’s ongoing commitment to community engagement:

- [College in Prison Program](#): The only on-site program of its kind in the United States, the CIPP provides education to prison staff and incarcerated men at a maximum security prison in Bonne Terre, Missouri. The program promotes service, and includes faculty research on education and incarceration.
- [Gardens To Tables](#): SLU’s Nutrition and Dietetics department is considered a leader in St. Louis for nutrition education and obesity prevention. Gardens To Tables annually educates hundreds of local school children and their parents on nutrition and healthy eating habits, as well as sponsors community gardens in our highly urban areas.
- [Student Organizations](#): The University sponsors twenty student organizations dedicated to service and the pursuit of justice, providing each with operating funds and staff advising to facilitate programs focused on outreach, service, and education.
- [Billiken Teacher Corps](#): Launched in 2015, the Billiken Teacher Corps combines service and teaching to offer a unique opportunity for faith-inspired college graduates to have a transformative impact on Catholic schools in the St. Louis metro area and live the Jesuit mission of being men and women for others.
- [Charter School Sponsorships](#): SLU sponsors two charter schools in the City of St. Louis: City Garden Montessori, a Pre-8th grade school serving mixed income families in South City; and Grand Center Arts Academy (GCAA), a vibrant middle/high school serving a very racially, ethnically, and socio-economically diverse population while emphasizing

the visual and performing arts. Students at City Garden and GCAA received 100% and 98% respectively on Missouri's Annual Performance Report.

- **Service Leadership Program:** A unique curricular program for John Cook School of Business students with a focus on integrated learning, leadership development and community service.
- **SLU Legal Clinics:** The School of Law sponsors five clinics—run by university faculty and students—that provide *pro bono* support both to members of the community and to non-profit agencies.
- **Service and Immersion Trips:** The Department of Campus Ministry annually facilitates 10-12 local, regional, national, and international service and immersion trips over Spring, Winter and Summer Breaks, drawing well over 100 students each year.

Clearly the University has devoted considerable resources to community engagement and outreach. From a budgetary perspective, SLU provides the salaries and benefits of 24 full-time employees whose primary role is community engagement, along with millions of operating dollars. This does not, of course, include the involvement of our faculty who teach the nearly 200 service-learning courses offered each year, nor the leadership of our thousands of students who serve the community on a regular basis.

Saint Louis University's high level of commitment to the community is rooted in both our campus' mission of service to humanity, as well as our Jesuit mission of faith that promotes justice.

Sources

- Billiken-Teacher-Corps_screenshot
- Budget-Summary_FY13-FY14-FY15
- Campus-Kitchen_screenshot
- Carnegie-Distinction-Community-Engagement_1-8-15_screenshot
- Casa-de-Salud_screenshot
- Catalyst-Economic-Impact-Study
- Charter-School-Sponsorship_screenshot
- Community-Relations_screenshot
- CPHSJ-About_screenshot
- CSCE-Annual_Report_2012-2013
- Gardens-to-Tables
- Governmental-Relations_screenshot
- Human-Resources-Home-Page_screenshot
- Immersion-Experiences_screenshot
- JCSB-Service-Leadership-Program_screenshot
- Leadership-Change_9-1-13
- Madrid-Assessment_screenshot
- Micah-Program_screenshot
- Mission-and-Identity-Home-Page_screenshot
- Office-of-Sustainability-and-Benchmarking_screenshot

- Pestello-Named-President_3-21-14
- Presidents-Higher-Education-Community-Service-Honor-Roll_screenshot_2015
- Prison-Program-Home-Page_screenshot
- Shared-Vision_screenshot
- SLU-Charter-School-Report
- SLU-Community-Organization-Survey_2014
- SLU-Rankings-and-Honors_screenshot
- SOL-Legal-Clinics
- SOM-Health-Resource-Center_screenshot
- Strategic-Enrollment-Management-Plan-Framework_2013-2018
- Student-Organizations-Service-and-Justice_screenshot
- Student-Survey-on-Service-Executive-Summary_2012-2013
- Sustainability-Initiatives_screenshot
- Washington-Monthly-2015_screenshot

1.S - Criterion 1 - Summary

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

Summary

Higher education in the United States has become a far more challenging and complex enterprise. Institutions are finding themselves at the crossroads of affordability and accessibility, while still conducting their missions to provide quality education to students. Additionally, colleges and universities are being asked to demonstrate the effectiveness of their education and services. While these issues loom large, Saint Louis University is well-poised to meet them head on, in large part due to its mission, its long-standing role in St. Louis' community development, and its overall educational and financial strength. By providing a holistic experience for an increasingly diverse group of students, and driven by a mission that consistently drives decision-making and operations, Saint Louis University will continue to thrive well into its third century of its existence.

Sources

There are no sources.

2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

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

2.A - Core Component 2.A

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

Argument

Saint Louis University (SLU) is a large and complex organization that operates throughout its academic, healthcare, and supporting functions, and its external relationships, in a fair and ethically responsible manner, and is compliant with law and institutional policy. The importance of this is reflected in *Magis*, SLU's strategic plan, which declares in Initiative Five that our commitment to our mission "...sets a high bar ...sets a high for institutional behavior in every aspect of its operations."

University policies may be initiated at any level and ultimately must be approved by the President's Coordinating Council, which is composed of the president, provost, vice presidents, Madrid campus director/academic dean, a dean representing the St. Louis-based colleges, schools, and libraries, and the leaders of the faculty, staff, and student governance organizations. There currently is no central repository for institutional policies, which traditionally are linked from the websites of the offices responsible for them. The impact of not having all policies accessible in a single location is currently under review by the [Operations Review Committee](#), formed to examine daily operations and administrative procedures to ensure they properly support execution of the strategic plan.

Business and Finance Functions

SLU strives to be the best possible steward of the resources needed to fulfill its mission and achieve its strategic goals. The University regularly receives [unqualified independent audits](#) that confirm the integrity of our financial controls and overall financial management. The Spanish branch of SLU's independent auditor audits the Madrid campus and coordinates its findings with those of the St. Louis branch.

In FY2015, SLU outsourced its internal auditing function to a highly regarded firm with extensive higher education experience and staff expertise, health care and information technology internal audit experience, and local account management. This decision, proposed by the Business and Finance Division and approved by the Board of Trustees, was made to provide

SLU with a constant source of competent auditors, trained in the latest techniques, with the ability to gather information and best practices from other sources, and be cost effective as well. As detailed in 5.D.1., the firm performs an annual risk assessment that is reviewed with the Board's Audit Committee to determine which operations to audit.

Business Services, a department of the Business and Finance Division, has undertaken two initiatives in recent years that demonstrate the University's ongoing efforts to conduct its affairs with integrity.

- [Blue Prints](#), SLU's competitively bid Managed Print Services program, features a partnership with a major provider of document technology and support services intended to ensure a higher level of customer service while (a) reducing costs through improved device (e.g., printer) utilization and more efficient ordering of supplies and services; and (b) realizing greater reliability of both equipment and service. Other benefits include increased document security and a reduction of printing and related equipment which supports SLU's sustainability initiatives.
- SLU's new eProcurement system, [Billiken Buy](#), involves the automation and management of the procurement-to-payment process and is part of the Division's strategy for reducing cost and leveraging efficiencies. Implementation is anticipated by June 1, 2016.

SLU's Information Technology Services (ITS) Division is part of the Business and Finance Division. Its [2020 Information Technology Vision and Priorities](#) statement issued in 2014 notes that information technology at SLU "is a means of facilitating activities that directly support the Catholic, Jesuit mission of the University." To this end, [ITS](#) has established and implemented an array of policies, standards, and procedures to ensure the security of University information and student, faculty, staff, and patient data. Two recent developments exemplify ITS's ongoing efforts to conduct its affairs with integrity:

- Having unsuccessfully sought HIPAA-mandated provisions safeguarding SLU's email and calendaring functions via Google, ITS convened a committee of University stakeholders in Fall 2015 to investigate alternative email providers. The outcome of this review, announced in January 2016, is that SLU will migrate to Microsoft Office 365 for email and calendaring for all faculty, staff, and graduate students to ensure HIPAA compliance. Undergraduate students will continue to use Google mail and calendaring, and all SLU personnel will retain access to Google education applications (e.g., Google Docs and Google Drive).
- In January 2016, ITS issued a [guide](#) to assist University personnel in determining how best to store SLU-owned sensitive electronic data.

Academic Functions

Policies specific to academic domains, such as [academic affairs](#) and [research](#), are linked from policy pages on the websites of the pertinent offices. Selected policies are referenced in *The*

Faculty Manual, which governs the University's St. Louis faculty; this document is currently undergoing [revision](#). Madrid campus faculty are developing their own manual, which will articulate academic policies that are in alignment with the national charter for private universities in Spain.

Further, a number of policies are printed in University catalogs. Over the past two years, [undergraduate](#) and [graduate](#) catalog policies have been thoroughly reviewed, with many revised and some new ones developed, to better reflect current academic practices. Our Policy on Graduate Academic Definitions is currently undergoing [revision](#).

Criteria 2.D. and 2.E. address integrity in the contexts of research and scholarship and academic integrity. Criterion 3 details our approval processes for new undergraduate and graduate programs. Board and most faculty conflicts of interest are addressed in 4.E.1. and 4.C., respectively.

Another significant area of University operations is health care. SLU's [Policy on Medical Center Conflicts of Interest in Patient Care and Service](#) establishes professional standards that guide relationships between SLU health care personnel and the business entities with which they interact, and details required disclosure and monitoring responsibilities. The Office of University Compliance administers required annual compliance training regarding issues of fraud, waste, and abuse for all SLU personnel who work in or support the SLUCare Physician Group; it also oversees the latter's [compliance policy](#) as well as government-required [online education](#) for HIPAA Awareness and Information Security. Compliance [newsletters](#) are accessible to all members of the SLU community. The Institutional Review Board website links to [resources](#) that aid compliance with research-related HIPAA privacy regulations.

Personnel Functions

The Human Resources (HR) Division maintains a readily accessible web page with links to most [University personnel policies](#). These include policies specifically addressing staff issues, such as the [Staff Classification and Compensation Policy](#). There is no staff handbook *per se*, but development of a web page dedicated to staff policies and information is under consideration. Policies applicable to students are printed in the annually updated [Student Handbook](#).

SLU conducts its hiring, separation, and employee performance evaluation practices with integrity. The first thing job applicants see when viewing SLU's employment page is our [Hiring for Mission Statement](#), which conveys to them the University's desire to employ a diverse workforce committed to furthering its mission. Staff hiring is governed by the [Staff Recruitment Policy](#), The *Faculty Manual* details [hiring procedures](#) for faculty, and student worker employment is addressed by HR's [Student Worker Policy](#). All hiring is conducted in compliance with the University's [Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Policy](#) as well as applicable federal laws and regulations. HR hosts [new employee orientation](#) sessions, required for faculty and staff, covering essential information such as University benefit plans, payroll, and

technology, and provides web-based [resources](#) to further assist new employees in assimilating into their new roles. In addition to these HR sessions, new full-time faculty are required to attend [New Faculty Orientation](#), conducted by the Office of Faculty Affairs. In Fall 2015, this office initiated [orientations for new adjunct faculty](#). Attendee feedback on these sessions aids in planning subsequent events. Faculty also may be expected to attend orientation programs sponsored by their respective academic units.

Staff performance evaluations are conducted annually, using a [process and online tool](#) detailed on the HR website. *The Faculty Manual* requires and provides guidelines for [annual review](#) of every faculty member. It also requires a [mid-point review](#) of tenure-track faculty during their probationary periods to assess their progress toward tenure. The processes by which faculty apply for tenure and/or promotion, and the standards for advancement, are guided by provisions of the *Manual* as well as by procedures and standards established by their respective academic units. An HR-sponsored [Learning & Development](#) program fosters continuous personal and professional development for faculty, students, and staff alike.

Separate processes exist to review and adjudicate staff and faculty grievances. For staff, guidelines for filing a grievance are addressed in the [Staff Grievance Policy](#), while the [Staff Peer Review Policy](#) describes the peer review hearing process implemented to resolve serious workplace disputes. *The Faculty Manual* outlines the process through which the [Faculty Senate's Professional Relations Committee screens and adjudicates](#) (1) appeals of non-renewals, (2) impositions of serious sanctions short of termination, and (3) appeals emerging from University processes related to violations of SLU policies on equal opportunity, harassment, or retaliation. For staff, involuntary separation from the University is governed by HR's [Staff Position Elimination Policy](#), while faculty [nonrenewal](#) and [termination](#) are addressed by detailed provisions in *The Faculty Manual*.

In February 2016, President Pestello announced a new initiative known as [Cura](#) (the Latin word for care), an extension of SLU's commitment to "*cura personalis*" or a deep "care of the person." It was developed to address issues raised in SLU's 2014 Climate Assessment and in discussions that contributed to the new strategic plan. *Cura* is intended to foster a more supportive and collaborative work environment and, like the *Magis* Operational Excellence Program, specifically addresses *Magis* Initiative Five, "Fostering a Culture of Excellence, Effectiveness, and Efficiency Deeply Rooted in Our Institutional Mission and Catholic, Jesuit Values." Its standards:

- Treating each other with dignity, compassion and respect
- Treating all colleagues as equally important team members, regardless of job, role or title
- Appreciating and understanding the culture, humanity and differences of others
- Building trust through open, honest communication, reliability and integrity

Concerns raised through the *Cura* initiative will be followed up by an HR representative in collaboration with appropriate institutional partners (e.g., Office of Faculty Affairs, Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity, Staff Advisory Committee, Faculty Senate, University Compliance, and Office of General Counsel).

The University's [Jeanne Clery Act Compliance Policy](#) sets out the required guidelines and procedures to ensure compliance with federal law requiring disclosure of crime on and around campus. SLU issues safety alerts in a timely manner, and via multiple means (email, phone, text) when authorities determine that an incident may pose an ongoing threat to members of the University community. A [daily crime log](#) is maintained and accessible to all SLU students and personnel at all times.

SLU's [Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity](#) actively works to monitor and comply with legislation related to personnel policies, including non-discrimination, harassment, and sexual misconduct; acts as an internal auditor; provide educational programs on diversity and inclusion awareness and policy training; and serves as a resource for all members of the University community. It is responsible for the resolution of discrimination and harassment complaints by faculty, staff, and students. The Office's policy and training initiatives regarding sexual misconduct are especially notable at a time when this subject is the focus of considerable national scrutiny. All students are required to complete "Haven," an online educational module that informs about issues associated with sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, and healthy/unhealthy relationships. At the start of 2016, this requirement was expanded to include all SLU faculty and staff. SLU's [Sexual Misconduct Policy](#) is reviewed annually, and updated as needed. In March 2015, a special Faculty Senate town hall meeting, in which the policy's implications for faculty were reviewed and discussed, was led by the Office director, Office of General Counsel leadership, and the vice president for student development.

Student Concerns

SLU maintains and enforces policies governing student behavior; those policies and related processes are codified in the *Student Handbook* section on Community Standards. The Handbook details procedures for addressing violations, including hearings, appeals, sanctions, records, and notifications. Throughout all aspects of every disciplinary situation, whether academic or not, SLU's actions comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The University recognizes that students may display behavioral concerns that pose imminent risk or harm to self, others, or the community. The Behavioral Concerns Committee, composed of professional Student Development Division staff, reviews such cases and works with students to develop action plans designed to both assist and support the students while balancing the needs of the University community.

Disposition of cases of alleged student misconduct are [cataloged and monitored](#) via the Maxient public safety incident reporting software. Individual cases of alleged misconduct are [addressed to their appropriate conclusion](#) per University policy.

In full compliance with federal and state regulations, SLU also provides opportunities for students to lodge complaints about their SLU experience both with the University and with other relevant parties, including the Higher Learning Commission and the departments of education from the states in which students reside. SLU maintains a [website devoted to assisting students with such complaints](#). That website includes information about other policies pertaining to

students, including the processes for filing grade appeals or complaints about other academic issues.

As a member of the Division I Atlantic 10 SLU is also committed to full compliance with regulations governing our student athletes and their athletic programs; that commitment is reflected in both an absence of NCAA sanctions and the operational guidance provided by the SLU Athletic Compliance Manual, a resource for compliance-related issues for Athletics Department staff that complements the regulations and guidance promulgated by the NCAA.

Auxiliary Functions

The Auxiliary Services Department provides contract management, financial oversight, and capital planning of the University's ancillary income divisions. Notable changes in these enterprises since 2012:

- Dining – In 2014, following a vendor selection process inclusive of numerous University stakeholders, SLU entered into a five-year contract with Aramark to provide on-campus dining services. The agreement also addressed the need to enhance the University's dining facilities and the funding of significant capital improvements over its life. Contract renewal is optional and based on performance.
- Chaifetz Arena – The home of the basketball and volleyball Billikens and site of major SLU events, including commencement, Chaifetz came under new management. Since 2012, POLLSTAR has ranked the arena among the [top 200 arena venues](#) in worldwide ticket sales. Its success as a venue is also reflected in the status of events it draws—forthcoming are performances by Janet Jackson, Bruce Springsteen, Carrie Underwood, Ellie Goulding, and the 2016 Men's U.S. Olympic Trials and P&G Gymnastics Championships.
- Residence Halls – In 2014, SLU [announced](#) that its first campus housing master plan called for construction of two new facilities on the main campus (one to open in August 2016, the other in 2017) as well as renovation of the aged Griesedieck complex (2019 target). These projects will meet increased student housing demand and enhance the SLU student campus experience.

Sources

- [2020_Information_Technology_Vision_and_Priorities](#)
- [Academic-Affairs-Policies_screenshot](#)
- [Adjunct-Faculty-Orientation](#)
- [Athletic-Compliance-Manual_screenshot](#)
- [Billiken-Buy_screenshot](#)
- [Blue-Prints_screenshot](#)

- Chaiftez-Arena_Pollstar-Rankings
- Compliance-Newsletters_screenshot
- Confidential-Grievance-Incident-Report_8-28-2014
- Consolidated-Financial-Statements-and-Independent-Auditors-Reports_FY14-FY15
- CURA-Announcement-President_2-1-16
- Daily-Crime-Log_screenshot
- Equal-Opportunity-Affirmative-Action-Policy_screenshot
- Faculty-Manual-Amendment-Proposals_2-23-16
- Faculty-Manual_Current
- Graduate-Academic-Definitions-Policy-Draft-2-11-16
- Graduate-Policy-Changes_FY15
- HIPAA-resources_screenshot
- HIPAA-training_screenshot
- HR-Hiring-for-Mission-Statement_screenshot
- HR-Learning-Development_screenshot
- HR-New-Employee-Orientation_screenshot
- HR-New-Employee-Toolkit_screenshot
- HR-Policies_screenshot
- ITS-Policies-Processes_screenshot
- ITS-Sensitive-Data-Guide_screenshot
- Jeanne-Clery-Act-Compliance-Policy
- Magis_Sept-2015
- New-Faculty-Orientation_FY16
- Office-of-Institutional-Equity-and-Diversity_screenshot
- Operations-Review-Committee_screenshot
- Policy-on-Medical-Center-COI-in-Patient-Care-and-Service
- Research-Policies_screenshot
- Residence-Halls-Announcement_10-9-14_screenshot
- Sexual-Misconduct-Policy
- Staff-Classification-and-Compensation-Policy
- Staff-Grievance-Policy
- Staff-Peer-Review-Policy
- Staff-Position-Elimination-Policy
- Staff-Recruitment-Policy
- Student-Complaint-Procedures_screenshot
- Student-Handbook_Current
- Student-Worker-Policy
- Total-Grievance-Reports_FY14-FY15-FY16
- UMG-Compliance-Policy
- Undergraduate-Policy-Changes_FY15-FY16
- University-Performance-Evaluation-Program_screenshot

2.B - Core Component 2.B

The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Argument

An educational institution's clear and complete presentation of all of its institutional information, including its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships, is a basic and appropriate expectation of both its students and the public. This expectation is even more pronounced as tuition and fee increases and attendant calls for accountability persist. Saint Louis University (SLU) has always strived to communicate as much information on these and other important topics as thoroughly and accessibly as possible.

Two of the most widely distributed marketing pieces, available in both print and online formats, are the prospective student-oriented [University Viewbook](#) and the annual [Profile](#). These snapshots of campus life include information about degree programs and key data points such as current tuition, fees, and financial aid.

The primary venue for the public presentation of institutional information is the [University website](#). A challenge for large, complex organizations such as SLU is ensuring that the information presented on its website is consistent across all of its multiple web presences (i.e., sites of units under the institutional umbrella). Information inconsistencies across institutional websites are addressed in a timely fashion when communicated to the entity responsible for resolving the error.

In January 2015, a major redesign of the SLU website was launched and a detailed implementation [timeline](#) announced. When completed in 2016, this initiative will refresh one of the University's most visible presences and ensure that all website content undergoes some level of review. This effort will help identify information that is outdated or in conflict so corrections and changes can be made. A concurrent undertaking is the [renewed branding](#) of the University in the form of the makeover of SLU's logomark (fleur-de-lis) and logo, and the Billiken (mascot) symbol—the first such changes in 20 years. The invigorated website and institutional symbols are anticipated to better communicate SLU's institutional identity.

Information about SLU's programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships, as well as that for other important topics, can readily be found and accessed on the University website as follows:

Programs and Requirements

The University's home page was intentionally designed to provide convenient access to information about academic programs. The [Majors & Programs](#) link in the footer leads potential and current students alike to launch pages for undergraduate, graduate and professional, and adult education majors and programs under which more detailed information is provided. The page for each undergraduate major (e.g., [English – undergraduate](#)) identifies the college, school, or center affiliation, linking directly to that entity's page about its degree programs; each such link also leads to (a) a broad overview of the degree program(s), (b) a brief "What You'll Learn in SLU's [XYZ] Program" explanation, and (c) a short summary of potential career options. Each page also includes links to a handy two-page fact sheet about the degree, information about SLU's undergraduate admission requirements as well as scholarship and financial aid, and a "Majors Quiz" to help the undecided start to think about potential areas of study that might be a good fit for them.

The main page for [Graduate & Professional Majors & Degrees](#) lists degrees offered by each program, and links each program's fact sheet to parent web pages that provide information similar to that provided for undergraduate degree programs. Persons interested in adult education are directed to the website of the [School for Professional Studies](#) which, in turn, leads to detailed descriptive information about its requirements and degree programs.

The University's [academic catalogs](#), compiled by the registrar in consultation with the academic units and the Office of the Provost, present current policies, descriptive information about the academic units and pertinent accreditation background, and special programs. For each program described in each catalog, users will find degrees, admission and graduation requirements, curriculum descriptions with course requirements, and lists of affiliated faculty. Each also links to the [online Course Catalog](#) containing course descriptions.

With information about academic programs available from numerous sources, ensuring that that information is consistently presented is an ongoing challenge. Hence, SLU is presently considering the purchase of catalog software that would feed consistent academic program data across all instances of the University's web presence.

Faculty and Staff

As noted above, the academic catalogs contain lists of faculty affiliated with each academic unit. The websites of colleges and schools feature departmental lists of affiliated faculty and staff; the sites of the degree-granting centers and the libraries also contain such lists. In all cases, additional information about the faculty is linked from there (e.g., [Nursing](#), [Psychology](#)).

The staff of non-academic units with whom students often interact, or who have direct responsibility for student-related matters, also are readily identified on the unit websites. The [Division of Student Development](#) home page, for example, clearly identifies all of the division's components, each of which provides staff contact information.

Costs to Students

While admission resources, such as the Viewbook, provide summary cost information, the website of [Student Financial Services](#) provides not only cost and financial aid information, but an extensive array of related material that contributes toward a fuller understanding of the financial aspects of SLU attendance. The website section, [Financing a SLU Education](#), features a detailed breakdown of current tuition, room, and board rates, as well as links to cost calculators, and process and policy information. Equally important, web pages are also devoted to information on scholarships and other awards, and about a range of loan opportunities.

Control

A Catholic, Jesuit university, Saint Louis University is a corporation organized for educational purposes pursuant to a charter granted by the General Assembly of the State of Missouri in 1832, amended by the Assembly in 1851, and amended again in 1932, by Decree of the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis. In 1967, SLU became the first major American institution operated by a Catholic religious order to vest legal ownership and control, including fiduciary responsibility, in a board composed of both lay women and men and religious. The University's charter vests governance of the institution's corporate affairs in a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees of 25 to 55 members, of whom at least six but no more than 12 are members of the Society of Jesus ([current membership](#) is 40, including 7 Jesuits). SLU's President is a voting, *ex-officio* member of the Board. While SLU is guided by the spiritual and intellectual ideals of the Society of Jesus, the institution has no legal relationship with the religious order.

Personnel at all levels of administrative leadership within the University are identifiable on the SLU website.

- University Leadership:
 - o [President](#)
 - o [Board of Trustees](#)
 - o [Executive Staff](#) – The University's senior leadership team, consisting of the president, provost and vice presidents, and the Madrid campus director/academic dean. Each of these administrators' areas of oversight has its own website (e.g., [provost](#), [general counsel](#)).
 - [Academic Deans and Degree-Granting Center Directors](#)
 - Academic Division and Department Leadership – Identified on unit websites
 - Faculty, Staff, and Student Leadership – The [Faculty Senate](#), [Staff Advisory Committee](#), and [Student Government Association](#) have websites dedicated to their respective activities.

Accreditation Relationships

The Office of Academic Affairs maintains an [accreditation log](#) of college, school, and program external accreditation relationships and status. This supplements the accreditation information noted in the University's academic catalogs and on web pages of the respective academic programs.

Other Key Information

Given the importance of institutional websites and the increasingly prominent place of other social media in the life of the University, the Division of Marketing and Communications offers [social media guidelines](#) to help ensure the appropriate and accurate use of all such tools (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, YouTube, blogs).

A host of topics—many ongoing, some related to specific situations—may naturally be of interest to the public as well as persons associated with the institution. Additional SLU websites that reflect selected topics and contribute to the accurate representation of the institution include:

- [Annual Security and Fire Safety Report](#) – Compliant with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act
- [Gainful Employment Disclosures](#) – Compliant per 34 C.F.R. §668 with public disclosure of specific data regarding all academic programs designated as "Gainful Employment" programs per Department of Education definitions
- [State Authorization to Operate in Other States](#) – Compliant with individual state distance learning regulations
- [Campus webcams](#) – Primarily a marketing tool, these webcams assumed a critical role in conveying to the public, and especially to SLU students' families, the campus conditions during the Fall 2014 Occupy SLU protests described in 1.B.

Sources

- Academic-Catalogs_screenshot
- Academic-Deans-and-Directors_screenshot
- Accreditation-and-Authorization-Log_May-2015
- Annual-Security-Fire-Safety-Report_2015
- Board-of-Trustees_screenshot
- Branding-New_screenshot
- Executive-Staff_screenshot
- Faculty-Senate-Home-Page_screenshot
- Financing-a-SLU-Education_screenshot
- Gainful-Employment-Disclosures_screenshot
- Graduate-and-Professional-Majors-Degrees_screenshot
- Majors-and-Programs_screenshot

- Nursing-Faculty_screenshot
- Office-of-General-Counsel-Home-Page_screenshot
- Office-of-the-Provost-Home-Page_screenshot
- Online-Course-Catalog_screenshot
- President_screenshot
- Psychology-Faculty_screenshot
- Residence-Halls_Announcement_10-9-14_screenshot
- SLU-Home-Page_screenshot
- SLU-Profile_2016
- SLU-Viewbook
- Social-Media-Guidelines_screenshot
- SPS-Majors-Programs_screenshot
- Staff-Advisory-Committee_screenshot-Home-Page
- State-Authorization_screenshot
- Student-Development-Division-Home-Page_screenshot
- Student-Financial-Services-Home-Page_screenshot
- Student-Government-Association-Home-Page_screenshot
- Timeline-Web-Redesign_screenshot
- Undergraduate-English_screenshot
- Webcams-Campus_screenshot

2.C - Core Component 2.C

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

1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Argument

2.C.1.

The full scope of Board members' responsibilities is detailed in the trustees' [Statement of Commitment and Responsibilities](#). In summary, and as noted in 2.B., Saint Louis University's charter vests "government and corporate powers of the University" in a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees. The [University Bylaws](#) (as amended December 5, 2015) provide for a Board composed of 25 to 55 members, including members of the Society of Jesus and SLU's President who is a voting member *ex-officio*. Article I of the Bylaws specify that

The primary corporate purposes of the University, expressed in its charter, are the encouragement of learning and the extension of the means of education. In common with other American social institutions, the University is dedicated to the service of its immediate community, the service of the Nation and the service of the world at large. The University fulfills its corporate purposes and carries out these dedications by means appropriate to a university in our society, that is, through teaching and research, and by the discovery, preservation and communication of knowledge. The University therefore, and its Trustees on its behalf recognize and accept three primary responsibilities: that of teaching; that of research; and that of community service.

Additionally, the Bylaws cite SLU's heritage as a Catholic, Jesuit university, and include a [statement](#) that the trustees acknowledge that furtherance of the institution's corporate purposes and the conduct of its operations are accomplished in this context.

A critical and fundamental Board responsibility is the hiring and oversight of the University's president. Following an extensive, year-long national search led by the Board but featuring input from a diverse and representative search committee, the [Board appointed Dr. Fred Pestello](#) as SLU's first permanent lay president, effective July 1, 2014.

SLU's Board of Trustees has been integrally involved in the University's latest [strategic planning process](#), initiated by President Pestello in his first semester in office. As detailed in 1.A. and 5.C.3., this process was characterized from the very start by transparency and extensive input from all institutional constituents—a level of collaboration beyond that of any in recent institutional memory and one that is especially significant for its largely bottom-up approach. Early in the process, a session of the full Board meeting on February 28, 2015, was devoted to a review of the developing plan's status with opportunities for input. The president and project leadership consulted with the Board on a regular basis throughout the development process, soliciting feedback on multiple drafts, and incorporating that feedback as appropriate. And on September 26, 2015, our new strategic plan, *Magis*, was approved by the Board, laying the foundation for the University's future and identifying priorities to guide its bicentennial (2018) comprehensive capital campaign.

2.C.2.

[Standing committees](#) accomplish much of the Board's work. The range of committees and their scope of responsibilities, as described in the [Trustee Handbook](#), reflect the University's corporate purposes and its relationships with pertinent internal and external constituencies.

The entire Board membership meets quarterly; the standing committees meet quarterly and as needed. Trustees may be appointed to from one to three committees; the president, Board chair and Board vice chair serve as *ex officio* members of all the committees. Each standing committee is supported by one or more members of SLU's senior leadership team (i.e., Executive Staff) who are responsible for reporting to their respective committees on pertinent University activity and related matters, and maintaining committee records such as meeting minutes. Representatives of SLU's faculty, staff, and student governance organizations sit on the following Board committees and participate in most of their deliberations: Academic Affairs, Clinical Affairs, Development, Finance, Human Resources, Investment, Marketing and Branding, Mission and Ministry, and Student Development. Meeting minutes of the Board and each of its committees regularly reference or include reports from the leadership of University units and governance organizations and, as appropriate, external constituents and entities.

2.C.3.

The Board's [Statement of Criteria for Trusteeship](#) and its [Statement of Commitment and Responsibilities](#) declare the expectation that its members serve the best interests of the University and demonstrate sensitivity to any situation that might cause even the appearance of a conflict of interest with their Board roles. [Article VII](#) of the University's Bylaws contains a Conflicts of Interest provision that references the [Board Conflict of Interest Policy](#) and provides for annual disclosure of such conflicts.

Each year, the vice president and general counsel, who also serves as secretary of the University, distributes to each trustee a packet containing the [Board Conflict of Interest Policy](#), the [Conflict of Interest Policy Acknowledgement form](#), and the [Board Conflict of Interest Questionnaire](#) which includes information needed for University certification for federal grant applications. Completed forms are sent to the president's office and filed with the chairman of the Board.

[Article I](#) of the Board Conflict of Interest Policy declares this purpose:

...to protect the interests of Saint Louis University (the "University") in any transaction or arrangement that might benefit the private interest of a member of the University's Board of Trustees, or a University Trustee's Family Member, as defined herein; and to monitor the activities of a member of the University Board of Trustees, or University Trustee's Family Member, that may compete with, or be detrimental to, the interests of the University.

[Article II](#), the obligations provision of the policy, states that "All decisions of the Board of Trustees of the University are to be made solely on the basis of a desire to advance the best interests of the University and the public good. The integrity of the University must be protected at all times."

The policy recognizes that trustee service in other capacities may raise conflict concerns and may actually be inconsequential, but requires that members identify any relationships that could be problematic. In addition to the formal, written, annual declaration of apparent or actual conflicts, [Article IV](#) states that trustees are expected to identify such situations as they arise during meetings or other Board deliberations. [Board minutes reflect such situations and the action taken.](#)

The Procedures provision, [Article IV](#), specifies the steps to be taken in determining whether a conflict exists; at various points, the Board chair, University general counsel, and Board Audit Committee may be involved in this decision. Violations of the policy result in appropriate action, up to and including removal from the Board or a Board committee. Finally, per [Article VIII](#), the Board of Trustees Audit Committee conducts periodic reviews "to ensure that the University operates in a manner consistent with its charitable purposes and that it does not engage in activities that could jeopardize its status as an organization exempt from Federal income tax, and that the University's interests are not compromised."

2.C.4.

The Board's [Statement of Criteria for Trusteeship](#) prizes the importance of trustees learning "the critical distinctions between active oversight and intrusive behavior" and understanding the boundaries that "distinguish effective governance from intrusive activities." Its [Statement of Commitment and Responsibilities](#) declares that the University president is accountable for the institution's day-to-day management and that the trustees focus "on the Board's responsibilities for issues of institutional strategy and high policy."

[Article II](#) of the University Bylaws details the structure and operational conduct of the Board of Trustees, whereas [Article III](#) delineates the officers of the University and their duties. The provision for the [president](#) clearly conveys the centrality of this position to the day-to-day management of the institution:

The President shall be the chief executive and administrative officer of the University...Subject to such limitations as the Board may prescribe, the President shall have the general and active management, supervision, control and direction of the business operations, education activities and other affairs of the University, and shall execute all authorized bonds, deeds, mortgages, notes or other securities of the University in the name of the University, except where required or permitted by law to be otherwise signed and executed, and except where the signing or execution thereof shall be expressly delegated by the Board to some other agent or officer of the University.

The Bylaws [provisions for the provost and vice president\(s\)](#) state that they are charged to “perform such duties and have such other powers as the President from time to time shall delegate...or as shall be prescribed from time to time by the Board.”

The minutes of Board and Board Executive Committee meetings reflect examples of appropriate Board oversight of actions led or conducted by members of the senior University leadership and their staffs. Examples from 2014-2015 (italics added here for emphasis):

- [February 28, 2015, Board meeting](#) – Describing anticipated budget challenges, *the President reported that he is utilizing the newly formed President’s Advisory Committee, a group of about 85 members of the campus community, to discuss the challenges facing the University, to reflect on appropriate responses to the shortfall and to make recommendations to him.*
- [May 27, 2015, Board Executive Committee meeting](#) – Discussion on health care transactions led by the Vice President and General Counsel who began by introducing *the internal leadership team that negotiated the deals.*

Another example of appropriate oversight occurs when the Board is called upon by its Academic Affairs Committee to approve the latter group’s recommendation of the establishment of new academic programs. The supporting documents for these recommendations are provided by the academic department(s) and college, school, or center in which the proposed program will reside, as well as the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee (UAAC) or Graduate Academic Affairs Committee (GAAC) as appropriate. That the Board observes proper boundaries in such cases is reflected in the [report by the Board Academic Affairs Committee faculty representatives](#) to the Faculty Senate on the Committee’s September 25, 2015, meeting.

Sources

- Board-AAC-Faculty-Rep-Report_9-25-15
- Board-COI-Questionnaire-and-Policy
- Board-Committees_FY2016

- Board-New-Trustee-Handbook_2015
- Board-New-Trustee-Orientation-Accreditation_2015
- Board-New-Trustee-Orientation-Selected-Governance-Articles_2015
- Board-New-Trustee-Orientation-Statements-Minutes_FY2015
- Board-New-Trustee-Orientation-University-Information_2015
- Magis_Sept-2015
- Pestello-Named-President_3-21-14
- Strategic-Planning-Process_screenshot
- University-Bylaws_Current

2.D - Core Component 2.D

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

Argument

The role of academic freedom at a Catholic university is a topic of great importance to our faculty and students alike. While most are drawn to Saint Louis University (SLU) because of its Catholic identity and the humanistic values of Jesuit education, they initially may be unclear about the interplay of that identity and the institution's mission and values with academic freedom. The [Occupy SLU Movement](#) referenced in 1.B. is a prime example of how that relationship can play out in a constructive matter.

In its [academic freedom provision](#), *The Faculty Manual* (2008) makes clear the centrality of this tenet to the University enterprise. Key excerpts:

- *Essential to the purpose of a university is the free and unhampered pursuit and communication of knowledge and truth. All members of the University, especially students and faculty members, have not only the right but also the duty to participate in this task of freely seeking after and sharing truth. Every student and every faculty member, therefore, has the freedoms of thought, of discussion, and of action that are required by the common pursuit of truth.*
- *In a Catholic university the different ways that have been developed for searching for knowledge are recognized in their diversity. The path of scientific experimentation and discovery, the path of philosophical analysis, the path of experience and humanistic insight, and the path of Christian scripture and Judeo-Christian tradition are all taken together as yielding to men and women a knowledge of themselves and of the world.*
- *All persons joining the faculty of the University are expected to understand and respect the fact that they are coming into an institution in which Christian scripture and Judeo-Christian tradition are recognized as sources of knowledge as valid as natural human experience or reason, and where theology is recognized as a discipline. This expectation, of course, does not prevent them from stating and explaining their own personal views.*

The Faculty Manual further addresses the concept of academic freedom in two other important provisions:

- (1) [its description of shared governance](#), noting that University faculty determine their course content, method of instruction, and degree requirements in their respective programs; and
- (2) [its outline of procedures](#) through which faculty may file grievances for violations of academic freedom in cases of contract nonrenewal.

In its teaching provision, *The Faculty Manual* offers this guidance to faculty in their interactions with students:

In the classroom and in student advising, faculty members should encourage free discussion, inquiry, and expression. They must allow students to take reasoned exception to the data or views they present and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion, although they must hold students responsible for learning the content of the courses in which the students are enrolled and they must evaluate student performance on academic grounds.

While *The Faculty Manual* does state that students as well as faculty possess “the freedoms of thought, of discussion, and of action that are required by the common pursuit of truth,” other University policies and provisions support freedom of inquiry for students. The [Student Handbook](#) references academic freedom in these contexts: (a) information technology; (b) harassment; acts of hate, bias, or other acts of intolerance; and (c) the [Performance, Presentation and Speaker \(Program\) Policy](#). The latter policy, with its related procedures, attempts to strike a balance between the criticality of students’ ability to engage in the open exchange and analysis of ideas and SLU’s Catholic, Jesuit heritage. Two recent student-organized events illustrate the tension that sometimes arises when dealing with especially contentious subjects:

- In February 2015, the School of Law’s student-run Saint Louis University Public Law Review hosted its academic symposium, “The Thin Blue Line: Policing Post Ferguson.” The St. Louis County prosecuting attorney in the case of the 2014 shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson had been invited as a featured speaker. Because of controversy over his handling of aspects of the grand jury process in this case, there were calls for him to be disinvited and even for the symposium to be cancelled. [President Pestello’s February 9, 2015, message](#) to the University community about this conflict stands as an example of the institution’s recognition of the importance of freedom of inquiry and expression in a learning environment.
- In late Fall 2015, amid increased national scrutiny of Planned Parenthood, SLU’s chapter of Law Students for Reproductive Justice planned to host a forum at the law school to discuss the national organization and the prevailing Missouri legal climate confronting it. Following discussions with senior University officials, including the president, the student group convened its event, but at an off-campus site.

Debates such as those that occurred in the aforementioned situations sustain community-wide discussion of academic freedom in the context of SLU’s Catholic, Jesuit identity.

The Student Handbook’s [Statement of Rights and Responsibilities](#) also specifies these pertinent student rights:

- the right to learn, which includes the right of access to ideas, the right of access to facts and opinions, the right to express ideas, and the right to discuss those ideas with others; and

- the right to express opinion, which includes the right to state agreement or disagreement with the opinions of others and the right to an appropriate forum for the expression of opinion.

Sources

- Faculty-Manual_Current
- Occupy-SLU-Movement-NBC-News_10-13-14
- Pestello-Message_2-9-15
- Student-Handbook_Current

2.E - Core Component 2.E

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

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.
2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.
3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Argument

2.E.1.

Saint Louis University's (SLU) Division of Research Administration is headed by the vice president for research who reports directly to the provost. Significant responsibility for the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by members of the SLU community rests with this office, with additional support provided by other institutional entities as appropriate. [Research compliance training](#) is an integral part of this responsibility. The division has direct oversight over a number of integrity-related functions, including the following:

[Animal Studies](#) – SLU's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) provides “oversight for compliance with all relevant laws and regulations so as to assist researchers, faculty, and students in the conduct of high quality research and teaching, thereby assuring the public of the humane care and use of vertebrate animals used for these endeavors.” SLU is a USDA-registered research facility and its Animal Care and Use Program is fully accredited by the Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care, International (AAALACi). The University files all assurance and other documents as required. The IACUC maintains a Google site accessible to the SLU community that provides animal protocols and channels through which reports—including anonymous reports—of animal care and research concerns may be made.

[Human Studies](#) – The Institutional Review Board (IRB) is the administrative body responsible for the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects recruited for participation in research activities conducted under the University's auspices. In 2012, following internal evaluation of IRB efficiency and effectiveness, SLU's separate disciplinary IRBs for behavioral/social science and for biomedical science were merged. The current operation is composed of two boards that each meet monthly, and a third board that meets on an *ad hoc* basis on urgent matters necessitating review outside the regularly scheduled board meetings. The membership of each board is constituted such that all of them can review research proposed by any academic discipline; this helps ensure that each board functions in a manner consistent with the others (e.g., in the assessment and classification of risks).

The IRBs review all human research studies that require full board review—proposals of more than minimal risk or minimal risk cases that do not meet the regulatory criteria for expedited review mechanisms conducted outside of the convened meetings. The IRBs also review all incidents of non-compliance that are classified initially by the IRB Office as possibly serious or continuing non-compliance. The convened board is the only body that can suspend or terminate IRB approval or disapprove a study outright, and/or reverse either of those decisions.

Human studies research proposed by members of SLU's Madrid campus community go through the same processes as proposals submitted by St. Louis-based personnel. Madrid campus representatives and University IRB administrators are jointly investigating additional considerations such as Madrid collaboration with non-US international partners, e.g., whether reliance upon international ethics committees may be an option. They also are reviewing the practices of other U.S. research universities with international campuses and engaging SLU's Office of the General Counsel about relevant laws, regulations, and policies.

The [Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs, Inc. \(AAHRPP\)](#) recently [reported](#) that “all major U.S. independent institutional review boards are AAHRPP accredited” and that over 60% of U.S. research-intensive universities and 65% of U.S. medical schools are either already accredited or are in the process of applying for accreditation. SLU is now among this influential group. To further strengthen the University's IRB's human research protection programs, work is underway to complete SLU's application for AAHRPP accreditation by June 30, 2016. This accreditation, which requires tangible evidence in the form of policies, procedures, and practices, provides assurance to all stakeholders, including the public, that an institution has achieved and maintains the highest ethical and professional standards for its human research programs. This, in turn, is anticipated to encourage increased collaboration with other AAHRPP-accredited institutions and may make SLU a more desirable funding recipient.

SLU's IRB Office has been closely monitoring the discussion of proposed changes to the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, intended to increase the efficacy of this policy implemented in 1991 as a Common Rule. The University is prepared to adapt to all revisions ultimately implemented.

Conflict of Interest in Research – The University's latest revision of its [Financial Conflict of Interest in Research Policy](#), compliant with federal regulations, went into effect on November 1, 2013. It acknowledges the importance of SLU-industrial (or other external) research partnerships but also recognizes that actual or even perceived financial conflicts of interest may result from such relationships. Its purpose is to aid researchers in structuring their relationships with external entities in ways that avoid conflicts—or to address them if they emerge—and to maintain public trust in the University's research endeavors. The policy requires all investigators applying for or engaged in externally sponsored research to complete an annual [Conflict of Interest in Research Disclosure Form](#), as well as to make *ad hoc* disclosures should their circumstances change. The role of the Conflict of Interest in Research Committee (COIRC) and procedures for dealing with real or perceived conflicts are detailed. An additional policy addresses the [COIRC's composition and general operations](#). [Presentations](#) and web-based

[FAQs](#) on financial conflicts of interest are made periodically to help educate potential and active investigators about this critical topic.

Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) – In adherence with its [Policy for Responsible Conduct of Research Training for Students, Post-Doctoral Fellows, and Trainees Supported by External Funds](#), SLU provides a formal training program “to ensure that faculty, students, and staff engaged in all fields of research have a working knowledge of the ethical and responsible conduct of research.” SLU’s training programs comply with the requirements of federal agencies such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF). SLU personnel involved in non-NIH or NSF research are also encouraged to participate in this training. RCR training takes these forms:

- Online modules available through the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI). Completion is required prior to the end of NIH- or NSF-funded activity for persons funded by these agencies.
- RCR-sponsored workshops are held through the fall and spring semester. Each addresses at least one key RCR topic and counts toward the face-to-face training requirement of the NIH and NSF. Most sessions consist of a panel of faculty and/or staff representing different disciplines and areas of expertise of the topic. Recent topics include Authorship Peer Review, Conflicts of Interest in Research, Copyright, Information Security in Research, and Patenting and Ownership.

Research Misconduct – SLU’s newly revised [Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct](#) serves to provide an equitable and timely method for resolving such allegations. Chief changes include processes that protect complainant confidentiality and recognition of the research integrity officer (i.e., SLU’s vice president for research) as having the authority to determine sanctions.

SLU’s other research compliance committees are the Institutional Biosafety Committee, which oversees research involving select agents, and the Radiation Safety Committee which oversees research using ionizing radiation at both the University and the hospital.

Responsibility for export controls rests with the Office of University Compliance, in SLU’s Office of the General Counsel. SLU has an export control officer dedicated to assisting University personnel with related issues and questions and ensuring compliance with our [Export Control Policy](#). This office also oversees the University’s confidential, toll-free [Compliance Hotline](#) available to anyone with concerns about any aspect of the institution’s operations, including those related to research and scholarship. Calls are answered by employees of an established independent entity contracted SLU for this purpose. Reports on the calls are submitted to SLU’s Office of University Compliance which then directs the concern to the appropriate office and personnel.

Another University entity whose scope and operations relate, albeit indirectly, to the integrity of research and scholarly activity at SLU is Information Technology Services (ITS). The [Saint Louis University Information Technology Appropriate Use Policy](#) “provides guidelines for the appropriate use of Saint Louis University’s IT resources, as well as for the University’s access to

information about and oversight of these resources.” (Complementing this important ITS policy is the [SLU University Libraries Appropriate Use Policy for Electronic Resources](#) which specifically addresses usage in support of research and teaching of “electronic resources licensed or made available by similar agreements” by the libraries.) The ITS Information Security Officer serves as the University’s Registered Agent for compliance with the federal [Digital Millenium Copyright Act \(DMCA\)](#).

2.E.2.

In our dynamic information world, with information constantly becoming accessible in ever increasing amounts, new formats, and diverse modes, it is imperative that students know not only how to evaluate information resources, but also how to ethically use them. The importance of this competency is reflected in Saint Louis University’s [undergraduate student learning outcome](#) “Graduates will understand inquiry as sustained engagement with increasingly complex questions” and its subcomponent, “Graduates will critically evaluate and incorporate information and its sources.” Per the [assessment rubric for this subcomponent](#), student work is evaluated on how well these criteria are met: “Integrate credible, relevant information to develop their own ideas” and “Incorporate sources according to appropriate academic and/or professional standards.”

Guidance for SLU students on the ethical use of information resources is carried out in a variety of ways, including

- In their instruction about research methodologies of their disciplines, course faculty address responsible research practices.
- Course faculty across the disciplines routinely require students to use standard style manuals and documentation practices in their writing, even in 1000-level courses at the undergraduate level. Some faculty spend class time explaining, for example, plagiarism prevention and proper source attribution, or invite consultants from [University Writing Services \(UWS\)](#) to make class presentations. Students are informed about UWS in course syllabi, and may be individually referred by their instructors to a UWS consultant.
- SLU’s Division of Research Administration issued a [Policy on Authorship for Scientific and Scholarly Publications](#) “to establish acceptable practices in responsible authorship and publication of knowledge gained through research and scholarly activities.”
- Partnering with course instructors, SLU library faculty conduct information literacy presentations to students at all levels and increasingly collaborate on the development of research assignments that require informed and appropriate evaluation and use of information resources.
- Pius Library faculty enjoy a decades-long collaborative relationship with the Department of English Freshman Writing Program that includes classroom sessions. [Two objectives](#) of the library component for ENGL-1900: Advanced Strategies of Rhetoric& Research and ENGL-1920: Advanced Writing for Professionals are (1) describe the characteristics of different kinds of information sources used in the scholarly research process in order to use them effectively, and (2) assess the credibility and relevance of

information sources in order to select appropriate resources for their research project. In 2015-2016, 62 sections of these courses were taught, each with 20 students.

- Students in the College for Public Health and Social Justice are required to complete an [Academic Integrity Module](#) that includes components about appropriate source citation, plagiarism, and the relationship of copyright to plagiarism.
- Graduate students and post-docs (and faculty) involved in research funded by the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation may choose to attend a [copyright session](#) focusing on research and publishing applications presented by SLU library faculty as part of the Office of Research Responsible Conduct of Research workshop series. A similar presentation focused on teaching applications is scheduled for presentation in Spring 2016 under the sponsorship of the Reinert Center for the Transformation of Teaching and Learning.
- SLU library faculty frequently provide guidance about public performance rights to students (as well as faculty and staff) who wish to show films owned by the SLU libraries at University events outside the classroom.

2.E.3.

In 2004, Saint Louis University (SLU) issued a statement of minimum standards for student academic integrity. Some academic units adopted that statement while others—a number that has increased over time—developed their own policies and procedures. Hence, a plethora of such documents came into being at the department and college or school level. They vary in form, title, breadth, and depth. Examples reflecting the range of these documents:

- The School of Law's [Student Honor Code](#) is printed in its entirety in the School of Law Student Handbook. Both conduct subject to the Code as well as processes that address violations are thoroughly detailed. An additional section of the Handbook includes the School's [Plagiarism Policy Statement](#).
- The College of Arts and Sciences has an extensive [Academic Honesty Policy](#) that delineates the responsibilities of faculty, staff, and academic administrators, as well as students, with regard to maintaining academic integrity. This policy further distinguishes between two classes of academic integrity violations, identifies infringing actions, and specifies processes and responsibilities for dealing with them. The College also has a required [Academic Integrity Syllabus Statement](#).
- The Doisy College of Health Sciences has an [Academic and Professional Integrity Policy](#).
- The John Cook School of Business has a student-focused [Academic Misconduct Policy](#) that details its procedures for addressing violations.

A significant step forward in addressing the matter of academic integrity policy from an institutional perspective was made with the June 2015 implementation of the [Saint Louis University Academic Integrity Policy](#). The [Student Handbook](#) includes this policy in its entirety.

The policy:

1. Defines the responsibilities of faculty, students, staff, and academic administrators;
2. Defines violations of academic integrity;
3. Sets minimum standards for reporting and adjudicating violations of academic integrity;
4. Establishes procedures for appeals to the Office of the Provost; and
5. Establishes standards and procedures for record maintenance.

This policy also establishes the expectation that the academic units will modify their respective policies to align with its definitions and minimum procedural guidelines. Importantly, it recognizes that the disciplines have their own standards of academic and professional conduct and thus states the expectation that these will be incorporated into unit-level policies. Several units, including the College of Arts and Sciences and the [Madrid campus](#), have already made progress on these changes.

The *Faculty Manual* also contains several provisions related to academic integrity:

- [Teaching](#) – This text establishes the expectation that faculty are obligated to know and follow the academic policies and procedures in effect at all levels of the institution.
- [Research and Scholarly Activity](#) – This text identifies actions and behaviors that faculty are expected to avoid that “deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the academic community for proposing, conducting, or reporting research.” It also references the University’s [Research Integrity Policy](#) which not only details SLU’s policy and procedures, but states the expectation that SLU personnel are expected to comply with the ethical codes and guidelines for the conduct of research established by their respective professional organizations.

Sources

- Academic-Integrity-Policy-Madrid
- Association-for-the-Accreditation-of-Human-Research-Protection-Programs-Inc_screenshot
- Association-for-the-Accreditation-of-Human-Research-Protection-Programs-Inc-Value_screenshot
- CAS-Academic-Honesty_screenshot
- CAS-Academic-Integrity-Syllabus-Statement_screenshot
- Compliance-Hotline_screenshot
- CPHSJ-Academic-Integrity-Module-and-Honor-Code-Pledge
- DCHS-Academic-and-Professional-Integrity-Policy
- Export-Control-Policy-Research
- Faculty-Manual_Current
- FAQ-Financial-COI-in-Research_screenshot
- Financial-COI-in-Research-Policy
- Financial-Conflict-of-Interest-Disclosure_screenshot
- Freshman-Writing-Program-Library-Component_screenshot
- Institutional-Animal-Care-and-Use-Committee_screenshot
- Institutional-Review-Board_screenshot

- ITS-Appropriate-Use-Policy
- ITS-Digital-Millennium-Copyright-Act_screenshot
- JCSB-Academic-Misconduct-Policy_screenshot
- Libraries-Appropriate-Use-Policy-for-Electronic-Resources
- Policy-and-Procedures-for-Responding-to-Allegations-of-Research-Misconduct
- Policy-for-RCR-Training
- Policy-on-Authorship-for-Scientific-and-Scholarly-Publications
- Policy-on-the-Composition-and-Operation-of-the-SLU-COI-in-Research-Committee
- Presentation-Financial-COI-in-Research
- RCR-Copyright_11-11-15
- Research-Compliance-Training_screenshot
- Research-Integrity-Policy
- SOL-Student-Handbook
- Student-Handbook_Current
- Undergraduate-SLOs-Assessment-Rubric-Two
- Undergraduate-Student-Learning-Outcomes_screenshot
- University-Academic-Integrity-Policy
- University-Writing-Services_screenshot

2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

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

Summary

As documented throughout this section, SLU evidences integrity in its actions and models ethical behavior and responsibility throughout the University's corporate purposes of teaching, research, service, and health care.

Sources

There are no sources.

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

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

3.A - Core Component 3.A

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

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Argument

3.A.1.

As an institution of higher education nearing the start of its third century of existence, Saint Louis University offers programs not only appropriate to American higher education but, in some cases, programs among the strongest in the nation.

Per the [Carnegie Classification system](#), SLU's undergraduate programming is classified as "professional plus arts and sciences," and graduate programming is categorized as "comprehensive doctoral with medical/veterinary." The University offers bachelors, masters, and doctoral degrees in programs across its 11 college/schools/centers in St. Louis, MO, and at its campus in Madrid, Spain. [The College of Philosophy and Letters](#) offers programming solely for students preparing for the Catholic priesthood. SLU's lone associate's degree (A.A.) is offered exclusively to the employees and incarcerated residents of the [Eastern Reception, Diagnostic and Correctional Center \(ERDCC\)](#) in Bonne Terre, MO999

3.A.2.

At a University-wide level, distinct [Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes](#) were established in December 2012; since then, a program for assessing student learning against those outcomes

has been developed and piloted, as detailed fully in 4.B. At the graduate level, distinct University-wide student learning outcomes are in the final stages of development by the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee (GAAC); this is also addressed in depth in 4.B.

New undergraduate programs are [vetted](#) by the University's [Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee \(UAAC\)](#), which is [comprised of faculty](#) representatives from the University's eight colleges and schools with undergraduate programs; there is also administrative representation from the Faculty Senate, the undergraduate deans' offices, the Madrid campus, the libraries, and the Provost's Office. Departments proposing new programs are encouraged to work with the University's Assessment Coordinator to develop the learning outcomes and evaluation methods to determine the program is current and requires levels of student performance appropriate to the degree awarded.

Current undergraduate programs are evaluated via our newly [re-established academic program review \(APR\)](#) process. The [APR process](#)—piloted in 2014-2015 and fully implemented starting 2015-2016—is required of all programs offered by the University. The APR schedule for [2015-2016](#) includes 11 distinct programs; the schedule for [2016-2017](#) includes 15 distinct programs. A detailed description of the program review policy and process is provided in 4.A.1.

In addition to our new, comprehensive APR process, many of SLU's programs are accredited by their respective professional organizations to ensure that student performance is appropriate to the degree awarded. For instance, the University's "Initial Teacher Preparation" and "Advanced Preparation" are accredited by NCATE; the B.S.W is accredited by the Council of Social Work Education; and the B.S. in Chemistry is accredited by the American Chemical Society. The complete list of accredited programs is detailed in the University's [Accreditation Log](#).

New graduate programs are vetted by the University's [Graduate Academic Affairs Committee \(GAAC\)](#), and the processes for new and current program review are akin to those for undergraduate programs. All current graduate programs will be evaluated via our newly re-established APR process, as well.

The University differentiates learning goals for undergraduate and graduate programs as articulated by the [UAAC](#) and [GAAC](#) guidelines for new programs. In addition, each College has separate guidelines for approval of undergraduate and graduate courses.

3.A.3.

Saint Louis University offers programs both in the classroom and online, and at our main campus in St. Louis and our [campus in Madrid, Spain](#). Additionally, SLU's School of Education offers both master's and doctoral-level programs in Educational Leadership at several HLC-approved, off-campus locations in Missouri (as well as courses at other additional locations not yet requiring HLC approval). We also offer credit for courses taken by nearly 4,000 high school students at their respective high schools in Missouri and beyond through our 1818 Advanced College Credit dual-enrollment program. Finally, the University has a [College-in-Prison](#)

[Program](#) at the Eastern Reception, Diagnostic and Correctional Center (ERDCC) in Bonne Terre, MO, where we offer an Associate of Arts degree to both incarcerated residents and prison employees.

SLU does not relegate off-campus or online programming to a distinct academic unit of the University, opting instead to embed any such programming within existing academic units to ensure consistency in expectations, rigor, and assessment. Regardless of the mode of delivery or location, all programs and courses are subject to the same approval processes. As detailed in 4.A.4., high school teachers who teach in the 1818 Program are trained by our full-time faculty on issues of course content and pedagogy so students learn the same material as they would taking such courses physically at SLU. In addition, only full-time faculty members teach in the College-in-Prison Program. Courses and programs on the Madrid campus go through the same UAAC and GAAC approval processes, and there is joint and constant monitoring of course delivery; faculty and students move back and forth between the two campuses. And in the School of Education's off-site cohort programs, the majority of credits are taught by full-time SLU faculty who travel to the off-site locations to teach; St. Louis-based and more local adjunct faculty supplement and complement the expertise of the full-time faculty as needed.

In Fall 2015, SLU entered into a consortial agreement with [Lourdes University](#) in Lourdes, Ohio, to deliver portions of SLU's Master of Social Work program to graduates of Lourdes' undergraduate program in Social Work. SLU teaches approximately 65 percent of the program online; the remaining 35 percent of the program is taught on-site at Lourdes University by Lourdes faculty. The Lourdes portion of the program includes some traditional course work as well as oversight of field experience/practicum work. Admission requirements for the program mirror those in St. Louis. Additionally, the curriculum is identical to the program offered on-site in St. Louis, as is the assessment program.

Sources

- [1818-Advanced-College-Credit-Program-Home-Page_screenshot](#)
- [Academic-Program-Review-Home-Page_screenshot](#)
- [Academic-Program-Review-Manual](#)
- [Accreditation-and-Authorization-Log_May-2015](#)
- [APR-Schedule_FY16](#)
- [APR-Schedule_FY17](#)
- [Carnegie-Classification-SLU_screenshot](#)
- [CAS-Board-of-Graduate-Education-Course-Change-Form](#)
- [CAS-Curriculum-Committee-Course-Approval-Change-Form](#)
- [College-of-Philosophy-and-Letters-Home-Page_screenshot](#)
- [GAAC-Bylaws](#)
- [Honors-Program-Information-for-Faculty_Teaching-Honors-Courses_screenshot](#)
- [Madrid-Campus-Home-Page_screenshot](#)
- [MSW-Lourdes-University_screenshot](#)
- [New-Program-Progress-Report](#)
- [Prison-Program-Home-Page_screenshot](#)

- UAAC-Bylaws
- UAAC-Roster_2015-2016
- UAAC-Undergraduate-Program-Proposal-Form
- Undergraduate-Student-Learning-Outcomes_screenshot

3.B - Core Component 3.B

The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

Argument

3.B.1 and 3.B.2.

Saint Louis University does not currently have a University-wide undergraduate general education program. Instead, each college/school establishes its own set of general education requirements that are appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution. Many of SLU's colleges/schools, such as the [College of Arts and Sciences](#), [Parks College of Engineering, Aviation, and Technology](#), and the [School for Professional Studies](#), have developed their general education requirements with the stated goal of educating their students to have an understanding of SLU's Jesuit educational heritage. For instance, the THEO 1000: Theological Foundations course is required in every college/school and is central to the University's mission as a Jesuit, Catholic institution. Furthermore, all colleges/schools have general education (or "core curriculum") requirements, which draw from the [components of College of Arts and Sciences Core Curriculum requirements](#) and meet the expectations of the HLC's Assumed Practices.

The University-wide [Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes \(SLOs\)](#), adopted in 2012, were not designed to dictate the core/general education requirements of each college/school—requirements that pre-date the University SLOs by well more than a decade, in most cases. The University SLOs address what at many institutions would be several key core/general education outcomes, but they also include outcomes more directly associated with academic major and co-curricular experiences. However, the development of the University SLOs has prompted

significant discussion about the core/general education curricula throughout SLU, particularly in terms of the relationship between the two. Some units have begun work to align their core/general education goals and curricula with the University SLOs, although that is not an institutional expectation. The lack of specific University core/general education learning outcomes hampers units seeking clear University-wide direction and expectations for core/general education curricula.

3.B.3.

All of the University's degree programs engage students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information and in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work through a variety of requirements, goals, presentations, performances, and symposia. A review of [each major's curricular requirements](#) highlights these expectations. For instance, the [Honors Program](#) requires students to engage in this type of intellectual work, and [ENGL 1900: Advanced Strategies in Rhetoric and Research](#), a course taken by about half of SLU's first-year students every year, has these skills as goals for the course. The Department of Fine and Performing Arts includes [performances](#) and [presentations](#) of student work regularly. The [Senior Legacy Symposium](#), [Sigma Xi Research Symposium](#), and [Graduate Student Association Research Symposium](#) challenge undergraduate and graduate students to conduct research in their majors or disciplines and then present that research to peers, faculty, and staff from across the University. Interdisciplinary programs such as the [Center for Interprofessional Education and Research](#) maximize expectations for these skills by integrating data collection, analysis, and communication across teams and with community partners so that health professional will solve real-world challenges. At an administrative level, guidelines for program development and program review within the University, as well as [external accreditation](#) for individual programs, set standards and checks that reliably ensure each degree program meets the development of these skills. The Graduate Student Association's [support for student travel to conferences](#) and the variety of professional development programs give opportunities to graduate students to practice the research and presentation skills that are imperative to professional life in academe as well as in the general workforce.

3.B.4.

Another hallmark of a Jesuit university is an education that recognizes and values the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work. This is clearly evident in the University [Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes](#), in the [core requirements of the College of Arts and Sciences](#), and in the core/general education requirements of other units. SLU's Center for Service and Community Engagement recently earned the [Carnegie Foundation's Community Engagement Classification](#) for commitment to engaging with local, national and global communities. Nationwide, only 361 institutions hold the prestigious classification, and only 83 received the designation in 2015.

A wealth of research tools--such as MAP-Works, EBI/ACUHO-I Residence Life Survey, Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership, Student Survey on Service, Campus Religious and Spiritual Climate Survey--assist the University in assessing and measuring students' success growing and adapting to a constantly changing landscape of cultural diversity. A highlight of SLU's commitment to cultural diversity is the [ATLAS Week program](#), which helps increase awareness of global issues in a participatory manner that inspires and informs action; students, faculty, and staff from across the institution participate in the program at high rates annually.

Additionally, students interested in health care have the opportunity to partner with diverse populations in the St. Louis community and beyond in a variety of ways. [Casa de Salud](#), a Saint Louis University-founded health care clinic for underserved populations, delivers high quality clinical and mental health services for uninsured and underinsured patients, focusing on new immigrants and refugees who encounter barriers to accessing other sources of care.

SLU's "North St. Louis Initiative" is another vehicle via which SLU faculty, staff, and students become part of the community to better serve its diverse population. A separate health care clinic (complementing Casa de Salud) run by SLU medical students and overseen by SLU School of Medicine faculty plays a key role in the initiative; so, too, does an [annual symposium](#) that brings together students, faculty, staff, and community organizers and change agents to advance their shared commitment to social justice and diversity.

In response to 2014 and 2015 events in Ferguson, MO--a suburb of St. Louis about 11 miles north of campus--many SLU departments, programs, and groups have created programs and events designed to recognize systemic injustice as well as develop and critically analyze potential solutions for change. As regular elements of the curriculum, the College of Arts and Sciences' general education requirements include a two-course cultural diversity component. [SLU's campus in Madrid, Spain](#) not only offers opportunities for students to study abroad, but also offers selected full degree programs of the College of Arts and Sciences. A wide variety of the courses at SLU Madrid fulfill the [College of Arts and Sciences cultural diversity requirement](#). The interactions between the St. Louis and Madrid campuses create multicultural experiences for students of all degree programs.

3.B.5.

The breadth of scholarship, creative work, and discovery of knowledge evidenced by SLU's faculty and staff reflects the diversity of our portfolio of educational programs and comprehensive nature of our University. Expectations for faculty research and scholarship are high, as evidenced by SLU's basic [Carnegie Classification](#) of "Doctoral University – Higher Research Activity." Expectations for creative work are similar for applicable programs, although such work is not measured by the Carnegie Classification system nor many other traditional means.

[Annual reviews of faculty](#) at the department level, as well as the [rank and tenure process at the University level](#), ensure that all faculty contribute to the extent appropriate to their programs and

Saint Louis University's mission. Many departments use rubrics to assist in the measurement of faculty output and contribution in this area. Additionally, SLU has been gradually implementing the Activity Insight database in which all faculty scholarly activity is to be tracked to facilitate research and reporting on faculty scholarly production and impact.

Sources

- Academic-Program-Review-Home-Page_screenshot
- Academic-Program-Review-Manual
- Accreditation-and-Authorization-Log_May-2015
- Atlas-Week-Program-About_screenshot
- Carnegie-Classification-SLU_screenshot
- Carnegie-Distinction-Community-Engagement_1-8-15_screenshot
- Casa-de-Salud-Community-Partner-Profile_screenshot
- CAS-Annual-Faculty-Review-Policy
- CAS-Components-Core-Curriculum_screenshot
- CAS-Core-Curriculum_screenshot
- Center-for-Interprofessional-Education-and-Research-Home-Page_screenshot
- English1900-Outcomes-Syllabus-Rubric_FY16
- Fine-Performing-Arts-Music_screenshot
- Fine-Performing-Arts-Studio-Art_screenshot
- Graduate-Research-Symposium_screenshot
- GSA-Conference-Awards-Guidelines_screenshot
- Honors-Program-Home-Page_screenshot
- Madrid-AS-Core-Curriculum_screenshot
- Madrid-Campus-Home-Page_screenshot
- Majors-and-Programs_screenshot
- Making-a-Difference-in-North-STL-Symposium_screenshot
- Parks-College-Undergraduate-Core-Curriculum_screenshot
- Senior-Legacy-Program_2015
- Sigma-Xi-Research-Symposium-2015_screenshot
- SPS-About_screenshot
- SPS-General-Studies-Curriculum_screenshot
- UCART-Roster_2015-2016_screenshot
- Undergraduate-Student-Learning-Outcomes_screenshot

3.C - Core Component 3.C

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

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.
2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.
3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.
4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.
5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.
6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

Argument

3.C.1.

Saint Louis University has [1,448 full-time faculty members](#) in eleven Colleges/Schools/Centers, and the University Libraries. Approximately 500 of these faculty members have been with the University for at least ten years. The faculty size allows the University to maintain a 11-1 student-faculty ratio and an average class size of 25.6. As outlined in the [Faculty Manual](#), faculty “have primary responsibility for setting the academic requirements for the degrees offered by the University; determining the contents of University courses and the methods of instruction to be used; setting standards for admission of students to the University; recommending the specific individuals who will be granted earned degrees.” This important task of overseeing the curriculum can be carried out through the size and continuity of the faculty.

New programs are approved through [UAAC](#) and [GAAC](#), and faculty members largely populate these [committees](#). Our newly adopted [undergraduate student learning outcomes](#) were developed by faculty members along with staff, [as were the rubrics for assessing the outcomes](#). The [program review council](#) of our newly implemented academic program review process is primarily composed of faculty members.

3.C.2.

The Provost's Office maintains a [list of qualifications](#) from each college/school/center articulating the terminal degree in each of the University's programs. This office also ensures all faculty are properly qualified to teach at the University. Faculty contracts for [new full-time hires](#) are not processed until receipt of official transcripts confirming the new faculty member's degree. Faculty must be [approved by their respective college/school/center to teach graduate courses](#) and to mentor graduate students. The Provost's Office maintains documentation of these approvals. The University's dual credit [1818 Advanced College Credit Program](#) is largely taught by high school teachers; in full compliance with the HLC's requirements for [faculty qualifications for dual credit programs](#), we require them to have completed a minimum of a Master's degree in their respective disciplines. In addition, all [new adjunct faculty](#) teaching at the University are also required to have a minimum of a Master's degree in their respective disciplines to teach at the undergraduate level. The faculty teaching in the Lourdes, Ohio-based cohort of the Master of Social Work program are regular faculty of Lourdes University and vetted through the SLU's School of Social Work before teaching in the program.

3.C.3.

All full-time faculty members are evaluated annually based on [standards established by their college/school/center/library](#). All faculty on the tenure track are evaluated at the midpoint between their hire and when they would normally apply for tenure and promotion, [as outlined in the *Faculty Manual*](#). In addition, the *Faculty Manual* articulates [how faculty are evaluated for all levels of promotion](#), both on the tenure track and on the non-tenure track.

In most academic units, all faculty are evaluated by students at the end of each course. The University supports an electronic tool for course evaluations, and in Spring 2016 is piloting new software that will appeal to many more units than use the current system. No standard, University-wide questions are required for any course evaluations, although the University-supported software provides the opportunity for both University-wide and customized, unit-specific questions. The lack of standard questions limits University-wide assessment and any cross-unit comparisons, although a few academic units use nationally-administered course evaluations such as IDEA.

The [Reinert Center for Transformative Teaching and Learning](#) has extensive programming for helping our faculty improve their pedagogy and course designs. The [Center staff](#) includes a director, associate director, three instructional designers, and an administrative secretary. In addition, the Center has graduate assistants who offer a [Certificate in University Teaching Skills](#) which had [166 participants in 2014-2015](#). The Reinert Center is a critical resource for faculty that supports the development of their teaching as evaluated annually and via standard promotion and tenure processes.

3.C.4.

In addition to their teaching roles, tenured and tenure-track faculty at Saint Louis University are expected to be active in their scholarly area. Expectations for faculty scholarship are detailed in each unit's promotion and tenure guidelines. SLU has been increasingly focused on its quality as a research institution, as faculty and leadership alike stress the importance of faculty productivity and impact in the area of scholarship. SLU's comprehensive [Office of Research Services](#) supports funded research by assisting with grant-writing, proposal submission, post-award compliance, and a host of other services that advance SLU's research efforts. SLU's [Sabbatical Leave Program](#) also significantly supports faculty scholarship. Additionally, SLU has adopted University-wide software that facilitates the tracking of and reporting on faculty scholarly activity for accreditation, program review, and other research and reporting purposes. Use of Activity Insight across units remains uneven, as resistance to both the concept of such tracking, the amount of work required, and the Activity Insight software itself results in inconsistent data entry and, therefore, inconsistent reporting across units. But each year increasingly more faculty data is entered into the system.

3.C.5.

The expectation that faculty are accessible to students is codified in the [Faculty Manual](#) where it states "Faculty members should provide ample scheduled office hours, as well as opportunities for informal discussions, and should encourage students to consult them about academic matters." In addition, students are mentored within their major. Most students are assigned a mentor upon declaring a major, and they meet with their faculty mentors each semester to discuss their progression towards graduation. Students admitted into the Doisy College of Health Sciences or the School of Nursing are [assigned faculty mentors](#) immediately upon admittance. Faculty also lead student co-curricular groups, as [student organizations are required to have faculty advisors](#). Faculty are heavily involved in mentoring students in capstone scholarship experiences, as is evidenced by the annual [Senior Legacy Symposium](#) where senior undergraduate students present the results of their scholarly work.

A study of [NSSE data](#) indicates that SLU compares well with fellow Jesuit institutions and other private research universities in terms of students' responses about their experiences with faculty, academic advisors, and others.

3.C.6.

All [academic advisors](#)—non-faculty professionals who serve students in concert with their faculty mentors from their major curricula—have at least master's degrees. All [student tutors and supplemental instructors](#) are rigorously screened by Student Success Center staff and, in some cases, departmental faculty, before being hired. Professional development is available to all student support staff via [SkillSoft](#), a portfolio of web-based professional development/training programs offered by the Division of Human Resources. In addition, student support staff in our

Division of Student Development are expected and encouraged to engage in [ongoing professional development](#).

Sources

- 1818-Advanced-College-Credit-Program-Home-Page_screenshot
- 1818-New-Instructor-Applicants_screenshot
- Academic-Program-Review-Council-Roster_2015
- Assessment-Academic-Affairs_screenshot
- CAS-Academic-Advising-Staff_screenshot
- CAS-Annual-Faculty-Review
- CAS-Graduate-Faculty-Appointment-Procedures
- CPHSJ-Student-Organizations_screenshot
- Faculty-Manual_Current
- Full-Time-Faculty_9-28-15
- GAAC-Bylaws
- GAAC-Roster
- HR-SkillSoft-Online-Learning_screenshot
- New-Adjunct-Faculty-Checklist
- New-Full-Time-Faculty-Checklist
- NSSE-Quality-of-Interactions-Data_2013_2014
- Office-of-Research-Services-Home-Page_screenshot
- Reinert-Center-Annual-Report_2014-2015
- Reinert-Center-CUTS_screenshot
- Reinert-Center-Home-Page_screenshot
- Reinert-Center-Programs-and-Services_screenshot
- Reinert-Center-Staff_screenshot
- Sabbatical-Leave-Proposal_Guidelines_screenshot
- Senior-Legacy-Program_2015
- SLU-Profile-2016
- SSC-Becoming-Tutors_screenshot
- SSC-Faculty-Mentoring_screenshot
- Student-Development-Staff-Professional-Development_screenshot
- Terminal-Degree-List-by-Department_Feb-2014
- UAAC-Bylaws
- UAAC-GAAC-Rosters
- UAAC-Roster_2015-2016
- Undergraduate-Student-Learning-Outcomes_screenshot
- Undergraduate-Student-Learning-Outcomes-Assessment-Rubrics
- Undergraduate-Student-Learning-Outcomes-Rubric-Development_screenshot

3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Argument

3.D.1.

The University designs and maintains student support programs and services geared to help students succeed at all levels. All currently enrolled students have access to the [Student Success Center](#), a one-stop-shop for Career Services, Academic Coaching, Tutoring Services, University Writing Services, and Disability Services. Centralizing key support services allows students to utilize, and familiarize themselves with, a variety of resources, and facilitates referrals among services. All of the services within the student success center have annual assessment plans to address usage, student learning, and information about specific student populations. These plans are created with the assistance of the Program Director for Strategic Planning and Assessment. In addition to physical centralization of services, [SLUConnection](#) is an electronic aggregation of student support services marketed directly to current students that incorporates additional support services including Counseling Services, Campus Ministry, the Student Involvement Center, the Cross Cultural Center, and the Center for Service and Community Engagement. These services create similar assessment plans, as well as participate in broader, national surveys like the EBI/ACUHO-I Residence Life Survey, the NIRSA Benchmarking Study, the Missouri College Health Behavior Survey (MCHBS), the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership (MSL), the Student Survey on Service, and the Campus Religious and Spiritual Climate Survey; results of these studies inform unit-level improvements that are supported by the Program Director for Strategic Planning and Assessment.

Prior to their participation in any of these services, all students at all levels engage in [orientation programs](#) to prepare them for University life, teach them about campus support resources, and introduce them to the faculty in their respective academic units. Distance learners can come to

campus for these orientations, or their participation may be facilitated through online technologies. Undergraduate students begin to make their transition to University life at SLU 101, a summer orientation program all undergraduate students are expected to attend. At SLU 101, students learn about support services, academic expectations, and meet individually with their advisors. While students will review requirements if they have declared a major, or take tentative first steps toward selecting a major if they are undecided, these one-on-one conversations are designed to be more than checklists of requirements. In fact, if students are registered as Undecided, they have the option of enrolling in [Major Exploration](#), a dedicated advising curriculum designed to help students choose a major prior to the end of their sophomore year. Additionally, [SLU 101 is designed to be an orientation for the families](#) to the support systems for our students. The program helps educate these key stakeholders in our students' lives on key transitional issues. Both students and families are asked to assess the SLU 101 program at various points in order to revise its curriculum and respond to changes in the student population; results are nearly always quite favorable.

3.D.2.

Students admitted to the institution amid concerns that they will require additional support to be successful are enrolled in the [Billiken Bridge Program](#) as a condition of their admission. Billiken Bridge is a four-week, intensive and rigorous summer program meant to help students acclimate to SLU, learn how and where to utilize campus resources, and get a head start on making the transition to the academic demands of the University. Students take courses, learn to study in groups, work on service and community building, and identify academic strengths and weaknesses; the Program then continues throughout the year. as these students partake in the [Peer Mentor Program](#), where they meet one-on-one, in small groups, and in various social settings with their peer mentors. Students in the Billiken Bridge Program are also enrolled in a [Learning Community](#) of their own choosing. Being part of a Learning Community means that these students will live with students who share similar academic interests, and they will also take classes with the other members of their Learning Communities. Mandatory courses include English 1500 in the fall and English 1900 in the spring.

The Billiken Bridge Program is part of Student Support Services, an office on campus partially funded by a U.S. Department of Education Student Support Services [TRiO grant](#). Saint Louis University's [Student Support Services \(SSS\)](#) provides academic, financial, co-curricular, mentoring, and career resources to first generation and low-income undergraduates, as well as students with documented disabilities. SSS provides intensive academic advising, advocating for and with their students, and attempts to develop a sense of educational responsibility within each student.

More general placement for students happens through online examinations for foreign languages, and through a combination of High School GPA and ACT/SAT for both math and writing. For math placement, this combination is called the "[Math Index](#)" and is based upon research conducted by the Mathematics and Computer Science Department using the previous five years' data on student success in SLU math classes. Online math skills assessment tests are available

for students who would like to verify, or improve, their suggested placements. Undergraduate students typically complete any math and foreign language examinations prior to summer orientation so that they can plan their schedules appropriately with their advisors.

International students have access to these same online assessments. International students whose native language(s) is not English are also asked to take one of three [standardized assessments of their English speaking and writing capabilities](#). International graduate students also take the Saint Louis University [Writing Examination \(SLUWE\)](#).

To assist in their transition to St. Louis, as well as Saint Louis University, international students are placed in a peer-mentoring program called [International Ambassadors](#). International students also have the opportunity to be a part of the [International Host Family program](#), where families of SLU alumni, faculty and staff embrace the opportunity to make our international students part of their families and help them gain a greater understanding of our culture.

Undergraduate students who have not demonstrated the skills to succeed academically at SLU may be admitted as part of the [English as a Second Language Program](#), where they take courses designed to help these students to begin SLU degree programs within two years. In order to accomplish this, Saint Louis University, through the College of Arts and Sciences, offers three levels of English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction. The University determines which level the student should enter based on each student's English proficiency, as determined by standardized test scores. The length of time that students spend in each level is dependent upon the amount of time it takes for them to become proficient. Throughout this experience, students are supported by the [English Language Center](#)—an academic resource center dedicated to supporting ESL students. Additionally, when international students are preparing to transition into courses applicable to their chosen SLU degrees they are provided with two advisors: a traditional Academic Advisor and an ESL Advisor.

3.D.3.

In general, academic advising at SLU is decentralized, which means that most colleges/schools are employ and supervise the advisors necessary to meet the needs of their unit's students. While this means that there is not a single advising office—or unified advising curriculum or approach for the entire campus—all SLU Advising offices are part of the [Integrated Advising and Mentoring System](#), a collaboration of all advising units headed by the Office of the Provost and the Division of Student Development.

Each advising office focuses on aiding students in developmental transitions, co-creating curriculum plans with SLU students, and clarifying academic requirements. All students are assigned both an academic advisor and a faculty mentor. Larger advising committees are in place to ensure consistency across programs, and an assessment plan for advising is in place across campus. [Career Services](#) supports both the advising community at large, but also individual students as they decide what career path to take.

For students the University believes need additional advising support, the office of [Retention and Student Success](#) has been created. The University utilizes a nationally-recognized diagnostic survey called [MAP-Works](#), as well as predictive algorithms developed by SLU's Office of Institutional Research, to identify these students. MAP-Works is an online survey system available for all first-time, full-time undergraduate students (including transfer students), and also for second-year students. Advisors in the Retention and Student Success office are specifically trained to work with students who may be struggling; these advisors are given smaller case-loads to facilitate the kind of intensive outreach this population of students may require to succeed. The success of this office (opened in 2014) is being assessed carefully and on an ongoing basis.

The academic advising community at SLU is also involved in supporting [U101](#), a one-credit hour, semester-long, first-year seminar in which approximately two-thirds of all SLU undergraduates enroll; many advisors teach U101. Without a common core, the University relies on its colleges/schools to find ways to integrate U101 into their respective majors. The course materials and learning outcomes are consistent across all sections, whether the course is taught by advisors, staff, or faculty. U101 is part of the University's comprehensive approach to supporting first year students, including the aforementioned Learning Communities, and extensive programming from the [Student Involvement Center](#).

3.D.4.

In order to support all those who teach on campus--whether academic advisors teaching U101 or tenured faculty teaching graduate classes--the Saint Louis University relies upon the [Reinert Center for Transformative Teaching and Learning \(CTTL\)](#). [Founded in 1992](#), the Reinert Center offers an [extensive teaching certificate program, workshops, retreats, and various forms of teaching observations](#). In addition, the Reinert Center supports SLU's award-winning [Learning Studio](#), a state-of-the-art teaching space designed by a team of faculty and students as part of the Herman Miller Learning Spaces Research Program. Using the instructional design assistance provided by the CTTL staff, and the unique features and technologies in the room, faculty teaching in the space can experiment with new teaching strategies.

One of the areas where the Reinert Center has helped improve teaching on campus is online learning. The Center has offered a wide range of resources for instructors teaching partly or exclusively online, including the [Online Teaching and Learning Institute](#), and they have partnered with the School for Professional Studies to help teach online pedagogy to anyone offering instruction online. Throughout campus, high-level educational technology is built into more and more classrooms each year. The [Division of Information Technology Services \(ITS\)](#) supports effective teaching and student learning by refreshing existing software and ensuring that University hardware and software continue to perform as needed. ITS also supports [Blackboard Learn](#), SLU's learning management system and primary vehicle by which SLU instructors deliver online course content. University-wide adoption of the [Tegrity lecture capture system](#) supports all forms of instruction, as well.

Physical space in the [SLU Libraries](#) has also been remade to improve opportunities for student learning. The Pius XII Memorial Library completed an extensive renovation in 2012 and the [Madrid campus library](#) moved into newly renovated quarters in San Ignacio Hall that same year. Medical Center Library facilities also have been refreshed in recently, and SLU's Law Library was completely renovated as a result of the School of Law's move to Scott Hall in 2013.

SLU's Libraries offer exceptionally rich holdings, supplemented by a myriad of online resources and significant reciprocal borrowing agreements. Pius Library, the Medical Center Library, and the Law Library collectively contain or provide online access to many of the major source collections, research tools, and scholarly journals essential for teaching and undergraduate and graduate study on SLU's St. Louis campus. Digital collections of rare and historical items from the Libraries' collections are making more accessible the Libraries' distinctive collections while helping to preserve the original items. Both the Pius and Medical Center Libraries are [federal government depositories](#). SLU's libraries are members of MOBIUS, a non-profit consortium of Missouri libraries whose purpose is to share materials quickly and efficiently between in-state locations; MOBIUS recently extended this partnership to Colorado and Wyoming academic libraries. The SLU Libraries also provide efficient Interlibrary Loan service through which journal articles and other publications not owned by SLU can be obtained quickly. Additionally, SLU's St. Louis libraries support the Madrid campus library through (1) representation in the SLU Libraries Catalog; (2) proxy server access to most of the electronic resources available at the St. Louis campus; (3) electronic document delivery via interlibrary loan; and (4) usage of ERes, the St. Louis libraries' online course reserve system.

[Subject specialist library faculty](#) assist students and faculty with both general research inquiries and those that are grounded in the disciplines. In partnership with the discipline-based academic faculty, subject librarians teach essential information literacy skills through in-class presentations, online tutorials, one-on-one research consultations, collaboration on student assignments, and the development of instructional research guides. The Libraries support an increasingly popular 24/7 librarian online chat service, which allows students to receive library assistance from any location. The SLU Libraries major website redesign in 2015 has greatly improved the Libraries' capacity to support students online; a new website usability study is underway to assess what further improvements might be made.

Musical and theatrical performances are hosted in the University Theatre in Xavier Hall, home to the Department of Fine and Performing Arts. McDonnell-Douglas Hall is home to the Parks College of Engineering, Aviation and Technology, as well as most of its own laboratories and experimentation and design space. Other natural sciences are supported by laboratories in buildings dedicated to the Departments of Chemistry, Biology, Physics, and Earth and Atmospheric Sciences; as part of a multi-million dollar [renovation of STEM-related space](#), many science classrooms and lab spaces were renovated and expanded for the start of the Fall 2014 academic year.

SLU also hosts several well-recognized, community-based clinics (for [Psychology](#), [Communication Sciences and Disorders](#), and [Law](#))--each with their own dedicated on-campus spaces; SLU faculty and students serve community members at low or no cost via these clinics. Additionally, SLU students participate in program-based clinical experiences throughout

the City of St. Louis, the region, and the nation--all fully supported by their program faculty and with approval of the states in which they are based.

3.D.5.

Students' effective use of research and information sources is a fundamental goal of all academic programs at SLU. There is no single course or experience at which such use is addressed; rather, it is addressed throughout courses and related programming. Every academic department works directly with a library faculty member who can (and often does) participate in courses at any point(s) in a term. Library faculty are key co-instructors in the effort to best teach students how and when to properly incorporate external source material. All faculty are encouraged annually to include in their syllabi references to support programs and offices that assist students with such issues.

All SLU colleges/schools/centers have adopted academic integrity policies that address the use of research and information resources. Issues of academic integrity and honesty are handled per those policies. Appeals of a college/school/center-level decision on academic integrity issues can be made by invoking the [University-level Academic Integrity Policy](#). All colleges/schools/centers follow this policy. Disciplinary standards, enforcement, and rehabilitation are determined at the college/school/center level. For example, the College of Arts and Sciences has a [College Committee on Academic Honesty](#), which can be convened if a student should desire a hearing after being reported to a Department Chair.

SLU's University Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes include the following outcomes:

- Graduates will systematically collect and analyze evidence.
- Graduates will critically evaluate and incorporate information and its resources

Although the University Graduate-Level Student Learning Outcomes have not yet been officially adopted, the current draft includes the following related outcomes:

- Graduates will assess relevant literature or scholarly contributions in the field of study.
- Graduates will evidence scholarly and/or professional integrity in the field of study.

Sources

- Billiken-Bridge-to-Success_screenshot
- Blackboard-Learn-Course-Management-System_screenshot
- Career-Services_screenshot
- CAS-Academic-Honesty_screenshot
- CAS-Committee-on-Academic-Honesty_screenshot

- CSCE-Immersion-Final-Report_2015
- CSD-Speech-Language-Hearing-Clinic_screenshot
- English-as-a-Second-Language_screenshot
- English-Language-Center_screenshot
- English-Proficiency-for-International-Graduate-Students_screenshot
- English-Proficiency-Requirements_screenshot
- ERM-Retention-and-Student-Success-Council_screenshot
- Fall-Welcome_screenshot
- Host-Family-Program_screenshot
- Integrated-Advising-and-Mentoring-System_screenshot
- International-Ambassador-Program_screenshot
- ITS-Home-Page_screenshot
- Learning-Communities-Overview_screenshot
- Libraries-Government-Documents_screenshot
- Libraries-Home-Page_screenshot
- Madrid-Library_screenshot
- Major-Exploration-Advising_screenshot
- MapWorks_screenshot
- Math-Placement-and-Skills-Assessment_screenshot
- Peer-Mentor-Program_Overview_screenshot
- Pius-MCL-Research-Librarians_screenshot
- PSY-Psychological-Services-Center_screenshot
- Reinert-Center-History_screenshot
- Reinert-Center-Home-Page_screenshot
- Reinert-Center-Institutes_screenshot
- Reinert-Center-Learning-Studio_screenshot
- Reinert-Center-Programs-and-Services_screenshot
- SLU-101-Parent-and-Family-Program_screenshot
- SLU-101-Summer-Orientation_screenshot
- SLUConnection_screenshot
- SOL-Legal-Clinics
- STEM-Proposal_2014
- Student-Involvement-Center-Home-Page_screenshot
- Student-Success-Center-Home-Page_screenshot
- Student-Support-Services-Home-Page_screenshot
- Tegrity-Lecture-Capture_screenshot
- TRiO-Programs_screenshot
- University-101_screenshot
- University-Academic-Integrity-Policy
- Writing-Examination-Admitted-International-Students_screenshot

3.E - Core Component 3.E

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

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.
2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Argument

3.E.1

Co-curricular programs and activities are central to fulfillment of the Mission of Saint Louis University as reflected in the University's Jesuit educational heritage. "Educating the whole person" (*cura personalis*) and educating students to be "men and women for others" requires intellectual, spiritual, emotional, professional, and emotional development beyond what can be accomplished within the parameters of academic coursework. While certainly more prominent at the undergraduate than graduate level, SLU's commitment to an educationally-purposeful co-curricular experience is manifested in many ways.

At the undergraduate level, just a few ways in which this commitment manifests itself include the following:

- Community Service
- Service Learning
- Civic Engagement Programming
- Residential Learning Program
- Learning Communities
- Academic and Non-Academic Clubs and Organizations
- Fraternity and Sorority Life
- Leadership Programs
- Student Activities
- Wellness Initiatives
- Work-Study Programs
- Intercollegiate and Intramural Athletic and Recreation Programs
- Community Service
- Service Learning
- Civic Engagement Programming

With the exception of SLU's residency requirement for first- and second-year students—a requirement grounded in a distinct educational philosophy and guided by a fully-articulated residential learning curriculum—most of the above-noted programs are voluntary. However, the

culture of student engagement at SLU is such that student participation in these programs is, generally, quite high.

The role of co-curricular programming in student educational development is evident in the University Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes, which are premised on students experiencing a comprehensive set of interrelated educational programs including co-curricular programs. Outcomes such as “Students will articulate the rewards and challenges of living their beliefs with integrity,” and “Students will act upon what they know in the service of others” essentially require that students engage in educational programming outside of “regular” courses. Results of pilot efforts to assess student learning in these areas (addressed in more detail in 4.B.) indicate that co-curricular programs indeed play a significant role in the SLU educational experience, but that the role they play is inconsistent across the student body and across the academic majors in which they are enrolled.

Primary challenges SLU currently faces on this front include the following:

- ensuring that co-curricular programs—individually or collectively—are intentionally designed to foster student development toward the University Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes.
- ensuring student participation across key programs such that no student can “opt out” of educational experiences and outcomes central to being a SLU graduate.
- ensuring collaboration across the divisions—administrative and cultural—of Academic Affairs and Student Development, such that curricular and co-curricular programs are intentionally complementary as well as appropriately sequenced, developmentally.

3.E.2.

Educating our students to be women and men for and with others is a key component of the Saint Louis University identity, and this is highlighted in our co-curricular programs. The primary focus of many of our [learning communities and freshman interest groups \(FIGs\)](#) is community service, and the [Micah Program](#) is an excellent example. The Micah Program houses two learning communities where the focus is faith and service, and they are among the most popular learning communities on campus. The [Faith and Justice Collaborative](#) is a [joint effort between our Office of Mission and Identity and the Division of Student Development](#) which aims to contribute to the growth and development of student organizations in a manner that is consistent with the University’s Jesuit Mission.

The [Center for Service and Community Engagement](#) exists to help students, faculty, and staff serve the community where they are best suited. The Center has been [recognized nationally by the Carnegie Foundation](#) for its commitment to community service. The [Center for Global Citizenship](#) promotes the University’s Mission via the lens of global awareness, [fostering service opportunities](#) well beyond the Saint Louis region. For instance, in 2014-2015 [the Center facilitated 17 meetings](#) between the campus community and non-profit organizations with a global impact for the purposes of purpose of spurring community engagement. The [Student](#)

[Involvement Center](#) in the Division of Student Services engages students with the community through a variety of events and organizations. In particular, the Center's [iLEAD Servant Leadership Experience](#) trains SLU students to become “humble, selfless leaders who are called to a life-long commitment of serving, and who aspire to affect both immediate and long-term change in order to transform their community and the lives of the poor and/or marginalized in our society.”

Saint Louis University’s students and faculty members are heavily involved in volunteerism; the over one million hours the University community devotes to serving the community was noted in the recognition for the [Carnegie Foundation's Community Service Classification](#). Examples of the University’s ongoing commitment to serving the community include the [Campus Kitchen](#), where University community volunteers rescue food that would otherwise be thrown out from the University’s dining services, as well as various grocery stores and food banks. The food is then used to prepare meals for community homeless shelters and food kitchens. Another example is [Casa de Salud](#), where the SLU health community works to provide high quality clinical and mental health services for uninsured and underinsured patients, focusing on new immigrants and refugees who encounter barriers to accessing other sources of care. School of Law students and faculty provide [volunteer legal services/advice](#) to a wide variety of community organizations via its community Law Clinic.

Saint Louis University celebrates and honors the community member’s commitment to serving the area through the annual [Making a Difference in North Saint Louis Symposium](#). The third symposium was held in November 2015 and it has quickly evolved into a large event where SLU students and faculty demonstrate and discuss what they have done in the community over the past year. Another way the University expands its connections to the greater region, as well as demonstrates its commitment to service, is through the Center for Service and Community Engagement, the St. Louis campus' hub for volunteer service and service learning efforts. The Center tracks and assesses its impact via an [annual report](#).

Sources

- [Campus-Kitchen](#)
- [Carnegie-Distinction-Community-Engagement_1-8-15_screenshot](#)
- [Casa-de-Salud-Community-Partner-Profile_screenshot](#)
- [Center-for-Global-Citizenship-Annual-Report_2014-2015](#)
- [Center-for-Global-Citizenship-Home-Page_screenshot](#)
- [Center-for-Service-and-Community-Engagement-Annual-Report_2012-2013](#)
- [Center-for-Service-and-Community-Engagement-Home-Page_screenshot](#)
- [Faith-and-Justice-Collaborative_screenshot](#)
- [Faith-and-Justice-Collaborative-About_screenshot](#)
- [Learning-Communities-and-FIGS-at-a-Glance](#)
- [Making-a-Difference-in-North-STL-Symposium_screenshot](#)
- [Micah-Program_screenshot](#)
- [Servant-Leadership-Programs_screenshot](#)
- [SOL-Volunteer-Opportunities](#)

- Student-Involvement-Center-Home-Page_screenshot

3.S - Criterion 3 - Summary

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

Summary

Saint Louis University's degree programs—regardless of location or delivery method—are appropriate to higher education, and the faculty teaching in these programs are appropriately qualified. Furthermore, the University has the appropriate staff to run these programs, and professional development opportunities exist for both faculty and staff to maintain and enhance the programs.

The University pursues many paths—curricular and co-curricular—to demonstrate that our students acquire a broad education where deep intellectual inquiry and application of the material are central to the learning experience. The University provides development opportunities for faculty and staff, and support for our students, to ensure this type of deep learning is taking place. Co-curricular activities are critical to the educational experience offered by Saint Louis University, particularly in developing our students to be “women and men for and with others”—

a Jesuit call to action and fundamental expression of SLU's Catholic, Jesuit-inspired educational mission.

Sources

There are no sources.

4 - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

4.A - Core Component 4.A

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

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

Argument

4.A.1.

A lack of regular program reviews, institution-wide, was a notable concern expressed by the HLC team that visited SLU in 2012. While many SLU programs hold [disciplinary/professional accreditation](#) in their fields and, accordingly, undergo regular review of their major curricula, comprehensive program reviews had not been regularly conducted University-wide for many years prior to that 2012 visit. In response to the HLC's concerns and the growing internal call for comprehensive program review, SLU developed and implemented a new University-wide [Academic Program Review \(APR\) policy and protocol](#). After several rounds of faculty- and staff-led planning—planning slowed by a notable changes at the dean and provost levels throughout 2012-2014—Interim Provost Dr. Ellen Harshman shepherded the endorsement of the

current APR policy and process through all faculty governance bodies and with the support of the Faculty Senate.

A pilot group of four academic programs participated in the new APR process throughout the 2014-2015 academic year. Documents related to each of these pilot reviews can be accessed via the links in the table below:

	Self-Study	External Consultant Report	APR Review Council Report	Action Plan
Athletic Training	AT Self-Study	n/a	AT APRRC Report	AT Action Plan
Philosophy & Letters	P&L Self-Study	n/a	P&L APRRC Report	P&L Action Plan
Business Administration	BSBA Self-Study	n/a	BSBA APRRC Report	BSBA Action Plan
Civil Engineering	Civil Self-Study	Civil Eng Ext Consultant Report	Civ Eng APRRC Report	Civ Eng Action Plan

Lessons learned from the pilot testing informed several revisions to the policy and process, which resulted in the final governing document.

All academic programs are [scheduled for APR once every seven years](#); as appropriate and feasible, program reviews are scheduled to either precede, coincide with, or immediately follow program accreditation reviews in an effort to minimize additional work for faculty. However, all programs—even those with external accreditation—are required to participate in the APR process.

The list of programs undergoing APR in the 2015-2016 academic year is found on the Program Review website. Most of the academic units chosen for review in 2015-2016 were, per the guidance of HLC's liaison to SLU, units that had not otherwise undertaken any similar institutional review or external accreditation review in a number of years. Having prioritized such programs for the initial years of the first seven-year APR cycle, later years in the cycle feature proportionally more programs with external accreditation. Documents produced via APR for the 2014-2015 pilot year are maintained centrally in the Office of the Provost.

A summary of the stages of the APR process—which is fully detailed in the APR policy document—is as follows:

- Annual Developmental Workshop
- Initial Stakeholder Meeting
- Program Self-Study
- External Academic Program Review and Site Visit

- Program Director/Chair/Faculty Review of Self-Study and External Review Summary Report
- Dean Review of Self-Study and External Review Summary Report
- Program Review Council Summary Report
- Provost Review
- [Action Plan Implementation](#)

Assessment of student learning—a significant concern in the 2012 HLC re-accreditation report—is a key, required element of the APR process. Section 13 of each APR Self-Study requires detailed responses to the following questions:

1. Describe and provide examples of assessment measures used for each program offered.
2. Describe how assessment information is used to improve the curriculum, teaching, learning, and the assessment program itself; provide specific examples.
3. What is the evidence that feedback and adjustments actually have improved the curriculum, instruction, and student learning?

An annual budget for various forms of support for the APR process—including funds for external reviewers serving as consultants in most reviews—has been established in the Office of the Provost. Additionally, a .5 FTE Assistant to the Provost position was established to oversee and coordinate all APR activity; SLU was fortunate that Dr. Scott Safranski, a respected SLU professor, former Interim Dean in the Cook School of Business, and veteran HLC peer reviewer and team chair, agreed to serve in this critical role for 2015-2016.

SLU recognizes that the pace at which our comprehensive APR process was adopted and implemented meant that too long a period had elapsed during which such reviews were not being regularly conducted (particularly for non-accredited programs). However, there is now strong, unified support for APR among the deans, the Provost, and the President. As momentum builds following the completion of this first year in the new APR cycle, program reviews will play a key role in efforts to maintain and advance academic quality and impact.

In addition to regular reviews of existing programs via the APR process, newly proposed academic programs undergo extensive review through the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee (UAAC) and the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee (GAAC). Proposed undergraduate programs and certificates must complete an extensive [proposal form](#); a similar form is required for proposed [graduate-level](#) programs. These forms require evidence of comprehensive academic planning for approval. Additionally, they require extensive descriptions of student learning outcomes, evaluation methods (including direct measures, which were highlighted by the HLC as lacking in our 2012 review), and plans for using assessment data for improvement of each proposed program.

4.A.2.

SLU has a mature and very deliberative process for the evaluation of all transfer credit. The Office of the University Registrar is charged with implementing the [University-level transfer credit policies](#) adopted by the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee and the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee; the Registrar is also responsible for implementing the individual transfer course articulation decisions of the colleges/schools/centers, which are governed by both University policy and any unit-specific criteria. Details regarding transfer credit policies are provided for all students on a designated [website](#) of the Office of the Registrar. This site includes all necessary forms, which further detail applicable transfer credit policies and procedures.

New and prospective transfer students also have a dedicated website featuring information on how SLU transfers credit from other institutions. Lists of previously-approved transfer courses from major SLU feeder institutions (typically the area community colleges) are complemented by a [searchable database](#) of previously approved transfer courses from institutions throughout the nation.

While SLU is decidedly supportive of its transfer students and current students who seek to take courses at other institutions, the rigor of the transfer course articulation/evaluation process is time consuming. Concerns have been expressed by students, academic advisors, and admission staff that the extensive time it takes for a decision on transfer credit from certain academic units is a detriment to prospective transfer decisions as well as the advisement of matriculated students. The University Registrar, with the support of the Provost, has made transfer credit decision turnaround time a matter of concern, and the response from academic units has been positive.

For our St. Louis campus, evaluation of college credit earned outside the United States is conducted internally by faculty supported by resources of the Office of Admission and [Office of International Services](#). Additionally, SLU's new partnership with [INTO](#)—designed to extend and strengthen SLU's international recruitment reach, as well as strengthen ESL and pathway programs for international students at SLU—brings a wealth of international higher education resources to SLU, including resources that support the analysis of systems and levels of higher education in foreign countries. At our Madrid campus, which enrolls students from throughout Europe and the Middle East, [transfer credit](#) is evaluated according to institutional standards but by local faculty and staff experienced in international credit evaluation. Our Madrid campus's nearly 50-year history is a vital asset to the faculty and staff's collective experience serving students educated from around the world.

SLU only awards academic credit for experiential or other forms of prior learning if it is documented and evaluated via an approved testing program such as Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), or the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Educational Support (DANTES/DSST). However, per a [new policy in our School for Professional Studies \(SPS\)](#), credit will also be awarded to students who have earned certification via a small group of selected approved external training programs. This new policy, applicable only to the adult students of SPS and governed by the SPS faculty and academic leadership, is designed to best respond to the breadth of educational experiences warranting academic credit for our non-traditional, adult student population.

4.A.3.

Evaluating the quality of transfer credit is done in multiple ways. While the response to 4.A.2 addresses how the quality of transfer credit is governed by policies “on the front end,” as students request credit via transfer, the quality of such credit is also evaluated by faculty and staff who research the success of students at SLU following their transfer of credit. For example, transfer policies regarding fields in which a tightly-sequenced set of courses is the norm across colleges and universities (such as foreign languages, accounting, and calculus) are informed by the analysis of the academic performance of students taking subsequent courses at SLU in those sequences. In 2013, [one such study](#) was conducted by the Office of Institutional Research to determine the quality of chemistry transfer credit as measured by the success of students in subsequent chemistry coursework at SLU.

A comprehensive evaluation of SLU’s University-level transfer credit policies began in 2014-2015, as a sub-committee of the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee (UAAC) began deliberating existing policies. It is expected that a comprehensive set of new draft policies will be presented to UAAC in late Spring 2016 for the Committee’s collective review, and for review by the faculty and staff constituents across SLU represented by the Committee’s membership. Proposed revisions will include a requirement for acceptance of transfer credit across all academic programs at SLU; this proposal is designed to limit the confusion and frustration experienced by students, faculty, and advisors when credit accepted by one SLU unit is not accepted by another unit upon the change of major or degree program of the student. Another, related proposed change will be that all SLU credit—including that awarded via our 1818 Dual Enrollment program, our School for Professional Studies, and our Madrid campus—will be accepted by all degree programs, University-wide. While such credit does not, technically, constitute “transfer credit,” SLU’s culture historically has been that credit earned via those SLU units/programs has not been universally and consistently respected across our colleges/schools/centers and departments—thus it has sometimes been treated more like transfer credit earned at another institution. Accordingly, some current discrepancies in acceptance policies for these forms of SLU academic credit disrupt student changes of major and inhibit the curricular exploration which SLU champions overall as a key element to holistic student learning and development.

4.A.4.

The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.

Authority over courses—their creation/deletion, prerequisites, rigor, learning outcomes and assessment plans, learning resources—is granted first to the faculty and their respective departments but, ultimately, to the overarching faculty governance bodies of their respective colleges/schools/centers. For example, in the College of Arts and Sciences (SLU’s largest academic unit), courses are proposed by academic departments and ultimately approved by the College’s Faculty Council, whose [bylaws](#) formally codify and empower the Council. The Faculty Council requires each newly-proposed course to be vetted and approved by the Council, and per the Council’s expectations for quality as detailed on their [Course Approval Form](#). The form requires descriptions of the course objectives and student learning outcomes/goals, primary modes of assessment of student learning, and the skills/knowledge being assessed. Similar forms governing similar processes are employed throughout SLU’s colleges/schools/centers, although processes and expectations are not identical across all academic units.

Students in all SLU courses have access to a variety of resources whose purpose is to help them achieve success. First and foremost are the [University Libraries](#): The Pius XII Memorial Library, the Vincent C. Immel Law Library, and the Medical Center Library as well as SLU’s [Madrid Campus Library](#). Details of library services are provided in Criterion 3.D.4.; information about library assessment initiatives is provided in Criterion 4.B.4.

Other resources supporting student success in courses include the Student Success Center, housed under the Division of Student Development, which has locations at the Frost and Medical Center campuses. Offices and programs available to students through this resource include: academic coaching, academic advising, career services, disability services, tutoring, supplemental instruction, and writing services.

SLU also has resources available to non-native-English speakers through the [English Language Center](#). This unit provides writing services to non-native speakers of English in the Saint Louis University community. The English Language Center works with any international student, undergraduate or graduate, who seeks assistance. Students can receive help in one-on-one settings or in group workshops on general topics.

Additionally, the [Language Resource Center](#) in the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures offers support to students, instructors, and teaching assistants. The principal objective of this facility is to enrich SLU students' foreign language learning experience by providing an environment for immersion and practice.

Saint Louis University operates a very large and extensive dual credit program called the [1818 Advanced College Credit Program](#). The program, founded in 1959 and now annually serving approximately 4,000 students in Missouri, Illinois, and several additional states, is accredited by the [National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships \(NACEP\)](#), and meets the strict [Dual Credit Policy requirements of the Missouri Department of Higher Education \(MDHE\)](#). In particular, that policy requires the following of SLU and all providers of dual credit courses in the State of Missouri:

- Dual credit courses, including course content and course requirements, offered in high schools must duplicate the identical course offerings delivered on campus to matriculated

students. On-campus college faculty must ensure that each dual credit course has the same level of academic rigor and comparable standards of evaluation as that of its campus-based equivalent.

- Institutions must ensure that dual credit assignments and grading criteria are identical to, or are of comparable design, quality, and rigor to the equivalent campus-based course. Elements of the dual credit course to be approved by the on-campus college faculty in the appropriate academic discipline include the syllabus, textbook(s), teaching methodology, and student assessment strategies.

Accordingly, and consistent with SLU's internal expectations, [quality and rigor of all 1818 Advanced College Credit Program](#) courses are closely governed by 1818 Program faculty liaisons in each of the academic units responsible for each course as well as by 1818 Program leadership; currently, all 1818 courses are housed in SLU's College of Arts and Sciences.

Necessary faculty qualifications—for all SLU faculty, including those employed via our 1818 Program—are established and monitored at an institutional level by our Office of Faculty Affairs, housed within the Office of the Provost (this office reviews and approves all faculty contracts and qualifications). Faculty Affairs staff require academic transcripts of all St. Louis-based faculty, and work with deans and department chairs to ensure that all faculty meet the minimum institutional qualifications. SLU's institutional requirements for minimum faculty qualifications mirror those of the HLC, although in most cases our faculty's qualifications exceed those minimums; for example, approximately 92% of SLU's full-time instructional faculty hold the terminal degree in the field in which they teach.

However, as has been evidenced throughout HLC institutions in 2015 as the HLC worked to clarify its guidelines on faculty qualifications, SLU does employ a small number of faculty who do not yet meet those expectations. While most of these comparatively few faculty do, in fact, serve the 1818 Program, others are employed in SLU's colleges and schools. Only approximately 30 current 1818 faculty have yet to fully meet the qualifications expectations of the HLC (and the MDHE, and SLU); the percent of non-compliant, non-1818 Program faculty at SLU is less than 1%. SLU is absolutely committed to fully complying with the HLC's new September 1, 2017, deadline for faculty qualifications across the University, a deadline the [MDHE has also adopted](#) for all Missouri institutions.

4.A.5.

A significant number of SLU programs maintain specialized accreditation, as evidenced in the University's [Accreditation Log](#), publicly available on our [University Accreditation webpage](#). Program accreditation information is also widely available on the various websites of the accredited programs. Of the 51 accredited (or licensed/otherwise approved) programs tracked on the Accreditation Log, only four such programs have accreditation statuses with some form of "condition" or "requirement" placed on the program. For example, SLU's accreditation with the HLC is noted on the Log as having a requirement, a reference to the 2016 Progress Report (now

embedded in this Assurance Argument) originally required of SLU following our 2012 affirmation of accreditation.

All SLU programs for which there exists some form of national or international accreditation are expected to both pursue and obtain, in perpetuity, that accreditation. Both the Undergraduate and Graduate Academic Affairs Committees (UAAC and GAAC) require academic units to address this issue before any program approval is granted.

Programs are financially supported to maintain accreditation through annual departmental operating budgets. Additionally, funds for episodic, major re-accreditation reviews (e.g., five- or seven-year re-accreditation visits) are available to accredited units from the Office of the Provost.

4.A.6.

The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) annually surveys SLU graduates from undergraduate programs to collect data about post-graduation career outcomes. The objective is to determine the number of graduates who are employed, in graduate school, employed and in graduate school, not employed and seeking employment, unemployed but not seeking employment, or participating in a year of volunteer service program. The response rate for the most recently surveyed graduating class (2013-2014) was 59%.

Survey results are posted on the [Alumni and Continuing Education Rates webpage](#), which is accessible via the Office of the Provost home page. University-wide results indicate that 92% of the 2013-2014 graduates who responded to the survey were either employed, enrolled in graduate school, participating in a year of service program, or not seeking employment. In addition, 86% of respondents employed full-time were working in a job related to their SLU major. Breakdowns of the [results by undergraduate colleges and schools](#) and [by majors](#) are also posted online.

Additionally, academic units individually track their graduates' success on licensure and certification exams. For example, the Department of Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy provides prospective and current students detailed [data on national certification and licensure pass rates for their program graduates](#); so, too, do the [Medical Laboratory Science](#) program, the [Physical Therapy program](#), and a number of other programs. SLU's Office of Pre-Professional Health Studies reports on its [website](#) that, typically, 75%-85% of SLU students who apply to medical school are admitted, with 60% being admitted on their first application. Nearly all such tracking of graduates' success is included in individual program accreditation data.

Sources

- 1818-Program-Website_screenshot
- 2015-2016-APR-Schedule
- Academic-Program-Review-Manual
- Academic-Program-Review-Rubric
- Accreditation-and-Authorization-Log_May-2015
- Accreditation-Website_screenshot
- Alumni-Outcomes-Main-Webpage_screenshot
- APR-Action-Plan-Template
- APR-Schedule_FY16
- CHEM-Transfer-Study-Highlights
- Civil-Engineering-Consultant-Report
- Civil-Engineering-Self-Study_2015
- Civil-Engineering-Program-Goals-Action-Items-and-Timeline_Nov-2015
- CAS-Course-Approval-Form
- CSOB-APR-Self-Study
- CSOB-Program-Review-Action-Items_2015-2016
- Documented-Credit-for-Prior-Learning-CLEP-DSST-and-Certifications-Certifications
- English-Learning-Center-Home-Page_screenshot
- English-Language-Center_screenshot
- CAS-Faculty-Council-Bylaws
- GAAC-New-Program-Proposal-Form
- HLC-Report-on-1818-ACC-Program
- International-Services-Home-Page_screenshot
- INTO-Corporate-Home-Page_screenshot
- Language-Resource-Center-Home-Page_screenshot
- Madrid-Campus-Library-Home-Page_screenshot
- Madrid-Campus-Transfer-Credit_screenshot
- MDHE-Dual-Credit-Policy_2015
- MDHE-Policy-on-Faculty-Qualifications-for-Dual-Enrollment-Courses
- Medical-Laboratory-Science-Certification-Pass-Rates
- MSW-Lourdes-University_screenshot
- NACEP-Website_screenshot
- Occupational-Therapy-Certification-and-Licensure-Pass-Rates_screenshot
- P&L-PRC-Report
- P&L-Self-Study-Pilot_Mar2015
- P&L-Action-Plan-Goals_2015-2016
- Physical-Therapy-Licensure-Pass-Rates
- PRC-Report-AT_May 2015
- PRC-Report-Civil Engineering-Final_June-2015
- PRC-Report-John-Cook-School-of-Business-BSBA_June-2015
- Pre-Professional-Health-Studies-Graduates-Outcomes
- Program-Review-Council
- Program-Review-Schedule-(Long-Term)
- Program-Review-Council-Roster
- SLU Academic Program Review - AT 2015 - FINAL

- SLU Academic Program Review – AT Program Goals, Action Items and Timeline - DRAFT 9-4-15
- SLU-Libraries-Home-Page_screenshot
- SLU-Undergrad-By-College-School-Alumni-Survey-Results
- SLU-Undergrad-By-Major-Alumni-Survey-Results
- SLU-Undergrad-Alumni-Survey-Results_5-1-15
- SPS-Credit-for-Prior-Learning-Policy
- Student-Success-Center-Home-Page_screenshot
- Transfer-Articulation-Searchable-Database_screenshot
- Transfer-Credit-Policy-in-2015-2016-Catalog
- Transfer-Credit-Website_screenshot
- UAAC-Effectiveness-Feedback-Report_3-4-15
- UAAC-Undergraduate-Program-Proposal-Form
- UG-Alumni-Survey_AY2013-2014 (By Major, combined years)
- Undergraduate-Alumni-Survey_AY2013-2014 (By Major, combined years)
- Undergraduate-program-review-report-final_April-30-2015

4.B - Core Component 4.B

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

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Argument

4.B.1., 4.B.2., and 4.B.3.

University-Level Assessment

Since the HLC's last re-accreditation review in 2012, Saint Louis University has done much to advance its assessment of student learning efforts at the program and University-wide levels, and to meet the requirements of the HLC-mandated "Progress Report" on assessment (embedded in this Assurance Argument).

[University-Wide Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes](#) were developed throughout the Spring 2012 and Fall 2012 terms with extensive faculty, staff, and student input. The Outcomes were approved in December 2012 by the President's Coordinating Council, following approvals by the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee (UAAC) (which included support from the Student Government Association and representatives from all undergraduate colleges and schools) and the Council of Academic Deans and Directors (CADD). The [development process](#) was extensive and drew upon resources from throughout SLU, the American Association of Colleges and Universities, our Jesuit university colleagues, and other external sources.

The Outcomes address both the curricular and co-curricular knowledge and skills that SLU aims for all of the students to achieve, regardless of their chosen major. They feature outcomes typical of most institutions, but also feature multiple outcomes reflecting SLU's Catholic, Jesuit educational heritage. A number of the Outcomes—particularly those addressing how SLU graduates will "understand themselves in solidarity with and for others" and how they will "understand their relationship with the transcendent"—were the subject of intense scrutiny and discussion in the University community during the deliberation process. Ultimately, it was decided that these are indeed the goals we have for students, and that therefore we should be doing all we can to demonstrate student achievement of them.

With the Outcomes approved, [rubrics](#) for measuring the Outcomes were then developed by a team of faculty and staff. They were revised several times since their initial creation, the result of several rounds of faculty and staff editing as well as pilot testing by faculty and staff with portfolios of graduating senior student work. Again, developing rubrics to measure student development toward the “solidarity” and “transcendent” outcomes (which is how we refer to them in shorthand) proved most challenging—but not impossible. The rubric development process forced the faculty and staff involved to think critically about and articulate—in increasingly concrete, measurable terms—what exactly we mean when we say things like “SLU develops men and women for others” or “SLU is committed to the development of the whole person.” The result is a current set of rubrics that, if successfully employed as part of a comprehensive assessment cycle, could pave the way for others—particularly our Jesuit institutional peers—to adopt more mission-focused learning outcomes that help institutions better distinguish and explain themselves.

Since 2012, SLU has conducted several small-scale e-portfolio-based assessment projects to gather and analyze direct evidence of student work towards the University-Wide Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes. Each year, graduating senior students have been solicited to participate in the project; participation numbers have been low, due primarily to the entirely voluntary nature of the project. Participating students have been oriented to the learning outcomes, trained on the e-portfolio software (first TaskStream, and now FolioTek in 2016), and regularly encouraged throughout each spring term (and incentivized with small amounts of “Billiken Bucks”) to upload artifacts of their learning that they felt evidenced achievement (at varying levels) of the Outcomes. Students have uploaded work to their e-portfolios in a variety of formats, including research papers, posters, lab reports, PowerPoint presentations, poems, YouTube videos, personal reflection papers, and blogs.

In June of each of the past three years, faculty and staff from a variety of disciplines and programs have come together for e-portfolio review workshops. The workshops have included orientations to the assessment rubrics, rubric calibration sessions to advance consistency in interpretation and application, and dedicated e-portfolio evaluation time. Faculty and staff have had between two days and one week to complete their e-portfolio reviews, depending on the number of portfolios to assess and the number of reviewers participating. During each workshop, changes to the various components of the outcomes assessment effort have been proposed by the participants and incorporated as appropriate.

As noted above, this current assessment effort is entirely voluntary for the students. With fewer than 100 pending graduates submitting completed e-portfolios for review each year, comparatively little can be said with authority about actual student achievement of these University-Wide Undergraduate Learning Outcomes. However, [a draft report detailing the results of the e-portfolio analysis for 2015](#) was developed, and it details the percent of students meeting or not meeting each learning outcome. Although the size of the sample of fully-completed portfolios was just 19 for 2015, the results reflect those seen in analysis of e-portfolios from previous years, and highlight a comparative lack of evidence submitted by students that demonstrates achievement of the “solidarity” and “transcendent” outcomes. These results—about outcomes at the heart of SLU’s educational and institutional identities—mean that SLU might need to be far more intentional about requiring student work that expressly attends to these

outcomes; it is certainly possible that students could evidence their achievement of these outcomes if given the opportunity in their curricula. However, at this time, SLU's academic and student development curricula and related assignments are more focused on the "standard" college/university outcomes dealing with disciplinary knowledge, communication skills, and critical evaluation skills.

SLU also lacks an appropriate curricular vehicle to collect enough artifacts to make conclusive statements about student learning, despite the fact that the process developed reflects many of the "best practices" in contemporary learning outcomes assessment. With no institution-wide core/general education curriculum, no common capstone or senior thesis requirement, SLU is left to rely on its very slowly-developing "culture of assessment" to foster expansion of this critical assessment effort. It is clear that, since 2012, significant progress on this front has been made; however, that progress could be so much greater.

It has been proposed that, instead of soliciting "complete" portfolios from individual students, SLU could turn to gathering artifacts of student learning directly from faculty teaching upper-level courses across the curriculum. Such a method has many advantages, and would dramatically increase the number of artifacts collected to review against our established rubrics and outcomes. However, in doing so SLU would likely lose the holistic picture of an individual's educational development, as we would not have enough artifacts from any one student to comprise a "complete" portfolio for that student; philosophically, this runs counter to SLU's commitment to whole student development in the Jesuit tradition. But with such a small-scale assessment effort at this point, we may need to make some sacrifices in method for practicality, at least until curriculum or other changes foster expansion of the current version of the program.

A decision was made to more fully develop the undergraduate learning outcomes and assessment program before beginning to develop outcomes at the graduate level. Accordingly, development of SLU's University-Wide Graduate Student Learning Outcomes, a project of the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee (GAAC), did not begin until Fall 2015. The [current draft of those outcomes](#) is still under review by the committee and the colleges/schools/centers. Once finalized and approved, rubrics for their assessment will be collaboratively developed and distributed to academic units to employ in their annual evaluation of student progress toward the outcomes.

Program-Level Assessment

A great deal of progress has been made to advance assessment of program-level learning outcomes across the University, another concern expressed by the HLC visiting team in 2012. Following the HLC's recommendation to hire someone under the Office of the Provost with primary responsibility for coordinating and supporting assessment, a University Assessment Coordinator was hired in July 2013. A very concrete result of that hire is that a process for program-level assessment has been established and implemented.

First, an inventory of academic programs was created. This inventory was used to create a [SLU assessment website](#) to establish a central, public location for assessment information and documents. All academic programs were asked to submit their assessment plans; a [program assessment plan template](#) was provided to the academic units to assist with the creation or

revision of assessment plans, and many programs chose to use the template. Assessment documents are now posted to the website, which lists program assessment documents by college/school/center and program.

The plans include measurable learning outcomes, appropriate methods of assessing the learning outcomes, each program's intended use of the collected assessment data, and the timeline for implementing the plan. Organizing the program assessment plans in a central location not only provides a way for programs to share assessment strategies, but it also provides a way of recognizing which programs may need additional assistance or resources for program assessment efforts.

In addition to program assessment planning, all academic programs are expected to submit annual program assessment reports—and again, many units have chosen to use the template provided by the Assessment Coordinator. Completed program assessment reports are now posted on the web alongside their respective program assessment plans. Units have been regularly reminded that results from direct assessments of student learning will be the most meaningful, and that direct assessments should constitute the majority of assessment activity.

The creation of program assessment plans combined with annual reporting of the implemented assessment activities encourages and establishes a continuous assessment process for each program. Further, for many programs, this process has provided an effective mechanism for documenting and formalizing the efforts towards assessment of student learning. The facilitation of this process from the University Assessment Coordinator provides support to programs to assure that their assessment efforts are meaningful, manageable, and sustainable.

The program-level assessment website containing the assessment plans and reports will continue to offer transparency and inform how the University should allocate assessment resources. Through the process of gathering and posting the program assessment plans and reports, it was identified that a regular review team would be a valuable addition to this process. Currently, the University Assessment Coordinator is drafting a charge for a new, University-Wide Academic Assessment Committee. The main charge of the committee will be to help inform academic program-level assessment efforts by way of offering peer feedback. This committee would also help to identify best practices and emphasize a regular reporting and improvement process.

Despite the development of a sound process for supporting program-level assessment across all academic units—as well as a centralized, web-based hub for presenting assessment data to the University community and to current and prospective students—not all programs have fully-developed assessment programs, nor do all have results of their assessment work. The number of programs that reflect employment of assessment data for program improvement is even smaller, as evidenced by the significantly fewer numbers of assessment reports posted to the program assessment website.

While notable progress has been made to improve program-level assessment, and to make it more transparent and accessible to all, much more needs to be done to fully meet SLU's own expectations and those of the HLC. The future of these efforts looks bright, however, as the institution has committed significant resources to advance assessment. Additionally, several of

SLU's newer deans and academic department chairs bring to SLU key external perspective about what can and should be done at SLU to improve assessment and its impact on meaningful programmatic change. And the full implementation of SLU's Academic Program Review policy, which requires detailed reporting on student learning assessment and its impact on program improvement, is ensuring that assessment of student learning is fundamentally part of all analysis of program quality.

Core Curriculum Assessment

The area of HLC's 2012 assessment concerns about which SLU has made less progress relates to assessment of our various core curricula. Each college/school controls its own curriculum, and no shared requirements for core/general education exist at SLU. The new University-Wide Undergraduate Student Learning Outcomes now provide direction for student learning holistically, but not directly for our core curricula. Additionally, several of SLU's colleges/schools have neither formally-defined core learning outcomes nor curricula common to all the programs within their academic units.

However, [Objective 1.3 from Initiative One of SLU's new Strategic Plan](#) states that SLU will "more clearly articulate the distinctive ways in which SLU's baccalaureate programs, rooted in Jesuit traditions, provide students with the knowledge and dispositions required to successfully tackle 21st-century problems." This objective--rooted in the shared commitments of faculty and staff on one of the key Topical Work Groups helping develop the Strategic Plan--is designed to provide the framework for designating University-wide outcomes that are to drive revision of SLU's various core curricula. Throughout the 2015-2016 academic year, a [Task Force on the SLU Baccalaureate](#), charged jointly by the Provost and Faculty Senate, has been working to develop a Vision Statement articulating "what is distinctive in a SLU undergraduate education, that education's roots in Jesuit traditions, and the ways in which a SLU baccalaureate is tailored to the challenges of the 21st century." The Task Force's work is expected to inform the curriculum change necessary to help ensure achievement of that Vision and the University-Wide Student Learning Outcomes.

As soon as the Task Force on the SLU Baccalaureate concludes its work in May 2016, SLU's faculty and academic leaders will be asked to directly address these concerns about our core curricula and assessment of student learning against core learning outcomes. Discussions have already begun about SLU opting to make this critical academic planning/development project the focus of our upcoming HLC *Quality Initiative*.

Co-Curriculum Assessment

Since SLU's last HLC accreditation Self-Study in 2012, the Division of Student Development has continued to maintain an annual assessment planning and reporting cycle, which includes assessment of student learning, as well as student success/engagement indicators and department operational goals. Further, a new position, the Program Director for Strategic Planning and Assessment, was created within Student Development in January 2014 to provide a more comprehensive focus on assessment in co-curricular departments and across the division. At the beginning of each academic year Directors must submit a rough draft of their [assessment plans](#) to

the Program Director for Strategic Planning and Assessment. Directors revise their assessment plans based on the [feedback](#) and then submit final drafts. The Program Director also holds mid-year check-in meetings with Directors to review the assessment plans and discuss any potential changes that may need to happen in the spring semester. At the conclusion of the academic year, Directors submit assessment reports using the template, identifying the extent to which the outcomes, indicators, and goals were met. The Program Director then reviews each report and provides feedback to the Directors that will inform their planning for the following year. The assessment reports are also used by the Program Director to write the Division of [Student Development's annual reports](#), highlighting our work for the SLU Board of Trustees.

In the Division of Student Development, departments make changes to programs based on student learning outcomes assessment when applicable. For example, the following have programs have changed in the last year as a result of assessment:

- Career Services' Career Decision-Making course
- Housing and Residence Life's learning communities
- Office of Student Responsibility and Community Standards Alcohol Education program
- SLU 101, SLU's summer orientation program coordinated by the Student Involvement Center.

Additionally, Student Development's assessment report template has been revised to prompt departments to reflect upon their student learning outcomes assessment by asking three questions: 1) In what ways have you shared and discussed these results with your department? 2) What conclusions did you and/or the department reach about student learning as a result of your efforts? and 3) What additional assessment questions are there for you to seek answers to regarding student learning in your unit? These recent additions to the template provide an opportunity for departments to think holistically about improving student learning in addition to the work they do to measure specific learning outcomes.

The SLU Madrid campus has recently focused greater attention on [assessment](#), engaging a campus-wide Assessment Committee and identifying a [staff](#) member to oversee student learning assessment--actions designed to better coordinate assessment work undertaken in St. Louis. The Madrid campus' [Spring 2014 Exit Survey Results](#) and the [2014-15 assessment report](#) provide examples of the ways in which that campus is utilizing student learning assessment data to make decisions and enact change.

4.B.4.

Faculty and staff from a variety of disciplines and programs continue to engage and participate in the review and evaluation of student portfolios towards institutional-level assessment. The number of participants involved with institutional-level assessment expands each year. Not only is this a means to make use of the student data that is collected, but it also encourages those evaluators to consider how assessment can be enhanced within their own programs.

In the Division of Student Development, the Program Director regularly facilitates sessions at the [Division Leadership Workshops](#), [department retreats](#), and with individual programs as needed to educate them on high-quality assessment, in addition to [division-wide professional development sessions](#). Most of her work with departments is related specifically to their assessment plans for the year, in order to ensure that direct methods are being used whenever possible, and to review assessment tools.

The Saint Louis University Libraries also take part in the assessment of student learning. Pius Library faculty's partnership with the Department of English Freshman Writing Program, which, in 2014-2015, reached 62 course sections of 20 students each, features a hybrid online and in-person instruction model that includes an assessment component designed to measure basic information literacy skills. Results of this assessment guide modifications to instructional tools (e.g., tutorials) and classroom content. In 2014, the Pius/Medical Center Libraries Assessment Committee sought to assess the contributions of the subject librarians to student learning and success. Specifically, the committee administered a survey and conducted focus groups to ascertain the awareness, use, and effectiveness of subject librarian's services for students. Among the [findings](#):

- Of the 28% of respondents who reported having consulted with a librarian on a paper or course project, 91% stated the belief that this interaction improved the quality of the paper or project.
- Of the 14%–48% of students who reported using the various subject librarian services, 93%–98% found these services either somewhat helpful or very helpful.

The benefits of librarian assistance reported by the students in this study complement those reported by faculty in a 2013 study conducted by the committee on subject librarian contributions to faculty teaching and research: of those faculty who referred individual students to a subject librarian, 80% believed individual assistance to have either a high positive impact (56%) or some positive impact (24%).

SLU has dedicated more resources and made significant progress towards assessment of student learning at the institutional and program levels. Critical to this progress has been the hiring of dedicated assessment professionals in both Academic Affairs and Student Development. These two positions provide assessment leadership for programs and departments to utilize as an assessment resource. In addition, both the School of Education and the School for Professional Studies created positions and hired dedicated staff for assessment efforts. This extends the total assessment staffing at SLU and demonstrates SLU's commitment to fostering a culture of assessment. These positions have been critical to helping refine and advance assessment of student learning at SLU.

In addition to creating these positions, the Office of the Provost has provided financial support by establishing a dedicated budget for assessment efforts. This budget is primarily used for faculty development by way of assessment mini-grants, books, workshops, guest speakers, and conference travel. To date, the office has awarded six mini-grants to a variety of departments/programs across the campus.

Each year since 2013, the University Assessment Coordinator in Academic Affairs has provided funding for groups of faculty and program leaders to attend the Assessment Institute in Indianapolis. This conference is well-established as a productive resource for helping foster conversations and better practices in assessment of student learning. The University Assessment Coordinator attends the conference with the group and facilitates conversations regarding the experiences at the conference. This has been an additional strategy for engaging SLU's campus in assessment conversations. It has also been a useful resource for sharing assessment experiences and strategies with SLU colleagues who may not otherwise have a chance to collaborate during their regular duties. To date, nearly a dozen faculty and staff from across the campus have attended the Assessment Institute.

The University Assessment Coordinator has also led the conception and establishment of a Saint Louis Area Assessment Consortium, an additional resource for SLU and ten other participating area colleges and universities. Consortium members meet each semester to share ideas, best practices, and discuss some of the challenges faced when facilitating assessment efforts at their college or university. This collaborative group not only discusses assessment efforts but also accreditation efforts, as all of the institutions involved are accredited by the HLC.

Sources

- Assessment-Participants
- Graduate-SLOs-DRAFT_January-2016
- Madrid-Assessment_screenshot
- Madrid-Assessment-Committee-Report
- Madrid-Assessment-Staff_screenshot
- Madrid-Exit-Survey-Results_Spring-2014
- Magis_Sept-2015
- Outcome-Development-Process_screenshot
- Program-Assessment_screenshot
- Program-Assessment-Annual-Report-Template
- Program-Assessment-Plan-Template
- SLO-Report-Draft_12-9-2015
- SLU-Baccalaureate-Task-Force-Meeting-Notice
- SLU-Libraries-Report-on-Subject-Librarian-Contributions-to-Student-Learning-and-Success
- Student-Development-Student-Involvement-Center-Retreat-Presentation
- Student-Development-Annual-Report_2014-2015
- Student-Development-Annual-Report_2013-2014
- Student-Development-Annual-Reports_screenshot
- Student-Development-Assessment-Plan-Template
- Student-Development-Assessment-Plan-with-Feedback-Example-1
- Student-Development-Assessment-Plan-with-Feedback-Example-2
- Student-Development-Assessment-Professional-Development-Session

- Student-Development-Assessment-Report-Template
- Student-Development-Assessment-Report-with-Feedback-Example-1
- Student-Development-Assessment-Report-with-Feedback-Example-2
- Student-Development-Check-In-Meeting-Reflection-Questions
- Student-Development-Division-Leadership-Summer-Workshop Presentation
- Student-Development-Guiding-Framework
- Student-Development-Retention-and-Academic-Success-Retreat-Presentation
- Student-Development-Strategic-Planning-and-Assessment-Website_screenshot
- Student-Development-Student-Health-Services-Meeting-Presentation
- Undergraduate-Student-Learning-Outcomes_screenshot
- Undergraduate-Student-Learning-Outcomes-Assessment-Rubrics

4.C - Core Component 4.C

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

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Argument

4.C.1.

SLU's Division of Enrollment and Retention Management (ERM) operates according to a comprehensive [Strategic Enrollment Management \(SEM\) plan](#) developed with input from academic, administrative, and student constituencies across campus. The plan details operating principles, planning framework, governance, and charges to three Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) councils: the Research and Reporting Council, the Recruitment Council, and the Retention and Student Success Council. In 2012 this unit developed a "2018 Strategic Enrollment Vision for 2018 - Bicentennial Billiken Student Profile". This outlines five goals related to the academic profile and diversity of the undergraduate student body, among others. In particular, there is a goal to "increase student persistence and success levels equal to fourth quartile of leading national universities." Specifically, we are seeking to achieve a 90% first- to second-year retention rate and an 80% six-year graduation rate. The institution has made progress toward these goals each year, with the [Fall 2014 first-year cohort persisting to Fall 2015 at a rate of 89.6%](#). The most recent six-year graduation rate (for the Fall 2008 cohort) was 72.5%.

4.C.2. and 4.C.4.

SLU's Office of Institutional Research (OIR) annually gathers and reports data on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs—including breakdowns by race/ethnicity,

student family income, academic background (ACT, high school GPA), SLU academic major, and other characteristics. Additionally, OIR conducts specialized, ad-hoc studies of retention and completion that inform academic and support program evaluations, as well as guide the development of new efforts to support student success.

Utilizing an internally-defined student cohort (which, unlike the cohort we report annually to IPEDS, excludes non-traditional students from our School for Professional Studies and students who began at SLU in our ESL programs), SLU’s retention and graduation rates overall are as follows:

SLU FR Cohort Year	1st-2nd Year Retention Rate	4-Year Graduation Rate	6-Year Graduation Rate
2008	85%	61%	72.5%
2009	83.7%	63.7%	73.7%
2010	86.4%	65.6%	
2011	87.8%	69.6%	
2012	87.4%		
2013	88.6%		
2014	89.6%		

The data illustrate a trend of continuously increasing student retention, a gratifying result considering the significant institutional resources dedicated both to enrolling well-qualified students and to supporting their success early on at SLU. Less satisfying are the four- and six-year graduation rates, as they indicate that a number of students leave SLU after having returned for their second year. The graduation rate data—while also showing steady improvement—indicate that a sizeable number of persisting students require more than four years to complete their SLU degrees. However, nearly all who do complete their SLU degrees do so within five years; the difference between SLU’s five-year graduation rates and six-year rates is almost always less than 1%. With strong first-to-second year retention rates having been achieved, academic leadership is now focused on improving graduation rates significantly.

The above retention and graduation rates are higher than the rates we report to IPEDS because of the differences in the cohort definitions. Per IPEDS data from the Fall 2014 dataset (the most recent year for which comparative IPEDS data is available), SLU’s retention and graduation rates compare with similar institutions (several of which are direct competitors) as follows:

Institution	Avg. ACT Comp	1st-2nd Year Retention Rate	4-Year Grad Rate	6-Year Grad Rate
Marquette University	27.5	89%	59%	79%
Loyola University (IL)	27.5	86%	65%	73%
Fordham University	28	89%	75%	80%
University of Dayton	26.5	91%	59%	76%
Creighton University	26.5	91%	66%	73%
Baylor University	27	89%	55%	72%
SLU	27.5	88%	58%	72%

These IPEDS data also illustrate that, comparatively, SLU’s graduation rates lag those of many of our peer and competitor institutions. With each stronger first-year student class that SLU enrolls, those graduation rates are likely to increase accordingly (as have the first-to-second year retention rates). However, it is also clear that some comparison institutions have had greater success with similarly-prepared students—again, that has begun to become a focus of academic program reviews, curriculum development and management efforts, and student support initiatives.

Retention and graduation rates at SLU vary by a number of variables, including student race/ethnicity, family income, and student academic background. OIR has produced a comprehensive set of data that details these variations to inform related decision-making by leaders in Enrollment and Retention Management, Student Development, and Academic Affairs.

The [Fact Books](#) annually published by OIR include data on freshman retention and graduation rates. Fact Books also shows freshman retention rates for each traditional and non-traditional SLU college or school.

OIR also produces weekly enrollment and admissions reports from January up to the fall census of each calendar year. Many of these reports are posted on a [reporting website accessible to the entire SLU community](#). The reports posted online include retention rates for traditional, non-traditional, and international freshmen enrolled in each SLU college or school. [A more detailed weekly retention report](#), shared with Enrollment and Retention Management leaders, deans, and

others, shows freshman retention rates according to ACT score, commuter or resident status, gender, and race/ethnicity. The detailed report also includes retention rates for new graduate and professional students and new transfer students broken down by SLU college or school.

OIR also provides related data as part of its [standard data set for all Academic Program Reviews](#). Not only does OIR provide these data to the 10-15 programs scheduled to undergo the academic program review process each year, but OIR has begun providing the same data for all academic programs annually to facilitate their academic planning and evaluation efforts.

In addition to the “stock” OIR reports on retention, persistence, and degree completion, OIR conducts other related analyses every year. The [Early Risk Model for Incoming Freshman](#) identifies new freshmen who are at risk of not retaining at SLU or of retaining with a GPA below 2.5. The model uses pre-college characteristics, including high school GPA, ACT score, FAFSA information, and demographics, to assign a risk score to every incoming freshman. The model developed in 2014 was used to assign risk scores to Fall 2015 prior to the start of classes; it is also used to complement MAP-Works data (addressed in 4.C.3).

Additional OIR research on [retention and student satisfaction](#) highlights the most important factors for retaining undergraduate students and ensuring that they are satisfied with their experiences at SLU. Results from a [retention study of the Fall 2009 cohort](#) demonstrate that academic performance at SLU is the most important predictor of freshman retention, and that student satisfaction and social integration together comprise the second most important predictor. These two predictors remain the most significant even when accounting for students’ high school GPAs, ACT scores, financial situations, and other factors.

The importance of student satisfaction for retention motivated additional research to identify the most important influencers of overall satisfaction with SLU. Results indicate that social integration, learning, and faculty support are most important for undergraduate student satisfaction; student GPAs, race/ethnicity, gender, ACT scores, and concerns about the costs of attending SLU are much less important for overall satisfaction. As SLU’s tuition continues to rise, there is an understandable connection made between cost and retention/graduation rates; however, having solid data indicating that financial concerns are not strongly associated with attrition has been helpful in prioritizing efforts to better support student success.

4.C.3.

Since 2008, Saint Louis University has utilized the MAP-Works platform to help identify first-year students at risk for leaving the institution. The platform uses an algorithm to identify varying levels of risk across a 4-point spectrum (very high, high, moderate, and low). The algorithm makes calculations based on two types of data: institutional data that is uploaded from the student information system (e.g., ACT score, high school GPA, financial aid info, number of credits), and students’ responses to the MAP-Works surveys. Survey topics include students’ commitment to SLU, financial means, self-assessed academic skills, academic behaviors, peer connections, and satisfaction with the institution. The first survey, the transition survey, is

administered to students 3-5 weeks into the fall semester. The second survey, the check-in survey, is administered in weeks 10-12 of the fall semester. A third survey is administered 3-5 weeks into the spring semester. After each survey students receive feedback on their risk in three primary categories: academic, financial, and socio-emotional. The algorithm is updated each time there is new data, whether from additional institutional data we have uploaded (e.g., mid-term grades) or survey data that leads to fluctuating risk levels. Beginning in 2014, new transfer students were also uploaded into the platform and asked to participate in the surveys. Starting with 2015, sophomores were incorporated into the use of this platform. Overall, response rates are exceedingly high, with 94% of first-year students completing the transition survey.

In addition to the survey and risk indicator functionality, MAP-Works also provides an avenue for different offices across campus to communicate with each other about the outreach and support being provided to students. For example, a residence hall director can log in to MAP-Works to see what resources have been suggested to the student by the student's University 101 instructor and have a follow-up conversation with the student about the extent to which those resources were helpful.

While the use of MAP-Works has historically been utilized in the University 101 course (a transition to college course) and by Housing and Residence Life staff, a new retention and success initiative took shape beginning in 2014: Student Success Coaching. This is a new unit within the Student Success Center whose primary responsibility is to reach out to and provide support for first-year students identified as at-risk by MAP-Works and OIR's model. The coaches use an appreciative advising model and hold one-on-one meetings with students to develop success plans, identify goals, and utilize campus resources. In 2014-2015, 540 students were identified as being at-risk. The success coaches held just over 1,000 one-on-one appointments with these students. Per the Retention and Student Success unit's end-of-year report, 91% of students who met with a coach persisted into the spring semester, whereas only 42% of at-risk students who did not meet with a coach persisted; other, related outcomes were similarly illustrative. SLU staff were selected to give a [presentation on this new model at the MAP-Works annual conference](#) and won the [MAP-Works 2015 Educational Excellence Award](#).

The decision to proceed with this new initiative was entirely based on retention- and success-related data. We discovered through data analysis that students who were at risk both through MAP-Works and OIR student risk modeling were less likely to use resources such as academic support and Career Services. A small think tank, comprised of members of the Division of Student Development and leadership within Academic Affairs, spent about four months benchmarking retention and student success models at schools nationwide before designing our own program.

Recent data analysis indicates that the Student Success Coaching program, initiated in Summer 2014, might already be paying dividends. [Per a report from the Office of Institutional Research in Fall 2015](#), SLU's first-to-second year student retention rate increased disproportionately higher than the increase in the academic quality of the students in that cohort. For example, as the OIR report indicates, while a significant portion of SLU's increasing retention rates over the past five years is likely attributable to the improving academic profiles (and, particularly, the average ACT score) of our incoming students, the disproportionately high increase in retention

evidenced by the Fall 2014 new student cohort indicates that something else—perhaps the new Student Success Coaches—might have had a critical impact on retention.

The proposal for the Student Success Coaching model included a “sunset provision” that called for the termination of the program if assessment data did not indicate that the program was achieving its intended impact; it is too early to know for sure if the retention gains experienced in the first year of the program have been impacted by the program itself. SLU hopes to replicate the data-informed process that guided the development and evaluation of the Student Success Coaching program with future student support efforts, ending or changing programs that cannot demonstrate impact and expanding as appropriate those that can.

Sources

- APR-Standard-Dataset (Example Data for ENGL Program)
- Office-of-Institutional-Research-Early-Risk-Modeling-for-New-Incoming-Freshmen
- Office-of-Institutional-Research-Retention-and-Satisfaction-Summary
- Office-of-Institutional-Research-Reporting-Website_screenshot
- Office-of-Institutional-Research-Retention-Study_2011
- Office-of-Institutional-Research-Undergraduate-Satisfaction-Study_2015
- Office-of-Institutional-Research-Weekly-Retention-Report-Example
- Office-of-Institutional-Research-Race-and-Retention-Analysis
- Retention-and-Student-Success-Report
- Saint-Louis-University-FactBook-Website_screenshot
- SLU-FactBook_2014-2015
- SLU-MAP-Works-Educational-Excellence-Award-Newslink-Article_screenshot
- SLU-MAP-Works-Presentation_2015
- Strategic-Enrollment-Management-Principles-Framework-Plan-Vision-and-Councils
- Strategic-Enrollment-Management-Research-and-Data-Forum-Presentations-Website_screenshot

4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Summary

SLU has demonstrably progressed in its efforts to develop a pervasive culture of assessment—but we are, admittedly, far from done. Although the senior leadership turmoil notably slowed our implementation of a true program review effort, we are now on track. Programs that hold disciplinary or specialized accreditation are typically more advanced in their assessment of student learning—although even some of their assessment programs need to mature and expand to meet institutional and HLC expectations that often exceed or are more diverse than those of their individual accrediting bodies. Many other programs have taken one, two, or even many critical steps toward implementing robust assessment plans—although the number of programs that clearly evidence how assessment data is regularly and systematically used for curricular, pedagogical, or operational improvement is still too small.

Many “best practices” are indeed in place at SLU—but not ubiquitously. Critical human and fiscal resources have been committed, long-term, to ensure that such practices become the norm across the institution. Educating the community is still fundamental to these efforts, as high-quality assessment—principally grounded in *direct* measures of student learning—is still relatively new to many.

At this point, perhaps the greatest obstacle on the way to the end of that tunnel is the assessment challenge posed by SLU’s various core curricula and their lack of shared educational goals. As conceded above, this issue remains to be addressed in the transformative way that it must, although there is clear movement toward making it not only an institutional imperative in the coming year but the focus of our upcoming HLC *Quality Initiative*.

Sources

There are no sources.

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

5.A - Core Component 5.A

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

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Argument

5.A.1.

Saint Louis University's Consolidated Financial Statements for FY2015 and FY2014 show that, in FY2015, SLU earned approximately \$746M in operating revenues and other support; total operating expenses were about \$740M, leaving a net operating surplus of approximately \$6M. For FY2015, the University's total net assets were about \$1.6B, and total liabilities and net assets together were approximately \$2.0B.

As detailed in SLU's [Annual Institutional Data Update](#) submitted to the HLC in Spring 2015, SLU maintains very strong ratios for financial responsibility as defined by the U.S. Department of Education. The table below details the Primary Reserve, Equity, and Net Income Ratios for the past four years and their respective annual Composite Financial Indicators; SLU's Total CFIs per year are also included.

	FY2014	FY2013	FY2012
Primary Reserve Ratio	1.17	1.24	1.10

Primary Reserve CFI	1.20	1.20	1.20
Equity Ratio	.78	.77	.73
Equity CFI	1.20	1.20	1.20
Net Income Ratio	-.03	.13	-.01
Net Income CFI	.07	.60	.11
Total CFI	2.47	3.00	2.50

SLU's endowment of nearly \$1.1 billion is one of the largest in the nation; currently, only about 70 institutions have endowments of \$1B or more. While the size of SLU's endowment is indeed impressive and does significantly strengthen the institution's overall financial position, SLU's senior leaders and board members are very prudent with their investment philosophies and endowment-related spending. As addressed in Criterion 5.C.4, the recent increase of SLU's annual endowment spend rate from 4.5% to 5% was done so only after significant consideration, and only for a designated period of three years as the institution engages in longer-term financial planning designed to mitigate the need for spend rate increases above 4.5% in the future.

Despite SLU's overall financial strength, and as detailed in Criterion 5.C.4, SLU has experienced very tight budgets in recent years, and has engaged in various initiatives to reduce both short- and long-term expenses. Projected budgets in the next several years will not be balanced without significant additional reductions in expenses and/or increases in revenues. Without notable gains in financial and operational efficiency, projected annual average deficits range from approximately 1%-3% of the University's operating budget.

The most recent [Facilities Services Annual Report](#) documents that SLU's St. Louis, MO, campus is composed of 134 buildings, spread across 271 urban acres and 7,544,028 GSF—all of which is maintained by 366 staff. SLU's Madrid, Spain, campus features three buildings in the historically-protected Metropolitano neighborhood; both campuses are readily accessible via public transportation. Our [FY2015 Consolidated Financial Statements](#) report that, overall, SLU's land, buildings, and equipment totaled \$1B before depreciation, and \$580M less accumulated depreciation. In the past decade, the University has significantly accelerated its efforts to reshape its physical presence to be increasingly sustainable. The [Facilities Services FY2015 Sustainability Report](#) highlights these efforts.

SLU has begun construction on two new residence halls on the St. Louis campus. The [first, scheduled to open in Fall 2016](#), is an eight-story, 153,000 square foot hall for 450 first- and second-year students. The [second, to open in Fall 2017](#), is a seven-story complex with 528 beds. Both of these halls will expand the University's on-campus living capacity which, in turn, enables SLU to re-convert some residence halls back to originally-conceived capacities, as well as de-commission as residence halls older buildings less conducive to renovation for contemporary student living. Together, these halls (and associated dining, meeting, and communal areas) constitute a \$115 million investment in our physical plant. Funding for the projects comes primarily via bonds issued under favorable terms that allow SLU to pay down

debt with income from the new facilities themselves; accordingly, on an annual operational budgeting basis, this major campus construction project has comparatively little direct impact.

SLU's careful monitoring of the changing health care landscape in St. Louis and nationally led the University to an historic partnership with SSM Health, a major local and national health care and hospital system. Effective September 1, 2016, the deal involved SLU re-acquiring Saint Louis University Hospital from Tenet Health Care (to which SLU had sold the hospital in the 1998), and then contributing the facility to SSM Health in exchange for a minority financial interest and governance rights in SSM Health St. Louis. Additionally, SSM committed \$500M to building a [new hospital](#) near the current facility on South Grand Blvd. The new hospital, coupled with an extension of the reach of the University's SLUCare medical practice via the SSM network, is designed to advance SLU's impact on health care in the region for the future, and ensure that the University's health care operations remain strong enough to sustain its critical services to those most in need throughout the community.

The University's [portfolio of technology infrastructure, services and products](#) is, by necessity at a major research university, vast and multi-faceted. So, too, is SLU's portfolio of [IT-related policies and procedures](#). A diverse group of IT Governing Committees provides opportunities for faculty, staff, and students from throughout the institution to be involved in key IT-related decision-making. Because of the rapidly-changing technology environment in which SLU operates, our Information Technology Services (ITS) leadership is constantly in both operational and planning modes simultaneously; indeed, ITS exhibits some of the most pro-active organizational planning at the institution. ITS's Spring 2014 assessment, for which the unit solicited campus-wide input, indicated the following about SLU's then-current state of IT affairs:

- Most services such as email, Banner, the learning management system (Blackboard) and the electronic health records system (EPIC) are reliable with few unplanned outages.
- Most operational activities are reliable and are meeting the base needs of Saint Louis University students and employees.
- Although information technology products and services are seen as reliable, there is a perception that much of the technology is old and is not supportive of new technologies used by students, faculty, physicians, researchers, or staff.
- While information technology activities are largely driven by academic, clinical, research or administrative requests there is a need to better plan and align future information technology activities to the short-term and long-term objectives of each unit.
- The delivery of information technology uses a model that is traditional in nature. The current model includes policy, procedure, and information technology services that outline specific uses for information technology products and services. The model focuses on delineating between supported and unsupported devices, software, or other activities instead of creating a technology ecosystem that enables agility and flexibility. While the traditional model of information technology service delivery is common in most universities, the model is not sustainable with the ever-changing expectations of students, faculty, physicians, researchers, and staff, and with the changing landscape of technologies that are being used at Saint Louis University.
- The University has a wealth of data that can be used for decision making. New reporting tools are being implemented, although more work will need to be done in order for on

demand and dashboard reports to be available to constituents based on the types of information needed in their role.

The results above played a major role in ITS's development of its [Strategic Technology Vision Statement for 2020](#), a planning document endorsed by the Presidents Coordinating Council that guides ITS's—and the University's—work to ensure SLU becomes far more adept at the technology adaptability that is the hallmark of a sustainable IT infrastructure.

5.A.2.

The University's increasingly collaborative budgeting process, summarized in Criterion 5.A.5., supports institutional decision-making characterized by strategic intentionality, commitment to mission, and accountability. As a non-profit, private institution subordinate only to its volunteer Board of Trustees and the constituencies it exists to serve, SLU is not beholden to any other financial or corporate interest to which financial or other resources would or could be disbursed. Additionally, as demonstrated in our most recent Consolidated Financial Statements, SLU holds [comparatively little annualized debt](#) for an institution of its size and budget.

The University's long history of tight financial controls, regularly evidenced in [unqualified independent audits](#), confirm the integrity of SLU's financial commitments to its educational purposes. And as noted in Criterion 5.C.1., the distribution of SLU's expenditures appropriately reflect those commitments and substantiate the University's capacity to fulfill them.

5.A.3.

No discrete, measurable goals are incorporated into the University's [Mission Statement](#). However, as discussed throughout this section on Criterion 5, the University's organization, resources, and opportunities otherwise demonstrably reflect the capacity to live the University's mission.

5.A.4.

Ensuring the quality of Saint Louis University's staff is a responsibility shared throughout the institution. Faculty qualifications are established by the hiring unit and always meet—but typically far exceed—HLC requirements. Of SLU's approximately 1,300 full-time faculty, 92% hold the terminal degree in their field, typically the doctorate.

All academic units provide some form of orientation and/or mentoring for new faculty, including adjunct and part-time faculty. Promotion and tenure expectations are rigorous, and prompt academic units to provide appropriate forms of support and guidance for pre-tenure faculty.

Because of SLU's mission and corporate purposes, tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarship, service and, as appropriate, clinical health care. Annual merit raises, promotions in academic rank, and the granting of tenure are all rewards for faculty excellence.

For SLU's approximately 3,000 staff, a comprehensive [position classification system](#) is at the heart of properly defining work expectations as well as the educational and professional backgrounds required for success in a given position. [Salary administration guidelines](#) provide guidance for rewarding and promoting professional excellence.

5.A.5.

Saint Louis University utilizes an annual, [incremental budgeting process](#) for its operations. Essentially, new institutional operational budgets are based on the previous year's budgets and changed, incrementally, based on analysis of data from multiple sources. This occurs at all levels of the institution, although individual budget managers may engage in some other, complementary forms of budgeting that help them arrive at their annual budget change requests.

Year-to-year budget change requests come in the following forms:

- requests for new spending (for personnel, programming, etc.)
- increases to meet contractual obligations
- increases for previously-approved academic programs
- capital requests
- requests grounded in projected changes in enrollment

Many academic programs are approved by senior leadership under the expectation that, as enrollment grows annually, so too will the need for additional faculty and/or staff. Accordingly, academic deans and directors annually request amounts for such expenses that were committed to by the institution at the point of program adoption by academic leadership and, in many cases, the Board of Trustees.

Projected capital expenditures are solicited from the vice-presidents of each division of the University, and a dedicated meeting cycle is established at which to address the coming annual capital budget as a component of overall institutional budgeting.

Each year, enrollment worksheets—featuring extensive historical enrollment data along with enrollment modeling projections—are distributed to academic deans and directors who work with faculty and staff in their units/programs to project future enrollments and, accordingly, related budget requests. As SLU is a fundamentally tuition-driven institution, enrollment forecasts drive the University's gross tuition revenue budget. Other factors incorporated into projected budgets include merit increases for faculty and staff as well as increases in tuition, room, and board rates for the upcoming year.

Budget discussions at various levels include representation across all institutional constituencies. Budget presentations are made upon request to many groups, but are also regularly offered to the following groups throughout the process:

- Faculty Senate
- Staff Advisory Council
- Student Government Association
- Academic Deans & Directors

Additionally, one of the highest-level bodies that deliberates each annual institutional budget—the President’s Coordinating Council—has amongst its members representatives from the student, staff, and faculty governance bodies, as well as a representative from the deans. A new group—the President’s Advisory Council (PAC)—has since Spring 2015 also been regularly informed about and engaged in budget planning. The PAC consists of approximately 80 members of the faculty, staff, academic leadership, administrative leadership, and student leadership.

A signature of President Pestello’s commitment to transparency in decision-making has been the PAC and, in particular, its influence in budgeting discussions. In Spring 2015, the PAC membership voiced significant concern about several potential budget reductions designed to combat a projected 1% operating deficit in FY2015. With that input, President Pestello and senior administrative leaders pursued alternatives suggested by PAC members, and eventually settled on a strategy that was met with much more support. Similar engagement of PAC members in planning for the FY2017 and subsequent budgets has been evidenced throughout Fall 2015 and Spring 2016. In particular, PAC-based budget discussions have featured multi-year budget projections that, historically, had usually only been shared with senior leadership and appropriate committees of the University’s Board of Trustees.

While PAC has been helpful as a means to communicate key budget University-level information to a wider audience, other communication mechanisms are used to share budget information at the college/school/center and department levels across the institution. Monthly and annual financial reports tracking budgets are readily available to all budget managers via Banner, SLU’s University-wide relational database. Additionally, a series of budget and related financial monitoring reports have been developed in Cognos, the University’s data reporting tool, for unit leaders and others with responsibility for financial management.

Starting in FY2015, the budgeting schedule across all units was altered to allow more time for current year financial monitoring and for more precise enrollment projections for the coming year. Accordingly, the bulk of the budgeting process is conducted in a given spring term. In February, the Board of Trustees sets new tuition, room, and board rates, as well as totals for any merit raises for the coming fiscal year. In May, the full annual budget for the coming year is approved by the full Board. Adjusting to the later timing of the final budget decision has not been without challenges, but the rationale for the change has been well communicated.

Sources

- 2014-2015_HLC-Institutional-Annual-Update-Final_4-2-2015
- 2020-Information-Technology-Vision-and-Priorities
- Facilities-Services-FY15-Sustainability-Report
- Facilities-Services-FY15-Year-End-Report
- FY16-Budget-Process
- FY2015-and-FY2014_Consolidated-Financial-Statements-and-Independent-Auditor's-Report
- Groundbreaking-for-First-New-Residence Hall_screenshot
- Groundbreaking-for-Second-New-Residence-Hall_screenshot
- HR-Position-Classification-System
- HR-Salary-Administration-Guidelines
- ITS-Policies-and-Standards_screenshot
- ITS-Procedures-and-Processes_screenshot
- ITS-Services-and-Products_screenshot
- SLU-Mission-Statement_screenshot
- SLU-SSM-Partnership-Announcement_9-1-15

5.B - Core Component 5.B

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

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

Argument

5.B.1.

The University's Board of Trustees is committed to ensuring that its members are knowledgeable about the institution. New members of SLU's Board of Trustees receive a comprehensive orientation to the Board and University, conducted by the University's Vice President and General Counsel (who also serves as Board Secretary). The [most recent orientation session](#), held in August 2015, included an institutional overview, an introduction to Board membership, information on Board governance initiatives, and overviews of University operations by the Provost and Vice Presidents. A [compilation of key documents](#) distributed prior to this meeting provided additional support and context.

Saint Louis University became an institutional member of the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) in FY2015. The importance SLU attributes to AGB best practices is reflected in the attention given these AGB statements during the Fall 2015 orientation session: [Fiduciary Duties of Governing Board Members](#), [Board Responsibility for the Oversight of Educational Quality](#), and [Board of Directors' Statement on Board Accountability](#). The orientation session and supporting documents not only provide new members with detailed insight specific to the University's operations, achievements, and challenges—including those related to the SSM Health Saint Louis University Hospital—but place this information in the context of contemporary higher education.

The Board's Governance Committee takes responsibility for ongoing professional development programming for trustees about general higher education issues as well as those of particular concern to SLU. One example is [Senior Associate General Counsel Danielle Uy's February 28, 2015, presentation to the Board on Title IX](#) of the United States Higher Education Amendments of 1972 and a variety of related statutes dealing with institutional responsibility for and to victims of sexual misconduct.

The continuous education of Board members is supported by the regular participation of SLU faculty, staff, and students on nine of the Board's committees, as detailed in Criterion 2.C.2. On the Board's Academic Affairs Committee, in particular, SLU faculty and staff regularly present research and academic proposals to the committee, as well as otherwise assist Board members in understanding how the University operates.

The Board of Trustees is ultimately responsible for the academic quality of the institution. Accordingly, the charge of its Academic Affairs Committee (AAC), detailed in the [Trustee Handbook](#), is substantial:

- The Academic Affairs Committee provides oversight for the establishment and elimination of academic schools, departments, centers and programs; academic priorities, goals and objectives; and academic policies and standards for the University. The Committee also provides oversight for the advancement of the University's research efforts and monitoring transfers of its intellectual property.

New academic programs (at the major, certificate, and degree levels) are proposed by faculty, endorsed by University academic and financial leadership, and then brought to the Board's Academic Affairs Committee for endorsement—upon which the full Board considers each proposal for final approval. The AAC also monitors program closures and the overall portfolio of the institution's program. Major changes to SLU's academic organization also require Board approval; for example, the move of the School of Social Work from the College of Education and Public Service to the College for Public Health and Social Justice required the AAC's endorsement and the full Board's approval. But approvals for new courses or lower-level academic program changes are made by programs and their college/school/center academic governance groups without Board input. This balance of Board engagement in academic and related forms of decision-making (as addressed in Criterion 2.C.4.) is well-understood and has, generally, been well-received by all involved.

The Board is also ultimately charged to ensure the University's compliance with fulfillment of all fiduciary responsibilities. SLU's overall financial health—as evidenced by the institution's long history of balanced annual budgets and strong endowment (both addressed in Criterion 5.A.1.)—and regularly unqualified independent audits demonstrate the success of the Board's financial leadership. Much of that leadership emanates from the Board's Finance Committee, which is charged with establishing financial planning priorities and policies as well as overseeing SLU's overall financial performance.

Via its Legal and Legislative Affairs Committee, the Board maintains responsibility for compliance with and fulfillment of all applicable legal responsibilities. The committee works closely with the staff of the University's Office of the General Counsel to ensure the protection and strength of institutional interests and assets in full compliance with local, state, and federal laws.

SLU's recently-enacted partnership with SSM Health (addressed in Criterion 5.A.1.) drew broadly upon the vast expertise of key board members—particularly those serving on its Finance and Legal and Legislative Affairs Committees—and serves as an example of the magnitude of

impact that a strong and experienced board can have on institutional success and strategic directions.

As noted in Criterion 5.A.5., annual institutional budgets, as well as tuition rates, must be approved by the Board. All matters pertaining to major capital expenditures (such as the \$115M project to construct two new residence halls on the St. Louis campus as noted in Criterion 5.A.1.), and all projects requiring SLU to issue debt for the financing of such projects, greatly involve Board members from the Finance and Executive Committees. The Board's Investment Committee establishes the University's investment philosophy and is responsible for monitoring progress toward investment objectives and performance of investment funds.

5.B.2.

Governance at SLU is distributed across various levels of hierarchy and type. A commitment to shared governance undergirds both formal and informal decision-making, although in different ways and to different extents across academic and administrative units. Within the various areas of the University, administrative structures enable representation and active participation in governance by all populations of the University community.

Institutional decision-making at SLU is conducted via a formal [governance structure](#) that includes bodies featuring broad representation of student, faculty, and staff constituencies.

The Executive Staff Committee consists of the president, all University vice-presidents, as well as the special assistants to the president (one for community engagement and one for mission and identity), and the dean/director of the Madrid Campus.

The President's Coordinating Council (PCC) consists of the membership of the Executive Staff Committee plus representatives from the following governance organizations: the Staff Advisory Committee (SAC), the Student Government Association (SGA), the Faculty Senate (FS), and a dean representing the Council of Academic Deans and Directors (CADD). Including representatives from these key leadership groups ensures a diversity of voices in truly institution-wide dialogues and deliberations.

The Council of Academic Deans and Directors is the principal advisory body to the Provost. As such, it deliberates and endorses as appropriate proposals for new/revised academic programs, policies, procedures, organizational structures, etc. Membership includes all deans/directors of all SLU colleges/schools/centers (including the Madrid campus), as well as the Dean of the University Libraries, and the President of the Faculty Senate. Regular administrative resources to the committee include the Vice President for Enrollment and Retention Management, the Vice President for Student Development, all Associate and Assistant Provosts, and the University Registrar.

The [Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee \(UAAC\)](#) is the University-level curriculum and academic policy decision-making body situated above the academic governance structures of

each college/school/center and below the CADD. [UAAC's bylaws](#) demonstrate the inclusivity of its membership, particularly with reference to key representatives from Student Development.

Like UAAC, the [Graduate Academic Affairs Committee \(GAAC\)](#) is UAAC's counterpart at the graduate level. [GAAC's bylaws](#) also document an inclusive membership evidencing SLU's commitment to subsidiarity and shared academic governance.

It is generally understood throughout the institution that matters requiring the highest level of University-wide perspective and deliberation—particularly University-level policies and budgets—are formally addressed by the PCC, which meets monthly. The Executive Staff Committee meets weekly, and feeds many of its recommendations to the PCC. Both groups clearly allow for constituent participation and facilitate decision-making. President Pestello's creation of the President's Advisory Council (PAC) in Spring 2015 has greatly extended the reach of shared input into institutional governance. The nearly 100-member PAC, which includes significant representation of faculty, staff, students, and academic and administrative leadership, has already played a significant role in influencing institutional action regarding budget and expense reduction initiatives (as discussed in Criterion 5.C.4.). Results from a [Summer 2015 survey of PAC members](#) evidenced overwhelming support for the PAC and how it was operated.

The importance of shared governance is widely held throughout the University community. The advent of the PAC and other efforts at increasing transparency in decision-making have engaged more constituents in shared governance and, in turn, strengthened constituencies' commitment to it. Faculty, students, and staff have operational definitions of shared governance that are collaborative and consultative but not always identical; however, all constituents understand that final operational decision-making authority rests with the President, and that the Board of Trustees is the corporate expression of the University and, therefore, is ultimately responsible for institutional action.

Faculty participate in the governance of the University at three levels: the University level, the college/school/center/library, and finally, the various academic departments. At the University level, two structures allow for faculty governance: the Faculty Senate and University committees and task forces. Documents, including constitution, bylaws, minutes, related to the governance and structure of the Faculty Senate are available on the [Senate website](#). Through various University committees, faculty address issues related to curriculum, instructional design, academic affairs, research, and rank and tenure. At the college/school/center/library level, a faculty assembly (or comparable body) is convened for the purpose of helping the members address significant issues, initiate proposals, and communicate their views to the Faculty Senate, administration of the college/school/center/library, or the administration of the University. At the department level, faculty members participate in meetings and committees that help to develop the goals of the respective department, courses, student advising, and research.

The [Faculty Manual](#) outlines the general norms and responsibilities of the faculty with regard to teaching, research, student advising, governance, and service. The Faculty Senate is the governing body for the faculty and the means by which the faculty participate in the larger governance of the institution. Each college/school/center/library has its own procedures for faculty governance within the unit.

Shared governance is addressed in [Article III. H.4. of the Faculty Manual](#). This provision articulates the complexity of governing the University and highlights the shared responsibility of Board of Trustees, the President, other members of the administration, faculty members, students, and the University staff. This vision for shared governance acknowledges the importance of interdependent roles, communication, and joint planning. Primary roles of the faculty include:

- setting the academic requirements for the degrees offered by the University;
- determining the contents of University courses and the methods of instruction to be used;
- setting standards for admission of students to the University;
- recommending the specific individuals who will be granted earned degrees; and
- recommending faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure according to institutional norms

SLU's Madrid campus operates as a second campus from the perspective of the HLC and U.S. Department of Education; from the perspective of the Spanish government, the campus is a private university operating in Spain and, therefore, is required to follow Spanish labor laws which significantly impact hiring, promotion, the Madrid campus's academic schedule, and other areas that are articulated in the University Faculty Manual or regulated by United States federal or state laws. Accordingly, the faculty at the Madrid campus are not governed by the University Faculty Manual. Rather, along with administrative staff, they are bound to nationally-mandated employment agreements, the [Estatuto de Los Trabajadores](#) and the *convenio* (collective charter/agreement) for Spain's private university sector. Madrid faculty have established their own [Faculty Senate](#) with its own [Constitution](#); a distinct faculty manual outlining academic policies is currently being developed. In addition, the Madrid Campus, as regulated by Spanish labor law, has an elected *Comite de Trabajadores* (worker's committee), which represents the interests of all employees on labor matters.

Madrid academic leadership is regularly represented on key University-wide committees, such as the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee (GAAC), the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee (UAAC), CADD and the PCC. A team of Madrid campus faculty and staff regularly participates in PAC meetings, as well. Video-conferencing technologies have brought the two campuses much closer together and have significantly facilitated shared governance and decision-making throughout the overall organization.

The [Staff Advisory Committee \(SAC\)](#) represents the interests and concerns of the University staff to administration. Membership is open to any staff member who is not covered by a collective bargaining agreement. Officers are elected annually. The President of SAC is a member of the President's Coordinating Council. Meetings of SAC are held monthly with the Vice President for Human Resources in attendance. SAC fulfills the following functions:

- to communicate the interests and concerns of a diverse University staff; to function in an advisory capacity in the development, review and implementation of University policies which affect staff;
- to provide a means of communication with the administration, faculty, and students, and support them with the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the staff; and

- to create and nurture a spirit of unity among all employees at the University

The [Student Government Association \(SGA\)](#), chartered by the University's Board of Trustees, is the governing body which oversees the governance and funding of student organizations and represents the students' perspective to administration. The SGA officers and senators are elected by the student body. The SGA charters all student organizations and nominates students to serve on University-wide committees. Senators represent all colleges and schools, residents of every hall and apartment complex, and commuters. In addition, there are senators representing the Graduate Student Association (GSA), the Black Students Alliance (BSA), the International Student Federation (ISF), and first-year students. The Senate meets weekly to create and debate legislation concerning all aspects of student life. University officials are regular participants in SGA meetings, communicating regarding institutional activities and proposals, and answering questions from student leaders.

The Student Government Association Statement of Shared Governance, approved by the President's Coordinating Council in 2011, codifies the SGA's role in key institutional decision-making:

Shared governance is a representative process that generally means that important areas of action will involve input from each of the institutional components in decision-making. These important areas of action typically include, but are not limited to, the budget of the University, tuition increases, policy changes, academic restructuring, and plans for construction on, expansion of, or major renovations to any University campus. Regarding these matters, the student body shall customarily be represented through the presence of at least one student delegate who is either a member of Student Government Association or is appointed by Student Government Association. The delegate(s) will serve as a voice to promote the students' interests in accordance with the mission of the Student Government Association.

The SGA statement also includes provisions specifying the Student Government Association as the official voice of the student body, the function and expectations of students in shared governance, and a corollary for the University administration.

5.B.3.

Bylaws and minutes of the governance bodies described in Criterion 5.B.2. document that administration, faculty, staff, and student are indeed involved in setting academic requirements, policies, and processes.

The PCC and CADD committee have yet to adopt formal bylaws that codify their respective long-standing memberships, charges, and scopes. Additionally, SLU has not yet adopted a formal articulation of the relationships among its academic and non-academic governance bodies and leadership positions. Codification of relatively well-understood governance organization norms would strengthen University-wide understanding of and faith in SLU's governance.

Sources

- Board-New-Trustee-Handbook_2015
- Board-New-Trustee-Orientation-Selected-Governance-Articles
- Board-New-Trustee-Orientation-Statements-Minutes-FY2015
- Board-New-Trustee-Orientation-University-Information_2015
- Faculty-Manual_Current
- Faculty-Senate-Home-Page_screenshot
- GAAC-Bylaws
- GACC-Home-Page_screenshot
- Madrid-Faculty-Senate-Constitution
- Madrid-Faculty-Senate-Home-Page_screenshot
- PAC-Meeting-Minutes_9-9-15 (with PAC Survey Results)
- SLU-Governance-Structure
- Spanish-Labor-Website_screenshot
- Staff-Advisory-Committee-Home-Page_screenshot
- Student-Government-Association-Home-Page_screenshot
- UAAC-Bylaws
- UAAC-Home-Page_screenshot

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Argument

5.C.1.

The University allocates its resources in a manner consistent with its multi-faceted corporate purposes of teaching, research, service, and health care—each of which is a corporate expression of our mission. SLU's expenditures compare favorably with institutions similar in size, educational scope, and mission.

According to data from the National Center for Education Statistics (see Table 5C1.1, below), in FY2014 Saint Louis University expended approximately \$240 million in the IPEDS-defined category of "Instruction"; that is significantly more than was expended by Loyola University Chicago (\$175M), Marquette University (\$115M), and Fordham University (\$209). In terms of expenditures in IPEDS' "Research" category, SLU spent \$38M, compared to Loyola's \$30M, Marquette's \$22M, and Fordham's \$14M. In IPEDS' "Public Service" Category, SLU's expenditure of \$10M trailed Fordham's \$18M and Loyola's \$17M; Marquette spent approximately \$5M in this IPEDS category. (Note: Comparative data on health care-related expenditures is not available via NCES.)

Table 5C1.1

	Instruction	Research	Public Service
Fordham University	\$209,436,815	13,565,361	18,302,175
Loyola University Chicago	175,648,682	30,446,927	16,787,626
Marquette University	115,257,000	22,152,000	4,588,000
Saint Louis University	236,154,843	38,101,560	10,140,225

As detailed in [SLU's Consolidated Financial Statement for 2015](#), SLU's total functional expenditures of \$739,726,000 were distributed by functional category as follows:

Table 5C1.2

Expenditure Category	Amount
Patient Care	\$294,500,000
Instruction	\$198,576,000
Research	\$36,997,000
Public Service	\$10,973,000
Academic Support	\$57,315,000
Student Services	\$27,516,000
Institutional Support	\$73,961,000
Auxiliary Enterprises	\$39,888,000
Total Expenditures	\$739,726,000

Regardless of accounting or reporting method, SLU's expenditures are demonstrably well-aligned with its mission and priorities.

[Additional evidence](#) includes details of expenditures on efforts to engage with and support the Midtown and broader St. Louis community—often via efforts that, simultaneously, advance the education of our students and the professional service of faculty and staff; this is a fundamental commitment of the University.

5.C.2.

While no single, formal mechanism exists via which assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting are regularly and systemically linked, evidence highlighted throughout this Assurance Argument illustrates the many linkages that both exist and strengthen the institution.

The new Strategic Plan (detailed in Section 5.C.3.), coupled with the recently-announced Magis Operational Excellence Program (described in Section 5.C.4.) are major catalysts for alignment of assessment, evaluation, planning, and budgeting across the University.

5.C.3.

The extent to which SLU's budget planning includes stakeholders from across the University and at multiple levels was addressed in detail in Criterion 5.A.5. Additionally, academic planning at the University level includes the Provost's Fall 2015 request that each academic unit dean or director develop strategic, three-year hiring plans that required unit leaders to work with faculty and department chairs across their units to prioritize and collaborate on their hiring plans. At the college/school/center level, no single planning mechanism is employed uniformly throughout those units, although participatory, collaborative planning is becoming both far more expected and the operational norm; that cultural shift has President Pestello's example of University strategic planning to thank, as that highly-participatory process—across all levels and types of faculty, staff, students, trustees, and community members—now greatly impacts those conducting unit-level planning throughout the organization.

The new University Strategic Plan stands as the most striking example of planning that encompasses and engages the institution as a whole—its “[governing principles](#)” (including being “Open to Participation,” “Transparent,” and “Inclusive”) were designed to ensure that would be the case. The process began in August 2014, just two months into his SLU presidency. As chronicled fully on [SLU's Strategic Planning website](#), Dr. Pestello gathered a group of nearly 100 students, faculty and staff—codified as the Strategic Planning Assembly—to kick off the effort and hear the ideas of those gathered for moving forward. A series of 22 “listening sessions” followed, each conducted by members of the [Strategic Planning Steering Committee](#) and engaging, in the aggregate, hundreds of University constituents. What came of those sessions was the set of “[planning imperatives](#)”:

1. A Commitment to Reinforcing Mission & Identity
2. A Commitment to Enhancing Diversity & Inclusion
3. A Commitment to Deepening Interdisciplinary Collaboration
4. A Commitment to Advancing Institutional Distinctiveness & Excellence

Also derived from the listening sessions and grounded in those imperatives was a set of eight “[Visions for SLU's Future](#)”:

1. SLU as a Source of Excellence Rooted in Values-Based Learning
2. SLU as a Center of Research and Disseminator of New Knowledge
3. SLU as a Health Promoter & Provider
4. SLU as a Leader in Student Access & Success
5. SLU as a Discerning Steward of Resources
6. SLU as an Entrepreneur for Social Justice and Responsibility
7. SLU as an Advocate for St. Louis
8. SLU as a Global Citizen

In the well-defined [strategic planning process](#), each of these Visions warranted significant, extended discussions amongst faculty, staff, and students. Accordingly, [Topical Working Groups \(TWGs\)](#) were formed to address each Vision, and to offer concrete objectives (grounded in documented rationales) to the Strategic Plan Steering Committee for consideration in the developing the full University plan. Each TWG was composed of 10-12 SLU community members, including a Jesuit representative on each. The TWGs met regularly for several months

throughout the Spring 2015 term to each develop a set of proposed strategic planning objectives for the University. Each TWG's set of proposed objectives, along with details about the Steering Committee's use of them, is available on the planning website; a [collection of those reports](#) has also been developed.

By Fall 2015, following significant work by the Steering Committee in the late spring and throughout the summer, the final draft of SLU's Strategic Plan had developed to include five primary initiatives, 22 goals, and 80 objectives. On September 26, 2015, SLU's full Board of Trustees approved the plan, called "[Magis: Saint Louis University's Strategy for the Future.](#)" Later in the Fall 2015 semester, the nearly 100-member President's Advisory Committee (PAC) was surveyed to prioritize the 80 planning objects in an effort to better guide University planning and implementation efforts in the near term. The result was a list of the "[top 23](#)" objectives per the PAC.

Work in Spring 2016 has turned to further narrowing and grouping the most highly-prioritized objectives. Once determined, the revised objectives will be allocated for leadership responsibility to members of the President's Coordinating Council (PCC). With responsibility for implementation assigned, indicators of success (interim and final), along with appropriate timelines for implementation and achievement, are to be developed and pursued. The PCC will be charged with monitoring achievement of the Plan's objectives, and President Pestello has committed to sharing regular progress reports throughout the University's constituencies.

5.C.4.

As noted in 5.A.1., SLU has experienced [shrinking revenues and increasing expenses](#) in the past several years. Enrollment declines in selected graduate programs, comparatively underperforming graduation rates, rising operational and personnel costs (including benefits), as well as other factors, have flattened out surpluses that had regularly characterized SLU's historically stronger annual operational financial statuses.

Much of our current financial scenario was foreseen by executive leadership and had been planned for accordingly. For example, demographic projections have long indicated a shrinking population of traditional undergraduates in our region. Rising health care costs have been tracked and forecasted for many years. While not easy to address, these concerns have been well-known and were attended to with appropriate intentionality.

Planning for such challenging financial trends also eventually included the recognition that, without significant fundamental and substantive changes to operations and expenditures (on programs and personnel), SLU would not be able to sustain balanced budgets going forward. Discussions of this scenario dominated meetings of the President's Advisory Council (PAC) in Spring 2015 and Fall 2015. As the PAC wrestled with various proposals to address anticipated budget shortfalls, members were strongly in favor of increasing the spend rate on SLU's substantial endowment. After much PAC discussion, including assessments of risk on bond ratings should the spend rate go too high for markets to maintain absolute confidence in SLU's

financial health, President Pestello and CFO David Heimburger recommended to the Board of Trustees an increase in the Board-designated endowment spend rate from 4.5% to 5.0%. The Board approved the increase for a three-year period. While many at the University hoped for a greater increase to offset the need for other budget cutting proposals, the recommendation for a .5% increase reflected senior leadership's understanding of the impact of the spend rate on external constituencies that hold influence over SLU's ability to borrow funds as needed.

Evidencing a commitment to strengthening the institution's long-term financial situation, in Spring 2016 President Pestello announced a new initiative aimed at critically evaluating all facets of SLU's operations and finances: the [Magis Operational Excellence Program](#). Leading this initiative is an 18-member steering committee co-chaired by the University's Provost, Dr. Nancy Brickhouse; Chief Financial Officer, David Heimberger. Project Coordinators are Associate Professor in the Center for Health Outcomes Research and Secretary of the Faculty Senate, Dr. Eric Armbrecht; and Vice President for Human Resources, Mickey Luna. Other committee members include faculty, staff, and students, many of whom represent shared governance units across the institution.

The steering committee will be assisted by the consulting resources of Bain & Company, in what is expected to be a major, multi-year effort to recommend and implement changes that will put SLU on a path to sustainable excellence. President Pestello indicated to the PAC in January 2016 that the Magis initiative will likely result in strategic investments in certain programs and units, as well as strategic expenditure reductions, personnel reductions, unit reorganizations and efficiency efforts that should leave a slightly smaller, but more efficient and financially strong University.

Ensuring appropriate compensation for the University's faculty and staff is another major institutional financial concern, one accentuated by several years of limited annual salary increases since the Great Recession. In recognition of these challenges specifically for SLU's faculty, the University engaged Mercer, a human resources consulting group, to conduct both a market equity study (focused on how SLU's salaries compare against its competitor and peer benchmark institutions) and an internal equity study (focused on highlighting issues of inequity within SLU's salaries across genders, races/ethnicities, and other factors). While results of the internal equity study have not been finalized, data from the market equity study indicate that a significant number of SLU faculty are paid below the median salaries of the benchmark schools. More specifically, to ensure that, minimally, all SLU faculty had salaries at least equivalent to the 25% percentile of salaries at the benchmark institutions would require an investment of approximately \$7.7M in base salary and fringe benefits funding; to ensure that all SLU faculty had salaries at 50% of the market, the investment would be nearly \$15.8 million in annual personnel funding. Accounting for such additional funding of salaries and benefits in upcoming annual budgets has been a significant challenge, one to be addressed both by institutional leadership and by the consultants assisting with the Magis Operational Excellence initiative.

Complementing the Mercer research is an internal research effort undertaken by the Gender Equity Task Force, a group charged by the Faculty Senate and headed by faculty seeking to better understand issues of equity in hiring, tenure and promotion, and compensation. The Task

Force's work is ongoing; data and resulting recommendations will be shared with the University community upon completion.

Finally, SLU's upcoming bicentennial capital campaign—via which the University will likely aim to raise approximately \$500 million to fund key strategic initiatives (with [funding for student scholarships at the top of the list](#))—is a clear statement of recognition that, as has been the case historically, SLU's ability to transform the lives of its students and community requires the continued support of alumni, friends, the corporate community, and others who seek to support SLU into and throughout its third century.

5.C.5.

As an enrollment-dependent, tuition-dependent institution with campuses in the United States and Europe, Saint Louis University has always monitored social, economic, cultural, and demographic shifts both nationally and globally that could impact our educational and operational capacities.

Having long-recognized and anticipated declining enrollments of traditional undergraduate students regionally, SLU has enacted plans to increase the proportion of students it enrolls from outside the Midwest, placing permanent, full-time admission counselors in Texas, California, New York, and Colorado. [SLU's partnership with INTO](#) is also an expression of the University's long-term plan to enroll and better support international students; that plan should help SLU meet its financial goals in the decade to come and, more importantly, help better internationalize SLU in St. Louis while providing an outstanding cross-cultural educational experience for students from abroad. SLU projects to enroll nearly 1,000 international students via our INTO partnership by FY2021.

Technology changes, including evolving means of student computer use, have manifested in changes to computer labs (some have been eliminated, others revamped), web-based educational and administrative functions, and significant upgrades of technology infrastructure. SLU's recently-announced move from Google's e-mail operations to Microsoft's e-mail platform is one example. Another is the recently-begun discussion of a new, enterprise-wide data system. Having implemented Banner in 2005, the University is now considering alternatives that better enable data collection and reporting, and that better facilitate the web-based services increasingly demanded by students. A committee has been formed to begin discussion of how to best evaluate such systems.

The recently-announced [Magis Operational Excellence Program](#), noted in 5.C.4., is another expression of SLU's recognition that success in the future will require more significantly more intentionality and commitment to changing enrollment, financial, and overall educational environments.

Sources

- Additional-Evidence-on-Expenditures-Aligned-with-Mission
- FY2015-and-FY2014_Consolidated-Financial-Statements-and-Independent-Auditor's-Report
- President-Pestello-Email-Re-Magis-Operational-Excellence-Program
- SLU-INTO-Announcement
- Magis_Sept-2015
- Strategic-Plan-Home-Page_screenshot
- Strategic-Planning-Eight-Visions_screenshot
- Strategic-Planning-Governing-Principles_screenshot
- Strategic-Planning-Imperatives_screenshot
- Strategic-Planning-Process-and-Phases_screenshot
- Strategic-Planning-Steering-Committee-and-Leadership_screenshot
- Strategic-Planning-TWG-Reports_screenshot
- Strategic-Planning-TWGs_screenshot
- Strategic-Plan-Overview-Early-Stages
- Strategic-Plan-Presidents-Letter_Spring-2015
- University-Budget-Challenge-Graph_Fall-2015
- University-Strategic-Plan-(2015)-23-Objectives-Prioritized-by-PAC

5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.
2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Argument

5.D.1.

Examples of Saint Louis University developing and documenting evidence of operational performance span all sectors of the institution. SLU has not adopted any single institution-wide assessment or effectiveness model, but has instead allowed major organizational units to adopt assessment processes most pertinent to their work. A few key examples are offered below.

Academic Affairs

Generally, the University collects and distributes significant amounts of data to institutional constituencies. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) is a central player in both generating and sharing such data to inform assessment and decision-making efforts. OIR regularly publishes [Census Reports](#) that include evidence of performance—at the University-level, as well as by specific academic programs, departments, and colleges/schools/centers—in terms of enrollment, student credit hours generated, and retention. OIR's [Annual Fact Books](#) also document evidence of diversity among SLU's faculty and students as well as institutional financial performance. OIR staff are also integral to the Strategic Enrollment Management Research and Reporting Council, whose [Annual Report](#) documents the Council's work and demonstrates the breadth of data and performance information available for institutional use.

As noted in the section on Criterion 4, SLU has made great strides in its [assessment of student learning outcomes](#) since the HLC cited this as a concern in 2012. The development of institution-wide undergraduate learning outcomes and detailed rubrics via which student achievement of the outcomes could be assessed were two significant accomplishments. The next phase of that assessment work—documenting student achievement—has begun on a small scale. Efforts to assess student achievement across the University are hampered by the lack of common curricular vehicles that could facilitate gathering of student assessment data across academic programs and student levels. But the data gathered thus far has already helped those involved modify the assessment process.

Academic program performance is now regularly documented via the [Academic Program Reviews](#). In 2014-2015, the new APR process was pilot-tested with four programs. Following modifications to the process, in 2015-2016 an additional 12 academic programs engaged in the

APR process. Spring 2016 will see the culmination of those reviews, including external reviews by teams of disciplinary experts for each program. As detailed in the [APR protocol](#), each review includes the development and implementation of a data-informed Action Plan, the results of which will subsequently be reviewed by the respective dean and the Provost one and three years after completion of the APR process.

SLU's "Undergraduate Instructional Program" classification per the Carnegie Classification schema is "Professions plus arts & sciences, high graduate coexistence." At the graduate level, that classification is "Research Doctoral: Comprehensive programs, with medical/veterinary school." Accordingly, a significant proportion of our undergraduate and graduate programs hold external disciplinary or professional accreditation, as documented in our annually-updated [Accreditation Log](#). These accreditations regularly require, via processes similar to that employed by the HLC, a significant amount of assessment work that includes the documentation of student, program, and administrative/operational performance. Accreditation data for all units is now maintained centrally in the Office of the Provost and is accessible as needed by academic leadership.

Enrollment Management

As noted elsewhere, SLU's Division of Enrollment and Retention Management is decidedly data-driven. An excellent example is the Division's [Annual Report for 2014-2015](#), as it details via dashboards progress toward short- and long-term strategic enrollment goals. That report documents a number of demographic and population changes that the Division tracks to inform changes in resource allocation and recruitment emphasis; it also lists goals and strategies for enhancing the diversity of the student body.

Student Development

The Division of Student Development conducts extensive research on the impact of its programs and services. In 2014, a dedicated Director of Assessment for Student Development was hired to oversee assessment efforts and, in particular, ensure that data on divisional performance was leveraged for improvement. The Division has begun to publish "Research Briefs" outlining results of its analyses, and has begun sharing them with academic governance bodies as well as committees charged with supporting student success; recently published briefs on performance include those addressing the [Career Center](#) and [retention efforts](#).

The University's wealth of information about student retention, supported by MAP-Works and other OIR-generated data, pointed to the possibility that even as SLU's retention rate neared 90%, certain at-risk populations could be better supported and potentially retained for long-term educational success. Accordingly, Student Development hired a small cluster of Student Success Coaches, each charged with extensive and intrusive advising and support of identified at-risk students throughout the first year. In the first year with the Coaches, retention improved disproportionately higher than would be expected by the incoming academic quality of SLU's first-year class. Efforts to more directly pinpoint the reasons for the retention increases continue as the University evaluates the effectiveness of its various retention support initiatives.

Business and Finance

SLU's Division of Business and Finance includes an internal audit operation designed to evaluate areas in need of improvement at the University, especially those that present some form of risk to our continued operational and educational success. Each year, approximately 10-14 major audits are conducted. The audits include the following work:

- Interviews with University stakeholders including members of senior management and the Audit Committee Chairman to understand the University's strategic objectives, perceived areas of risks and ongoing or emerging initiatives.
- Understanding perspectives from institutional knowledge and review of historical internal audit results to understand areas evaluated in recent years.
- Coordination with University Compliance to align the internal audit and compliance audit plans.
- Incorporating points of view from other higher education and academic medical center teams and subject matter specialists.

For fiscal years 2015 and 2016, the following audits were conducted or are still to be completed:

- Merge Implementation Review
- University-wide Expenditure Analytics
- IT Security Maturity Assessment
- Fiscal Management Review
- Electronic Personnel Action Form Audit
- IT Change Management Review
- Emergency Preparedness Review
- Sponsored Research Administration Review
- IT Vendor Management Review
- Clinical Documentation Readiness Assessment
- Department of Neurosurgery Audit
- Division of University Development Audit
- PCI Program Assessment
- Meaningful Use Assessment
- Parks College of Engineering, Aviation, and Technology Audit
- IT Logical Access Review (in process)
- College for Public Health and Social Justice Audit (in process)
- Time and Effort Reporting
- HR Functional Area Review
- HIPAA Review

Overall at Saint Louis University, a culture of assessment is slowly being developed—not so much by a centralized institutional effort, but by a multitude of unit-specific efforts at various levels and in various areas throughout the University. The cumulative effect of these efforts is that, across SLU, units are increasingly intentional about auditing their work and using what they learn to advance effectiveness, efficiency, and excellence. However, new leaders in the Provost and President positions have, since their respective arrivals, championed the performance

improvements and efficiencies tied to more holistic, data-driven assessments. Accordingly, they have set SLU on a path to complement individual, unit-drive assessment with coordinated, University-wide assessment.

Two recent University-level efforts demonstrate this new commitment to analyze institutional operational performance holistically. First is the adoption of a new institutional [Strategic Plan](#) in Fall 2015. Developing such a plan was one of Dr. Pestello's first initiatives, as he recognized the need for the entire University to focus its collective efforts on a [shared vision for strategic change](#). In Spring 2016 the University community will engage in a process to develop specific, measurable performance targets for each of major the Strategic Plan objectives, as well as assessment plans that require the analysis of collected performance data and recommendations for improvement based on that analysis.

A second recent University-level effort to document and analyze key performance data is the initiative to implement an interactive, dynamic University Performance Dashboard (UPD). Fleeting notions of implementing a true dashboard system over the past decade were not uncommon; however, at any given time either the institutional will or the resources required were not sufficient. Upon her arrival in Summer 2015, Provost Brickhouse began discussions with the President and other vice presidents about such a system, and by late Fall 2015 a template and [mock-up](#) version had been developed. An external vendor has been contracted to work with SLU's Office of Institutional Research, Office of Information Technology Services, and other units to finalize development of the UPD for implementation in Summer 2016. The UPD will feature student, enrollment, faculty, financial, and related data accessible dynamically to different employees at appropriately-differentiated levels of complexity and depth. The key outcome of the UPD will be for each department/program chair, dean, director, vice president, as well as the president, to be able to run real-time reports on key unit- and institution-level performance.

5.D.2.

SLU does not lack for examples of productive use of assessment data and analysis to improve its operations. Most administrative and academic units/programs, in some way(s)/shape(s)/form(s), do so—although not necessarily in a systematic, disciplined manner. Some units—like the Division of Enrollment Management—evidence sophisticated and mature assessment operations fundamentally grounded in regular evaluation of performance data that directly informs change for improvement in future work cycles. Others engage in assessment work only episodically, or when a particular question or operational concern sparks a particular research and analysis effort. SLU's recent re-implementation of a significantly-revised, institution-wide Academic Program Review (APR) process demonstrates both (a) a recognition that regular assessment for improvement was not happening in all academic units on a continuous, scheduled basis, but also (b) that SLU truly values that regular assessment and now requires it for all academic programs, including those with accreditors that have always required some form of internal and external review.

Examples of solid assessment work—focused on employment of results to inform improvement—include the following:

Undergraduate- and graduate-level program development processes

At the University level, the process for vetting and evaluating new academic program proposals evolves as shared governance bodies learn from the successes and challenges of implementing the process. For example, the current [undergraduate new program proposal form](#) reflects multiple changes adopted in the past several years—changes informed by deliberations at the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee (UAAC) table among committee members themselves, as well as with faculty representing proposed new academic programs. New or revised elements of the protocol include emphases on (a) having a market assessment conducted by the University’s Office of Institutional Research; (b) potential instances of curricular overlap or duplication; (c) comprehensive assessment plans (including plans for how program assessment data will be used to inform curricular or pedagogical improvements); (d) written confirmation of support from the leaders of academic units providing any portion of the required or optional curricula. While these changes add to the length of each new program proposal—and, frankly, add to what some refer to as the “hurdles” placed in front of units seeking to develop new programs—UAAC committee members have expressed significant support for the changes, indicating that their past experiences on the committee directly informed the needed changes. Thanks to these and related changes, decisions to approve new academic programs are far better informed, and better account in advance for potential post-implementation obstacles than ever before. A [survey of UAAC members in Spring 2015](#) helped confirm this (a [similar survey of GAAC members](#) produced similar results). However, the proposal protocol and form are not regularly/annually reviewed as a matter of standard committee business, and doing so might enhance the operational assessment process.

Enrollment and Retention Management financial aid awarding processes

SLU’s Division of Enrollment and Retention Management (ERM) voraciously produces, consumes, and analyzes data with the explicit intent to use that data to inform operational change. ERM’s contract with Noel-Levitz includes annual meetings to analyze previous performance data regarding financial aid packaging and the full aid matrix. Each year’s assessment regularly results in revisions to the matrix and packaging practices. A more recently-retained consulting group, Human Capital Research Corporation, assists ERM leaders in strategic enrollment planning that informs institutional planning on a larger scale.

Administration of Online Programs

While not a major player in online education nationally, SLU has several outstanding online programs—each supported primarily by resources and services paid for by the respective academic unit offering the program. What the University lacks, however, is an institutional infrastructure of expertise, equipment, and related resources to encourage and properly support online education throughout SLU’s colleges, schools, and centers. Recognizing that, SLU set out in Fall 2015 to fully assess its strengths and shortcomings in this area by engaging in a University-wide audit: the [Quality Scorecard for the Administration of Online Programs](#). The

purpose is to provide industry-benchmarked data to inform a strategic plan for online education throughout the institution. Developed by the Online Learning Consortium (formerly the Sloan Foundation), this audit clearly shows a lack of infrastructure and organizational capacity for excellence in online education across the University. A key recommendation of the committee of faculty and staff that conducted the audit was that the University community engage in strategic planning for our online existence. Such planning has not been conducted historically, perhaps because the success of our few, isolated online programs has not signaled a University-wide need. But the audit results helped clarify, for a wide and influential institutional audience, that significant planning and subsequent work needs to be done to enable SLU to effectively serve students online across the institution.

These and other examples demonstrate that Saint Louis University does collect and indeed uses data to inform improvement efforts. However, like many colleges and universities, we have, historically, not done enough with that data—regularly, and systematically—to inform improvement. The recently-announced Magis Operational Excellence Program is clearly designed to be a University-wide data gathering and analysis effort fundamentally aimed at institutional change; it should serve to establish a new, University-wide approach to institutionalizing data-informed decision-making.

Sources

- Academic-Program-Review-Home-Page_screenshot
- Academic-Program-Review-Policy-and-Process
- Accreditation-and-Authorization-Log
- Assessment-Academic-Affairs_screenshot
- Census-Reports-Web-Page-Institutional-Research
- Enrollment-Management-Annual-Report_2014-2015
- GAAC-Effectiveness-Feedback-Report_3-22-15
- Quality-Scorecard-for-the-Administration-of-Online-Programs--Score-and-Comments
- Saint-Louis-University-FactBook-Website_screenshot
- Strategic-Enrollment-Management-Annual-Report
- Magis_Sept-2015
- Strategic-Plan-Presidents-Letter_Spring-2015
- Student-Development-Brief-Career-Success
- Student-Development-Brief-Retention
- UAAC-Effectiveness-Feedback-Report_3-4-15
- UAAC-New-Program-Proposal-Form_2015
- University-Performance-Dashboard-(Mock-Up_January-2016)

5.S - Criterion 5 - Summary

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Summary

As detailed throughout the preceding section, SLU maintains the resources, structures, and processes sufficient to fulfill our mission, improve the quality of our educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

Our institutional planning is maturing, and with each year becomes more coordinated across organizational structures and functional areas.

Sources

There are no sources.