

3/1/2016

1 - Mission

educational charism. Examples include the following:

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

Examples of mission principles manifesting in the curricula of various colleges/schools/ centers, include the following: the [College of Arts and Sciences](#), the [John Cook School of Business](#), and the [Center for Interprofessional Education and Research](#). Additionally, our [School of Medicine](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SLU-Profile_2016

SOM-Curriculum-Overview_screenshot

STARS-Rating_screenshot

Strategic-Planning-Process_screenshot

Student-Development-Annual-Report_2013-2014

Student-Development-Staff_screenshot

Student-Educational-Services-Home_screenshot

Undergraduate-Student-Learning-Outcomes_screenshot

1.B - Core Component 1.B

The mission is articulated publicly.

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

Argument

1.B.1.

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

mpus, our Madrid campus does a thorough job of ensuring our mission is fully represented and understood:

[English and Spanish.](#)

The mission statement is posted around campus, in handbooks, and is referenced in all of

Orientations to the campus involve a section on mission, which F6 12 .i25 is refer

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

Shared Values for the Common Good: In our aspirations to realize the University's mission, we celebrate a shared set of values that support the common good. These values, referred to as the "5Cs"--competence, conscience, compassion, commitment, and community--also frame the annual performance evaluation tool for all University staff.

Oath of Inclusion: Originated by the Student Government Association, students pledge to

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

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

In pursuit of our mission, we foster the sort of academic environment that bonds university resources with local, national, and international communities. Through collaborative efforts, we search for answers; transmit, integrate, and apply knowledge; address vexing problems; extend compassionate care;

1.C.2

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

1.D - Core Component 1.D

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

Argument

1.D.1.

SLU asks that all of us students, faculty, staff and alumni respond to this call to serve others in our community, especially the most poor and marginalized. Through this service, we then can grow closer to each other in a spirit of s

of our work to achieve this:

Over 1.6 million hours of service are provided to the community each year by SLU students, faculty, and staff.

[80% of SLU students are involved](#) with some form of community service each year nearly three times the national average for college students nationwide.

A [2012 economic impact study](#) showed that SLU is the largest single developer in the Midtown area, with more than \$850 million in campus improvements, enhancements and expansions during the past 25 years.

[72% of community organizations with which the University works](#) said that SLU was

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

Ranked for five consecutive years by the *Washington Monthly* as the No. 4 school in the [2015 College](#)

[Guide](#)

SLU currently has both an [Assistant Vice-President for Community Relations](#) and a [Director of Governmental Relations](#). These entities serve as liaisons among the various community organizations, businesses, elected officials and government agencies with which SLU regularly interacts.

In 2013, the Schools of Public Health and Social Work combined for a more effective way to address societal issues, forming the [College for Public Health and Social Justice](#).

services to those most affected by the complex factors that undermine health and welfare.

The Medical Center Campus assists with the operations of

Pestello-Named-President_3-21-14

Presidents-Higher-Education-Community-Service-Honor-Roll_screenshot_2015

Prison-Program-Home-Page_screenshot

Shared-Vision_screenshot

SLU-Charter-School-Report

SLU-Community-Organization-Survey_2014

SLU-Rankings-and-

2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

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

2.A - Core Component 2.A

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

Argument

Faculty Manual, which governs the Univer
undergoing [revision](#). Madrid campus faculty are developing their own manual, which will articulate academic policies that are in alignment with the national charter for private universities in Spain.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In February 2016, President Pestello announced a new initiative known as [Cura](#) (the Latin word *cura personalis*" or a deep "care of the person."

that contributed to the new strategic plan. *Cura* is intended to foster a more supportive and collaborative work environment and, like the *Magis* Operational Excellence Program, specifically addresses *Magis*

standards:

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

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

Its

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

As a member of the Division I Atlantic 10 SLU is also committed to full compliance with regulations governing our student athletes and their athletic programs; that commitment is reflected in both an absence of NCAA sanctions and the operational guidance provided by the

Chaiftez-Arena_Pollstar-Rankings
Compliance-Newsletters_screenshot
Confidential-Grievance-Incident-Report_8-28-2014
Consolidated-Financial-Statements-and-Independent-Auditors-Reports_FY14-FY15
CURA-Announcement-President_2-1-16
Daily-Crime-Log_screenshot
Equal-Opportunity-Affirmative-Action-Policy_screenshot
Faculty-Manual-Amendment-Proposals_2-23-16
Faculty-Manual_Current
Graduate-Academic-Definitions-Policy-Draft-2-11-16
Graduate-Policy-Changes_FY15
HIPAA-resources_screenshot
HIPAA-training_screenshot
HR-Hiring-for-Mission-Statement_screenshot

2.B - Core Component 2.B

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

Argument

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

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

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

In January 2015, a major redesign of the SLU website was launched and a detailed implementation [timeline](#) announced. When completed in 2016, this initiative will refresh one of

of review. This effort will help identify information that is outdated or in conflict so corrections and changes can be made. A concurrent undertaking is the [renewed branding](#) of the University [-de-lis](#) and logo, and the Billiken (mascot) symbol the first such changes in 20 years. The invigorated website and institutional symbols

o students, control, and accreditation relationships, as well as that for other important topics, can readily be found and accessed on the University website as follows:

Programs and Requirements

provide convenient access to information about academic programs. The [Majors & Programs](#) link in the footer leads potential and current students alike to launch pages for undergraduate, graduate and professional, and adult education majors and programs under which more detailed information is provided. The page for each undergraduate major (e.g., [English undergraduate](#)

Accreditation Relationships

The Office of Academic Affairs maintains an [accreditation log](#) of college, school, and program external accreditation relationships and status. This supplements the accreditation information programs.

Other Key Information

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

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

[Annual Security and Fire Safety Report](#) Compliant with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act

[Gainful Employment Disclosures](#) Compliant per 34 C.F.R. §668 with public disclosure of specific data regarding all academic programs designated as "Gainful Employment"

(T)3(ube)lsiniit)-4(f1 00g 897.96f)JTJc)- s per

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

[strategic planning process](#), initiated by President Pestello in his first semester in office. As detailed in 1.A. and 5.C.3., this process was characterized from the very start by transparency and extensive input from all institutional constituents a level of collaboration beyond that of any in recent institutional memory and one that is especially significant for its largely bottom-up approach. Early in the process, a session of the full Board meeting on February 28, 2015, was

Each year, the vice president and general counsel, who also serves as secretary of the University, distributes to each trustee a packet containing the [Board Conflict of Interest Policy](#), the [Conflict](#)

Board-New-Trustee-Handbook_2015

Board-New-Trustee-Orientation-Accreditation_2015

Board-New-Trustee-Orientation-Selected-Governance-Articles_2015

Board-New-Trustee-Orientation-Statements-Minutes_FY2015

Board-New-Trustee-Orientation-University-Information_2015

Magis_Sept-2015

Pestello-Named-President_3-21-14

Strategic-Planning-Process_screenshot

University-Bylaws_Current

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

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

While *The Faculty Manual*

thought, of discussion, and of action tha

University policies and provisions support freedom of inquiry for students. The [Student Handbook](#) references academic freedom in these contexts: (a) information technology; (b) harassment; acts of hate, bias, or other acts of intolerance; and (c) the [Performance, Presentation and Speaker \(Program\) Policy](#). The latter policy, with its related procedures, attempts to strike a

Two recent student-organized events illustrate the tension that sometimes arises when dealing with especially contentious subjects:

-run Saint Louis University Public Law

The St. Louis County prosecuting attorney in the case of the 2014 shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson had been invited as a featured speaker. Because of controversy over his handling of aspects of the grand jury process in this case, there were calls for him to be disinvited and even for the symposium to be cancelled. [President](#) to the University community about this conflict

inquiry and expression in a learning environment.

of Law Students for Reproductive Justice planned to host a forum at the law school to discuss the national organization and the prevailing Missouri legal climate confronting it. Following discussions with senior University officials, including the president, the student group convened its event, but at an off-campus site. 0 0 1 108.02 252.98 Tm[stud95BDC BT1 0 (

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

Sources

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

2.E - Core Component 2.E

application of knowledge by its faculty, students and staff.

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

Argument

2.E.1.

president for research who reports directly to the provost.

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

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

Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) In adherence with its [Policy for Responsible Conduct](#)

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

Students in the College for Public Health and Social Justice are required to complete an [Academic Integrity Module](#) that includes components about appropriate source citation, plagiarism, and the relationship of copyright to plagiarism.

Graduate students and post-docs (and faculty) involved in research funded by the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation may choose to attend a [copyright session](#) focusing on research and publishing applications presented by SLU library faculty as part of the Office of Research Responsible Conduct of Research workshop series. A similar presentation focused on teaching applications is scheduled for presentation in Spring 2016 under the sponsorship of the Reinert Center for the Transformation of Teaching and Learning.

SLU library faculty frequently provide guidance about public performance rights to students (as well as faculty and staff) who wish to show films owned by the SLU libraries at University events outside the classroom.

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

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

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

[Teaching](#) This text establishes the expectation that faculty are obligated to know and follow the academic policies and procedures in effect at all levels of the institution.

[Research and Scholarly Activity](#) This text identifies actions and behaviors that faculty

[Research Integrity Policy](#) and
procedures, but states the expectation that SLU personnel are expected to comply with

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

2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

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

SLU does not relegate off-campus or online programming to a distinct academic unit of the University, opting instead to embed any such programming within existing academic units to

UAAC-Bylaws

UAAC-Roster_2015-2016

UAAC-Undergraduate-Program-Proposal-Form

Undergraduate-Student-Learning-Outcomes_screenshot

3.B - Core Component 3.B

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

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

Argument

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

Saint Louis University does not currently have a University-wide undergraduate general education program. Instead, each college/school establishes its own set of general education requirements that are appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the schools, such as the [College of Arts and Sciences](#), [Parks College of Engineering, Aviation, and Technology](#), and the [School for Professional Studies](#)

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

Sources

- x Academic-Program-Review-Home-Page_screenshot
- x Academic-Program-Review-Manual

~~x Academic-Program-Review-Manual~~

3.C - Core Component 3.C

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

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic

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

Sources

1818-Advanced-College-Credit-Program-Home-Page_screenshot
1818-New-Instructor-Applicants_screenshot
Academic-Program-Review-Council-Roster_2015
Assessment-Academic-Affairs_screenshot
CAS-Academic-Advising-Staff_screenshot
CAS-Annual-Faculty-Review
CAS-Graduate-Faculty-Appointment-Procedures
CPHSJ-Student-Organizations_screenshot
Faculty-Manual_Current
Full-Time-Faculty_9-28-15
GAAC-Bylaws
GAAC-Roster
HR-SkillSoft-Online-Learning_screenshot
New-Adjunct-Faculty-Checklist
New-Full-Time-Faculty-Checklist
NSSE-Quality-of-Interactions-Data_2013_2014
Office-of-Research-Services-Home-Page_screenshot
Reinert-Center-Annual-Report_2014-2015
Reinert-Center-CUTS_screenshot
Reinert-Center-Home-Page_screenshot
Reinert-Center-Programs-and-Services_screenshot
Reinert-Center-Staff_screenshot
Sabbatical-Leave-Proposal_Guidelines_screenshot
Senior-Legacy-Program_2015
SLU-Profile-2016

3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to e3BDdrthe

campus for these orientations, or their participation may be facilitated through online technologies. Undergraduate students begin to make their transition to University life at SLU 101, a summer orientation program all undergraduate students are expected to attend. At SLU 101, students learn about support services, academic expectations, and meet individually with their advisors. While students will review requirements if they have declared a major, or take

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

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

To assist in their transition to St. Louis, as well as Saint Louis University, international students are placed in a peer-mentoring program called [International Ambassadors](#). International students also have the opportunity to be a part of the

Physical space in the

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

3.D.5.

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

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

3.E - Core Component 3.E

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

1. Co-educational experience of its students.
2. The institution demonstrates educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Argument

3.E.1

Co-curricular programs and activities are central to fulfillment of the Mission of Saint Louis

cura personalis

intellectual, spiritual, emotional, professional, and emotional development beyond what can be accomplished within the parameters of academic coursework. While certainly more prominent at

Student-Involvement-Center-Home-Page_screenshot

4 - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

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

4.A - Core Component 4.A

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

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

Argument

4.A.1.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The list of programs undergoing APR in the 2015

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

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

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

An annual budget for various forms of support for the APR process including funds for external reviewers serving as consultants in most reviews has been established in the Office of the Provost. Additionally, a .5 FTE Assistant to the Provost position was established to oversee

4.A.3.

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

A comprehensive evaluation of 100-level transfer credit policies began in 2014-2015, as a sub-committee of the Undergraduate Academic Affairs Committee (UAAC) began deliberating existing policies. It is expected that a comprehensive set of new draft policies will be presented.

Authority over courses – their creation/deletion, prerequisites, rigor, learning outcomes and assessment plans, learning resources – is granted first to the faculty and their respective departments but, ultimately, to the overarching faculty governance bodies of their respective

academic unit), courses are proposed by academic departments and ultimately approved by the Council, whose [bylaws](#) formally codify and empower the Council. The Faculty Council requires each newly-proposed course to be vetted and approved by the Council, and per [Course Approval Form](#). The form requires descriptions of the course objectives and student learning outcomes/goals, primary modes of assessment of student learning, and the skills/knowledge being assessed. Similar forms [es/schools/centers](#), although processes and expectations are not identical across all academic units.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Institutions must ensure that dual credit assignments and grading criteria are identical to, or are of comparable design, quality, and rigor to the equivalent campus-based course.

Elements of the dual credit course to be approved by the on-campus college faculty in the appropriate academic discipline include the syllabus, textbook(s), teaching methodology, and student assessment strategies.

Accordingly, and consistent [quality and rigor of all 1818 Advanced College Credit Program](#) courses are closely governed by 1818 Program faculty liaisons in each of the academic units responsible for each course as well as by 1818 Program leadership; c

Necessary faculty qualifications for all SLU faculty, including those employed via our 1818 Program

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

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

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

4.A.6.

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

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

certification exams. For example, the Department of Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy provides prospective and current students detailed [data on national certification and licensure pass rates for their program graduates](#); so, too, do the [Medical Laboratory Science](#) program, the [Physical Therapy program](#) -
Professional Health Studies reports on its [website](#) that, typically, 75%-85% of SLU students who apply to medical school are admitted, with 60% being admitted on their first application. Nearly accreditation data.

Sources

SLU Academic Program Review AT Program Goals, Action Items and Timeline -
DRAFT 9-4-15

SLU-Libraries-Home-Page_screenshot

melne

4.B - Core Component 4.B

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

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for

With the Outcomes approved, [rubrics](#) for measuring the Outcomes were then developed byS

outcomes; it is certainly possible that students could evidence their achievement of these academic and college/university outcomes dealing with disciplinary knowledge, communication skills, and critical evaluation skills.

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

SLU could turn to gathering artifacts of student learning directly from faculty teaching upper-level courses across the curriculum. Such a method has many advantages, and would dramatically increase the number of artifacts collected to review against our established rubrics and outcomes. However, in doing so SLU would likely lose t educational development, as we would not have enough artifacts from any one student to

commitment to whole student development in the Jesuit tradition. But with such a small-scale assessment effort at this point, we may need to make some sacrifices in method for practicality, at least until curriculum or other changes foster expansion of the current version of the program.

A decision was made to more fully develop the undergraduate learning outcomes and assessment program before beginning to develop outcomes at the graduate level. Accordingly, development -Wide Graduate Student Learning Outcomes, a project of the Graduate Academic Affairs Committee (GAAC), did not begin until Fall 2015. The [current draft of those outcomes](#)

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

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

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

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

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

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

While notable progress has been made to improve program-level assessment, and to make it expectations and those of the HLC. The future of these efforts looks bright, however, as the institution has committed significant resources to advance assessment. Additionally, several of

what can and should be done at SLU to improve assessment and its impact on meaningful

which requires detailed reporting on student learning assessment and its impact on program improvement, is ensuring that assessment of student learning is fundamentally part of all analysis of program quality.

Core Curriculum Assessment

Each year since 2013, the University Assessment Coordinator in Academic Affairs has provided funding for groups of faculty and program leaders to attend the Assessment Institute in Indianapolis. This conference is well-established as a productive resource for helping foster conversations and better practices in assessment of student learning. The University Assessment Coordinator attends the conference with the group and facilitates conversations regarding the

in assessment conversations. It has also been a useful resource for sharing assessment experiences and strategies with SLU colleagues who may not otherwise have a chance to collaborate during their regular duties. To date, nearly a dozen faculty and staff from across the campus have attended the Assessment Institute.

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

Sources

Assessment-Participants

Graduate-SLOs-DRAMtETBT1 0 0 1 228.41 386.81 Tm[)IT(71 90.0241)-3(e)-5(nt C)-4(oET386.81 Tm

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

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

Utilizing an internally-defined student cohort (which, unlike the cohort we report annually to IPEDS, excludes non-traditional students from our School for Professional Studies and students

follows:

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

Institution	Avg. ACT Comp	1st-2nd Year Retention Rate	4-Year Grad Rate	6-Year Grad Rate
Marquette University	27.5	89%	59%	79%
Loyola University (IL)	27.5	86%	65%	73%
Fordham University	28	89%	75%	80%
University of Dayton	26.5	91%	59%	

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

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

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

Additional OIR research on [retention and student satisfaction](#) highlights the most important factors for retaining undergraduate students and ensuring that they are satisfied with their experiences at SLU. Results from a [retention study of the Fall 2009 cohort](#) demonstrate that academic performance at SLU is the most important predictor of freshman retention, and that student satisfaction and social integration together comprise the second most important predictor.

GPA, ACT scores, financial situations, and other factors.

The importance of student satisfaction for retention motivated additional research to identify the most important influencers of overall satisfaction with SLU. Results indicate that social integration, learning, and faculty support are most important for undergraduate student satisfaction; student GPAs, race/ethnicity, gender, ACT scores, and concerns about the costs of

rise, there is an understandable connection made between cost and retention/graduation rates; however, having solid data indicating that financial concerns are not strongly associated with

administered to students 3-5 weeks into the fall semester. The second survey, the check-in survey, is administered in weeks 10-12 of the fall semester. A third survey is administered 3-5

4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary

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

Summary

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

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

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

Sources

There are no sources.

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

5.A - Core Component 5.A

maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

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

Argument

5.A.1.

Consolidated Financial Statements for FY2015 and FY2014 show that, in FY2015, SLU earned approximately \$746M in operating revenues and other support; total operating expenses were about \$740M, leaving a net operating surplus of approximately \$6M.

together were approximately \$2.0B.

Primary Reserve CFI	1.20	1.20	1.20
--------------------------------	------	------	------

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

the University to an historic partnership with SSM Health, a major local and national health care and hospital system. Effective September 1, 2016, the deal involved SLU re-acquiring Saint Louis University Hospital from Tenet Health Care (to which SLU had sold the hospital in the 1998), and then contributing the facility to SSM Health in exchange for a minority financial interest and governance rights in SSM Health St. Louis. Additionally, SSM committed \$500M to building a [new hospital](#) near the current facility on South Grand Blvd. The new hospital, coupled

Sources

2014-2015_HLC-Institutional-Annual-Update-Final_4-2-2015
2020-Information-Technology-Vision-and-Priorities
Facilities-Services-FY15-Sustainabilit(-)] 0 0 18

5.B - Core Component 5.B

support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

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

Argument

5.B.1.

orientation to the Board

General Counsel (who also serves as Board Secretary). The [most recent orientation session](#), held in August 2015, included an institutional overview, an introduction to Board membership, information on Board governance initiatives, and overviews of University operations by the Provost and Vice Presidents. A [compilation of key documents](#) distributed prior to this meeting provided additional support and context.

Saint Louis University became an institutional member of the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) in FY2015. The importance SLU attributes to AGB best practices is reflected in the attention given these AGB statements during the Fall 2015 orientation session: [Fiduciary Duties of Governing Board Members](#), [Board Responsibility for the Oversight of Educational Quality](#),

. The orientation session and supporting documents not only provide new members with detailed insight specific to the U including those related to the SSM Health Saint Louis University Hospital but place this information in the context of contemporary higher education.

for ongoing professional development programming for trustees about general higher education issues as well as those of particular concern to S407LU.(y)202m9(e)4(r e)7mplrd erac408005200517be,28 0 186 Tm(c)4(u0Tf2i5(mb a)70mue)4cD

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

As noted in Criterion 5.A.5., annual institutional budgets, as well as tuition rates, must be approved by the Board. All matters pertaining to major capital expenditures (such as the \$115M project to construct two new residence halls on the St. Louis campus as noted in Criterion 5.A.1.), and all projects requiring SLU to issue debt for the financing of such projects, greatly

Committee

progress toward investment objectives and performance of investment funds.

5.B.2.

Governance at SLU is distributed across various levels of hierarchy and type. A commitment to shared governance undergirds both formal and informal decision-making, although in different ways and to different extents across academic and administrative unit~~555~~(unitnt)553(jin)4(t a t)-3(va)levelant

each college/school/center and below the CADD. demonstrate the inclusivity of its membership, particularly with reference to key representatives from Student Development.

Like UAAC, the [Graduate Academic Affairs Committee \(GAAC\)](#) graduate level. commitment to subsidiarity and shared academic governance.

It is generally understood throughout the institution that matters requiring the highest level of University-wide perspective and deliberation particularly University-level policies and budgets are formally addressed by the PCC, which meets monthly. The Executive Staff Committee meets weekly, and feeds many of its recommendations to the PCC. Both groups clearly allow for constituent participation and facilitate decision-

ately extended the reach of shared input into institutional governance. The nearly 100-member PAC, which includes significant representation of faculty, staff, students, and academic and administrative leadership, has already played a significant role in influencing institutional action regarding budget and expense reduction initiatives (as discussed in Criterion 5.C.4.). Results from a [Summer 2015 survey of PAC members](#) evidenced overwhelming support for the PAC and how it was operated.

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

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

The [Faculty Manual](#) outlines the genBT1 0 0 1 7v,-14(64004me432.55 TmF1 1 1, 1 1, ()JTJETBT/F2JETBT1 0

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

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

Department of Education; from the perspective of the Spanish government, the campus is a private university operating in Spain and, therefore, is required to follow Spanish labor laws

areas that are articulated in the University Faculty Manual or regulated by United States federal or state laws. Accordingly, the faculty at the Madrid campus are not governed by the University Faculty Manual. Rather, along with administrative staff, they are bound to nationally-mandated employment agreements, the

Sources

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

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

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

Argument

5.C.1.

The University allocates its resources in a manner consistent with its multi-faceted corporate purposes of teaching, research, service, and health care – each of which is a corporate expression similar in size, educational scope, and mission.

According to data from the National Center for Education Statistics (see Table 5C1.1, below), in FY2014 Saint Louis University expended approximately \$240 million in the IPEDS-defined

Chicago (\$175M), Marquette University (\$115M), and Fordham University (\$209). In terms of

approximately \$5M in this IPEDS category. (Note: Comparative data on health care-related expenditures is not available via NCES.)

Table 5C1.1

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

As detailed in
expenditures of \$739,726,000 were distributed by functional category as follows:

Table 5C1.2

Expenditure Category	Amount
-----------------------------	---------------

at multiple levels was addressed in detail in Criterion 5.A.5. Additionally, academic planning at the University level includes the Provo director develop strategic, three-year hiring plans that required unit leaders to work with faculty and department chairs across their units to prioritize and collaborate on their hiring plans. At the college/school/center level, no single planning mechanism is employed uniformly throughout those units, although participatory, collaborative planning is becoming both far more expected example of University strategic planning to thank, as that highly-participatory process across all levels and types of faculty, staff, students, trustees, and community members now greatly impacts those conducting unit-level planning throughout the organization.

The new University Strategic Plan stands as the most striking example of planning that encompasses and engages the institution as a whole

financial health, President Pestello and CFO David Heimburger recommended to the Board of Trustees an increase in the Board-designated endowment spend rate from 4.5% to 5.0%. The Board approved the increase for a three-year period. While many at the University hoped for a greater increase to offset the need for other budget cutting proposals, the recommendation for a

s as needed.

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

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

institutional financial concern, one accentuated by several years of limited annual salary

faculty, the University engaged Mercer, a human resources consulting group, to conduct both a [Salary Benchmarking Study](#) (which compares SLU salaries to those of peer institutions) and an internal equity study (focused on highlighting issues of inequity

internal equity study have not been finalized, data from the market equity study indicate that a significant number of SLU faculty are paid below the median salaries of the benchmark schools. More specifically, to ensure that, minimally, all SLU faculty had salaries at least equivalent to the 25% percentile of salaries at the benchmark institutions would require an investment of approximately \$7.7M in base salary and fringe benefits funding; to ensure that all SLU faculty had salaries at 50% of the market, the investment would be nearly \$15.8 million in annual personnel funding. Accounting for such additional funding of salaries and benefits in upcoming annual budgets has been a significant challenge, one to be addressed both by institutional leadership and by the consultants assisting with the Magis Operational Excellence initiative.

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

Sources

Additional-Evidence-on-Expenditures-Aligned-with-Mission
FY2015-and-FY2014_Consolidated-Financial-Statements-and-Independent-Auditor's-
Report
President-Pestello-Email

5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

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

Argument

5.D.1.

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

Academic Affairs

Generally, the University collects and distributes significant amounts of data to institutional constituencies. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) is a central player in both generating and sharing such data to inform assessment and decision-making efforts. OIR regularly publishes [Census Reports](#) that include evidence of performance at the University-level, as well as by specific academic programs, departments, and colleges/schools/centers in terms of [Annual Fact Books](#) also

financial performance. OIR staff are also integral to the Strategic Enrollment Management Research and Reporting Council, whose [Annual Report](#) demonstrates the breadth of data and performance information available for institutional use.

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

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

Business and Finance

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

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

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

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

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

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

Two recent University-level efforts demonstrate this new commitment to analyze institutional operational performance holistically. First is the adoption of a new institutional [Strategic Plan](#) in

need for the entire University to focus its collective efforts on a [shared vision for strategic change](#). In Spring 2016 the University community will engage in a process to develop specific, measurable performance targets for each of major the Strategic Plan objectives, as well as assessment plans that require the analysis of collected performance data and recommendations for improvement based on that analysis.

A second recent University-level effort to document and analyze key performance data is the initiative to implement an interactive, dynamic University Performance Dashboard (UPD). Fleeting notions of implementing a true dashboard system over the past decade were not uncommon; however, at any given time either the institutional will or the resources required were not sufficient. Upon her arrival in Summer 2015, Provost Brickhouse began discussions with the President and other vice presidents about such a system, and by late Fall 2015 a template and [mock-up](#) version had been developed. An external vendor has been contracted to

Examples of solid assessment work

