



**LOYOLA**  
COLLEGE IN MARYLAND

**Plan for Assessment and Continuous Improvement**

**February 2005**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
A. Institutional Mission, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement.....	1
B. Organization of this Document.....	1
C. History.....	2
D. Definitions and Principles.....	3
E. Relationship with the College’s Strategic Plan.....	6
F. Responsibilities for Drafting, Reviewing, and Implementing the Plan .....	6
II. STUDENT LEARNING.....	7
A. Process for Setting Loyola College Institutional Educational Aims .....	8
B. Assessing Program Learning Aims/Goals: Developing and Implementing Plans.....	10
C. Using Assessment Results for Improving Student Learning .....	12
D. Recommended Timeline and Responsibilities.....	12
E. Ongoing Assessment Related to Student Learning and Development .....	15
III. INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS .....	18
A. Comprehensive Campus-wide Assessment Initiatives: Academic and Administrative ...	18
B. Other Assessment of Academic Processes .....	20
C. Other Assessment of Administrative Processes.....	20

## APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Academic Program Review Guidelines
- Appendix B: Support Services Review Guidelines
- Appendix C: Undergraduate Educational Aims
- Appendix D: Graduate Learning Goals

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **A. Institutional Mission, Assessment, and Continuous Improvement**

Assessment and continuous improvement effectively nurture the College's mission:

*Loyola College in Maryland is a Jesuit Catholic university committed to the educational and spiritual traditions of the Society of Jesus and to the ideals of liberal education and the development of the whole person. Accordingly, the College will inspire students to learn, lead, and serve in a diverse and changing world.*

Assessment attempts to determine if the College is achieving its mission. If it is not, well-thought out changes must be enacted to achieve the mission. Then these changes must be assessed to determine if they have the desired effect. This cyclical process of identifying areas that need improvement, enacting new policies, procedures, and curricular improvements to enhance these areas, and evaluating their impact capture the spirit and intent of assessment. In effect, assessment is the process of gathering and analyzing information regarding student learning, service, or process, purposely leading to improvement of student learning, service, or process in achieving the College's mission.

Assessment should not be confused with the evaluation of individuals. While certain tools used for evaluation such as course evaluations and student exams may be used in aggregate for assessment of student learning, the purpose of collecting assessment data is to provide enhanced opportunities for students to learn. This assessment must be done principally by faculty with staff support. Faculty must own the assessment process by setting goals, identifying objectives, gathering information, and evaluating results. Appropriate resources must be provided to support assessment processes. Loyola faculty should establish their own internal standards for assessment that are aligned with broader standards in their academic disciplines, accrediting associations, and professional organizations.

Assessment at Loyola has been organized around two areas: Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness. Student learning is central to the mission of the College. Therefore, the assessment of student learning is the primary focus of this assessment plan. At the same time, many institutional processes and support services enhance student learning. Ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of these administrative processes and services is discussed in the final section of this document.

### **B. Organization of this Document**

This document is divided into three major sections:

1. The introductory section presents a brief history of assessment at Loyola, describes the principles that guide assessment efforts, explains the relationship of this assessment plan to the College's Strategic Plan, and delineates responsibilities for reviewing the plan and maintaining its currency.

2. The second section focuses on the assessment of student learning. It describes the processes, plans, and anticipated timeline for developing learning aims and goals, assessing their achievement, and continuously improving the curriculum based on assessment results. It also includes descriptions of ongoing institutional assessment of student learning and development.
3. The third section focuses on the assessment of institutional effectiveness. It includes descriptions of ongoing institutional assessment of academic and administrative processes and services.

Attached as appendices are Academic Program Review Guidelines, Support Services Review Guidelines, Undergraduate Educational Aims, and Graduate Learning Goals.

### **C. History**

Loyola College, like any reflective educational institution, has been evaluating itself since its inception over 150 years ago. However, the 1980s was a decade of increasing calls (primarily by accrediting agencies) for the assessment and improvement of educational institutions as a whole, particularly the quality of student learning. Therefore, in 1991, the College Council, the highest governing body of the College at that time, formed an Assessment Planning Committee of faculty and administrators. The Committee gathered information on (1) a mission statement and relevant background information; (2) indicators and assessment mechanisms; and (3) the impact of assessment from many areas of the College. Its optimistic findings were included in the College's 1995 Middle States Periodic Review Report.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, the Committee was not able to complete one of its goals: the formation of an institutional assessment plan. During the 1994-95 academic year, the Assessment Planning Committee was replaced by two committees: the Academic Assessment Committee (reporting to the Academic Senate) and the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Committee (reporting to the Loyola Conference).

In 1996, assessment was mentioned for the first time in a College Strategic Plan. Later, the Steering Committee appointed to oversee the 1999 accreditation report to Middle States was charged with including a chapter on assessment. In fact, about one-fifth of the College's Self-Study was devoted to assessment.<sup>2</sup> These pages discussed Assessment Principles and applied these principles to Student Learning Outcomes (called "the most important area covered"), Program Evaluation, Faculty Evaluation, Faculty Development, Benchmark Studies, and Assessment in Administrative Areas (Academics, Finance, College Relations, and Student Development). In turn, the 1999 Middle States Evaluation Team issued a 12-page report (Evaluation Team Report), two-and-a-half pages of which responded to the College's report on its own assessment. In contrast to the optimism expressed in the College's 1995 Middle States Periodic Review Report, the review team reported that "attention to assessment is uneven throughout the institution." It made a number of recommendations, including asking the College

---

<sup>1</sup> 1995 Middle States Periodic Review Report, pp. 80-81 and pp. 87-88, including " ... overall at the College assessment activities are already deeply ingrained" (p. 87)

<sup>2</sup> Prepared for presentation to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, November 8-10, 1999, Chapter IV (pp. 80-99)

“to determine if there is any articulation between student learning inside and outside of the classroom,” “to establish a second benchmark group” of schools with which to make comparisons, “to create a culture of assessment at Loyola,” and “to outline the goals of faculty development.”

As part of its ongoing strategic planning efforts, Loyola’s current Strategic Plan addresses a number of issues raised by the College’s Self-Study and the Evaluation Team Report. The Plan includes strategies that aim to create a culture of assessment, including continuing work on the goals of faculty development (for example, IV.E.1; F.1, 3, 5; G.1, 3) as well as articulation between student learning inside and outside of the classroom (for example, II.A.1; B.3, 4, 5, 7, 8). With respect to the recommendation that Loyola establish a second set of benchmark schools, the recent practice has been to benchmark specific processes at other specific institutions (rather than continue to develop lists of benchmark schools for every process).

During the development of the current Strategic Plan, the College’s Mission statement was revised, and Vision and Values statements were developed. Based on these, the current Strategic Plan contains a number of general objectives, more specific goals, and concrete strategies. Many of the specific strategies call for the improvement of student learning and institutional practices by assessing how well those practices attain their goals and how well student learning goals are met. Specific groups within the College are already working on action plans to implement these strategies according to agreed-upon timetables.

Assessment for continuous improvement is and always will be an unfinished task at Loyola College. The purpose of this plan is not to summarize each of these ongoing efforts. Rather the goals are:

1. To rearticulate the main principles that guide efforts to improve Loyola College on the basis of assessing its aims and goals: the Guiding Principles for Assessment and Continuous Improvement.
2. To articulate the relationship among College assessment and improvement plans and to delineate responsibilities for enacting periodic as well as ongoing assessment for continuous improvement of student learning.
3. To inventory the main assessment instruments that the College is already using, and plans to use, to improve both student learning and institutional effectiveness.

#### **D. Definitions and Principles**

The following definitions clarify the meaning of the terms below as they are used in the context of this plan.

*Undergraduate Educational Aims and Graduate Learning Goals:* the aspirational aims and goals that the College desires of all its graduates (of undergraduate programs and graduate programs, respectively). Learning aims and goals complete the phrase: “It is an aspirational aim that Loyola College graduates be able to \_\_\_\_\_.” Learning aims and goals can address

multiple dimensions such as knowledge, cognitive skills, behaviors, achievements, attitudes, and values. While student learning is a partnership between students and faculty, students ultimately bear the responsibility for their own learning. For the College's graduate programs, the words "learning goals" were strategically chosen, as specific goals and outcomes must often be achieved in order for students to join a profession and/or advance within a profession. Aims and goals can be articulated at the institutional level, program level, core curriculum level, and course level. The Undergraduate Educational Aims and Graduate Learning Goals are in Appendices C and D, respectively.

*Institutional Educational Aims:* aspirational aims/goals toward which the College strives, i.e., desired outcomes for all students. Collectively, the Undergraduate Educational Aims and Graduate Learning Goals comprise Loyola's Institutional Educational Aims.

*Program Goals:* those learning outcomes that encompass the types of student performance expected of all students in a program.

*Core Curriculum Goals:* those learning outcomes addressed in the Core Curriculum.

*Course Goals:* intended outcomes of instruction that faculty expect of all students in a given course. Course goals address the types of specific student performances that demonstrate student achievement of more general institutional, program, and core curriculum goals.

*Assessment:* the process of determining whether the College's aims/goals are being achieved.

*Actual Outcome:* the actual result in comparison to the original aims/goals.

*Continuous Improvement:* the consistent use of assessment results to bridge gaps between the College's aims/goals and actual outcomes.

*Direct Assessment:* evidence-based student learning data provided through actual observations of student performance or behavior (e.g., looking at samples of student work).

*Indirect Assessment:* perception-based student learning data provided through such means as student surveys, alumni surveys, employer surveys, focus groups, and exit interviews.

### *Guiding Principles for Assessment and Continuous Improvement*

Loyola College has identified a set of principles to guide the institutional assessment process. While some of these principles were included in the College's Self-Study, others have been developed since that time. The guiding principles include four general principles for assessment and continuous improvement.

## General Principles for Assessment and Continuous Improvement

1. Assessment is connected to the real concerns and core values of an institution. Its purpose is to improve student learning and institutional processes. Assessment is used to ask new, often novel questions, and to make meaningful decisions. It helps an institution define and measure the extent to which it meets its goals.
2. Effective assessment plans are ongoing and cyclical in nature. Assessment results are used for continuous improvement.
3. Academic assessment must be done principally by faculty with staff support. Faculty must own the assessment process - setting goals, identifying objectives, gathering information, and evaluating results. Appropriate resources must be provided to support assessment processes.
4. Loyola faculty should establish their own internal standards for assessment that are aligned with broader standards in their academic disciplines, accrediting associations, and professional organizations.

### Establishing Assessment Goals

*[What do we want our students to know, be like, or be able to do?]*

5. Assessments must be accompanied by explicit statements of proficiencies (knowledge, skills, and dispositions) that students are expected to demonstrate. The purpose of defining learning aims/goals and assessing them is the improvement of student learning. Aims and goals should focus on the profound and truly important learning that the College, its programs, and its faculty desire and not on a trivial checklist.
6. All sections of a course should have some common learning aims/goals. Faculty may, as appropriate, specify additional learning aims/goals for their individual course sections and are always free to choose their own approaches to structuring and teaching the course content.

### Measuring the Achievement of Assessment Goals

*[How can we measure our success or failure in that regard?]*

7. The best assessments contain both direct and indirect measures of student learning.
8. Qualitative as well as quantitative approaches to assessment should be used across the institution as a whole, although individual departments may choose qualitative or quantitative approaches.

## Using Assessment Results for Change

*[How can we use the information that is gathered to make positive changes?]*

9. Data collected for the purpose of assessment are primarily used to improve student learning and institutional processes, not to review or evaluate individuals. However, the College, its departments, and faculty are responsible for efforts to improve student learning and institutional processes when assessment results indicate this is needed.
10. Assessment results that expose shortcomings will be used for positive change and continuous improvement, not blame or punishment.
11. Informing the various constituencies of the findings of assessment and evaluation is important. Key stakeholders and decision-makers must be identified and involved.
12. One of the principal benefits of assessment is that it triggers communication and collective reflection among the faculty of what students are learning and what is truly important. Careful analysis of assessment results and consideration of possible improvements require time for reflection. Therefore, assessment results should take into account the rhythms of contemplation and action appropriate to liberal education and/or professional learning in different departments and programs.
13. The College must create a positive environment that places emphasis on the continuous quality improvement of programs through assessment and avoids the temptation of a quick fix.

### **E. Relationship with the College's Strategic Plan**

The entire College community was involved in developing the most recent Strategic Plan. Additional inputs to the Strategic Plan included the College's Self-Study, the Evaluation Team Report, results from various ongoing assessment activities (e.g., CIRP, NSSE, CSS surveys), and other assessment data that were available at the time the plan was developed. The Strategic Plan outlines numerous strategies for assessing and improving student learning and institutional processes related to that learning. Draft action plans have already been developed for many of these strategies.

There clearly is overlap between this assessment plan and the College's Strategic Plan, as there should be. This plan summarizes assessment initiatives already taking place and articulates how the College plans to assess student learning for continuous improvement. It brings together in one place the College's efforts, ideas, and plans related to the aims, goals, assessment, and improvement of student learning as well as institutional effectiveness.

### **F. Responsibilities for Drafting, Reviewing, and Implementing the Plan**

The Academic Assessment Committee of the Academic Senate had primary responsibility for drafting this assessment plan with the assistance of the Deans and Vice President for Academic

Affairs. The President's Executive Council monitored the development of the plan, including the non-academic components dealing with instructional effectiveness and support services review.

The student learning components of the plan (Section II in particular) were presented to the Academic Senate for review and feedback. The Academic Senate approved Section II as well as the Assessment Principles in Section I on November 9, 2004. The entire assessment plan was submitted to the Loyola Conference in its role as the Steering Committee for the Middle States Periodic Review Report. The Loyola Conference approved the plan on February 15, 2005. The plan was forwarded to the President and the Board of Trustees; the Board reviewed a draft on December 8, 2004 and approved it on April 20, 2005.

Responsibility for implementing the student learning sections of the plan rests with the vice presidents, deans, department chairs, and program directors of the College who ultimately rely on faculty and staff. The Academic Assessment Committee will help facilitate implementation of the plan by periodically synthesizing institution-wide assessment practices, fostering ongoing dialogue and discussion, and providing resources such as workshops and speakers for the continuous improvement of assessment processes. Any additionally-needed resources will be brought to the attention of the deans and vice presidents. The Director of Institutional Research, who is an ex-officio member of the Academic Assessment Committee, will assist with these efforts. A representative from each of the deans' offices will assume responsibility to assist with assessment within each school. The Academic Assessment Committee and the Council of Academic Deans will review this aspect of the plan annually or biannually and monitor its progress. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs is responsible for maintaining the plan.

Responsibility for implementing the institutional effectiveness sections of the plan rests with the President's Executive Council and the vice presidents of the College. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee, which is chaired by the Director of Institutional Research and which has representation from across the entire institution, will facilitate implementation of this aspect of the plan.

## **II. STUDENT LEARNING**

Student learning aims/goals can include multiple dimensions such as knowledge, cognitive skills, behaviors, achievements, attitudes, and values. At Loyola College, learning aims/goals have been divided into Institutional Educational Aims (including Undergraduate Educational Aims and Graduate Learning Goals), Program-Specific Learning Aims/Goals, Undergraduate Core Curriculum Learning Aims, and course learning aims. In developing learning aims/goals, assessing the extent to which they are being achieved, and using these results as a tool for improving student learning, the College is following the blueprint contained in the College's Self-Study. The Evaluation Team Report stated that Loyola should "take the steps necessary to make assessment a part of the culture of the college."<sup>3</sup> While many undergraduate and graduate programs at the College have been active in assessment for quite some time, the current *Loyola*

---

<sup>3</sup> 1999 Self-Study, pp. 80-83

*College Plan for Assessment and Continuous Improvement* is designed to build on these existing strengths and help promote an institution-wide culture of assessment.

Middle States Standard 14 states, “Assessment of student learning demonstrates that the institution’s students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and program goals and that graduates meet appropriate higher education goals.” In providing the context for this standard, Middle States notes,

“The systematic assessment of student learning outcomes is essential to monitoring quality and providing the information that leads to improvement. [...] The mission of the institution provides focus and direction to its outcomes assessment plan.”<sup>4</sup>

This section is divided into the three phases of assessment whose principles were summarized above: (a) setting learning aims/goals, (b) assessing learning aims/goals, and (c) using assessment results for the improvement of student learning. The section concludes with an outline of the timeline and responsibilities that are associated with each of these processes.

### **A. Process for Setting Loyola College Institutional Educational Aims**

Loyola’s Undergraduate Educational Aims and Graduate Learning Goals, collectively referred to as Institutional Educational Aims, are directly related to the College’s Jesuit, Catholic mission and values and reflect aims and goals that are paramount to faculty and staff who work most closely with students. Faculty from all academic departments as well as personnel from the offices of Student Development, Center for Values and Service, and Campus Ministry, initially drafted the Undergraduate Educational Aims. These aims were refined by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee after receiving feedback from academic departments. The aims were debated, further refined, and approved by the Academic Senate. The College also developed and approved a set of learning goals common to graduates of its graduate programs in the College of Arts and Sciences and the Sellinger School of Business and Management. These Graduate Learning Goals were developed by the Graduate Curriculum Committee and approved by the Academic Senate.

#### *Process for Developing Program Learning Aims/Goals*

At the academic program or major level, faculty are responsible for developing Program Learning Aims (undergraduate) and Program Learning Goals (graduate). The deans have requested that each undergraduate and graduate program develop its own set of learning aims/goals. Department chair workshops on learning aims/goals have been held in which departments that have successfully developed their own aims/goals have shared their work with other departments. Departments have received a copy of *Student Learning Assessment Options and Resources* by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education to aid them in developing program learning aims/goals and devising ways to assess whether their aims/goals are being achieved. Some departments, especially those that undergo program accreditation, have already developed learning aims/goals for their programs, begun to assess actual student outcomes against those aims/goals, and made improvements based on the assessment results. The deans

---

<sup>4</sup> Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2002). *Characteristics of excellence in higher education: Eligibility requirements and standards for accreditation*. Philadelphia, PA: Author.

will initially review these aims/goals. They will later be reviewed by other faculty and external consultants as part of the Academic Program Review process. The Academic Program Review Guidelines are in Appendix A.

### *Process for Developing Course Learning Goals*

Faculty within a program are responsible for developing course goals for courses in the program. These faculty will decide exactly how this will be done. It is the responsibility of the faculty in the program, under the leadership of the department chair, to review the learning goals of courses in the program. The purpose of this review is to ensure that program learning aims are adequately addressed in the goals of appropriate courses in the program's curriculum.

### *Process for Developing Core Curriculum Learning Aims*

An *Ad Hoc* Committee for Core Review has been charged with reviewing the undergraduate core curriculum and proposing learning aims, which are related to the College's Undergraduate Educational Aims. The proposed Core Curriculum Learning Aims will be presented to the Academic Senate for its consideration and approval. They will then be forwarded to the President and Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

### *Relationship of Learning Aims/Goals at Different Levels*

What is the relationship between the Institutional Educational Aims and Program Learning Aims/Goals?

At Loyola, the Undergraduate Educational Aims and Graduate Learning Goals (referred to collectively as the Institutional Educational Aims) were passed by the Academic Senate in Spring 2002. Their attainment relies on all the experiences that students have in and outside of the classroom, as well as in co-curricular and extracurricular activities.

For undergraduate programs, individual Program Learning Aims will vary in their alignment with the institution-wide Undergraduate Educational Aims. Some Program Learning Aims will be closely aligned with some of the Undergraduate Educational Aims; typically in such cases, they will be more specific than the institutional statements, relating the learning aim to the particular discipline. Others may be unique to the program and not directly related to the Undergraduate Educational Aims. Some Undergraduate Educational Aims will not be included among the Program Learning Aims except, perhaps, to state that all undergraduate students should achieve those aims through the core curriculum and through the many other experiences students have at Loyola. Through a survey of departments in 2002, the College has learned which individual departments contribute to undergraduate students' attainment of each Undergraduate Educational Aim. In general, there is variation in the number of Undergraduate Educational Aims addressed by each department across the College. Some are addressed by many programs, while others are addressed by only a few programs.

In contrast to the undergraduate aims, each of the College's graduate programs will address all of the institution-wide Graduate Learning Goals.

What is the relationship between the Core Curriculum Learning Aims and the Undergraduate Educational Aims?

Coordinated by the *Ad Hoc* Committee for Core Review, a set of Core Curriculum Learning Aims will be developed and will be closely aligned with the Undergraduate Educational Aims. The Core Curriculum Learning Aims will address a subset of the Undergraduate Educational Aims and may be articulated in greater detail. It is possible that the process of developing the Core Curriculum Learning Aims may eventually result in refinements to the Undergraduate Educational Aims.

What is the relationship between Course Learning Aims/Goals and Program Learning Aims/Goals?

Courses within programs will address one or more of the Program Learning Aims/Goals so that all of the Program Learning Aims/Goals will be achieved as a student progresses through the entire program. Just as Program Learning Aims/Goals vary in their relationship to Institutional Educational Aims, so too may the Course Learning Aims/Goals vary in their relationship to Program Learning Aims/Goals.

## **B. Assessing Program Learning Aims/Goals: Developing and Implementing Plans**

All departments and programs should be familiar with the Middle States booklet *Student Learning Assessment Options and Resources*. This booklet, distributed to all department chairs in Fall 2003, provides concrete examples of assessment measures (ranging from class tests and grades to departmental portfolios and nationally-normed achievement tests) as well as descriptions of technical vocabulary used in much of the assessment literature. Chairs and programs directors who need other resources (e.g., outside advisors) for the development of their assessment plans should consult their deans and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

In order to develop a coherent assessment plan, departments will first define Program Learning Aims/Goals for each of their academic programs and then identify areas of alignment between these aims/goals and Loyola's Institutional Educational Aims. Similarly, course learning aims/goals will be established by faculty in the program to implement the program learning goals already agreed upon. After a list of program-specific learning aims/goals has been established and aligned with the Institutional Educational Aims, a methodology to assess these aims/goals will be constructed by the academic department. Some departments and programs (particularly those with outside accrediting agencies) have already developed such methodologies while others have not. Faculty may elect to begin with the assessment of some subset of aims/goals as they work toward a more comprehensive assessment plan. The choice is not between assessing everything and assessing nothing. Instead, faculty will develop ambitious, yet achievable, plans that provide departments with valuable information about the degree to which they are achieving one or more of their aims/goals. As departments and programs complete various aspects of their assessment plans (e.g., for assessment of departmental contributions to the undergraduate aims and graduate goals, core courses, and majors), these plans will be submitted to the Academic Assessment Committee for the purpose of sharing best practices. The Committee will provide

feedback to departments on how their assessment plans compare with those of other departments. The Office of Institutional Research will keep a comprehensive library of assessment plans from across the campus.

After assessment plans have been developed, programs will begin implementing those plans. Representatives from programs, along with the Academic Assessment Committee and College administrators, will lead broader discussions of assessment methods focused on particular aims/goals. The intention is to have all programs develop meaningful ways of assessing and improving student learning related to each of their Program Learning Aims/Goals and the Institutional Educational Aims to which their program contributes. Eventually, the intention is to promote greater depth and quality of assessment practices for all of the aims/goals. In addition, these processes will promote institution-wide knowledge of key assessment practices that may simultaneously address several aims/goals.

Over time and through experience, the College hopes to identify which assessment methods provide the most useful information for improving student learning and institutional processes. The Middle States' booklet *Student Learning Assessment Options and Resources* provides a range of methods that faculty will use. These methods include: (1) direct assessment (based on direct evidence of student learning); (2) indirect assessment (e.g., based on surveys of student judgment of their learning); (3) summative assessment (assessment used for the purpose of evaluation, e.g., grades); and (4) formative assessment (assessment used for the purpose of improvement, e.g., repeated brief evaluations of teaching in order to make adjustments to improve or enhance opportunities for students to learn). In addition to assessment activities with currently enrolled students, additional methods for assessing long-term learning aims/goals may include alumni surveys, alumni focus groups, and analysis of graduate/ professional school placement and employment patterns. Program faculty will explore possible uses for any appropriate combination of these types of assessment measures. In the process, they will learn the extent to which various types of assessments yield information that directly leads to improvement. Programs will report their assessment results in their departmental annual reports and report plans for addressing their higher priority improvement areas.

Resources will be provided to faculty and others to support assessment processes. These resources could possibly include, but are not limited to, participation in assessment workshops and conferences, faculty consultants in the discipline from other colleges and universities, release time, and support for data collection and analysis from the Office of Institutional Research.

In avoiding the temptation of a “quick fix” (see Guiding Principle #12), it is important to acknowledge that the assessment of Program Learning Aims/Goals within departments and the assessment of Institutional Educational Aims across the College are iterative processes. While some departments may already have strategies in place for assessing many of their Program Learning Aims/Goals, they may find that certain ones are not well-formulated. In such cases, departments may want to revisit their Program Learning Aims/Goals to determine if revisions are needed. Similarly, the Academic Senate may want to revisit the Institutional Educational Aims if the College-wide assessment process reveals that one or more aims/goals is not well-formulated.

The College will also explore the possibility of student self-assessment as part of the overall college-wide assessment plan. The intention would be to promote students' ownership of their learning and show their attainment of Institutional Educational Aims. One of the possible tools is a final summative portfolio that demonstrates development in, and understanding of, the Institutional Educational Aims. Other approaches that will be explored by some departments or by the Academic Assessment Committee are exit surveys, exit interviews, and alumni surveys and interviews.

### **C. Using Assessment Results for Improving Student Learning**

Middle States points out that “perhaps the most difficult part of assessing student learning is the process of effecting change in teaching and learning as a result of information gained through assessment practices” (*Student Learning Assessment Options and Resources*, p. 66). The gauge of assessment measures is whether they help faculty and students improve learning. Thus, departments and programs will need to develop plans for using their assessment results to improve student learning. As in the case of developing and assessing aims/goals, plans for using the results of assessment should be appropriately ambitious and realistic. That is, if an aim/goal is not being achieved, perhaps the aim/goal needs reformulation, or perhaps a department or program needs to experiment with other measures for its achievement. In addition, departments and programs may discover that while some of their Program Learning Aims/Goals may be assessed immediately, the achievement of other aims/goals may only be assessed over time, even well beyond a student's graduation. As stated above, the process is iterative: developing aims/goals, assessing their achievement, and using the results of assessment to improve student learning is a process that must be practiced over time to have its maximum impact.

Departments and programs will summarize their efforts to improve student learning in their annual reports and in their 7-year Academic Program Reviews. The deans and Academic Assessment Committee should keep a record of these efforts and facilitate sharing best practices with other departments and programs.

### **D. Recommended Timeline and Responsibilities**

The practice of assessment is an example of what Loyola's Core Values statement calls “discernment,” i.e., a habit of reflection and self-examination in relation to our aspiration for academic excellence. Discernment takes time, and timetables must take into account the rhythms of contemplation and action appropriate to liberal education and/or professional learning in different departments and programs.

The timeline and responsibilities for assessment outlined in this section pertain to the following two strategies in the College's Strategic Plan:

*Strategy III.A.5* Each department will develop and periodically review its own programs' learning outcomes.

*Strategy III.A.6* The faculty will periodically review the overall College learning outcomes.

This timeline is intended to represent an initial implementation of this plan for all academic programs in the College, both undergraduate and graduate. Since some academic departments

house multiple programs with different learning aims/goals, this timeline is intended as a guide for assessment at the program level rather than at the entire department level. Thus, it is possible that different programs within the same department may be on separate assessment timelines. Figure 1 suggests a timeline for programs that are further along in their initial assessment efforts (i.e., they have already developed and agreed upon program learning aims/goals and are developing assessment plans). Approximately one-third of Loyola's programs are following this first timeline. Figure 2 suggests a timeline for programs that are just beginning to assess student learning in the more formal manner described in this document (approximately two-thirds of Loyola's programs). It also represents the anticipated timeline for the *Ad Hoc* Committee for Core Review's assessment of student learning in the undergraduate core curriculum. After this initial implementation, programs will develop their own timelines for periodic assessment and continuous improvement of student learning. Departments will summarize in their normal annual reports and in their 7-year Academic Program Review their progress on assessment efforts and on the use of assessment results to improve student learning.

**Figure 1: Recommended Timeline for Initial Implementation of Plan  
(For Programs Where Formal Assessment Is Already Underway)**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Define institution-wide learning aims/goals</b>	<b>Programs develop learning aims/goals</b>	<b>Programs develop assessment plans*</b>	<b>Programs implement assessment plans</b>	<b>Programs continue to implement assessment plans and analyze gaps between aims/goals and assessment results</b>	<b>Programs initiate/implement appropriate changes to improve student learning based on gaps between aims/goals and assessment results</b>
<b>Who</b>	UCC GCC Senate	All Departments	All Departments	All Departments	All Departments UCC GCC	All Departments UCC GCC
<b>Target Completion Date</b>	Completed	Underway	Fall 2004	Spring 2005	Fall 2005	Spring 2006

\* Given that the Ad Hoc Committee for Core Review is focusing on the assessment of student learning in the core curriculum, undergraduate programs are encouraged to focus on the assessment of student learning in the major rather than the core.

**Figure 2: Recommended Timeline for Initial Implementation of Plan  
(For Programs Where Formal Assessment Is Just Beginning)**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Define institution-wide learning aims/goals</b>	<b>Programs develop learning aims/goals</b>	<b>Programs develop assessment plans*</b>	<b>Programs implement assessment plans</b>	<b>Programs continue to implement assessment plans and analyze gaps between aims/goals and assessment results</b>	<b>Programs initiate/implement appropriate changes to improve student learning based on gaps between aims/goals and assessment results</b>
<b>Who</b>	UCC GCC Senate	All Departments	All Departments	All Departments	All Departments UCC GCC	All Departments UCC GCC
<b>Target Completion Date</b>	Completed	Underway	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007

\* Given that the Ad Hoc Committee for Core Review is focusing on the assessment of student learning in the core curriculum, undergraduate programs are encouraged to focus on the assessment of student learning in the major rather than the core. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, the deans, and the chairs should work together on appropriate adaptations to these timetables in particular cases.

## **E. Ongoing Assessment Related to Student Learning and Development**

In addition to the assessment of learning aims/goals, other assessment activities already in place at the College provide useful information about the improvement of student learning and institutional processes. Ongoing institution-wide initiatives that pertain to undergraduate student learning and development are described in this section. The results of these assessment measures will be studied regularly by the Academic Assessment Committee and Council of Academic Deans, as well as by leaders in Student Development, Campus Ministry, and the Center for Values and Service. These groups will make timely and targeted recommendations as to which results might be useful to others such as academic departments, program directors, and administrators. Working together, opportunities for improvement will be identified, priorities will be set, and plans will be developed for improvement in higher priority areas. This section summarizes ongoing assessment activities at the institutional level that focus on undergraduate student learning and development. The assessments are presented chronologically, following the typical path of a college student from pre-matriculation through alumni status.

### **New Student Survey**

*Contact: Assistant to the Vice President for Student Development (Kathy Clark Petersen)*

The New Student Survey is administered to all incoming first-year students during summer orientation. It covers a wide range of topics related to students' academic and social expectations for college and pre-existing perceptions of campus life at Loyola. Data are collected regarding student attitudes, behaviors, and opinions in a variety of areas ranging from community service and technology use to drinking and living with roommates. A parallel survey is administered to all parents attending orientation. The survey results are presented during the second day of orientation to highlight similarities and differences between student and parent responses and to initiate discussions about the realities of college life.

### **CIRP and CSS**

*Contact: Director of Institutional Research (Jennifer Frank)*

Loyola administers the CIRP (Cooperative Institutional Research Program) Freshman Survey and CSS (College Student Survey) through UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). The two surveys ask similar questions about student expectations, behaviors, beliefs, and values. The College is able to link the responses of first-year students with seniors to review changes and outcomes during the undergraduate years. Information from the CIRP survey is used to examine such topics as participation in and time spent on various activities during high school, student expectations for college life, and reasons students decided to come to Loyola. The CSS survey, administered as students graduate, is used to evaluate the usefulness of various programs and services at Loyola as well as to gain an understanding of the various activities students participated in during college. These surveys have been administered annually; to ensure that students are not over-surveyed the College is considering administering them bi-annually.

### **Your First College Year Survey (YFCY)**

*Contact: Director of Institutional Research (Jennifer Frank)*

The Your First College Year (YFCY) Survey is designed to provide comprehensive information on the academic and personal development of first-year college students. YFCY collects information on a wide range of cognitive and affective measures, providing institutional and comparative data for analyses of persistence, adjustment, and other first-year college outcomes. Further, YFCY is designed as a follow-up survey to the annual CIRP Freshman Survey and allows for longitudinal research on the first year of college. In Spring 2005, YFCY will be administered to all first-year students at Loyola. The results will be used to help improve Loyola's first-year programs. It is anticipated that the survey will be administered every other year thereafter.

### **Research on First-Year Programs**

*Contact: Dean of First-Year Students and Academic Services (Ilona McGuinness)*

The College uses both national and Loyola-specific assessment instruments to evaluate the residential, social, spiritual, and academic experiences of first-year students. Integrated relational databases have been established to track the developmental progression of first-year students and to conduct longitudinal student retention and engagement studies. In addition, qualitative assessment is conducted through focus groups with students, faculty, and administrators. Results are used to make ongoing improvements to the College's first-year academic programs (e.g., Alpha, Collegium, FE 100, and the Honors Program) and to help the campus community develop a better understanding of the student experience during the first year.

### **National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)**

*Contact: Director of Institutional Research (Jennifer Frank)*

In Spring 2000 and 2004, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) was administered to Loyola undergraduates through Indiana University's Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning. The survey items represent student behaviors that are highly correlated with many important learning and personal development outcomes of college. The results of the 2000 survey were shared with the Loyola Conference, the Academic Senate, and the group of over 100 faculty, staff, and administrators who developed the first draft of the College's Strategic Plan. Many initiatives in the Strategic Plan were, at least in part, shaped by the results of the NSSE, addressing needed improvements. Loyola also participates in a Jesuit consortium that develops questions for the NSSE that pertain specifically to student learning experiences in Jesuit colleges and universities. NSSE will be administered every three years to assess progress and establish priorities. The College is developing means to better disseminate the voluminous data in ways that can be more widely understood and acted upon.

### **National Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)**

*Contact: Director of Institutional Research (Jennifer Frank)*

In Spring 2004, the National Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) was administered for the first time to all tenured and tenure-track faculty at Loyola. This survey is part of a

national research program on student learning coordinated through Indiana University's Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning. The FSSE focuses on such topics as faculty perceptions of how often their students engage in different types of learning activities, the importance faculty place on various domains of student learning and development, and the types of interactions faculty have with students. The survey results provide valuable information about ways in which Loyola faculty members involve students in learning both inside and outside the classroom. In conjunction with NSSE (see above), FSSE will be repeated every three years to assess progress and establish priorities.

### **Student Lifestyle Survey**

*Contact: Assistant Director of Alcohol and Drug Education (Cindy Parcover)*

The Student Lifestyle Survey is administered to a sample of undergraduate students at Loyola once every two years. The purpose of this survey is to collect assessment data related to student health and wellness that can be used to inform drug and alcohol education outreach efforts, programming in the residence halls, and student services in the counseling center, health center, and other areas on campus. The data are also used as part of Loyola's ongoing efforts to create positive social norms on campus and to educate students about healthy lifestyle choices. Topics addressed on the survey include physical health, mental health, diet and exercise, body image, alcohol use, drug use, tobacco use, and stress management.

### **Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Survey**

*Contact: Director of Alcohol and Drug Education and Support Services (Jan Williams)*

Loyola participates in this national survey on a periodic basis, most recently in 2001 and 2004. The survey examines the prevalence of high risk behaviors among college students, including heavy drinking, smoking, drug use, gun possession, violence, and other issues confronting today's college students. At Loyola, the data are used in prevention and harm-reduction educational interventions in a variety of formats throughout the academic year. Survey results are routinely shared with faculty, staff, and administrators in key departments, residence hall staff, student leaders, and the Board of Trustees.

### **Annual Follow-up Study of Placement**

*Contact: Director of the Career Center (CreSaundra Sills)*

Each year, the Career Center disseminates a summary report on the professional activities of students six to nine months after graduation. The report is organized by major and includes information about full-time or part-time employment (including position and name of company/organization), full-time or part-time attendance in graduate school (including degree sought and name of institution), military service, and the number of students still seeking employment. These data are used to assess the effectiveness of the College's career development programs and services and to track the placement rates of graduates over time.

## **MHEC Alumni Survey**

*Contact: Director of Institutional Research (Jennifer Frank)*

Every three years, the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) administers an alumni survey to bachelor's degree recipients the year after they attained their degree from a public or private college or university in the State of Maryland. The survey instrument covers such areas as initial post-college employment patterns (e.g., career field, place of employment, and salary), graduate school attendance, college loan debt, self-perceived gains from attending college, and overall satisfaction with the institution attended. Comparative data for benchmarking are available to all participating colleges and universities.

As indicated by the summaries above, the majority of Loyola's assessment activities related to student learning are annual and ongoing. In addition, however, targeted "one-time" assessment projects are initiated as particular needs arise. For example, Loyola participated in a national assessment of the core curriculum through ACTC in 2002. An outside consultant studied the evolution of the core requirements at Loyola and compared these requirements to those of other institutions in the study and to those of a select group of benchmark institutions. The results of this study are now being used as part of the review of Loyola's core curriculum.

## **III. INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

Assessment of institutional effectiveness involves assessing processes and services. The College does this in a number of ways. Academic processes are examined primarily as part of the academic program review process. Administrative processes are assessed primarily through the support services review process. Ongoing practices are summarized in this section under the following three topics: comprehensive campus-wide assessment initiatives (academic and administrative), other assessment of academic processes, and other assessment of administrative processes. The results of these assessment measures are studied regularly by the President's Executive Council and appropriate offices and departments across the College. These groups make timely and targeted recommendations as to which results might be useful to others. In this way opportunities for improvement are identified, priorities are set, and plans are developed for improvement in higher priority areas. The guidelines for Academic Program Review and Support Services Review are in Appendices A and B, respectively.

### **A. Comprehensive Campus-wide Assessment Initiatives: Academic and Administrative**

The two primary means to assess institutional effectiveness are academic program review and support services review.

#### **Academic Program Review**

*Contact: Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs (Donald Boomgaarden)*

Each academic program in the College participates in the program review process once every seven years. This process provides an opportunity for periodic review of the program's progress and efforts to improve student outcomes. The review requires a program self-study that addresses

quality, faculty, students, support, resources, and viability. It also involves an internal review team and at least one external consultant in the discipline area. For academic programs with external accrediting bodies and standards, program reviews are timed and coordinated with the self-study and other review processes required for program accreditation. After the review is completed a memo of understanding is sent by the dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The department develops a plan of action based on this memo. All program review materials are reviewed by the President; external letters and the memo of understanding from the dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs are reviewed by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. The Academic Program Review Guidelines are in Appendix A.

### **Support Services Review**

*Contact: Director of Institutional Research (Jennifer Frank)*

Conducted on a 7-year rotating cycle, the Support Services Review process is designed to evaluate the effectiveness, quality, and efficiency of campus services and the degree to which these services are central to the mission of the College. In general, this process is intended to assist administrative offices and departments with self-evaluation, problem-solving, strategic planning, and continuous improvement efforts. The reviews are important tools for identifying services and processes within the College that cross departmental lines so that interdependencies and cross-functional responsibilities can be assessed. The review involves a self-study (addressing such areas as mission, responsibilities, staffing, resources, and planning), an internal review team, and often, external consultants from other colleges and universities. The Support Services Review Guidelines are in Appendix B.

### **Institutional Characteristics**

*Contact: Director of Institutional Research (Jennifer Frank)*

The College carefully tracks institutional characteristics on an annual basis. Loyola submits annual reports to the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) and the Maryland Independent Colleges and Universities Association (MICUA). These annual institutional performance accountability indicators include access, diversity, effectiveness, efficiency, and quality. These are also included in the Factbook that is distributed throughout the College and posted on the Office of Institutional Research website.

### **Data Dashboard Indicators**

*Contact: Director of Institutional Research (Jennifer Frank)*

In Fall 2004, a new “data dashboard” was created as a management tool to help facilitate the analysis of significant short-term and long-term trends affecting Loyola. This tool organizes and consolidates data that is normally housed in different divisions across the institution and presents this information in a visual format that is more conducive to integrative trend analysis. The initial version of the dashboard is divided into three overarching areas: (1) Students and Faculty, (2) Admissions and Financial Aid, and (3) Development and Finance. It will be presented annually to the President’s Executive Council and the Board of Trustees.

## **B. Other Assessment of Academic Processes**

### **Annual Assessment of Academic Advising**

*Contacts: Dean of First-Year Students and Academic Services (Ilona McGuiness), Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (Jim Buckley), Dean of the Sellinger School of Business and Management (Lee Dahringer)*

Student satisfaction with academic advising is assessed annually through the Core Advising Survey and Major Advising Survey. The Core Advising Survey is administered when undergraduate students initially declare a major area of study. The Major Advising Survey is administered to all seniors prior to graduation. In addition providing feedback about their faculty advisors, students are also asked to provide feedback about their experiences with the College's Center for Academic Services and Support (C.A.S.S.). The results of these assessments are used to help individual advisors, academic departments, and C.A.S.S. make improvements to the advising process, advising materials, and advisor training.

### **Peer Evaluation of Research**

*Contacts: Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (Jim Buckley), Dean of the Sellinger School of Business and Management (Lee Dahringer)*

Peer evaluation of research occurs in every department for the purposes of annual evaluation, salary determination, and promotion and tenure. Departments undergoing program review or program accreditation, collect and analyze the data as a whole to systemically assess the quality and quantity of research in the department for purposes of systemic improvement.

### **Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

*Contacts: Dean of Arts and Sciences (Jim Buckley), Dean of the Sellinger School of Business and Management (Lee Dahringer)*

Students complete course evaluation forms in every course every semester. The standard College form has two parts, quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative part is scored and a summary report is provided to the faculty member. The qualitative part is read by the faculty member and the department chair and used for self-improvement. Several departments are experimenting with an instrument that provides national norms for evaluation results. In addition, peer (faculty-to-faculty) evaluation of teaching is used in many departments. Departments undergoing program review or program accreditation collect and analyze the data as a whole to systemically assess the process of teaching and learning for purposes of systemic improvement.

## **C. Other Assessment of Administrative Processes**

### **Annual Salary Assessment**

*Contacts: Vice President for Academic Affairs (David Haddad) and Vice President for Administration (Terrence Sawyer)*

Faculty salaries are analyzed annually by rank and discipline and compared to a comprehensive list of peer institutions using information from American Association of University Professors

(AAUP) and College and University Professional Association (CUPA). Additionally, a statistical model is run to detect and correct any gender disparities in faculty salaries. Results are reported to the annually the Faculty Compensation Committee. In addition, periodic assessments are conducted to analyze staff and administrator salaries in comparison to similar external organizations and local market conditions. Structural, merit, and market adjustments are made to bring these salaries to target levels and to adjust the targets.

### **Financial Audits**

*Contact: Director of Resource Management (David Daughaday)*

The financial status of the College is affirmed on an annual basis by an audit that is performed by an independent accounting firm. Prepared using generally accepted accounting principles and guidelines set by the Financial Accounting Standards Board, the audit provides a certified statement of the College's financial position to any outside constituency. The audit looks at the validity of the College's Financial Statements, reviews processes, and does testing of transactions. Since the Financial Statements resulting from the audit follow an industry-wide standard format, they allow for year-to-year comparisons internally and with other institutions. Ratios, developed from the certified Financial Statements, are used to look at a series of key financial statistics, both in terms of internal trends, and in comparison with various industry groups, including other institutions and those with similar ratings. This ratio analysis gives the College the tools to improve its financial profile in order to better carry out its mission. The audit is presented annually to the Board of Trustees by the auditor.

### **Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ)**

*Contact: Dean of Admissions (William Bossemeyer)*

The Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ) is designed to assess the attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of students who are admitted to Loyola. It compares the responses of enrolling versus non-enrolling students to each other as well as to a group of competitor cross-applicant institutions. The ASQ is used to help Loyola attract the type of student body it would like to have, to assess the quality of its recruitment efforts and admissions process, and to examine external perceptions of the College.

### **ACUHO-I Residence Hall Survey**

*Contact: Director of Residence Life (Leonard Brown)*

A nationally-normed instrument, the ACUHO-I Residence Hall Survey is administered once every two years to all on-campus undergraduate students living in the residence halls at Loyola. It measures student satisfaction with multiple aspects of residential life, including amenities and services, safety and security, roommates, special interest housing, academic and social climate, and rules and regulations. Results are used by the Office of Residential Life for continuous improvement in such areas as renovations, hiring and training resident assistants, and educational programming in the residence halls.

As indicated by the summaries above, the majority of Loyola's assessment activities related to institutional effectiveness are annual and ongoing. In addition, however, targeted "one-time" assessment projects are initiated as particular needs arise. Examples of such targeted assessment projects include the McGuire Assessment of Graduate Programs, which was designed to study the perception of Loyola graduate programs in the external marketplace, and the Kaludis Assessment of Technology Services, which was initiated to help the College plan for and prioritize evolving information technology needs.

Loyola is planning to launch additional assessment initiatives in areas that either are not currently being assessed or have not been assessed for some time. For example, the College will administer a campus-wide climate survey to all faculty, staff, and administrators during the spring 2005 semester. The survey will cover such topics as communication, diversity, workload, benefits and compensation, opportunities for advancement and development, and overall employee satisfaction.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW GUIDELINES**  
**Pilot Phase Version 3.1**  
**August 2004**

**Introduction**

Program review affords a department the opportunity to review and evaluate its academic program(s), to reflect on and refine its vision, to exchange ideas and best practices with others, and as a result to strengthen existing programs and develop plans for the future consistent with the College's Strategic Plan. Program review enables the College to focus attention on academic programs and to insure that its strengths and resources are being used most productively. This document outlines procedures, timeline, and criteria for program review.

Near the beginning of the program review process, the department should schedule a joint meeting with the offices of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) and the appropriate dean. This meeting provides an opportunity for faculty and administrators to mutually clarify their expectations for the program review. Additional meetings may be necessary during the program review, or at the end.

Program review is currently in a pilot phase. During this period departments are piloting the guidelines and providing suggestions for improvement to the offices of the VPAA and the deans. Previous feedback has been used in this current version of the guidelines. After another year or two, a revised document will be shared with the Academic Senate for its consideration and approval.

**Background Questions and Answers**

What is the scope of program review?

In most instances program review will focus on an academic department and will include all of the department's undergraduate and graduate degree programs. In the College of Arts and Sciences, however, departments that teach both undergraduate and graduate students may have separate program reviews, one for their undergraduate program(s), and one or more for their graduate program(s).

How frequently will program review occur?

Academic program review will be conducted on a 7-year cycle, so that each academic department or program will be reviewed every seven years.

How long does program review take?

Academic program review will be conducted and completed within an academic year.<sup>1</sup> The department will begin the process in late spring and the final report will be due no later than late spring of the following year.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the pilot phase some reviews may not begin until fall; in that case, the final report would be due no later than late fall of the following year.

How is program review related to department/program accreditation and the self-study reports required for accreditation visits?

At the option of the department, program review can be timed to occur the semester before or the year before the accreditation self-study report is due. This allows the department or program to make use of the program review process to enhance the accreditation self-. In some instances, the department may wish undergo program review simultaneously with accreditation. In such a case, the accreditation self-study report can form the primary basis for Loyola’s program review. Questions that are unique to Loyola’s program review self-study report and thus not in the accreditation report should be addressed in a supplement.

How will the department obtain the data about its program(s)?

The basic information and data required for the department self-study will be provided by the appropriate College and divisional offices. In particular, the offices of the VPAA and the appropriate dean, through the Office of Institutional Research, will furnish to the department a packet of information that includes the following data, as applicable to the program:

<b>Data</b>	<b>Self-Study Question(s)</b>
Peer/Competitor Institution Comparisons	AD4
Undergraduate Major Advising Survey Results	PQ6
Current Faculty Demographics (Gender, Race/Ethnicity, FT/PT, Highest Degree, Rank, Tenure Status, Tenure Year, Time at Loyola)	FA1
Student Headcounts by Gender and Race/Ethnicity	ST1
Degrees (Major and Minor) and Certificates Granted by Gender and Race/Ethnicity	ST1
For Undergraduate Programs: Average SAT Scores of Undergraduate Majors and Minors	ST1
For Graduate Programs: Undergraduate Schools Attended; Undergraduate Grades; GMAT and GRE Scores	ST1
For Graduate Programs: Applicant Pool Size and Yield	ST1
Undergraduate Degree Recipients Attaining Phi Beta Kappa, Beta Gamma Sigma, and/or Latin Honors at Graduation	ST2
Summary Statistics from Career Development and Placement’s “Annual Follow-up Report” for Undergraduate Majors	ST3
Historical List of FT/PT Faculty FTEs	PV1
FT/PT Faculty Coverage of Course Sections	PV2
Course Sections, Student Enrollments, Student Credit Hours, and Average Course Size by Location and Course Level	PV2, PV3

Whenever possible, this data will cover a 6-year time period.<sup>2</sup> For comparative purposes of undergraduate programs, the data packet also will include 6-year summary data for the College as a whole and for the division in which the department is located.

<sup>2</sup> In the pilot phase it may not be possible to provide six years of data for all indicators.

What are the major steps of program review?

Basic elements of the review process, which are explained below, include:

- notice of upcoming review;
- naming of the review team;
- provision of required information and data;
- self-study and report;
- naming of external consultants;
- external review and written report;
- review team report;
- departmental response;
- program review closing memo from the appropriate dean and VPAA;
- submission of final documents to Institutional Research..

### **Procedures and Timetable**<sup>3</sup>

1. **Notice** In late spring the offices of the VPAA and the appropriate dean will notify those departments that will be reviewed in the next academic year. If the department is accredited by an outside body, the program review will normally occur one year prior to the year of (re)accreditation.
2. **Provision of Required Information and Data** When possible, the data for the first five years of the 6-year period will be forwarded to the department on or about the date the offices of the VPAA and the appropriate dean provide notice of the upcoming review. By August 1 of the year in which the review is to be conducted, the remaining data will be sent to the department.
3. **Naming of Review Team** The offices of the VPAA and the appropriate dean in consultation with the department chair will name a 2- or 3-member review team, with one faculty member from a related department and one faculty member from a different division. These assignments will be made no later than September 15. See page 9 of this document for information about the review team's responsibilities.
4. **Self-Study and Self-Study Report** The self-study will be conducted by the department or program so that the report is available to the review team, the appropriate dean, and the VPAA no later than January 15. Often the department selects a departmental review team to undertake the self-study and prepare the report. In those instances when a subset of the department has primary responsibility for drafting the self-study, it is important for all departmental tenured and tenure-track faculty members to participate and be included in the process.

See page 4 of this document for the outline of the self-study.

5. **Naming of External Consultants**<sup>4</sup> The appropriate dean, in consultation with the department, the review team, and the VPAA, will identify one or two faculty members from outside Loyola who are in the same or a related discipline and who agree to serve as external consultants. The process of identifying and contacting potential consultants will take place in the summer so that they can be named by mid-fall. At that time a date for their campus visit will be set.

---

<sup>3</sup> In the pilot phase some modifications to the timetable may be necessary.

<sup>4</sup> Although these guidelines specify two external consultants there may be reviews for which only one consultant is needed. Such cases will be determined by the department and the dean.

No later than February 1 -, the appropriate dean will send to the consultants a packet of information. This packet will contain basic information about the College, such as undergraduate and graduate catalogues, College viewbook, the Strategic Plan, and Loyola's Vision and Values statement. It will also include the self-study, the review team's report, and any other information that department considers useful.

6. Review Team Report By November 15 the department will share a draft of the self-study with the review team. The team will begin its work and, by December 15, offer suggestions for improvement of the self-study report. See page 9 of this document for more information about the role of the review team.

Within two weeks of receiving the final version of the self-study, the review team will submit its written report and share the report with the department, the appropriate dean, and the VPAA.

7. External Consultants' Review and Report The consultants will visit the campus for one and a half days during spring semester. They will meet with members of the department, the review team, the appropriate dean, and the VPAA as well as others who the consultants and/or the department deem to be pertinent to the review. For a sample schedule and activities for the consultants' visit see page 11 of this document. The consultants will submit their written report within three weeks of their campus visit. This report will be shared with the department, the appropriate dean, and the VPAA.
8. Departmental Response After considering the reports from the review team and from the consultants, the department may prepare, if it wishes, a response. This response, which is optional, will be shared with the appropriate dean and the VPAA, and is due no later than June 1.
9. Program Review Closing Memo The appropriate dean and VPAA will prepare a program review closing memo no later than July 1. The purpose of this report is to highlight the crucial strengths of and challenges for the program, so that faculty and administrators can engage in the sort of joint effort it will take to build on the program's successes and meet its future challenges for continuous improvement. The memo will serve as an aid in departmental planning for the future. This memo will be shared with the department.
10. Submission of Final Documents to IR At the conclusion of the review process, the department will forward to IR copies of all reports pertinent to the review. This includes the self-study report, the review team report, the external consultants' report, and departmental response.

### Summary Calendar

#### May

VPAA and the appropriate dean notify department it will be reviewed in the coming year.  
IR provides department with data.

#### Summer

Department begins working on self-study.  
Potential external consultants are identified and contacted.

#### August 1

IR provides department with additional data, if appropriate.

#### September 15

Review team is named.

Fall

Department continues to work on self-study.

External consultants are named.

Date for external consultants' visit is set.

November 15

Review team begins its work.

Department sends draft self-study to review team.

December 15

Review team sends suggestions for improving the self-study to the department.

January 15

Department sends self-study to VPAA, dean, and review team.

February 1

Review team sends its report to VPAA, dean, and department.

Dean sends information packet including self-study to external consultants.

February 15 to April 1

External consultants visit campus.

External consultants submit their report 4 weeks after campus visit.

June 1

Department sends its response, if any, to VPAA, dean, and review team.

July 1

VPAA and dean prepare memo.

Department forwards copies of all relevant material to IR.

Department forwards copies of all relevant material to the President.

Department forwards copies of the review team's report, the external consultants' report, the memo from the VPAA and dean, and department response, if any, to the VPAA; these documents will be shared with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Spring of the subsequent years

Chair comments on program review action items in the departmental annual report.

### **Review Criteria:**

The following outline provides the structure and content for the academic program review self-study. The self-study report should be no more than 25 pages, excluding appendices.

#### **Academic Department (AD)**

AD1 What are the department's major goals for its program(s)? How do these relate to the College's mission, core values, and strategic plan? (If the department has a mission statement, please append it.)

[Suggestion: Comments on the strategic plan should include, but not be limited to, Alpha and other programs for first-year students, diversity, curriculum infusion, service-learning, and the College's faith and justice initiatives.]

AD2 Describe the department's history for the past six years or since its last external review. In what ways have its goals and/or programs changed, either for the better or worse, during this time period?

- AD3 In what specific ways, if any, does the department contribute to the education of students in other programs? With which departments or programs, if any, does the department interact most frequently?
- AD4 Identify three to five colleges and/or universities that provide targets of academic aspiration for the department. Specify the ways in which the department is and is not comparable to the corresponding department at each of these institutions.
- [Suggestion: Examples of factors that the department may want to take into account when selecting “aspiration schools” include number of majors, curricular offerings, number of full-time faculty, success in obtaining outside funding, and laboratory facilities. For example, a department seeking to increase the number of majors might include one or two schools that have significantly more majors.]

Program Quality (PQ) - complete for each program<sup>5</sup>

Note: An academic program is defined as a course of study that requires the completion of a specified number of credits from among a prescribed group of courses and leads to a degree. At the undergraduate level, an academic program is generally a major; at the graduate level, an academic program is generally the degree itself. At the undergraduate level, program review encompasses all of a department’s undergraduate offerings, not just courses for the major. This is particularly true for those departments that have extensive offerings in the Core.

- PQ1 What is the structure of the program’s curriculum and its rationale? What are the requirements to earn a degree in the program?
- [Note: The focus of this question is on the structure and requirements of the program.]
- PQ2 What are the program’s student learning aims/goals? How do these relate to the College’s student learning aims/goals? How does the department assess its student learning aims/goals? What evidence is there that the program is achieving its aims/goals? How does the program intend to address any shortfalls between its aims/goals and actual outcomes?
- [Note: The focus of this question is on the program’s educational aims.]
- [Suggestion: In answering this question it may be useful to include in an appendix sample syllabi, which contain course-specific learning aims.]
- PQ3 Describe the role, if any, that the program’s courses play in the undergraduate Core. What are the student learning aims/goals of the department’s Core courses? How do these relate to the overall student learning aims/goals of the Core?<sup>6</sup> How does the department assess the student learning aims/goals of its Core courses? What evidence is there the department is achieving these aims/goals? How does the department intend to address any shortfalls between its aims/goals and actual outcomes?
- [Suggestion: It may be useful to include in an appendix sample syllabi, which contain course specific learning aims.]

---

<sup>5</sup> As explained in the Note, a department that teaches only undergraduates and offers only one major should replace the word “program” with “major” or “department,” as appropriate, throughout this section.

<sup>6</sup> This question will begin to be relevant during the 2004-2005 academic year, as the Core Review Committee begins its work.

- PQ4 What are the opportunities for faculty/student interaction and for interaction and dialogue among students in addition to that which occurs in the classroom? What opportunities are available for students to engage in independent study and research, and to enroll in internships and practica?
- PQ5 How does the program measure teaching effectiveness? What have been the results of this assessment over the past six years?  
[Suggestion: Instruments for measuring or assessing teaching effectiveness may include student course evaluations, peer reviews, course portfolios, and surveys.]
- PQ6 How is the program involved in advising? How is effectiveness of advising measured? What have been the results of this assessment over the past six years?  
[Suggestion: Information from the Undergraduate Major Advising Survey may be useful in answering these questions.]
- PQ7 What, if any, external grants has the program received over the past six years?
- PQ8 What aspects of the program need to be addressed in the next six years to improve its quality? Does the program have a plan to address these improvements? How will the improvements be monitored?

#### Faculty (FA) <sup>7</sup>

- FA1 Profile the program's faculty in terms of teaching and research expertise as well as other characteristics such as highest degree, tenure status, years of experience, years at Loyola, gender, and ethnicity.  
[Note: Some of this data will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research. The program should verify the accuracy of the data, making additions and corrections as necessary.]
- FA2 How does the program assess the teaching, research, and service of its faculty for annual review, tenure, and promotion? How are junior faculty mentored? How are untenured tenure-track faculty kept informed of their progress toward tenure?
- FA3 What are the accomplishments of the program's faculty over the past six years in teaching; in research, scholarship, and creative efforts; and in professional, institutional, and public service?
- FA4 What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program's faculty?  
[Note: This question refers to the program's faculty as a whole, not individual faculty members.]

#### Students (ST) – complete for each program

- ST1 What are the data and trends over the past six years on the number and quality of students in the program? Undergraduate programs should provide information about the number of majors in and graduates of the program in the past six years; compare these

---

<sup>7</sup> As explained above, a department that teaches only undergraduates and offers only one major should replace the word "program" with "department" throughout this section.

percentages to those of the division and the College. Graduate programs should provide information about the number of graduates for each degree offered by the program under review.

[Note: Some of this data such as number of majors and number of graduates will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research. The program should verify the accuracy of the data, making additions and corrections as necessary.]

ST2 What are the data and trends over the past six years on the accomplishments of students in the program? If the program has incomplete information about its students' accomplishments, what plans does the program have to gather this information in the future?

[Suggestion: Ways measuring or assessing this may include academic records, academic and research awards, scholarly, research and creative efforts, graduation with honors.]

ST3 What are the career paths and achievements of the program's graduates over the past six years? If the program has incomplete information about its graduates' career paths and accomplishments, what plans does the program have to gather this information in the future?

[Suggestion: Include information such as the percentage who find employment related to the degree, who go to graduate or professional schools, and so forth. Information from Career Development and Planning may be useful in answering these questions.]

ST4 What procedures are used to recruit students for graduate program(s), if applicable? Is the program competing well for top students? What help is needed in recruiting?

#### Program Vitality and Resources (use of resources to contribute to the College's mission)

PV1 Provide information about the number of full-time and full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty over the past six years. What is the average faculty teaching load in the department?

[Note: Some of the data required for this section will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research. The program should verify the accuracy of this data, making additions and corrections as necessary.]

PV2 Provide information about enrollments as well as percentage of full-time coverage by section and by student credit hour in the program's courses in the past six years. How do these percentages compare to those of the division and the College?

[Note: Include data such as the number of students, student credit hours, and full-time equivalent students. While this question and the one which follows both concern class size, the two questions have different purposes. The focus of this question is on the relationship between section size and faculty coverage.]

PV3 What are average class sizes by course level (e.g., 100 level, 200 level, and so forth)? Are these class sizes appropriate for the learning aims and pedagogues of the curriculum? How do they compare to those of the division and the College?

[Note: The focus of this question is on the relationship between section size and learning aims. Undergraduate programs should also include average class sizes for core courses, required major courses, and electives, as applicable. Graduate programs should include average class sizes for regular graduate courses and graduate field work/internships, as applicable.]

PV4 Does the program make good use of its resources? Does it efficiently serve the College's mission and meet students' needs?

[Suggestion: Use the data in questions ST1 and PV1 through PV3 to answer these questions. The department should consider whether the resources in its personnel and operating budget, and capital budget, if applicable, are being used to the best advantage in order to meet the department's as well as the College's mission and goals. How such resources are used and whether they could be better used should provide a context for any requests for new personnel, operating, or capital resources. For example, departments should understand the relationship (and sometimes trade-offs) between the College's mission, and enrollments and faculty coverage. Graduate programs should also summarize the relationship between their costs (especially faculty and other personnel and contribution to indirect costs) and revenues (especially tuition and enrollment history, plans, and realistic projections).]

PV5 What aspects of program vitality and resources need to be addressed in the next six years? Does the program have a plan to address these needs?

#### Departmental Support (DS)

DS1 Profile any professional non-faculty staff members who make significant contributions to the program. Describe and evaluate the department's current level and type of technical and office support staff.

DS2 Describe and evaluate the department's facilities and other support services that affect the department's teaching, research, and service programs.

[Suggestion: Include such things as laboratories, data banks, computer centers, computer classrooms, and library resources.]

DS3 Rank order the department's specific and most pressing support needs, if any.

#### Summary

In one page, highlight the most salient points of the self-study. Place emphasis on plans, new directions, and pressing needs. This summary should be the first page of the self-study.

#### Suggested Appendices

- Departmental profile and comparative data provided to the department.
- Mission Statement.
- CVs of all full-time faculty.
- Departmental faculty annual evaluation criteria.
- Departmental tenure and promotion criteria.
- Selected course syllabi.
- Departmental publications or brochures.

#### **Role of the Review Team**

Internal peer review of program reviews is essential for building an academic community that teaches and learns from one another on the many issues raised by program review. The role of the internal review team is similar to the role of external reviewers: to help the department or

program think about its current strengths and challenges with respect to the major areas of the Program Review Guidelines. These areas include the mission, vision, and values statements as well as the strategic plan as they relate to the department, so that the department can set priorities for the future. Good reviews will balance an appreciation of strengths with a recognition of challenges, resisting any temptation to focus exclusively on strengths and making any criticisms constructive. The department, in conversation with the offices of the VPAA and the appropriate dean, determine what to value most highly in the reports of internal (or external) reviewers.

The role of review team is to provide a university-wide perspective external to the department's. One of the team's functions is to assist the program in the latter's preparation of its self-study. As such, the review team should read an early draft of the self-study and provide the program with suggestions for improvement. For example, the review team should consider the following:

- Are the questions in the self-study answered clearly and completely?
- Are data used correctly and appropriately?
- Does the self-study meet Loyola's standard of academic excellence?
- Are the department's goals in AD1 clearly linked to the College's mission, core values, and strategic plan?
- Has the department clearly stated in AD3 the ways in which it contributes to the education of students in other programs?
- Are the "aspiration schools" in AD4 appropriate?
- Are the program's student learning aims/goals in PQ2 stated clearly? Does the department assess these aims/goals and make use of the results, in appropriate ways?
- Are the program's student learning aims/goals for its Core courses in PQ3 stated clearly? Does the department assess these aims/goals and make use of the results, in appropriate ways?

After reading the self-study, the team will meet with the department<sup>8</sup> to discuss the self-study, ask any questions that are pertinent to the review, and share initial impressions. The team will hold follow-up meetings with the department or subsets of it, as the team deems appropriate. In its report, which will be shared with the department and the external consultants, the review team will comment on the department's self-study and will include any recommendations it may have. The review team will meet with the external consultants when the latter visit campus.

---

<sup>8</sup> In the case when the Program Review is limited to one program within a department, the review team may meet with the Program Director and other faculty who teach in the program.

### *Sample Schedule and Activities for the External Consultants' Visit*<sup>9</sup>

The sample schedule below assumes that the consultants will be available for 1½ days, arriving mid-afternoon (approximately 2 PM) the first day and leaving no later than 5 PM the second day.

Prior to the Visit: The department will send the consultants a packet of information, including the self-study, undergraduate and graduate catalogues, College viewbook, the strategic plan, and Loyola's Vision and Values statement.

#### Day 1: Mid-afternoon

- Initial meeting of the consultants (45 minutes)  
The consultants will meet, become acquainted with one another, and share their initial impressions of the self-study.
- Initial meeting with the dean and other administrators, as appropriate (45 minutes)  
The consultants will meet with the appropriate dean, and others, as appropriate for the review. For example, the meeting may include the associate dean.
- Tour of facilities (1 hour)  
The tour should include a general tour of campus as well as departmental space. The latter may include department offices, seminar room, laboratories, classrooms frequently used by the department, and offices of other departments or support services with which the department interacts.

#### Day 1: Evening

- Dinner with members of the department  
This informal meeting provides an opportunity for the department to clarify the purpose of the review process. The consultants may want to provide department members with a short list of structured questions for the interviews on the following day.

#### Day 2: Morning and Early Afternoon (until approximately 2 PM)

- Individual/group interviews with departmental faculty members (30 - 45 minutes each)  
Depending on the size of the department and time constraints the consultants may meet with department members individually or in small groups. Depending on their area(s) of expertise, the consultants may conduct these interviews together or individually.
- Group interview with students (1 hour)  
This might be scheduled as a breakfast or lunch meeting.
- Interview with internal review team (30 - 45 minutes)
- Interviews with other relevant campus representatives (20 minutes to 1 hour)  
Such interviews might include meetings with faculty from related departments.
- Meeting with the department chair (30 - 45 minutes)

#### Day 2: Mid to Late Afternoon (approximately 2 - 5 PM)

- Development of the preliminary oral report (1 hour)  
The consultants will meet to collect their thoughts, discuss their conclusions, and develop a preliminary oral report.

---

<sup>9</sup> This schedule is adapted from "Planning the site visit," by Thomas P. Pusateri, Loras College, distributed at the Best Practices in Assessment Conference, Atlanta, Georgia, September 27-29, 2002.

- Final meeting with the department (1 hour)  
The consultants will provide a preliminary report of the major findings from the review with the department. Ideally the consultants' report will occur in the first half of the meeting; the department will then have an opportunity to respond to and discuss the findings.
- Final meeting with the dean and other administrators, as appropriate (30 minutes - 1 hour)  
The consultants will provide a preliminary report of the major findings. This meeting may precede or follow the meeting with the department.

After the Visit: Within three weeks of their visit the consultants will submit their written report.

### **Improvement of the Academic Program Review Process**

The College is committed to improving the program review process. The current guidelines, version 3.0, have benefited from the comments and suggestions of departments that piloted earlier versions. To ensure that this improvement process continues, the department is asked to briefly address the following:

- Describe the process by which the program completed the review.
- Who are the main authors of the self-study?
- How long did the review take?
- How did the department divide the work?
- How many meetings did the whole department or a subset of the department have to write the self-study?
- What, if any, changes to the guidelines does the program recommend?

The answers should be submitted in a memo separate from the self-study and sent to the offices of the VPAA and the appropriate dean.

**SUPPORT SERVICES REVIEW GUIDELINES  
LOYOLA COLLEGE IN MARYLAND  
2004-2005**

The Strategic Plan calls for the College to assess the quality of services provided to constituencies; to continually improve those services to better meet the needs of students, faculty, and staff; and to better support the College's mission. The purpose of the Support Services Review process is to evaluate the effectiveness, quality, and efficiency of services provided and the degree to which these services are central to the mission of the College. These reviews seek to identify critical functions, services, and processes; internal and external constituencies served; and challenges that impede the attainment of performance objectives. The reviews are also an important tool for identifying services and processes within the College that cross departmental lines so that interdependencies and cross-functional responsibilities can be assessed. Finally, this process is intended to assist units with self-evaluation, problem-solving, strategic planning, and continuous improvement efforts.

For the sake of simplicity, please note that these guidelines refer to the entity under review as a "unit." However, it is important to acknowledge that the "unit" may be a single office, entire department, cross-functional service, or administrative process, depending upon the scope and focus of the review.

**Overview of the Support Services Review Process**

- Like Loyola's Academic Program Reviews, Support Services Reviews will be conducted on a seven-year rotating cycle.
- A **Steering Committee** for Support Services Review has been established to provide oversight for the process. This Steering Committee consists of six members, including one representative each from the divisions of Academic Affairs, Administration, Development, Finance, the President's Office, and Student Development. Members are appointed by their respective Vice Presidents. Serving as the seventh member, the Director of Institutional Research coordinates the work of the committee and provides administrative support for the review process.
- Well in advance of the beginning of each academic year, the units undergoing review will be identified by the Vice Presidents. A self-study will be completed by each unit that should, at a minimum, address the topics outlined in these guidelines. In consultation with the Vice President and/or supervisor of the division, the director (or appointed designee) of each unit will have responsibility for carrying out the self-study with fellow staff members and other colleagues whom he or she chooses to involve. Units may also choose to involve external consultants or reviewers (e.g., a colleague from a similar functional area at another college or university). At the end of the self-study process, a culminating **Self-Study Report** should be prepared, not to exceed ten pages in length single-spaced.

- In consultation with the unit under review, the Steering Committee will appoint a three-member **Unit Review Team**, which will include an individual from the unit under review (who was not in charge of the self-study) and two members from a department or unit that is directly affected by the process or service being reviewed. A student may be included as a fourth member of the Unit Review Team when appropriate.
- The Unit Review Team will read the Self-Study Report and conduct interviews with constituents and participants of the process or service under review. The goal of this step of the process is to clarify, enhance, substantiate, and respond to the Self-Study Report and its recommendations. The Unit Review Team will then compose a preliminary **Unit Review Report**, not to exceed three pages in length single-spaced. This report will summarize the review process and outcomes, analyze the strengths and weaknesses identified through the review, provide additional observations and recommendations, and examine any barriers or challenges the unit may face in implementing proposed changes.
- Once completed, the Unit Review Report will be shared with the unit under review to allow time for questions, comments, and input. The Unit Review Team will then finalize the Unit Review Report to incorporate feedback and reactions from the unit under review.
- The Steering Committee will review the Self-Study Report and Unit Response Report and may ask for a more detailed analysis of specific points if necessary. All reports will be submitted to the President and Vice Presidents.
- The President, in consultation with the Executive Council, will make final decisions on recommendations that are to be implemented.

### **Timeline of a Typical Review Cycle**

We anticipate that the typical Support Services Review will take approximately three to six months. Units participating in the review process are free to determine their own schedules based on their workflow during various times of the year. While some units may choose a review cycle to correspond with the beginning of a semester or academic year, others may want to conduct their reviews over the summer. The following is suggested as a “typical” timetable for a review:

#### **Months One & Two**

Units meet with the Director of Institutional Research and their divisional representative on the Steering Committee to plan for the review and seek clarification when necessary. The unit works on its self-study using the suggested guidelines in this document. It may choose to collect data and information via surveys, focus groups, interviews, benchmark comparisons, and other methods deemed appropriate. At some point, it may decide to send a draft of the report to the Steering Committee for preliminary feedback.

## **Month Two**

Unit Review Team is named.

## **Month Three**

Self-Study Report is sent to the Unit Review Team. Unit Review Team reads the Self-Study Report, meets with constituents of the process or service under review, and prepares a written response (Unit Review Report).

## **Month Four**

Unit Review Team provides its preliminary Unit Review Report to the unit under review. The unit provides feedback and comments to the Unit Review Team for incorporation into its final report. The Self-Study Report and final Unit Review Report are forwarded to the Steering Committee and to the appropriate Vice Presidents. The director of the unit under review meets with his or her Vice President to discuss the outcomes of the review process and recommendations for action.

## **Guidelines for Preparing the Self-Study Report**

At a minimum, the Self-Study Report should address the topics that are described in this section. The College's self-study review indicators are organized along the following six dimensions:

- A. Mission and Purpose
- B. Responsibilities, Functions, and Services
- C. Staffing and Resources
- D. Assessment of Quality
- E. Self-Study Findings
- F. Outcomes and Strategies for Change

If units already have assessment or review standards in place that have been established by external professional organizations (e.g., Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education ["CAS Standards"] for student affairs, APA accreditation standards for the Counseling Center, etc.), they are encouraged to use these criteria to shape the self-study and review process. However, the College's self-study review indicators should be addressed in the final Self-Study Report if they are not directly addressed by the external standards.

### **A. Mission and Purpose**

- A.1. Describe the mission, goals, and purpose of the unit.
- A.2. Describe the relationship of the unit to the mission of the College and the Strategic Plan.

**B. Responsibilities, Functions, and Services**

- B.1. Identify the major services provided by the unit. Who are its primary stakeholders and constituencies?
- B.2. Describe the relationship between the unit and other units on campus. How is work coordinated among the units? Are there areas where consolidation or streamlining could occur?
- B.3. Discuss the unit's history over the past six years (or since its last formal review). In what ways have its goals, activities, and responsibilities changed over this time period?

**C. Staffing and Resources**

- C.1. Describe the unit's staffing, including brief position descriptions. Summarize any significant changes (including increases, decreases, and turnover) over the past six years and discuss services affected by them.
- C.2. Describe the unit's fiscal resources, including budgetary data. Summarize any significant changes over the past six years and discuss services affected by them.
- C.3. If applicable, describe adequacy of other resources (e.g., technology, space allocation, professional development opportunities, etc.) to support the unit in fulfilling its mission.
- C.4. Describe any recent changes in efficiency and effectiveness within the unit. Could further efficiencies be achieved without decreasing effectiveness?

**D. Assessment of Quality**

- D.1. Describe the kinds of assessment data that are regularly collected to provide feedback to the unit on the achievement of its objectives and the satisfaction of its stakeholders and constituencies.
- D.2. Describe how assessment data are currently used or can be used to improve the unit.
- D.3. If available, provide evidence of the effectiveness of unit's performance compared to norms or benchmarks established by external associations/ organizations or compared to other units that perform similar functions.

**E. Self-Study Findings**

- E.1. Examine and discuss areas of strengths identified by internal and external sources (internal staff, staff outside the unit, faculty, students, consultants, etc.).
- E.2. Examine and discuss areas of weakness identified by internal and external sources.
- E.3. Examine and discuss any significant opportunities identified by internal and external sources.
- E.4. Examine and discuss any significant threats, challenges, or barriers identified by internal and external sources.
- E.5. Examine and discuss recommendations identified by internal and external sources to improve the unit's services.

**F. Outcomes and Strategies for Change**

- F.1. Based on the self-study findings, what areas should be addressed over the next six years to improve the quality of the unit and its services? What is the unit's plan for prioritizing, implementing, and monitoring these recommendations?
- F.2. Describe any barriers, limitations, or challenges that may impede the success of the proposed changes or recommendations.
- F.3. Describe any other anticipated future needs, changes, or plans for the unit (both short-term and long-term). How do these plans relate to the changing needs of the College?

## **Undergraduate Educational Aims of Loyola College**

### **1. Intellectual Excellence**

- a. appreciation of and passion for intellectual endeavor and the life of the mind
- b. appreciation of and grounding in the liberal arts and sciences
- c. excellence in a discipline, including understanding of the relationship between one's discipline and other disciplines; understanding the interconnectedness of all knowledge
- d. habits of intellectual curiosity, honesty, humility, and persistence

### **2. Critical Understanding: Thinking, Reading, and Analyzing**

- a. the ability to evaluate a claim based on documentation, plausibility, and logical coherence
- b. the ability to analyze and solve problems using appropriate tools
- c. the ability to make sound judgments in complex and changing environments
- d. freedom from narrow, solipsistic, or parochial thinking
- e. the ability to use mathematical concepts and procedures competently, and to evaluate claims made in numeric terms
- f. the ability to find and assess data about a given topic using general repositories of information, both printed and electronic
- g. the ability to use information technology in research and problem solving, with an appreciation of its advantages and limitations

### **3. Eloquentia Perfecta**

- a. the ability to use speech and writing effectively, logically, gracefully, persuasively, and responsibly
- b. critical understanding of and competence in a broad range of communications media
- c. competence in a language other than one's own

### **4. Aesthetics**

- a. an appreciation of beauty, both natural and man-made
- b. a cultivated response to the arts, and the ability to express oneself about aesthetic experience

### **5. Leadership**

- a. an understanding of one's strengths and capabilities as a leader and the responsibility one has to use leadership strengths for the common good
- b. a willingness to act as an agent for positive change, informed by a sense of responsibility to the larger community

## **6. Faith and Mission**

- a. an understanding of the mission of the Catholic university as an institution dedicated to exploring the intersection of faith and reason, and experience and competence in exploring that intersection
- b. an understanding of the mission of the Society of Jesus and of the religious sisters of Mercy, especially of what it means to teach, learn, lead, and serve "for the greater glory of God."
- c. a habit of thoughtful, prayerful, and responsible discernment of the voice of God in daily life; a mature faith
- d. habits of reflection in solitude and in community
- e. a commitment to put faith into action

## **7. Promotion of Justice**

- a. an appreciation of the great moral issues of our time: the sanctity of human life, poverty, racism, genocide, war and peace, religious tolerance and intolerance, the defense of human rights, and the environmental impact of human activity
- b. commitment to promote justice for all, based on a respect for the dignity and sanctity of human life
- c. commitment to and solidarity with persons who are materially poor or otherwise disadvantaged

## **8. Diversity**

- a. recognition of the inherent value and dignity of each person, and therefore an awareness of, sensitivity toward, and respect for the differences of race, gender, ethnicity, national origin, culture, sexual orientation, religion, age, and disabilities
- b. awareness of the structural sources, consequences, and responsibilities of privilege
- c. awareness of the global context of citizenship and an informed sensitivity to the experiences of peoples outside of the United States
- d. awareness of the multiplicity of perspectives that bear on the human experience, and the importance of historical, global and cultural context in determining the way we see the world

## **9. Wellness**

- a. attentiveness to development of the whole person--mind, body, and spirit
- b. ability to balance and integrate care for self and care for others
- c. understanding the importance of productive and responsible use of leisure time
- d. freedom from addictive behaviors

Approved by the Academic Senate on April 8, 2003

## Graduate Learning Goals

**The Goals are intended to provide a framework within which different graduate programs will develop discipline-specific goals. These goals embrace the core values and principles inherent in the mission of the College.**

*Graduates of Loyola College should:*

*Master Knowledge and Skills:*

1. Master the skills, methods and knowledge appropriate to the discipline.
2. Synthesize knowledge using interdisciplinary approaches.
3. Acquire the tools to continue professional development and life-long learning.

*Think Critically:*

4. Access, analyze and evaluate information effectively.
5. Disseminate and communicate information effectively.

*Manifest Leadership and Social Responsibility in the Workplace and Community:*

6. Understand and value individual differences and have the skills for working effectively in a diverse and changing world.
7. Comprehend the ethical principles appropriate to the discipline, have the ability to identify ethical dilemmas, and understand the frameworks for selecting and defending a right course of action.
8. Contribute professionally and personally to the broader community.
9. Consider issues of justice in making decisions.